

DECONSTRUCTING TIME/SPACE FOR RECONSTRUCTING DRAMA AND DREAM VS UTOPIA AND HETEROTOPIA

Yasin Aktay*

Modernisation has been characterised by the radical changes in the human experience of time and space. There has occurred almost a convention among the sociologists about the changes in both the human notion of time/space and in their actual interrelationships with each other. The process of modernisation is accomplished through a radical change in the interrelationships between time and space. In this article, we will initially try to review the views of the masters of sociology in their sociological conceptions on modernisation. The aim of this descriptive review is to indicate the value labelling nature of the time/space dualism.

This article tries to show that this hierarchical dualism is elaborated in various ways by all classical sociologists, such as Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Parsons etc., in behalf of time which is equated to dynamism, change, evolution, development etc., and against space which, on the contrary, is equated to stagnation, stability etc. This hierarchical dualism is elaborated through the evolutionist discourse of modernity in association with some other ideological values of modernity. Actually, the vocabulary associating time is also of a modernist nature, and that which correspond to space is operated for completing a hierarchy in behalf of modernism.

On the other hand, especially with the increasing globalisation, this given hierarchy seems to be overthrown and reconstructed reversely, because of the geographical, so spatial, nature of the process. Globalisation has been promoting a spatial vocabulary over a temporary one, since a few decades, which can be seen also the era of postmodernism. Of course, all these serial changes in the conceptions of time and space should have much to do with the religious cosmological and ontological conceptions and practices. This relationship is a mutual one, and it is at the focus in this article. Keywords: Deconstruction, TimeSpace Dualism, Drama, Dream, Utopia, Heterotopia, Globalisation, Modernisation. Introduction The Sociological Context of Time-Space The Sociological Context of Time-Space

121

ZAMAN-MEKAN DÜALİZMİNİN YAPI ÇÖZÜMÜ Ütopla ve Heterotopyaya Karşı Dram ve Rüyanın Yeniden İnşası

Modernleşme insanın zaman ve mekan tecrübelerindeki radikal değişimlerle nitelenegelmıştır. Sosyologlar arasında hem insanların zaman/mekan tasavvuruyla ilgili hem de bu ikisinin birbirleriyle fiili ilişkilerindeki değişimler konusunda neredeyse tam bir uyuşum söz konusudur. Modernleşme süreci zaman ve mekan arasındaki karşılıklı ilişkilerdeki radikal değişimlerle tamamlanır. Bu makalede, başlangıçta sosyolojinin öncü isimlerinin modernleşme hakkındaki sosyolojik tasavvurlarını gözden geçireceğiz. Bu betimleyici özetin amacı zaman/mekan düalizminin değer-yüklü bir düalizm olduğuna işaret etmektir.

Bu makale, bu hiyerarşik düalizmin Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Parsons gibi bütün klasik sosyologlar tarafından değişik şekillerde, dinamizm, değişim, evrim, gelişmeyle denkleştirilen zaman lehine ve tam aksine durağanlık ve durgunlukla denkleştirilen mekan aleyhine işlenmiş olduğunu göstermeyi denemektedir. Bu hiyerarşik düalizm modernliğin diğer bazı değerleriyle birlikte evrimci söylemi aracılığıyla işlenmektedir. Gerçekten de, 'zaman'a eşlik eden lügatçe modernist bir tabiata sahiptir; ve 'mekan'a karşılık gelen lügatçe ise modernizm lehine kurulu bir hiyerarşiyi tamamlamak üzere işletilmektedir.

Diğer yandan, özellikle artan küreselleşmeyle birlikte, sürecin coğrafi, dolayısıyla da mekansal doğası gereği, bu verili hiyerarşinin alaşağı olacağı ve tam tersine yeniden kurulacağı görünüyör. Küreselleşme, en azından 10-20 yıldır mekansal bir lügatçeyi zamansal bir lügatçeye karşı terfi ettirmektedir ki, bu çağ aynı zamanda postmodernizm denilen çağa da tekabül etmektedir. Kuşkusuz zaman ve mekan tasavvurlarındaki tüm bu değişimler dizisinin dinsel kozmolojik ve ontolojik tasavvur ve pratiklerle de yakından ilgisi vardır. Bu ilgi ve ilişkiler karşılıklıdır ve bu makalenin ilgi odağındaki konulardandır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yapıçözümü, Zaman-Mekan Düalizmi, Dram, Rüya, Ütopia, Heterotopya, Küreselleşme, Modernleşme

* Dr., S.Ü. Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi.

Modernisation has been characterised by the radical changes in the human experience of time and space. There has occurred almost a convention among the sociologists about the changes in both the human notion of time/space and in their actual interrelationships with each other. For example, the explanations on the development of capitalism has largely relied on the depictions of the control mechanisms of time and space. In Marx' writings, in one sense, the control of time and space played a crucial role in the development of capitalism. That was largely because, the production of value, which is the central focus of the Marxist analysis of capital, depended on the power and ability to control time, which in turn, produces a control privilege of space (Harvey 1990).

On the other side, the common explanations of the process of modernisation are accomplished through a depiction of the changing interrelationships between time and space. Among others, Anthony Giddens' approach is an original example. He characterises the process of modernisation by the transformation of time and space. While all premodern cultures possessed modes of the calculation of time, such as the calendar, the time reckoning which formed the basis of daytoday life, certainly for the majority of the population, always linked time with place, and was usually imprecise and variable. "No one could tell the time of day without reference to other sociospatial marker: 'when' was almost universally either connected with 'where' or identified by regular natural occurrences" (Giddens 1991). According to Giddens, the invention of the mechanical clock and its diffusion to virtually all members of the population were key significance in the separation of time from space and that is the initial point of the process he called the "disembedding mechanisms of social systems" which characterised the modernisation process itself. By 'disembedding' Giddens means the 'lifting out' of social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spans of timespace. If one indicator of the disembedding of social relations is the invention of the mechanical clock, the subsequent mechanism is the invention of the money proper which requires a mode of deferral, providing the means of connecting credit and liability in circumstances where immediate exchange of products is impossible. Money is a means of bracketing time and so of lifting tran-

sactions out of particular milieux of exchange. In other words, it is a means of timespace distanciation, because it provides for the enactment of transactions between agents widely separated in time and space. Indeed, in this diagnosis of the process of distanciation, Giddens, relies both on Marx and Simmel's analysis of money. As a matter of fact, Simmel had defined the role of money, Giddens quotes, as "...associated with the spatial distance between the individual and his possession ... Only if the profit of an enterprise takes a form that can be easily transferred to any other place does it guarantee to property and the owner, through their spatial separation, a high degree of independence or, in other words, selfmobility ... The power of money to bridge distances enables the owner and his possessions to exist so far apart that each of them may follow their own precepts to a greater extent than in the period when the owner and his possessions still stood in a direct mutual relationship, when every economic engagement was also a personal one" (Giddens 1991. Simmel 1978). The third mechanism of the disembedding of social systems is the development of the expert system which arises out of the social differentiation and division of labour.

Another important context of the thematisation of timespace in terms of its role in modernisation grows out of the so-called globalisation. In this context, the modernisation and globalisation are contrasted in terms of favouring their appropriate part in our duality. Thus, modernisation is characterised by the promotion of time, because the basic principles of modernity such as the emphasis on the "present", the evolution, development, progress, and the capitalist equation of money and time (Weber 1930), the irreversible tendency towards a delivery to a minimum speed in all spheres of life (remember the minimum speed in the authobans, the efficiency, effectivity and rationalisation of all process of productions etc.) involve strong references to time (Harvey 1990). Globalisation process, however, because of its promotion of the concept of space and geography, of its emphasis on the "density of time and space" as a result of the increasing speed in transportation and communication, brings about the precedence of space over time. The analyses of globalisation process, in one sense, represents the attempts to explore the extent to which the rise of the globalisation problématique represents

the spatialisation of social theory. This resonates with the general thrust of postmodern theory which has been to privilege the spatial over the temporal mode of analysis (Featherstone & Lash 1995, Rodinson 1995). Featherstone and Lash criticise the postmodernist analysts for ignoring the strong spatial dimension of globalisation and for following their predecessors, i.e., the Marxist social theory and more generally the modernists who focused on the historical development throughout time in their studies. They try to explain postmodernity as a mode of, perhaps cultural mode of, globalisation, and as a historical transition from one stage to another. In any way, the debates on globalisation and postmodernisation rely widely on the reproduced tension between time and space dualism. But, really, is there such a duality? Or what are the mental conditions of such a dualism? These are the main focus of this study.

In this study I want to talk on space in its widest sense. It is an established and elaborated issue inasmuch as no one might be asked why he prefers to work in this area. So that the frame of the study, the way of approaching the problems in the frame, the possible extensions and implications of any step in advancing during the study has already been determined. For a widespread example, when we attempt to talk on space it seems impossible to avoid from arriving at any conceptualisation without an appeal to the notion of time, as constructed in the binary oppositionality that is thought to be the unique product of the Western metaphysics. At the outset of our enterprise, therefore, we should be aware that our interest with the notion of space, too, has already originated from the same metaphysical foundation. My aim, however is not to concentrate on the analysis of this metaphysics, but it is rather to attempt to an evaluation of space as a sociological invention or construction.

Then, in spite of being aware of the engagement in the same metaphysical frame, and of the danger of advancing in feeding and strengthening the fictitious space, I will try to find out the possible attitude for approaching the once taken for granted space in some Islamic literature on the everyday practices of the believers. The study also aims to create a ground on which such questions could, at least, be asked (if not answered) as: what is the perception of time and space prevalent among Muslims either in terms of the attitudes they display in

constructing their world or of the possible preference in any dichotomisation between time and space? Attempts to improve a modernist version of Islam have much to do with history. Then, does the dispute on time/space and its possible implications make any significance in explaining the modernisation of Muslims? For such an inquiry the works by Mircea Eliade, his analysis of the sacred and profane in terms of the transformation took place with modernity; Michel Foucault, especially with his emphasis on the heterotopies, and Ali Shari'ati, with his very literary observations on the series of rituals involved by the Islamic Pilgrimage, might provide us some good points of departure that all together might, again, create some tensions required for producing such a knowledge. And I hope the implications of this knowledge would be connotative and stimulating in treating the nature and the possible consequences of modernity on the Islamic conception, which recently has been usually mentioned in respect of having ability to survive with modernization. For, as I shall try to show the notion of specifying the space or time and to derive from any one of them an existential explanation is to be signified as unique to our modernity.

Deconstructing SpaceTime Dualism

The 'space' as it is usually appealed to call the 'time' within certain contexts is, really, not a concept as old and static as we now think of it. Now we think of the Space as if it forces, by its very nature, us to name and think of it in the current manner. Of course that is already the natural way man thinks of and names the things. S/he do so as if the things want to be named in this manner, or as if the words occur as the necessary corresponding of the things. Notwithstanding in certain periods we realise some shakes in our ongoing ways of naming the things. We modify our vision of the reality whereby sometimes we recognise that we have certain initiative in constructing the reality in our mind before we organise or encounter it actually. That is the wellknown door opened before us for a possible history of being Subject. We, the subjects, treat space as the dead, the fixed the undialectical, the immobile, and the time as richness, fecundity, life, and dialectic. In such a conceptualisation of time/space in the form of a dichotomous dualism, the dichotomy is specified in terms of a presence and

an absence as in all other classical examples of dualism which took the form of A/notA.

It is often said that it is the age of space in which we live. That is to say its existence owes thanks to an historical break with the age of 'history' that is commonly considered as the invention and the very deviance of the nineteenth century. It is the age of synchronism, of the near and the distant; we realise the world as a network connecting the points and intersecting with its own skein. When Foucault try to explain what gives liveliness to certain current ideological struggles, he claims that it is the encounter of the decided habitats of space and the faithful heirs of the time (Foucault 1988). Thus, the history of spatialisation begins with a strong reference to time. It construct (or it originates within a construction of) a binary opposition that hierarchically has to work in favour of one of the two, from a deconstructionist point of view. Hence, initially it would be useful to remember that the space is above all a mental abstraction. Moreover, it should be realised that as an abstraction it doesn't only refer to a part of reality but at the same time it functions in nourishing the very existence or even construction of another conceptual being. Hence, in as much as space would be revealed as an instrument establishing power by controlling and disciplining the everyday life, it can not save itself from subjecting to the working of the discourse. It is realised as a negative dimension of being in order to make reference to the positivity of the temporary.

Paradoxically, here, the space conceived as subjecting to the working procedure of the power gains somehow temporality because of the slippery ground on which it plays. Therefore the space in any way is constructed as a dependent and secondary variable in the dualistic formulation of the modern cosmology. Personally I don't think that the proliferation of space by capitalism or by modernisation and the special techniques developed to establish an order or a world by ordering the everyday life throughout the space are more important than conceiving the conflict as occurring between what is temporal and what is spatial, although it is important to see how capitalism orders and organises the space of itself on which all human behaviours and everyday conducts are defined and coded by its appropriation. It would, perhaps be stimulating enough to remember the relationship between speed and capitalism

inspired by the fast lives in the world achieved in the advanced societies. It is found out by someone (Virilio 1988) that it is this automatic (of course not 'natural') will of capitalism to appropriate the space that created some minimal limits of speed in the autobahns.

The Sociological Invention of Time and Space
Sociological Invention of Time and Space To repeat, however, it is not to ignore the proliferation of space in the advanced stages of modernity, that is in fact not but the proliferation of the mental procedures of classification of the space, but to refer to the underlying metaphysical origins and implications of the Western thought why I begin with mentioning the differentiation of and emphasis on the nature of space. Thus, the problem focused on the history of how the space became a matter of interest and how it was distinguished from time in the sociological imagination, that is to say the historical analysis of the invention of time and space would be more meaningful, at least from the point of a good analysis of the origins of modernity. Notwithstanding, here I am not to advance further in such a task, as I announced earlier, but rather to gain a relatively sufficient access to be able to introduce some remarks concerning space.

In order to give some impressions of the transformation of the space, the distinction usually is made between the medieval conception of space and the modern one in that the former is characterised by the very proper presence of everything in its place. The space was of an hierarchical composition: the sacred and the profane spaces, reserved spaces and the open spaces, the urban spaces and the rural spaces, which all together held places in the real human life:

For the cosmological theory, there were over-next worldly spaces on the one side of the next, worldly spaces and the thisworldly spaces on the other side. There were spaces in which what was plucked savagely from its place was put, and just on the contrary, spaces the things found their natural environments and stabilities. That is crudely the space of the Medieval Age, the space of being in its proper place, which was composed of this absolute hierarchy, contradiction, of the intersecting of the spaces (Foucault 1988).

Deconstructing Time/Space for Reconstructing Drama and Dream... (121-132).

This being in its proper place was dismembered by Galilee. The shocking aspect of Galilee's studies was the creation of infinite and eternally opened space, rather than being the invention or the reinvention that the world was turning around the sun. In such a space the place of the medieval age was being dissolved. The place of any thing was just a point in its movement, any more, just as the stability of anything was its becoming slower infinitely. This was the extension in space that replaced the finitude in space and would be replaced by the spot at present according to Foucault. Spot was defined by Foucault according to the degree of proximity of the elements to each other .

More concretely, the problem of determining place or spot takes place in respect of demography, too. The problem concerning human spot or living space is not consisting the problem just of whether there is sufficient place for men in the world or not; it consists of also the question as what kind of relations of nearness should be applied in reaching certain goal in certain situations, which way would be followed in storation, circulation, signification and classification of the human elements. Thus, for Foucault the space seems as interrelationships among spots. And it is the point where he delivers that "the anxiety of our era has to do fundamentally with space ... a great deal more than with time" (Foucault, quoted by Massey, 1992). It is the participation point of Foucault to the dualistic dichotomisation according to Massey who suggest us to get away from a notion of society as a kind of threedimensional, and indeed more usually twodimensional. He also propose the need to conceptualise space as constructed out of interrelations, as the simultaneous coexistence of social interrelations and interactions at all spatial scales, from the most local level to the most global. Foucault on the other hand as if to justify Massey's criticisms nourishes a completely desanctified space in which no personal space would be separated from the public one, nor the familial one from the societal, the cultural from the useful and the leisure from the working spaces. His support is based on the very identification of these examples with the remaining cultivation of the secretly existent sacredness (Foucault 1988).

The space we live in, and our ancestors have been living in, is/was not homogeneous. On the contrary it is filled with various qualities and

quantities, so that we sometimes realise that we live in a completely fictitious world. But in as much as they are fictitious they are important in the analysis of the ideas, so essentially of the inner spaces. Notwithstanding we are now interested with the external space as inspired by Foucault. It is what we live in, taking us out of ourselves and being the scene of the erosion of our lives, times and histories, the space which consumes us utterly at the same time is an heterogeneous one. Consequently we become aware that we are living within a set of relations picturing the spots definitely couldn't be overlapping and reducible to each other, rather than within an emptiness in which we could locate individuals and objects, and which could be coloured by several tones of light.

It would be possible to depict these spots, departing from the set of relations making possible to define each spot. For example the spots of transportation, streets, trains are defined by some sets of relations. But among all these spots there are some ones that, in relation with other spots, make the sets reflected and mirrored by those spots doubtful, and isolate or reverse them. These spaces which are connected to all other spaces but at the same time opposed to them are the utopias and the heterotopies which constitutes the famous tensional points of the postmodern criticisms.

Drama and Utopia and Utopia

Utopias, are spaces without any real place. They are within level or counteranalogous relationships with the real spaces of the society. They represents the society in perfectness or in reversed way. In any way they are of unreal spaces (Foucault 1988).

Utopia etymologically means "nowhere" , but as a concept in terms of being thought to be present in anywhere or being desired to be created everywhere it expresses the will to social change to a possible future project. Thus, it become to evolve from the point of nowhere to the point of "here" in terms of the demand to create it. Utopia requires some warriors devoting themselves to struggle to achieve the imagined city, no matter how much it is hard. It also requires the belief in the Subject (with the capital 'S') as it is referred as a condition for a constitution or permanence of an ideology by Althusser (James 1985). The utopist should be

against or at least unsatisfied by the present social relations and he should not believe that the circumstance can not be changed. Thus, he is aware of living in certain time and within certain social conditions he has put himself just against these conditions (Çubukçu & Albayrak 1992). Needless to say all these functions of an utopia have been stimulating the postmodernist criticisms. It would be sufficient to refer to the dramatical consequences of the heavenly cities of the modern societies, now referred as the metanarratives, for an illustration of the justification of those criticisms.

Alia İzzetbegoviç (1993), refers to the utopia as the basic deviance of humanity, in terms of its prerequisite of an heavenly city. For, according to him, heavenly city, which is the strongest utopia of the middle ages as a restoration of the Golden Ages of the religions, is not possible in this world. Because the world is by itself a world of the "other" of the heaven. It is the ignorance of the western thought that couldn't see the prevalence of the dramatical dimension of beingintheworld. By utopias, as a matter of fact, what is revealed is the dramatical state of man, for it reflects the will of the man to power, to remove the ethical problems and to be able to create "dedramatisation" of the world. Therefore in a possible confrontation of drama as a way of approaching the human state, as proposed by İzzetbegoviç, with utopia, as both the manifestation of the dramatical condition of men and as a way of approaching the human condition, once occurred, it can be said that, drama is interested with man while the utopia's focus is on the earth (to be read with the connotation inspired by Heidegger). The magnificent internal world of man has been reduced to the level of fictitious assistant. In utopias there is no human problems, that is, no ethical problems. Therefore those who live in the utopias are not men as such, but they are merely some instruments which fulfil their functions. Because there is no freedom, therefore no personality, instead there is 'psychology'.

Dream and Heterotopia and Heterotopia

As for the heterotopies, they are the actualised utopias through which the all real spaces existing in a culture could, at the same time, be represented, denied and reversed; something as counterspaces. Although it is possible to refer

to their places in reality these places are out of all places. Since they are fundamentally different from the places they reflect and represent, they are called as heterotopy by Foucault (Foucault 1988).

Trying to develop an analytical investigation of the heterotopies, Foucault called his attempt 'heterotopology' through which he identifies six principles for depicting them. Firstly, there is no any society in the world that hasn't constructed heterotopies. Of course, the heterotopies manifest themselves in quite different ways so that there might not be found an absolute, universal one. Two general types, however, can be identified: one is the crisis heterotopy which existed in societies called primitive. There is privileged, sacred and forbidden spaces reserved for individuals in the society, for the youngs in their adolescence, for the menstruating women, pregnant women, old men etc. In modern societies these heterotopies have consistently been abolished. They are replaced by the heterotopies of deviance as psychiatric clinics, prisons etc. The old age asylums lay between the deviance and crisis heterotopies. Because old age is a crisis and it is also a deviance, for in a society whereby the working time rules, the leisure is a deviance. It might not be difficult to see the transition from the crisis to the deviance which coincides with the periodisation by Foucault of the history of their modernity, and the new techniques of power. But some of the examples Foucault brought for referring to the crisis heterotopy are still at work in modern societies. For example, if the military barracks have played such a role as Foucault describe (that is, to provide a 'space' for the adults to be aware of their sexuality "in another place") it can still be asserted or viceversa. In addition, the honeymoon as a possibility of breaking virginity (for men and women) in a "no where" is still a prevalent custom consisting of the properties of the heterotopies.

The second principle of the heterotopies is that a society may operate an heterotopy during its history in different ways. Each heterotopy may perform some different functions in respect of the synchronism of the society it takes place. The example, here, is the cemetery. It is related with the other spaces of the societies, for every family or every individual have relatives in the cemetery. It has been present since the existence of the human society. But it has realised se-

rious changes. Without entering the details of the explanation by Foucault, the best point, I think, is to be signified as the relatively positive relation between modernisation and the developing of the cemetery. The classical hierarchy of the church cemetery was not excluding any one but in an hierarchical order. The most of the graves were of the unknown people. The cemetery sheltered in the sacred space of the church transformed into a cult of death in the modern times, just in the period of the "atheism". In the times when it had been believed in the immortality of the spirits the, remainder of the deads, naturally, were not to make any significance. It was just after the people fallen in doubt about the resurrection after death that they improved some sensitivities about the right of the property of a box into which their body would be put and kept. Notwithstanding it is also the same time with excluding or taking the cemetery out of the city because of the new attitude developed against the death. Death was an "illness" any more. Thus, the cemetery was sent to the periphery of the city, so that its centrality of the sacred and immortality was eliminated to be just a dark "other city" in which every family has its eternal resting space.

The third principle is that an heterotopy can make more than one space, normally impossible to be converged or overlapped, overlap on each other in the same spaces. Like the cinema and the theatre of the modern times and the carpet and garden of the traditional societies. Both garden and carpet are the representation of a microcosmic composition by gathering various figures of plants around a pond.

The fourth principle is that the heterotopies, usually are in connection with some divisions by absolute break of the humanity from the traditional time. Heterotopy works in its full capacity. This is explained by the libraries and museums with one difference that, they are the heterotopies of the infinitely accumulating time. It was until the end of the seventh century that they were just the expressions of personal preferences. The idea of accumulating everything, constituting a general archive; encompassing all the times, while remaining outside the time; the project of organising the infinitely and permanently accumulating time in constant place... all are unique to our modernity. There is another kind of taking place for the principle as

in the fairs by which the completely opposite heterotopies take place. These heterotopies, by the nature of the fair, rely on the dichotomies, unstable state of the time. They belong absolutely to the present.

The fifth principle, the heterotopies always have a system of opening and closure which makes them both accessible and isolated. The heterotopical space is not freely accessible like the public sphere. There is either a compulsory access like in the barracks and the prisons or there is voluntary introduction for ritual and purification. There is even heterotopies reserved to such a purification which is both hygienic and religious like the Muslim hamams.

The last principle of the heterotopies is that it has some functions about the rest of the space. These functions has two opposite polars. It either create a fictitious space in order to reveal and expose that all other real spaces and spots man divides in the every day life are in fact more fictitious, or the "other space" is created in as much perfect, fastidious and exact as ours is false, crooked and careless. The brothel is given to illustrate the former one, and for the latter some colonies have displayed a proper example. That is, the puritanist societies established in American colonies by the Jesuits. There is organised a life in all details as realisation of an utopia. Every conduct of the everyday life is ordered, the city is designed elaborately and the life works as a clock.

Undoubtedly the heterotopies, in as much as they don't leave the human spaces in the level of perception as just functionality and using value, and enrich the dreams, are the best, and perhaps the only, handles of the modern desanctified societies. This statement presupposes that it is the absence of dream that characterises the modern societies. And the heterotopies are the remainders of the world throughout which the weight of the dream has not been contrasted with the reality. In one sense the sanctification process of the world works together or with the help of heterotopies although in the modern times the former is substituted by the latter.

The construction of the World The Sacred Spaces and Eliade The construction of the World The Sacred Spaces and Eliade

For the pious, again, the space is not homogeneous. It presents some ruptures, breaks and discontinuities. But the constitution of the discontinuities are originally different from that of the men. Although it represents the travel of the frame of reference from the heaven to the earth Eliade (1992) stimulates the impression that some attempts of breaking the continuity of the world works essentially in the same manner in both. Thus, I think the significance of Eliade's works on the emergence of the sacred and profane in the world of the pious lies, first, in showing the very appropriate examples inspiring one to find the common origin of the sacred and the profane will to get the world in order (but not simply with the Heideggerian connotations of the word by which the world is revealed as a framework and as standingreserve).

The emergence of a sacred space makes possible to obtain "a constant point" to find a direction within the chaotic condition of the homogeneity of the space, and to construct the world and to live the real. The world with an homogeneous space is not "a world" yet for men. They can not live in such a chaos, nor can he construct it just in respect of the functionality and the using procedure of the space he would live in, as the secular men do. Such a construction does not give any ontological confidence.

Before constructing the space in terms of the everyday functions and of using procedure, the pious wants to ensure his spatialisation by some absolute approvals. This approval is waited for by a sign or more specifically by revelation. If there is not any spontaneous sign, it is motivated or more appropriately it is provoked. For example, with the help of an animal this sign is caught. What happens consequently is to put an end to the anxiety motivated and nourished by the pressure of relativity. In order to live in the world, the world should be constructed ontologically. This requires a location of the man himself in the centre of the world. In Eliade the sacred almost is identified with such a location. The pious is that who constitutes his existence in the sacred sphere. The profane is just the opposite of the sacred, but what is more significant from saying this, is that the profane can not exist in its fundamental form. It is impossible for one to erase from his world the traces of the profane world, even if he has chosen the

profane very consciously. However, the transformation is realised as desanctification is discerned. For the modern man, who is just the opposite of the sacred, the will to orient to the centre has been replaced by the will to functionality; the home has been reduced to the level of settlement machine so that it could be left like the countries and cities.

The sacred man desires to live as much near of the Centre of the World as possible; the position of his temple, home, country and city is determined by this desire. He sees the temple as a Centre through which the communication with the other world. The architecture of the temples, houses and cities of the sacredworld people are with full representations of this sacredness. Eliade gives us many examples from various religions. He tries to find what is common in all as a representation of the sacred. For example, he finds out from the architectures of the temples of all religions that, it is conceived as a quarter for salvation and for communicating with the Gods and with the other world. What is common in all architectural structures of these societies is that the construction of the building be it temple or an home imitates the creation of the God. So by every building there occurs a recreation of the universe. And by the maintaining of the structure the high order of universe is represented overtime. There is some architectural figures representing the relationship between man, God, Angels (from the smaller to the magnificent) and the heroes of the religion.

In every mosque, for example, there is a niche that represents the path to reach the God and to communicate with him; on two side of the niche there are usually two globes. One of the globe represents the universe of the God, so there is written the name of God and on the other the name of the prophet whose globe might represent the world of the men to whom the God has sent Prophets last of whom is also the best one, namely Muhammed. There is some other cycles ordered around the global top of the mosque representing the heroes of the religion: the first four Caliphs, the sons of the Prophet's daughter, the two uncles of the Prophet etc. As for the global top itself, it represents the infinitude of the universe and, by nature, of the God. And the minaret as a way for rising to the level of the heavens or the God. These are only some examples from the Islamic figures which a-

Deconstructing Time/Space for Reconstructing Drama and Dream... (121-132).

re common in all religions. Eliade, too, brings almost the same examples from other religions. The town to approximate to God, the path to transcend the profane being, the centrality of the temple and the home even the cities etc. all together are, perhaps the heterotopic motives participating in the construction of the world, almost in common way in all religions.

Now, what is the significance of heterotopies in any explanation of the transformation of the space? Of what kind is the resemblance and difference of sanctification of the space with the heterotopies? Are the sacred spaces equivalent to the heterotopies or are they each belonging to certain period, two different modes of constructing the world? Is the difference just in the fact that the former construct a world or participate in construction of a world as an handle, while the latter works in a world previously has been constructed?

Well, the sacred requires the operation of heterotopies for its existence. Heterotopy provides a possibility of representation of the religious results overtime. And it expands the sacredness to every where. But above all it should be admitted that all these questions are dependent to the context of the agenda of this study. Perhaps, by oneself they might not be so meaningful. Because the heterotopy and sanctification of space have not to be compared in, perhaps, any case. They are just two instruments developed in social scientific contexts to perceive how some special kinds of the space are constructed in the social life. It would be not so easy, and in fact not so essential, to explain one in terms of the other, although such an attempt might enrich the analytic approach to the space.

Undoubtedly the heterotopies, in as much as they don't leave the human spaces in the level of perception as just functionality and using value, and enrich the dreams, are the best, and perhaps the only, handles of the modern desanctified societies. This statement presupposes that it is the absence of dream that characterises the modern societies. And the heterotopies are the remainders of the world throughout which the weight of the dream has not been contrasted with the reality. In one sense the sanctification process of the world works together or with the help of heterotopies although in the modern times the former is substituted

by the latter.

Secularisation of the World Through Resanctification of Space? Secularisation of the World Through Resanctification of Space?

But in the Islamic sphere there arises some problems that couldn't be passed without mentioning. Though the problems don't make any difference with the nature of the construction of the world by the sacred, but in the level of authenticity of the figures. That is, all the mentioned examples brought for from the mosque, are of unislamic origins. The minaret, for example is a luxury and if it should be associated with the mentioned meaning as a way to approximate the God, the response of the religion had already taken place as: the God is closer to you than yourselves. Even as symbol it has realised many problems of legitimation. Because it is known that it was declared by the prophet that it was the sign of the eschatology that the mosque be decorated luxuriously. That was referring to the other examples, too. The ideal state of the mosque of the prophet, thus, is pictured as very simple. The decorations could be accepted only for their functions. Minarete, for example, has already approved because of the ease it has provided for expanding the voice of the calling to prayer. The meaning it symbolises was definitely rejected in the scripture in the depiction of the situation of the previous societies. For example Pharaoh the rival of Moses had ordered to his assistant Haman to build for him a tower to arrive at the level of the God. The heroisation and the symbols helped to achieve such result is by definition of the monotheist religion as coinciding to the stage of degeneration of the religion that recurred overtime.

It is often mentioned that Islam, too, is a religion anti-enchancement like the other monotheistic religions. Although it should be reported that some admission of Muslims as the influence of the God on the natural, even social occurrences is encompassed by the definition of this enchantment, it can be delivered that Islam is anti-enchancement. Here the enchantment should be used in terms of the animistic believes. But what is the importance of distinguishing the animistic enchantment and monotheist religious enchantment of the world? The point, here should be made that Islamic emphasis on the sacred spaces never supposes the rest to be profane. As a matter of fact all of the earth was ma-

de mosque while some places as the Ka'be and Jerusalem were specifically consecrated. It is possible for any one to pray in anywhere in any time. So there is no much specified sacred spaces in Islam. This fact inspired Demirci to think that if there is, really, a relationship between the proliferation of the religious space and secularisation, or exactly with his terms, between polytheism and secularisation this relationship would definitely be found to be positive (Demirci, 1984). The more the religious figures or the gods are specified the more societies get secularised. Because the more the sacred place is multiplied the more the spaces of the nonreligious world get justified. For such a multiplication always makes references to the other spaces to settle on its own place. Other spaces get legitimation by the specification of the other spaces and so on.

Here, examples might have given from the Hajj of the Muslims with its very symbolic character and with, no doubt of, authenticity might be quite provoking. For it can very good be understood with both Foucault's heterotopies and Eliade's analysis of the sacred (if not appealing to any calling for the profane). It is, again, the centre of the world. So it can be said that there is no any place to relativism in Islam. God has determined for men a point of departure. All believers are obliged to be united in their orientation to that point five times a day, and they have to visit it during their lifetime once at least. The architecture is very simple: a square which implies an expansion to all of the world. It includes a stone that is ascribed definite sacredness, that is called Haceru'l Aswad. It implies much things in terms of clarifying the position of the enchantment in Islam. One anecdote from the second Caliphate is quite meaningful: during the normal procedure of the Hajj ceremony he comes in front of the Stone and Stops, saluting it says that: "Well! I know you are not but a simple stone. Be sure that if I haven't seen the Prophet saluting you I wouldn't definitely have saluted you." The words of the Caliph had very strongly been motivated by the general discourse of the scripture which has very strong emphasis on the disenchantment of the world, on the one hand, and precisely not lesser emphasis on the absolute delivery to the commands of the God and the Prophet on the other.

The famous Persian sociologist, Ali Shari'ati

(1979), interpreting some religious archetypes and rituals in terms of the constitution of a world, finds out very rich symbolisms underlying the all ceremonies of the Hajj. He suggests that the Hajj ceremony is a demonstration in which all the roles have been distributed. The basic roles are that of the God, Adam, Abraham, Hacer, and the Satan. In the contact with the God and the Satan the role of Adam, Abraham, and Hacer will be displayed by the pilgrim, by everybody who will journey to Makkah, no matter whether it be male or female, white or black, young or old. The hadji (pilgrimage) is the hero of the demonstration. All of the pilgrimage is, already composed of the play of creation and penetrating the unity of God all over the world/life. Like in the last principle of heterotopy, in the pilgrimage you participate in such a spatial state that produces much implications on the rest of the all space. You turn around the Ka'be, for example, to symbolise that every thing turns around the God, that is, every thing obeys to God compulsorily, and the Muslims obey to him with their free choice. That means an elaboration of the consciousness, and perhaps the superconsciousness, in the daily life to obey to the commands of the God. The ceremony of the sacrifice is interpreted by Shari'ati as the examination of men with full delivery to the God. It is the highest level of the sacrifice because it is more than sacrificing in property, or in himself. He is asked to sacrifice what is at the highest value in his life. With a striking narration Shari'ati concludes that it is the son/daughter of oneself. Then he declares: "lean the knife against the throat of your son, so that you may be able to take the knife from the hands of the satan!" Of course, actually the sacrificing of a man is definitely forbidden in the religion. And, even in the original event of the emergence of the ceremony of the sacrifice the Son motive has been represented just for an examination. By the sacrifice the Subject, with the capital S, is highly promoted. There is no any limitation before the man to change himself in the directions of the God: no love of world, no love of money, no love of woman and even the love of the sons. The sign of the Sacrifice, as it is well-known, comes through the permanently recurring chain of dreams. And the action of the master of the Abrahamian religion penetrates into the rest of the life of Muslims through this dream.

There is three satans to be thrown by stones. By seven stones each. Shari'ati with a clear influence from the modern ideologies argues that these satans are not casually three. We know that the satan, personally is one. Where do come the others from? They are, he answers, the representations of the despotism, golden and conspiracy. These three dimension which is common to all social formations (just as in Althusser's formulations) are personified by Pharaoh, Karun and Belam . The first is a despot, ruling and exploits the people with the financial support of the second who is also the exploiter of the people. Neither of them can stand by without the ideological support of the Bel'am who is characterised in Qur'an as religiousmen who sold his knowledge to the service of the Pharaoh. He legitimates the ongoing system relying on the exploitation of the triple of the Pharaohnean system. this is not a personification to be just buried in the depth of the history. They determine all of the human societies in which the domination of each might change in respect of the other. Reformulated as politics, economy and ideology the three dimensions of the society can be understood by Althusserian approaches. And in the Hajj you have to be sure that you have thrown all of the satans. From their eyes or from their heads. You should be sure, that is why you should experience, for each, seven times. You throw the satans, so that they couldn't determine your freechoice in rebelling against the despots.

Conclusion

We travelled from the attempt to deconstruct the time and space dualism, through emphasising the utopic character of modernism whose basic handicap was the absence of drama as was put by Alia İzzetbegović (now the famous actor of the drama realised in BosnaHerzegovina, which was burdened to him by the utopic ideals of Western societies) and the historical reaction to these utopic metanarratives by the postmodernists or the poststructuralists as Foucault. The heterotopy was introduced by this reaction as a quest for the lost dream within the modern societies. As David Harvey (Harvey 1991) points out this reaction made us be aware of the absence of any handle in our experience of modernity. In spite of the atheist and secular world modernism had created, good or bad, fallacy that would convict us that we were living in the same world. Now we are strok

where we are living. In which world do we live? In the world indexed to the time/space coordinate of the market of 24 hours or in the historical world of the nationstate, none of its current examples is older than 100 years, or in the longtime world of the global heating? It's contribution in creating the crisis of identity, is usually emphasised. Harvey formulates it with the will of men to live in a world with outlined coordinates of time and space. In such a world with the absence of the coordinates what kind of confidence could the search of heterotopia give, although Foucault himself never introduces it as a shelter of confidence. So, the question, once asked, has to follow Foucault's mode of discourses analysis. What kind of search of confidence do the depictions of the heterotopy conceal?

Then, the world of the sacred which is constructed in absolute way, where the chaos has concretely transformed into the cosmos, should be recalled in order to be able to catch a point of origin. Where did we come from? And how far we are from our point of departure? All the depictions of space and time taught us that our world can not be completely desanctified as can not be disenchanting. I tried to catch the point from Eliade that the profane can not exist in its pure, fundamental form and the emergence of the sacred in our life (hierophany) is not of a period now exceeded. Even the dichotomy of the sacred and profane, appears in Eliade's work as a temporary formulation under deconstruction.

For example E. Gellner 1981, 1992, Routledge and Elizabeth Özdalga 1992.

For a good illustration of the dichotomisation of the time and space see Michel Foucault 1980: 70; and for a deconstructionist criticism of this dualism, see, Dorren Massey 1992, No: 196.

All the themes as development, stagnation, crisis, cycle, the accumulation of the past, all which are the constituent elements of the time-notion of modernity, nourished our way of participating in time and created a deviantly adoption to a notion of history.

Storing the data or the results of a calculation in the memory of a machine; the casual circulation of singular elements (as the highway

traffic, or the voices in the telephone cables) are the examples given by Foucault. Here, the signed and coded elements in a line diffused causally and classified according to singular or plural classifications, are identified.

Train is very special example in Foucault's consideration of the spots in terms of its composition of interrelationships. For, first, it is a space passed from within; second, it is an instrument for men to pass from one point to another point and; third, it is a thing passing from in front of men.

Some other interpretations include the personal figure of Haman in this triple of the social formation, perhaps because of the relatively recent emphasis on the Bureaucratic dimension of the modern society. Haman is the assistant of the Pharaoh.

REFERENCES

- Çubukçu A ve Sadık A (1992) Postmodernizm, Evrensel Kültür, December .
Demirci K (1984) Dinlerin Dejenerasyonu, İnsan Yayını, İstanbul.
Dorren K (1992) Politics and Space/Time, NLR, NovemberDecember, Number: 196.
Eliade M (1992) Kutsal ve Dindışı, trans, M. Ali Kılıçbay (çev), Gece Yayını, Ankara.
Featherstone M and Lash S (1995) Global, Modernities, Sage Publication, London.
Foucault M (1980) Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977, C Gordon (ed), Pantheon Books, New York.
Foucault M (1988) Öteki Mekanlara Dair, Def-

ter, No: 4.

- Gellner E (1981) Muslim Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Gellner E (1992) Postmodernity, Reason and Religion, Routledge, New York.
Giddens A (1990) The Consequences of Modernity, Polity Press, Oxford.
Harvey D (1990) The Condition of Postmodernity, Blackwell, London.
Harvey D (1991) Looking Backwards on Postmodernism, Architectural Design.
Izzetbegovich A (1995) Islam Between the East and the West, Nehir Yayınları, İstanbul.
James S (1985) Louis Althusser, in The Return of Grand Theories in the Human Sciences, by Quentin Skinner (çd.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Massey D (1992) Politics and Space/Time, NLR, NovemberDecember, No: 196.
Özdalga E (1991) Türkiye'de Dini Uyanış ve Radikalleşme Üzerine, İslâmî Araştırmalar, vol. 4, No. 1, January.
Robertson R (1995) Gocalization: TimeSpace and HomogeneityHeteogeneity, Featherstone, M and Lash S (eds.) Global Modernities, Sage Publications, London.
Shari'ati A (1979) Hacc, trans. Fatih Selim, Düşünce Yayınları, İstanbul.
Simmel G (1978) The Philosophy of Money, trans by, David Frisby, Routledge, London.
Virilio P (1988) Speed and Politics, Semio-text(e), New York.
Weber M (1930) The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Trans. by Talcott Parsons, London. □