

**Alchemy Revived: Fraudulent Evolution of Power Politics
from Dr. Frankenstein* to Dr. Huntington**Alchemy Revived: Fraudulent Evolution of Power Politics
from Dr. Frankenstein to Dr. Huntington

Ertuğrul KOÇ**

Abstract

Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Samuel P. Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations and Who Are We?* can be seen as completely different works in terms of the eras in which they were written, in terms of form and content, and in terms of the political messages they reveal. However, to be able to *comprehend* Huntington's "clashing civilizations" project and the "identity problem" of the Eastern and Western worlds, Mary Shelley's work is of great help, for the two clashing characters in her novel (Dr. Frankenstein and the Monster) may come to represent the two "different" paradigms which, Huntington suggests, must be in perpetual conflict so that the Western paradigm can define itself through its opposite: the Eastern paradigm. In this article, Huntington's new world order is analyzed under the light of the conflict created by Mary Shelley in *Frankenstein* between the empowered creator and the disempowered created, which generates the metaphor to help us judge Huntington's project of the clash with a new moral vision. When looked at from Mary Shelley's moral perspective, identity crisis is a constructed phenomenon, and by extension, the constructed identity lacunae, experienced by both the Eastern and Western worlds, is the result of the manipulative and imperialistic designs of the oligarchy in power, and such a plutocratic system has always had the upper hand in constituting artificial or imposed political systems. Hence, the article explores the social and psychological dynamics behind the desire for power, and draws parallels between Dr. Frankenstein's construction of a monster in *Frankenstein* who causes a great ruin for both his creator and the creator's family, and Huntington's proposal of a world in conflict as the new post-colonial world order which is likely to cause a great devastation

* Although nowhere in the novel the title "Dr." is used to refer to Victor Frankenstein, "Dr. Frankenstein" has become a popular name to describe the character's dangerous (non)-scientific experiments on human cadavers. In this article, this popular title will be used to suggest the parallel states of mind and parallel endeavors of both Dr. Huntington and Dr. Frankenstein, the Western alchemists who dare to go beyond the limits of natural and ethical laws.

** Yard. Doç. Dr., Çankaya Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim-Tercümanlık Bölümü,
ekoc@cankaya.edu.tr

for the world. The article reaches the conclusion that Huntington, in fact, proposes a neo-imperialist, neo-colonialist world order in which the West, like Dr. Frankenstein, will be forming artificial (political) bodies in the East in order to define itself through its opposite, and continue its hegemony in the 21st century. From Mary Shelley's perspective, such an alchemical construction (or contraption) is a sign of the moral decadence of Western culture, and reveals, at the same time, the perverse psychology of the creator, or the Western paradigm that has been forming and deforming the Eastern world for the last two centuries.

Key Words: Frankenstein, Huntington, East, West, Oligarchy, Plutocracy, Neo-imperialism.

Öz

Mary Shelley'nin *Frankenstein*, Samuel P. Huntington'ın *Clash of Civilizations* ve *Who Are We?* adlı eserleri yazıldıkları dönemler, tür ve içerikleri ile taşıdıkları politik söylemler göz önüne alındığında, birbirlerinden tamamen farklıymış gibi görünebilir. Ancak, Huntington'ın "medeniyetler çatışması" projesi ve "Batı'nın kimlik sorunu" söyleminin daha iyi algılanması için Mary Shelley'nin eserindeki iki karakter arasında (Dr. Frankenstein ve Monster) yarattığı çatışmayı ve bu çatışmanın sebeplerini ve anlamını incelemek gerekir. Çünkü bu karakterler Huntington'ın öngördüğü Doğu ve Batı paradigmaları arasındaki daimi çatışma ve iki medeniyetin kendini karşıtıyla tanımlaması gerektiği tezine uymaktadır. Bu makalede, Huntington'ın yeni dünya düzeni, Mary Shelley'nin *Frankenstein* adlı eserinde kullandığı mecazdan yola çıkarak, Huntington'ın "çatışma" projesine yeni bir ahlaki bakış önerilmektedir. Mary Shelley'nin bakış açısından kimlik sorunu ve çatışma, oluşturulmuş olgulardır. Bu görüş ışığında Huntington'ın eserleri değerlendirilecek olursa, Doğu ve Batı paradigmalarının yüz yüze kaldığı kimlik bunalımı ve çatışma, iktidardaki oligarşi tarafından amaçlı bir şekilde yaratılmaktadır. Böylesi bir kimlik sorunu yaratan plütokratik yapı da, her zaman yapay ve zorlama siyasi oluşumları ortaya çıkarmıştır. Dolayısıyla, bu makalede; gücü istemenin ve kullanmanın ardındaki sosyal ve psikolojik dinamikler araştırılmakta ve *Frankenstein* adlı eserde Dr. Frankenstein'ın hem kendisinin hem de ailesinin yok oluşuna sebep olan canavarı nasıl oluşturduğu ile Huntington'ın toplu yok oluşa neden olabilecek muhtemel "çatışan dünya" tezi arasında paralellikler kurulmaktadır. Makale, Huntington'ın tezinin aslında emperyalizm ve kolonyalizm kavramlarının yeni bir boyut kazanmasına hizmet ettiğini ortaya koymakta; Batı medeniyetinin tıpkı Dr. Frankenstein gibi yapay oluşumlar peşinde koştuğunu; Batı'nın, inşa ettiği Doğu dünyası sayesinde kendini tanımlama yoluna gittiğini ve bunu yaparken de 21. yy. da hegemonyasını devam ettirmenin asıl amacı olduğunu anlatmaktadır. Mary Shelley'nin bakış açısından böylesi bir "simyagerlik,? emperyal Batı medeniyetinin ahlaki çöküşünün bir belirtisi ve aynı zamanda Doğu dünyasını ikiyüz yıldır dönüştüren Batı paradigmasının sapkın psikolojisinin bir göstergesidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Frankenstein, Huntington, Doğu, Batı, Oligarşi, Plütokrasi, Neo-Emperyalizm.

Introduction

The construction of the state by the powerful, the varying forms of government together with the varying concept of justice are, in fact, long disputed phenomena: the philosophers of antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, the Age of Revolutions, the Victorian Age, and the modern era have discussed the nature of this ruling body and its religious, political, and moral constituents. While Plato in *The Republic* emphasized the necessity of establishing a just system under the rule of philosophers by stating that “there is no other way of happiness either for the state or for the individual” (Lamm, 1984, p.147), Aristotle defined man in *Politics* as “by nature a political animal” (1943, p. 295), creating diverse systems and rulers. He emphasized that if the system is pure oligarchy, “which regard[s] only the interest of the rulers,” such a constitution then becomes the core of “all defective and perverted forms” (1943, p. 296). In the Middle Ages, St. Augustine accentuated in his *Confessions* the primacy of faith in establishing truth and a just worldly order through creating “true happiness” (Augustine, 1970, p. 229) for man. He claimed that “True happiness is to rejoice in the truth, for to rejoice in the truth is to rejoice in. . . God,” and if people are unhappy, “It is because they attend far more closely to other things whose power to make them unhappy is greater than the power of their dim memory of truth to make them happy” (1970, p.229). St. Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, merged faith with reason for the same intent. He believed that “faith could be defended by reason. . . [and he] placed a higher value on human reason, on human life in this world, and on the abilities of humans to participate in their own salvation” (Lerner, 1998, p. 346). Later on, Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan* demonstrated the necessity of a strong central authority to avoid *bellum omnium contra omnes* (war of all against all). He believed that the sovereign should use his authority to prevent man from fighting with each other because it is “the natural condition of war of every one against every one” (Hobbes, 1985, p.185). Machiavelli, on the other hand, regarded the absolute power of the oligarch as essential to maintain unity, and in *The Prince* he gave to the prince the advice that, to achieve unity and harmony, it “is much safer to be feared than loved,” (c. xvii)¹ while Rousseau in *Du Contrat Social* explained what man would lose and gain by signing a social contract, declaring that “What man loses by the social contract is his natural liberty and an unlimited right to everything he tries to get and succeeds in getting” (Copleston, 2003, p.83), and Locke in his *Two Treatises of Government* talked about the need to make a treaty, emphasizing that a group enters “into a society to make one People, one Body Politic under one Supreme Government” (Locke, 1960, p.89) in order to secure their worldly claims more completely.

¹ See <http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince00.htm>

All these ideas—vacillating between the worldly and the otherworldly—influenced the 18th century American and French Revolutions. Evolutionary, Functionalist, and Conflict theorists of the 19th and 20th centuries tried to define the pillars of the “just system,” and attempted to find remedies for the decadent communal conduct, and for the consequent social dissolution and disorder. They found fault with governmental systems built upon power struggle and the class system. Hence, they dealt with social stratification and the concept of the moral in a state apparatus. Especially the conflict theorists and cultural anthropologists like Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Max Weber (1864-1920) regarded conflict itself as the vital means of remedying social inequalities and injustices. “Marx initiated the definition of the development of the modern state as a process of expropriation of powers. Weber took over this idea and added to it two more definitions of the state: as the holder of a monopoly of the means of violence and as an authority based on rational-legal legitimation” (Redner, 1990, p.638). Like Hegel, these early conflict theorists optimistically noted that history proceeded towards its goal, and they hopefully estimated that the finale of this process would be in the form of a classless, humanistic social organization.

Although philosophers saw conflict as essential to establish a just and humane social system, they underestimated the pervasive power of the oligarchy (or plutocracy) in creating “controllable” conflicts to immorally form and deform political systems in the world. Western concepts such as equality, justice, and freedom, which paved the way to American and French Revolutions in the 18th century and formed the political tradition in the West as egalitarian, were undermined by the ensuing capitalist *and* positivist² competitive ethos of the 19th and 20th centuries, and are about to be discarded completely in the 21st century. With the “clashing civilizations” project of Dr. Samuel P. Huntington,³ who imagined in his *The Clash of Civilizations* the new world order as the Christian Western Empire dominating the East, the new mission of the Western oligarchy concerning the future of the world has thus been revealed. In fact, the work has helped disclose the aggressive imperialist policies of the West over the East for

² “A philosophy that denies validity to speculation or metaphysical questions, maintaining that the proper goal of knowledge is the description and not the explanation of phenomena. Although its history stretches back as far as Berkeley and Hume, the doctrine was most emphatically formulated in the nineteenth century by Auguste Comte, who coined the term positivism. In the twentieth century positivism has developed into LOGICAL POSITIVISM, a form of empiricism that introduced the methods of mathematics and experimental science into philosophy. . . Positivism has permeated much of twentieth-century thought . . .” C. Hugh Holman, William Harmon, *A Handbook to Literature*, 6th Edition (New York: Macmillan, 1992) 369.

³ Samuel Phillips Huntington (1927–2008) was an American political scientist who gained prominence through his *Clash of Civilizations* (1993, 1996) thesis of a post-Cold War new world order. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_P._Huntington

Huntington gives advice to the Western oligarchy that the best way to cope with the world is to recreate the world through crusading over the East, and through creating the Eastern world anew as desired by the West. As such an *artificial structuring* of the East is evocative of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* in which Dr. Frankenstein forms a non-natural being and comes, later on, to confront his own creation, what Huntington proposes for the world is likely to produce the same result: the formed (or deformed) East will come to confront the Western Civilization. In this article, Huntington's postmodern approach that the West has to perpetually deconstruct and thereby dominate the East will be shown, with reference to Marxist and Postcolonial critics, to be a Gothic dystopia suggesting the themes in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* in which Dr. Frankenstein creates an artificial life form which causes the destruction of his own paradigm. Drawing metaphorical parallels between the projects of Dr. Frankenstein and Dr. Huntington, the study will make *histopolitical*, *histocultural*, and literary analyses of both *Frankenstein* and *Clash of Civilizations*. Finally, the article will reveal that Huntington's project is a part of the plan to restructure the Western Colonial Empire, and that Huntington discards the harmonious codependence of cultures just as Dr. Frankenstein rejects the fact that his creature is, in reality, his other self.

In *Postcolonial Imaginings: Fictions of a New World Order* David Punter defines the colonial empire as follows:

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, according to the dating imposed on the world by its dominant socio-theological order, it is worth remembering that the beginning of the twentieth marked the peak of the colonial empire. In fact, by far the larger part of the land surface of the world was then formed into empires, if we take the word 'empire' in its broadest sense. The ancient Chinese and Ottoman empires were still in existence, although in precarious conditions . . . But when thinking of a colonial empire specifically, we usually mean an empire that has overseas 'possessions', rather than simply a large collection of adjacent states or territories under a single regime (2000, p. 1)

The greatest colonial empire of the 19th century was Britain for she had many "overseas possessions" which made the country the supreme world power on which the sun never set. Such a colonizing entrepreneurship, the gothicists of the age witnessed, was not only the work of a group of capitalist individuals, but it was the work of a culture which had already been structured by the "enlightened" industrialist spirit of the age. Hence, the Romantic Gothic writers of the age created bizarre settings and gruesome characters in their works to refer to the capitalist bourgeois paradigm and, as Alok Bhalla remarks, "The monstrous themes with which the [Romantic] Gothic writers preoccupied themselves were neither different from those employed by the political theorists and the radical poets nor separable from the various actions of repression and lawlessness in the daily political conduct of the age" (1991, p. 10). The Gothic is, in fact, within the

realistic locus of the novel form and, through creating conflicts between villainous and virtuous characters in awe-inspiring settings, the gothicists created allegorical figures and situations to refer to the prevalent hypocrisy and ethical dilemmas in the bourgeois culture.

Aware of the imperialistic and totalitarian designs of the oligarchy in her age, Mary Shelley (1797-1851), as the British novelist of the Romantic-Gothic tradition, analyzes in *Frankenstein* the nature of the destructive conflict between Frankenstein and his Monster, who can be taken as the figures representing the two different cultures and ideologies. While the Europeanism of Dr. Frankenstein is stated very early in the novel as a Genoese and his family “one of the most distinguished of the republic” (Mary Shelley, 1999, p.26), his creature, with no family background, assumes the identity of the disoriented other. In fact, “‘European’ is the first adjective used to describe Frankenstein when he appears in Mary Shelley’s novel. Introduced as a ‘European,’ Frankenstein’s activities are ideologically connected with radical attempts to re-shape European society” (Stock, 2008, p.336). Coming from a famous family whose members were “perpetually occupied by the affairs of the country” (Mary Shelley, 1999, p.26), Frankenstein, like his ancestors, wants to make his own contribution to changing the face of his society. Although Dr. Frankenstein creates a being to change for better the course of human life on earth, he later “sees” that *his* creature is ugly. Disgusted with the Creature, he leaves him on his own, and denies his existence. Later on, however, the Creature reminds him that he exists, and tells Frankenstein that he must shoulder the responsibility of his creature. What the Creature is after is an agreement with his creator and at first persuades Frankenstein to create a female companion for him. Despite the promise that he “will dwell . . . in the most savage of places” (Mary Shelley, 1999, p.113), meaning that he will not disturb Frankenstein’s civilized paradigm, Frankenstein, however, comes to worry that if the Creature and his bride “were to leave Europe, and inhabit the deserts of the new world . . . a race of devils [would] be propagated upon the earth” (p. 127), and would eventually pose a threat to his “civilized” Western paradigm. He, therefore, destroys the Creature’s female partner, the project he was about to finalize. Disappointed with his creator, and having already killed the friend and family members of Frankenstein, the Creature leaves Europe and goes to the East, which makes him a figure of the Orient: Rhône, the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, Tartary and Russia are the regions he wanders through, and Frankenstein, as the maker of this wanderer is in the hunt of him for he is the uncivilized non-European. This (im)moral perspective of Frankenstein is what Mary Shelley shows to be the culture, and the ideology of the European bourgeoisie as this class has already labelled the “other,” the non-European as the Monster, as the Easterner. The destructive conflict between the two paradigms stems from the capitalist cultural ideology of this class, and Mary Shelley demonstrates in her novel that it is the arrogant, but eventually aberrant psychology

within this culture that gives way to the creation of monsters and finally to devastating conflicts.

Man-made life in the grotesque form and the resultant man-made conflict between the creator and created in *Frankenstein* stand as metaphors for the questionable man-made political systems, and this is the contribution of a literary figure to the already existent discussion about political structures in the world, showing what is wrong, what is perverse about man and his social systems. As such, Dr. Frankenstein, the product of the Western capitalist ethos, can be taken as a symbol signifying the abnormal psychologies of the individual and his institutions that create fabricated, anomalous political contraptions. Frankenstein's miserable Creature is thus the emblem and the embodiment of this perversity, causing the downfall of his creator's conformist paradigm. As the contraption which emerged as a result of "infusing life into an inanimate body" (Mary Shelley, 1999, 45), the Creature kills Frankenstein's little brother William, the servant girl Justine (unjustly accused of William's murder and so executed), his best friend Henry Clerval, his beloved Elizabeth, and eventually Frankenstein himself. Through the depiction of what Frankenstein has achieved at the end (in fact, his destruction only), Mary Shelley prophesies the coming of a pseudo-scientific dystopia. She is prophetic in showing that in the future dystopia the Western man, on account of his *hubris*, ignores universal moral values, and desires to go beyond the limits of natural laws.

If Victor Frankenstein and his Monster are taken as figures standing for polarized cultural paradigms, it will not be a far-fetched metaphor to label Frankenstein as signifying the manipulative oligarchy of the Occident (for he creates a being to manipulate), and the Monster as representing the manipulated *and* exploited Orient, the residue of the defunct empires from whose remains new political structures are created. With his desire to do "good," Frankenstein also stands for the "enlightened virtues" of his culture. His "deviant" research and its unforeseen catastrophic consequences, on the other hand, epitomize the *hubris* and the *hamartia* in the white man's culture. As the postcolonial author Frantz Fanon puts it in *The Wretched of the Earth*, "what parcels the world is . . . the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species" (1963, p.40), and as Frankenstein *belongs* to the elite class of the Western society which has already monopolized knowledge and power, what he creates cannot be his social equal or superior. Although initially he plans to create a "perfect" creature, he is, in fact, after creating an inferior being, a lesser species since he starts the project with the prospect that the "new species would bless [him] as its creator and source" (Mary Shelley, 1999, p. 43). Frankenstein designs the creature as his inferior because the construction of such a lesser being can be utilized by Frankenstein for the psychological satisfaction of social emolument as he has already admitted that he "became dizzy with

the immensity of the prospect which it illustrated . . . that among so many men of genius who had directed their inquiries towards the same science, that [he] alone should be reserved to discover so astonishing a secret” (p. 41). His wish to ameliorate the condition of man, the universal “philanthropic” urge, turns into a lie as he competes with his colleagues to “dress up his egotistic ambition [with] the euphemistic terms of altruistic zeal” (Koç, 2005, 142). And this man, Mary Shelley reveals, is the *sciolistic* “scientist” of the Western paradigm who, without any inner perspective about himself, tries bluntly to go beyond the human limits. When the positivistic principles of science fail to satisfy his hunger for more, he even goes to the extent of appropriating alchemical means for his ulterior motives. Hence, through the figure of Dr. Frankenstein, Mary Shelley reveals the psycho-moral nature of Western capitalist culture.

By depicting Frankenstein as the representative individual of the egotistic and competitive Western culture, and by putting him in conflict with his project (the Creature), Mary Shelley, in fact, constructs the moral basis for just behavior, and defines the concept of justice in the novel. As Colene Bently discusses in “Family, Humanity, Polity: Theorizing the Basis and Boundaries of Political Community in *Frankenstein*,”

What Shelley presents in her novel is a notion of justice and ethical agency involving the recognition that individuals and communities are often connected to and responsible for people with whom they may or may not be intimately related but to whom they nonetheless belong. (2005, p.345)

Frankenstein belongs to the society in which selfish undercurrents define the individual acts, and Mary Shelley shows that if individual egotism becomes the sole driving power in such a competitive culture, this will then violate the natural order of the social structure which depends on the responsibility of individuals for other individuals. She demonstrates that the passionate endeavors of individuals such as the enterprise of Dr. Frankenstein usually end in catastrophe, causing devastation not only for the individual himself, but also for the others. Hence, the idea that everybody is connected to everybody, and therefore, everybody is responsible for everybody is emphasized in the novel. This is the concept of justice Mary Shelley offers: as she was an idealist like her parents and like the other Romantics of her age, her aim is to show that humanity is a great family, and each individual has to shoulder the responsibility of other individuals and of the society he is a part of. With such a political perspective, Mary Shelley shows that she is an egalitarian defending the idea that, regardless of class and cultural distinctions, everybody is equal.

Variouly interpreted since its first publication in 1818, perhaps no work in the history of literature has haunted popular imagination as *Frankenstein* did, and still the main conflict of the story—between the creator and the created—can be used to refer to the paradoxical nature of social and cultural schisms for the opposites are used to create

identities. The text, however, seems to have assumed more significance with the “clash of civilizations” hypothesis of Huntington, who published an article in 1993 in *Foreign Affairs* magazine, which he later elaborated into a book published in 1996 under the title *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, where he claims that “cultural identities, which at the broadest level are civilization identities, are shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration, and conflict in the post-Cold War world” (1996, p.20). His assertion is, in fact, a continuation of the utopian program proposed by Toynbee in an article titled “For the First Time in 30,000 Years” published in *Worldview* in 1972.⁴

Huntington, of course, has never referred to *Frankenstein* his analysis of the “clash.” It is, however, through *Frankenstein* that Huntington’s conflict theory concerning the present and future paradigms can be analyzed and criticized better. An advisor to the White House as a member of Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), and having been lauded by the oligarchy in the U.S. for his *magnum opus*, which made him the “intellectual crusader” of imperialism, Huntington is the concern not only of the West, but also of the secular nation states in the world, for his *aggressive* social theories directly or indirectly affect the lives of all. Following the “utopian” goal of Toynbee, he argues that “The survival of the West depends on Americans reaffirming their Western identity and Westerners accepting their civilization as unique not universal and uniting to renew and preserve themselves from non-Western societies” (1996, p.20). In fact, the European supported U.S. invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan as “responses” to September 11 attacks demonstrate parallels with his predictions concerning the necessity of the clash, for these invasions and the consequent casualties have widened the already existent schisms. The war (or invasion) in the Middle East, and the Great Middle East Project, prepared by the Western plutocracy and enforced during Bush administration, have already augmented the chaotic convergence of worldwide conflicts for power, sharply polarizing the world into two: namely Eastern and Western worlds, the two “different” modes of existence, one ancient, outmoded, and “obsessively dogmatic” from the Western viewpoint; the other egotistical, arrogant and already “materialistically decadent” from the Eastern perspective.

The reaction given by America to “global terrorism” in the form of either sending troops or occupying “countries” in Asia, Middle East and North Africa for conflict

⁴ Toynbee says that “If the Western European peoples can unite with each other voluntarily, as they are now demonstrating they can, a voluntary unity of mankind, on a global scale is not a utopian objective.” (“For the First Time in 30,000 Years,” *Worldview* 15 (March 1972): 9) Highlighting the dominance of Western European culture over the rest of the world, Toynbee suggests the founding of a world government. This means that while the Western Europe is to integrate, the rest of the world has to disintegrate to be attached to this integrated body.

prevention and for the preservation of American understanding of democracy, and the eventual losses suffered by all parties, have politicized the world culturally. Moreover, these cultures have been transformed into ideologies as the extension of the polarized structure already established by the Cold War. The shifting of the civilizational construction into ideology is what imperialism has been willing to do since the Yalta Conference (1945) to parcel the globe among the victors after the war. Under the pretext of conflict resolution in Asia and Africa, however, the West has gained the upper hand in reshaping the East. America's claim to bring "democracy" to the "oppressed" peoples of the MENA region⁵ is the way to do it: American oligarchy has been "democratizing" the Eastern world for the past century, but has accelerated this practice after the collapse of the Communist Bloc to gain full control. This, in fact, is what Toynbee "prophesied" in 1962 in *America and the World Revolution*, where he says that America must have the initiative to secure the freedom of Eastern peoples, and adds that this may "stand out in retrospect as the epoch making event of our age" (p. 86). Like Dr. Frankenstein, America designed a project: bringing "freedom" to Eastern peoples. However, the project has turned into the abuse of the Eastern lands and peoples, and "the epoch making event of our age" came into sight as the massacre of the ones who rebel against imperialism in the invaded lands of the East, and "divide and rule" policy is still the valid means of manipulating countries and regions for America.

In *Power, Politics and Culture*, Said explains how the imperialist action to break up countries in the Middle East flourished an Islamic reaction. He says that since "the nationalistic energy is over, [and since] the Arab regimes, nearly every one of them, have been attacked by Israel, invaded, their lands occupied: so, Islam is the answer. What gets lost in all of this is a secular alternative" (2002, p. 50-51). As any nationalist movement and foundation of a national state may come to mean the nationalization of oil resources in the region, the West has been replacing secular nation states with theocratic regimes, and meanwhile, causing inner turmoil in the lands of Islam. Giving the example of Anwar El Sadat, the assassinated president of Egypt (1970-1981), Said explains how the "Russians, as well as everything else that represented Abdel Nasser [the secular, anti-colonial, pan-Arab president of Egypt (1956-1970)]" (2002, p.50) were discarded during Sadat's presidency, and how Sadat invited Americans to the country, "opening the country to a new imperialism" (2002, 50). From then on, Egypt was gradually left into the hands of religious groups whose leaders seemed anti-American, but who, in fact,

⁵ "The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) is an economically diverse region that includes both the oil-rich economies in the Gulf and countries that are resource-scarce in relation to population, such as Egypt, Morocco, and Yemen. The region's economic fortunes over much of the past quarter century have been heavily influenced by two factors – the price of oil and the legacy of economic policies and structures that had emphasized a leading role for the state." http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/mna/mena.nsf_

collaborated with imperialism. Hence, to dissect and destroy nation states, Western oligarchy uses religion as ideology. With the pretext of bringing democracy and freedom to the peoples of the Third World, and labeling the secular nation state as oppressive because of its stance against religion and micro-nationalism, the oligarchy has been forming Mild Islamism together with micro-nationalist groups within the developing states of the East. This, however, may turn out to be a dangerous game of power politics for the West. Just as corrupt oligarchic Rome collapsed with the rise of Christianity, which promised a just system and a far better attitude toward humanity, Western oligarchy may face the return and spread of the Islamic theocracy as the undesired paradigmatic shift which is likely to emerge as the consequence of immorally manipulating Eastern world.

Secular humanism, which first emerged in the West (through the Renaissance and the Reformation) against the City of God (*De Civitate Dei*),⁶ and which, after centuries of bloody struggles, could be established as a universal political system separating the worldly and the otherworldly, has already permeated into the body politics of the republics and monarchies in MENA like Tunisia (republic), Algeria (republic), Syria (republic), Egypt (republic), Jordan (monarchy), Bahrain (monarchy), and even Iraq (under invasion). The hired “intellectuals” and the compradors of the oligarchy, however, try to hinder this rise of secularism in the Eastern Muslim world as a political imperative by introducing the concept of the “mild-Islamic model.” A “friendly” Islam (or a weakened microbe) will facilitate the accomplishment of the imperialist designs on the MENA countries. Even Turkey, despite being geographically located outside the MENA, is under the influence of mild Islam. The secular system of the country, once a good example to the peoples of theocratic regimes like Iran and Saudi Arabia, has gradually been converted to the mild Islamic model. Currently, these nation states are being sacrificed to the identity creating *and* profit making mentality of Western oligarchy. If, however, the idea of secularism is completely erased from the Eastern paradigm, the counterbalancing power to avoid crude Islamic theocracy will have been lost with it. As Dr. Frankenstein hoped his creature would be “beautiful” (Shelley, 1999, p.45), but eventually created a “miserable monster” (p.46) who eventually turned against his creator, “mild Islamism,” a *bricolage* of the West, may not remain “mild” forever. The newly formed and already existent pro-American “Islamist” systems in the MENA together with the ex-communist states of the Balkans are all the patchworks Occidental oligarchy has contrived. Western oligarchy, “driven by unquenchable and destructive

⁶ St. Augustine, in the first complete formulation of a Christian philosophy of history, viewed the story of humanity as a conflict between two cities. One of these was the City of God, the other the City of Man. In the beginning, when time was created, everything belonged to the good city, yet with the revolt of the angels and Satan’s expulsion from heaven, the other city came into being.

cravings” (Baldick, 1987, p. 128), is forming, like Dr. Frankenstein, a monster. In fact, as Marx argues in *The Revolutions of 1848*, “What the bourgeoisie [oligarchy in the post-modern world] therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers” (1973, p. 79).

For Huntington “Civilizations are the ultimate human tribes, and the clash of civilizations is tribal conflict on a global scale” (1996, p. 207). Disagreeing with President Clinton’s views about Islamic paradigm that “the West does not have problems with Islam but only with violent Islamists” (1996, p. 209), Huntington says that “Fourteen hundred years of history demonstrate otherwise” (1996, p. 209). If the events of the last fourteen hundred years are to be remembered again, Huntington then forgets mentioning what the Crusaders did in Asia Minor and the Middle East in the first three Crusades (1096-1192), and how they plundered Constantinople (modern Istanbul) almost to extinction in the fourth infamous Crusade (1202-1204). Westerners, in fact, utilized these raids on the Islamic and Orthodox worlds to increase trade and knowledge, for “The Crusades further stimulated the growing trade of Europe . . . ships returned laden with the enticing goods of the East . . . This trade in turn, led to the growth of banking . . . Through their contacts with the educated Byzantines and Moslems the Europeans came to realize that there was much they did not know” (Welty, 1969, p. 317). However, he disagrees with his words about “fourteen hundred years of history” (1996, p. 209) in *The Clash of Civilizations* when he confesses that “The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion, but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact, non-Westerners never do” (1996, p. 51). He emphasizes Eastern “antagonism” towards the West, and thus champions for a global conflict through which, he thinks, the West will stop the shifting of power from the West to the East. He seems to be a “conflict theorist,” but in reality he is no more than a conflict-monger, or he can be labeled as the Dr. Frankenstein of 21st century.

Although Huntington has defined nine different cultures, namely Western, Latin American, Islamic, Sinic, Hindu, Orthodox, Buddhist, Japanese, and African, it is understood from the overtone of his work that he specifically targets Islam, the lands of the defunct Ottoman Empire, and the Muslim nation states of the Middle East. In *Who Are We?* he states that “The twenty-first century is beginning as an age of religion. Western secular models of the state are being challenged and replaced” (2005, p. 360). There is, however, elusiveness in this assertion because only the countries under the grip of imperialism have come to encounter the challenge of the theocratic threat. Although he says that religion is gaining power and authority over nations, he limits this influence with the East. He cannot even stand the diverse ethnic and religious groups in America forming their different consciousness: Huntington sees the formation of such consciousness as the “other,” as the threat to American national identity for he says that “cultural and political fragmentation and conflict emanating from intensified ethnic and

religious consciousness poses the main current challenge to the American national myth” (2005, pp. 138-39). While trying to maintain unity “at home,” he sees that a new kind of Islam and together with it a schism, has emerged out of necessity. A new moneyed class having come to power is, for him, a sign of the competition between Islam and Christianity, and Islam has already started “affecting former Communist countries of Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus, as well as Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, China, and South East Asia” (Moghadam in Huntington, 2005, p. 360). Totally ignoring the role of the centralizing power of money and the role of oligarchy acting in and above nations, and serving the imperialistic ends of a group of people, Huntington is “right” in asserting that not religious fundamentalism but Islam is the problem for the West.⁷ Having acquainted us with the “revolutionary” and “revengeful” sides of this religion,⁸ he deems it necessary that Islam is to be reinterpreted and reshaped. However, he never mentions Western involvement in having formed Islam in the previous centuries as the hybrid the world confronts today. The moneyed class in the Islamic world consists of those who cooperate with imperialism. Islam, in the 20th century, was created anew by the West, and has been made a problem on purpose: it emerged as an alchemical contraption produced in the underground think-tank laboratories of the West. Huntington is one of the new species of alchemists of our age. Like the alchemists of the Middle Ages who, by using both science and magic (or pseudo-science), tried to transmute base metals into gold, Huntington applies non-scientific “methods,” and seems to be suggesting scientific and positivistic solutions.

Huntington’s “scientific” approach brings to mind Dr. Frankenstein and his contraption. At the University of Ingolstadt, Frankenstein studies chemistry. He studies a positive science, but later on deviates from the limited, positivistic principles of chemistry; he also makes use of an older and *less responsible* “pseudo-science”: alchemy. This, the “chemistry” of the Middle Ages, concerned primarily with attempts to transmute base metals into “gold,” constitutes the core of a *forbidden* corpus of knowledge. “Alchemists assumed an intricate system of affinities between chemicals and other forms of being . . . alchemy rested upon philosophical principles most clearly and authoritatively stated by Aristotle and developed by scholastic philosophers”

⁷ “Islam’s borders are bloody and so are its innards. The fundamental problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power.” Original article by Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations” in *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 3, Summer 1993, 39.

⁸ The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion, but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact, non-Westerners never do — *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, 51.

(Kieckhefer, 1989, p. 135). The alchemists never considered themselves as magicians. It was in the following centuries that they were considered as sorcerers with the elixir in their hands. In this sense, future generations will consider Huntington as the social alchemist of the twentieth century, whose conjured views about the world order affected the twenty-first century, taking the world back to the chaotic paradigm of the Middle Ages.

If Huntington's theories about tribal identities are put into practice, the outcome of his project will be in the form of creating "cultures" whose distinctive features have already been washed off and bleached, and in which the individual turns into the fabricated mass man. Huntington sees the creation of these characterless paradigms as necessary, and the confrontation between Western and Eastern cultures as compulsory to overcome the regional and worldwide conflicts. He thinks that a "two-part world picture may in some measure correspond with reality. The most common division, which appears under various names, is between rich (modern, developed) countries and poor (traditional, undeveloped or developing) countries" (1996, p. 32). What he really proposes here is, in fact, a bigger conflict to avoid the smaller ones. He claims that the necessity to divide the world into two has already emerged, and agrees with the scholars who "have analyzed the world in terms of the Orient and the Occident, North and South, center and periphery . . . This distinction was reflected, and in a sense reversed, at the end of Cold War by American scholars who divided the world into 'zones of peace' and 'zones of turmoil.' The former included the West and Japan with about 15 percent of the world's population, the latter everyone else" (1996, p. 32).

If Dr. Frankenstein is taken as signifying the "15 percent" in today's world, the Monster becomes "everyone else;" while Victor's biological, psychological, and cultural roots are of one origin, the Monster has been made up of bits of human remains collected from charnel houses and cemeteries: he comes to represent not one but many people(s), and stands for a convergence of cultures. His inferiority complex is grounded in his being hybridized, and in his inability to use science and technology to "create" a being—in his case a female partner—to manipulate. Though a new creature, he represents the old order, for his body parts come from those who lived in the past. He is thus a living dead, carrying in his formed (or deformed) body a soul imbued by the archetypes of the past world, and at the same time a *tabula rasa*, waiting to be encoded by his creator and creator's culture.

Victor's deserting his creation is a metaphor for all those ruinous Enlightenment and Industrialization processes which left the poor, the needy, and the destitute outside the "formal" social structure. Fleeing to a hovel next to the cottage of the De Lacey family, the Monster, by learning from the family the words and the language which initiate his thought process, becomes a thinking and criticizing being. Furthermore, by reading "*Paradise Lost*, a volume of *Plutarch's Lives*, and the *Sorrows of Werter*"

(Shelley, 1999, p.98) he develops a rebelling but compassionate psyche. These works trigger in him the already existent archetypes of the past world. As the Monster expresses, these books “which had for their object something out of self, accorded well with [his] experience . . . and with the wants which were for ever alive in [his] bosom” (1999, p. 99). By reading the works of anterior humane tradition, he encodes himself as the spiritual anti-personality against Frankenstein’s materialist paradigm. He learns from Mestrius Plutarchus (46-120 AD), Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) and John Milton (1608-1674) the humanistic fiats of the previous Occidental culture and philosophy, which emerged in the West through and after the Middle Ages as the amalgam of world cultures. The creature’s psyche is thus the product of the anterior Western culture, which has formed itself through various confrontations and interactions with the East; he comes to oppose the posterior capitalist culture which emerged from the base structure of the “enlightened” scientific order. Frankenstein, meanwhile, as the product of the new culture, refuses to communicate with this defunct civilization: he develops a neurotic reaction against the Monster (or the archetypes he represents) whose existence, he thinks, disturbs his present “unity.”

In “The Dissection of Psychical Personality,” Freud argues that “The past, the tradition of the race and of the people, lives on in the ideologies of the super-ego, and yields only slowly to the influences of the present and to new changes.” (1990, p. 213) When Frankenstein cuts all his ties with the past world, he comes to discard all the accumulated ethical experience of his culture. If Frankenstein had communicated with his creation, he could have merged his rational, conscious existence with the irrational realm, and would have acquired a more spiritual and supra-cultural identity, covering both the past and the present, Eastern and Western paradigms.

The paradigmatically shaped psyches of the two characters collide in the novel. The Monster, as the antagonist of Dr. Frankenstein’s *soi disant* “enlightened and humanistic” culture, can be considered as the pathetic residue of the East that has been formed (or deformed and defamiliarized) as a patchwork by the West during the last century. In Huntington’s words, “At the conclusion of World War I, Britain, France, and Italy administered the coup de grace and established their direct or indirect rule throughout the remaining Ottoman lands except for the territory of the Turkish Republic” (1996, p. 210), which comes to mean that the West created the Middle East out of the corpse of Ottoman Empire. In this sense, Frankenstein himself, belonging to the “powerful and organized” paradigm, and vacillating between the desires of his super-ego and id (or between “civilization” and “violence”), represents the forming (also the deforming) power of Western capitalist (and imperialist) civilization. The conflict between the two paradigms gradually turns into a multi-layered war, including in itself the remnants of historical, social, economic, and psychological interactions.

“Relatively few critics have examined *Frankenstein’s* relevance to historically

specific political and socioeconomic concerns or what bearing its psychological themes might have on these issues” (Clemens, 1999, p. 110). In fact, the repressed foreign territory of Victor Frankenstein, his unconscious mind and related instincts form the super-ego of the Western culture which has already developed a high-brow attitude concerning the other, and this phenomenon is revealed by Mary Shelley as having been formed in individuals like Frankenstein by the imperialist order. If the psychological core of this imperial mental structure is closely examined in the individuals, this may help us penetrate more into the obscure dialectic of power politics in the West.

More rationally and dispassionately than the male Romantics could, Mary Shelley strips away the “super-ego” of oligarchy; she analyzes her time’s imperialist culture to penetrate more to the core that constructs the *self* in a society whose positivistic and materialistic codes determine both culture and personality. She acknowledges the existence of a primordial potential energy for pleasure and pain in human nature, and a desire to *define* the self. She shows that culturally determined values give shape to this energy, and she sees *ambition* as having permeated into the psyche of the age which forms the psychologies of individuals. This underlines her account of Frankenstein’s construction of a self or two selves—his and the Monster’s—since Frankenstein defines *himself*, as much as the Monster, through the “pleasurable process” and then the “painful results” of creating a system.⁹

Abnegations of responsibility, stubborn intransigence, and arrogance are all the hallmarks of a culture heading for a breakdown in civilized behavior. They are also indices of psychological dysfunction, of “false consciousness” (in an existential sense, “bad faith”) or hypocritical willful misunderstanding of the duties that the exercise of free will involves. Power and social status are the gratifications in bourgeois society—and yet, in accordance with Freud’s pleasure principle, a gratification which brings with it new, unresolved desire. Likewise, the “pleasurable process” for the oligarchs of the West, who formed the Eastern world in the last century, has already turned into a new unresolved desire. No longer satisfied with the amount of power they have been enjoying, and afraid of losing this power with threats emerging from the East, they think that they have to do something new to make their supreme status continue. Frankenstein

⁹ For Freud, the stages of personality development are associated with sexuality, and he calls this process the “psycho-sexual development” of individual. If man is the outcome of this process, then his civilization is also built on this psyche. The six stages of psychosexual development for Freud are in the following order: (1) Early oral (sucking) stage, (2) late oral-sadistic (cannibalistic) stage, (3) early anal-sadistic stage, (4) late anal-sadistic stage, (5) early genital (phallic) stage, and (6) final genital stage. Corresponding to each of these stages there are corresponding developments of object love, and the various types of neurotic or psychotic disease are said to be related to dominant points of fixation when the normal transition from one stage to the next has failed to occur. (Hilgard, 15)

created the Monster to overcome death, and likewise, the Western oligarchy has created the East. The “painful results” of this process have to be encountered now by the peoples of the two worlds simultaneously, and the social theorists of imperialists like Huntington try to find an outlet for the system in trouble.

As opposed to Marxist conflict theory, which claims social change is proactive in the sense that proletariat will initiate a revolution to change the economic order and thereby transform the competitive bourgeois ethos into a passive humane culture, Huntington’s conflict theory is an aggressive one, emphasizing the necessity of disorder by which oligarchy strengthens the position and power it has been enjoying as the ruling class for centuries. To demonstrate the necessity of war, and to euphemize its cruelty, he claims that people “develop their sense of national identity as they fought to differentiate themselves from other people with different language, religion, history, or location” (2005, p. 29). It is, in fact, imperialism itself which creates a cultural super-ego, labels it as “identity,” and exploits this fabricated identity in accordance with its global interests. The motivating power behind the desire being the id of the Western culture, what the system actually needs is the existence of an ego. Social institutions, however, are built upon this neurotic psyche, which seems to be simultaneously striving after the “glorious” and the “moral,” and yearning for the satisfaction of very crude desires. Consequently, individuals are created to serve the ends of the system. Like the personality of Victor Frankenstein, which operates on two different levels (both the id and the super-ego), the Western civilization is neurotically hypocritical.

Said discusses in *Orientalism* why the West needs the East:

The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of Europe’s greatest and richest and oldest colonies, the source of its civilizations and languages, its cultural contestant, and one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other. In addition, the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience. Yet none of this Orient is merely imaginative. The Orient is an integral part of European material civilization and culture (1978, p. 23).

Accordingly, the West became the supreme world power by exploiting the old continent, and to continue its supremacy, the recurrent archetype of the East as the Other has to remain the same since this distancing gives the West the pretext to violently exploit the natural resources of the Orient. Any attempt to alter this created image of the East is to be avoided for the interaction of the Eastern paradigm with the West may give way to Western culture assuming a more universal moral appeal. Huntington now deems it necessary to refresh or recreate the depressing image of the East in the Western mind as cruel and barbaric. In fact, what Huntington is after is the re-creation of the “Western perceptions of the Orient dating back to Classical times” (2000, 15) when the Persian Empire was the greatest threat to the Hellenistic world. By refreshing the fading negative archetypes about the East in the collective unconscious of the West, he tries, with no

“empirical evidence,” to polarize and thereby separate the two paradigms, and continue the *status-quo* of the West as the dominating and colonizing power over the East.

Huntington suggests that “global tribes” sustain their positions by maintaining their unique identities. He observes identity lacunae in both Western and Eastern worlds. However, while acquiring an identity is a “must” for the West, it is something gratuitous for the East. From his perspective, acquiring identity for the Westerners depends on their isolating themselves from the Eastern paradigm, and any interaction between the two worlds is to be avoided. The relation between the two worlds is to be like the relation between the super-ego and the id without the balancing power of the ego. If such a one-dimensional psychology is achieved, the remaining polarized “purged of the ego” civilizations, may, then, come to the point of confrontation.

Although Huntington sees identity crisis as a global experience affecting not only Americans but the whole world, and showing the causes for the erosion of American identity as the “global economy, tremendous improvements in communications and transportation, rising levels of migration, the global expansion of democracy, and the end both of Cold War and of Soviet communism as a viable economic and political system” (2005, p. 13), he fails to explain what each of these terms has come to mean. He questions the deconstructionist programs that enhanced “the status and influence of subnational racial, ethnic, and cultural groups” (2005, p.144), and, comparing them with the imperial and colonial governments of the past which “provided resources to minority groups and encouraged people to identify with them, so as to enhance the government’s ability to divide and rule” (2005, p.145), he avoids revealing the neo-imperialist policies of the new order. He seems to think that the “divide and rule” policy is out-of-date. However, by not explaining the core and nature of multiculturalism, he ignores the fact that this is no different from the old imperialist strategy. Although principal political actors in the 21st century will be civilizations rather than nation-states, he is afraid that America is about to leave its three-hundred-year-old national identity, and together with it, her worldwide resources: many American banks and companies have already gone bankrupt, or been sold to the oil-rich Gulf States. While defending the unity in the West, it is understood from his tone in his works that Huntington is in favor of multifractionalism (or factionalism) elsewhere. For him, the cultural super-ego of America, which has been formed over three hundred years, is under Hispanic influence, which he sees as the greatest of all threats. Against any influence that may put at risk the great project of the oligarchy, Huntington disdains multiculturalism. There are, then, two Americas: the innocent nation-state consisting of different colors, and the established kingdom of oligarchy within this structure, driving the nation-state to dangerously profitable goals. To do this, the oligarchy needs to create a new fighting ethos formed from a one-dimensional psychology.

In addition to the persistent Orientalist approach which sees the countries in the West as imperialist powers crushing the poor Eastern peoples underfoot, through Mary Shelley we learn that imperialism sacrifices everybody regardless of race and nationality. The peoples of the West get their share from the confrontationalist policies of their governments. The social stratification in the West is being remodeled for it is no longer utilitarian. The price of labor, having already been cheapened in the world, is the beginning of the adjustment in the hierarchical arrangement, indicating that global competition is speeding up to sharpen the social pyramid. The concept of “social state” disappears, to be replaced by oligarchic totalitarianism. As Marx explains in *Surveys from Exile: Political Writings*, “At the same pace mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance” (1973, 300). Remembering what happened to “imperial” Europe during and after the two World Wars, and suggesting that the U.S., the new Olympus of world economics after World War II, used as the new military base by imperial gods, we see the infamy the oligarchy is in. Having been in a state of war since the War of Independence, and forgetting what Thomas Jefferson expressed in “The Declaration of Independence,” that “all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights” (Norton, 1994, p. 165), American oligarchy has been creating problems and victimizing Americans in various global clashes. When confronted with emerging economies like China, Russia, and India, the oligarchy takes daring steps. The war has begun. To make Americans sense “the threat,” or to initiate neurosis, the oligarchy creates a new identity crisis: Americans are provoked to define themselves through their “opposite,” and the consequent aversion created in people will be the driving power of the Western neo-classical economic system.

Frankenstein has now become a name suggesting both Dr. Frankenstein and his disparate Monster. There is truth in this naming, for the two characters, in fact, form one personality: as Frankenstein created the Monster, he also created the *doppelgänger* of his own subconscious mind. Similarly, Prof. Huntington prepared a project for the Western oligarchy to put into practice in the 21st century. Now a laboratory experiment for the West, the lands of Islam are gradually being remodeled for the sake of creating the monster by means of which the West will be able to create its anti-identity. As the West has formed the East as an alchemical contraption in the last two centuries to serve the wish-fulfillment of its alter-ego, this process is sure to continue in the future as no different from Dr. Frankenstein’s desire to define himself in terms of what he is not, a desire gratified through the construction of the other. A warning to the future generations about the coming of a dystopian world order and a foreshadowing of the extent to which man can go for the sake of “civilizing” the world, *Frankenstein* stands as a unique gothic novel with political overtones. After all, it is through this work that modern alchemists like Huntington, and the system they represent can be comprehended better.

References

- Aristotle. (1943). *On Man in the Universe: Metaphysics, Parts of Animals, Ethics, Politics, Poetics*. L. R. Loomis, Ed. New York: Walter J. Black.
- Baldick, C. (1987). *In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth-century Writing*. New York: Oxford U.P.
- Bentley, C. (2005). Family, Humanity, Polity: Theorizing the Basis and Boundaries of Political Community in *Frankenstein*. *Criticism*, 47, 3. Michigan: Wayne State U.P.
- Bhalla, A. (1991). *The Cartographers of Hell*. New Delhi: Sterling.
- Clemens, V. (1999). *The Return of the Repressed: Gothic Horror from The Castle of Otranto to Alien*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Copleston, F. (2003). *A History of Philosophy: The Enlightenment-Voltaire to Kant*. New York: Continuum.
- Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Methuen.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Freud, S. (1990). *The Dissection of the Psychological Personality. Ten Approaches*. Watson, E. A., Ducharme, E. W., (Eds.) Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Gerges, F. (1999). *America and Political Islam: Clash of Cultures or Clash of Interests*. New York: Cambridge U.P.
- Herman, E. S. (1993). The Media's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy. *Journal of International Affairs* 47, no.1 p.25.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Simon&Schuster.
- Huntington, S. P. (2005). *Who Are We? America's Great Debate*. London: Free Press.
- Hilgard, E. R. (1970). *Experimental Approaches to Psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis as Science*. E. Pumpian-Mindlin, M.D. Westport, (Eds.) Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Kieckhefer, R. (1989). *Magic in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Koç, E. (2005). *Birth of English Novel*. Ankara: Çankaya U.P.
- Lamm, R. C. Ed. (1984). *The Search for Personal Freedom*. Seventh Edition. Dubuque: C. Brown.
- Lerner, R. E. (1998). *Western Civilizations*. New York: Norton.
- Locke, J. (1960). *Two Treatises of Government*. P. Laslett, (Ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge U.P.
- Marx, K. (1973). *The Revolutions of 1848: Political Writings*. Vol. I. D. Fernbach, (Ed.) Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Marx, K. (1973). *Surveys from Exile: Political Writings*. Vol. II. D. Fernbach, Ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Ninkovich, F. (2004). *The United States and Imperialism. A Companion to American Foreign Relations*. R. D. Schulzinger, Ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Norton, M. B. (1994). *A People and a Nation: A History of the United States*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Patterson, C.H. (1966). *Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Perry, M. (1996). *Arnold Toynbee and the Western Tradition*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Punter, D. (2000). *Postcolonial Imaginings: Fictions of a New World Order*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U.P.
- Punter, D., Byron, G. (2005). *The Gothic*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Redner, H. (1990). *Political Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.
- Said, E. (2002). *Power, Politics, and Culture: Interviews with Edward W. Said*. New York: Vintage.
- Saint Augustine. (1970). *Confessions*. Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Shelley, M. (1999). *Frankenstein*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth.
- Stock, P. (2008). The Shelley and the Idea of 'Europe'. *European Romantic Review*. 19, 4. London: Routledge.
- Toynbee, A. J. (1962). *America and the World Revolution*. New York: Oxford U.P.
- Welty, P. T. (1969). *Man's Cultural Heritage: A World History*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.