

A Postmodern Novel In the Light Of Deleuzian Nomadism: Sunset Park

Deleuzecü Göçebelik Işığında Postmodern Bir Roman: Sunset Park

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

Emrah ÖZBAY¹

Gönderim Tarihi: 16.09.2019 | Kabul Tarihi: 23.03.2020

Abstract

Postmodern literature has gained much popularity in the recent years. Accordingly, the number of academic studies about the postmodern literature has increased. In American Literature, contemporary writer Paul Auster, whose books were translated to many languages including Turkish, is regarded as one of the most important representatives of postmodern literature. Auster examines the psychological world of mobile postmodern individual. The writer deals with the mental and physical mobility of American society in his novel Sunset Park. In the novel, the writer tells the story of young people who were forced to live in an abandoned building due to various reasons. Focusing on his characters' experiences and problems, Auster's reveals his characters' inner world.

While investigating nomadism, Gilles Deleuze's view about this subject has been an important guide. French philosopher created the substructure of nomadism and made new expansion into postmodern world with some definitions. The aim of this paper is to examine Sunset Park in the light of theme nomadism, and to reveal the reflection of nomadism to postmodern life and individuals.

Key Words: Paul Auster, Sunset Park, Nomadism, American Literature

Özet

Postmodern edebiyat son yıllarda büyük rağbet görmekte, dolayısıyla postmodern edebiyat ile ilgili akademik çalışmaların sayısı da artış göstermektedir. Amerikan Edebiyatı'nda, eserleri Türkçe de dahil olmak üzere birçok dile çevrilen çağdaş yazar Paul Auster postmodern edebiyatın önemli bir temsilcisi olarak görülmektedir. Auster, eserlerinde devingen postmodern bireylerin psikolojik dünyasını incelemektedir. Yazar Sunset Park adlı romanında Amerikan toplumunun zihinsel ve fiziksel hareketliliğini ele almaktadır. Bu romanda Auster çeşitli nedenlerden dolayı terk edilmiş bir binada yaşamak zorunda kalan genç bireylerin hikayesini anlatmaktadır. Auster, karakterlerin yaşadıkları tecrübeler ve sorunlara odaklanarak onların iç dünyalarını gözler önüne sermektedir.

Göçebeliği incelerken Gilles Deleuze'ün bu konudaki görüşleri önemli bir rehber niteliğindedir. Fransız filozof göçebeliğin alt yapısını oluşturmuş ve bazı tanımlarıyla postmodern dünyaya yeni açılımlar kazandırmıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı göçebelik teması altında Sunset Park'ı incelemek ve göçebeliğin postmodern hayat ve bireylere olan yansımalarını gözler önüne sermektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Paul Auster, Sunset Park, Göçebelik, Amerikan Edebiyatı

Introduction

Although philosophy and literature are closely related to each other, the number of academic studies about the relation between postmodern literature and Deleuzian nomadism is very limited. In this paper, it is aimed to analyze Paul Auster's *Sunset Park* in the light of Deleuzian nomadism. The point of this paper is that the characters in Paul Auster's *Sunset Park* can be regarded as the literary representatives of schizophrenic subjects in Deleuze's concept of nomadism. Examples both from characters' actions and speeches in *Sunset Park* will be given to support this hypothesis.

Postmodernism has become very common since the second half of the 20th century. Accordingly, postmodern writers' works have been the centre of many literary studies. Paul Auster is regarded as one of the most outstanding postmodern writers and representatives of contemporary American literature. His works have already been a suitable platform for literary studies. In his novels, Auster deals with today's individuals and sheds light on their inner world. He blends fact and fiction smoothly. His characters are usually mobile and they are in search of something missing in their lives. In his novels, Auster's themes are generally coincidence, nomadism and loneliness.

Examples of nomadic characters can be seen in Auster's novels. No sooner an individual becomes a nomad than his mobile way of living starts. Nomads have no home to come back, when the nomadic journey starts it never ends. However, the journey mentioned here is not only a physical one from one place to another; it is also a journey to the inner world of the people. As a result of this journey, individuals learn and discover new features and situations about their inner world. Theoretical aspects of nomadism directly take us to Gilles Deleuze's studies. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari's studies create a philosophical substructure for nomadism. For Deleuze, subjects can liberate their desire thanks to the migrations from striated spaces, which is created by repressive authority, to smooth spaces.

1. Nomadism

Nomadism, in the most general sense, can be regarded as a spatial movement and transfer from one geographical, social or political place to another. Changes in the dispersion of individuals are consistently observed in a social system. An individual's consistent mobility also affects the society that he belongs to. "Main reason that underlies this mobility is the individuals' desire to fulfill their motivation at the highest level because nomadism increases the opportunities which individuals can benefit from and provides vocational and social mobility" (Tekeli, 2008: 18). When an individual feels that his desires cannot be made real in the environment where he already dwells, he wants to leave that area and move somewhere new. At this point, the idea of nomadism appears.

The relation between nomadism and postmodernism is very close, because the key ideas in postmodernism give opportunity to examine nomadic life. In postmodernism, there is no absolute truth or values. The truth that people believe comes from what they think, experience and feel. Postmodernism can also be seen as an individualist philosophy; individuals rather than the society are of great importance in postmodernist ideas. Postmodernism strongly refuses any possible external interference to an individual's life from an institution, society or state. A nomadic life is regarded as a choice which can shape and renew individuals' lives. According to the understanding of modernist state, everything and everybody should be in order and stable as it is easier to direct people to any idea or keep them under pressure when they are located in an area of which borders have already been drawn by the state itself. Therefore, nomadism is against the idea of modern state institution. "With modernity, as Orwell's *Big Brother* shows this best, standardization and panopticon observation reached its highest point. Only mobile ones can escape from subtle camera of panopticon. From that moment on, the ideal of the authority is absolute immobility" (Maffesoli, 2011: 35).

Similarly, Chambers states that: "It is the dispersal attendant on migrancy that disrupts and interrogates the overarching themes of modernity: the nation and its literature, language and sense

of identity; the metropolis; the sense of centre; the sense of psychic and cultural homogeneity. In the recognition of the other, of radical alterity, lies the acknowledgement that we are no longer at the centre of the world. Our sense of centre and being is displaced” (Chambers, 2001: 23). Postmodern migrancy comes from this changing point of view.

1.1 Deleuzian Nomadism

When nomadism is discussed, Gilles Deleuze’s studies with Felix Guattari lead the way to scholars. “They anticipate the possibility of a new postmodern mode of existence where individuals overcome repressive modern forms of identity and stasis to become desiring nomads in a constant process of becoming and transformation” (Best and Kellner, 1991: 77). Deleuze, in his studies, talks about liberating bodies and desire, in other words, decentering the subjects. Decentered subjects are constantly mobile, dispersed and far away from any established identities. According to Deleuze, nomadism only depends on mobile and changing limits and in order to realize the deserved value of nomadism, it should be noted that the nomadism cannot be reduced to any movement or ideology. It is much more different than a part of any other already discussed ideology. “For Deleuze

, life is difference, the power to think differently, to become different and to create differences” (Colebrook, 2001: 13).

While discussing deterritorialization Deleuze talks about Chess and Go.

Chess is indeed a war, but an institutionalized, regulated, coded war, with a front, a rear, battles. But what is proper to Go is war without battle lines, with neither confrontation nor retreat, without battles even: pure strategy, whereas chess is a semiology. Finally, the space is not at all the same: in chess, it is a question of arranging a closed space for oneself [...] In Go, it is a question of arraying oneself in an open space, of holding space [...]. The “smooth” space of Go, as against the “striated” space of chess. The difference is that chess codes and decodes space, whereas Go proceeds altogether differently, territorializing or deterritorializing it (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 352).

In short, Deleuze stresses that chess is a game of state but Go is not. Also, for Deleuze, an individual consists of lines rather than a unity. Deterritorialization line is, in fact, a becoming line and it moves forward, it is a journey line. People, animals and plants have different becoming lines and deterritorialization appears, when an individual escapes from where he dwells.

Ali Akay also examines deterritorialization from Deleuze’s point of view and explains that “Deleuze deals with this issue from two different angles; these are negation and affirmation” (Akay, 1996: 19). In negation, deterritorialization flight lines can be broken at any time and we can find ourselves again inside the already taught terms such as identity, origin, country, nation, family... etc. However, in affirmation, deterritorialization lines are in fragments since the beginning, namely they are molecular lines and include flight lines with becoming. In affirmation, there is no risk of returning from concept of deterritorialization and individuals always move forward

Goodchild summarizes Deleuze and Guattari’s theoretical approach to nomadism: “There are no longer any true or false ideas, there are just ideas. There is no longer any ultimate goal or direction, but merely a wandering along a multiplicity of lines of flight that lead away from centers of power” (Goodchild, 1996: 2). Established thought is replaced by exploratory desires. Any move from the tradition, institutions, social norms and obligation is something desirable in their understanding of nomadism.

Further, Deleuze mentions desires when he explains nomadism, because according to Deleuze liberating the desire is one of the most crucial reasons of nomadism. “Desire is not conceived of as something to be repressed and/or contained, rather it is a flow” (Hitchcock, 2008: 110).

It is only when individuals can liberate their desire, they can feel themselves free, as well. Deleuze and Guattari’s work proceeds through conceptual dichotomies; “the hierarchical state and nomadic

tribes, paranoia and schizophrenia. It is often said that desire differs from need in that it cannot attain fulfillment; it an ever-renewed failure, a constant yearning” (Sarup, 1993: 96). By the same token, Deleuze and Guattari define desire as “not a form, but a procedure, a process (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 8).

Therefore, what Deleuze intends to do is to evaluate the desire quintessentially and set it free from every kind of pressure. However, Deleuze’s understanding of pressure on desire is different than what is commonly believed. “For Deleuze desire does not begin from lack – desiring what we do not have. Desire begins from connection; life strives to preserve and enhance itself and does so by connecting with other desires” (Colebrook, 2001: 91). Eventually the connections mentioned here constitute social unities; communities or societies are formed when the bodies gain much more power upon connecting with the other bodies. Thus the power has a role for the enlargement and development of desire. Deleuze sees singularity as a pressure on desire. For Colebrook, Deleuze comments the power different than it is commonly defined. Colebrook explains Deleuze’s ideas on power as such: “Power does not oppress us; it produces us. Cultural forms, like literature, do not deceive us; they are ways in which desire organizes and extends its investments” (Colebrook, 2001: 94). In other words, the states try to direct and manage individuals’ desire instead of putting pressure on them and this is what Deleuze exactly opposes.

Deleuze and Guattari also regard the production of schizophrenia necessary in order to make deterritorialization real. “In their analysis, schizophrenia is not an illness or biological state, but a potentially liberatory psychic condition produced within capitalist social conditions, a product of absolute decoding (Best and Kellner, 1991: 90). With their term schizophrenia, Deleuze and Guattari express a way of thinking which is totally free from any stable norm.

Schizophrenic situation can be regarded as a kind of process and at the end of this process liberation of desire is predicted. Namely, a subject who can complete this process can save himself from singularization effect of modernity. Desire is always in flux and the primary duty of the modern society is to stop and tame this flux, because once the desire is stopped, it is easier to keep it under control and shape it according to some norms.

Further, Madan Sarup defines the schizo as a free man, irresponsible, solitary and joyous and asserts that Schizo is “able to say and do something simple in his own name, without asking permission; a desire lacking nothing, a flux that overcomes barriers and codes, a name that no longer designates any ego whatever. He has simply ceased being afraid of becoming mad” (Sarup, 1993:97).

The method Deleuze and Guattari used while analyzing the production and circulation of desire in a society is termed ‘schizoanalysis’. “Schizoanalysis is the antithesis of psychoanalysis and rationalist Marxist politics” (Best and Kellner, 1991: 90). Although psychoanalysis and schizoanalysis sometimes seen as similar methods, Deleuze in his book *Dialogues* criticizes the psychoanalysis from many different aspects. He indicates that “The fact is that psychoanalysis talks a lot about the unconscious – it even discovered it. But in practice, it always diminishes, destroys and exorcises it. The unconscious is understood as a negative, it is the enemy” (Deleuze, 1987: 77). In traditional psychoanalysis, desire is “territorialized” through political and ideological structures like family, religion, school, medicine, media, etc. What Deleuze and Guattari posit is a “deterritorialized” desire. “Deterritorialization is desire as flow; it opens up possibility of multiple ways and directions at once, regardless of socially sanctioned boundaries that only seek to domesticate the flow of desire. Deterritorialized desire produces without structure because it is rhizomatic” (Hitchcock, 2008: 110). Marc Robert also argues in his article that “Schizoanalysis can be understood as an analysis of, and intervention within, the passive synthesis of time that characterizes desire and which constitutes the continuity of subjectivity.” (Robert, 2007: 126). To sum up, Deleuze and Guattari argue that the pressure, prohibition and limitations on unconscious practiced by the capitalist society caused the birth of schizophrenia.

There are also two more terms related to deterritorialization, these are “body without organs” and “rhizome”. “Deleuze and Guattari refer to the deterritorialized body as the ‘body-without-organs’. The body-without-organs is not an organless body, but a body without ‘organization’. “A body that breaks free from its socially articulated, disciplined, semiotized, and subjectified state to become disarticulated, dismantled, and deterritorialized, and hence able to be reconstituted in new ways” (Best and Kellner, 1991: 90). Bogue stresses the relation between body without organs and nomad subjects. He remarks that:

Social codes impose an exclusive, restrictive, and negative use of the disjunctive synthesis, and thereby channel desiring-production into prescribed pathways. But if those codes are scrambled, or deterritorialized, an inclusive investment of the body without organs becomes possible, and the nomadic subject, the third component of desiring-production, is produced. The nomadic subject is a point of pure intensity traversing the grid of the body without organs, a mobile locus of becoming commingling identities as it migrates from desiring-machine to desiring-machine (Best and Kellner, 1991: 94).

Similarly, Anne Sauvagnargues states that “the body without organs is useful when thinking about the corporeality and morphogenesis of bodies without tying them to an external unifying principle, such as the soul, form, or the unity of organism” (Sauvagnargues, 2003: 57). Desire wants to leave the whole body in order to realize itself, so body without organs can be seen as the last limit of deterritorialized whole body which shows unorganized situation.

Second term related to deterritorialized movement is rhizome. Rhizome is antithesis of root-tree or arborescence structure of the society. “Rhizomes are non-hierarchical, horizontal multiplicities which cannot be subsumed within a unified structure, whose components form random, unregulated networks in which any element may be connected with any other element” (Bogue, 1989: 107). As root-tree structures have stable basis and they depend on stable thinking systems they can only produce ideas which can be generalized, reduced and centralized. On the other hand, rhizome deconstructs this way of thinking and decays the dichotomies inside the system. Main target in rhizome is to demonstrate the every kind of differences and multiple thinking. “Rhizomatics is a form of ‘nomadic thought’ opposed to the ‘State thought’ that tries to discipline rhizomatic movement both in theory [...] Universalist state thought is exercised through ‘state machines’ and nomad thought combats them through its own ‘war machines’ such as rhizomatics” (Best and Kellner, 1991: 102). Deleuze and Guattari’s concepts; deterritorialization, body without organs and rhizome are all together describe Deleuze’s understanding of nomadism. Nomadic life is an experience of becoming and creation and it is against traditions. Postmodern nomads try to liberate themselves from all the roots, limits, and patterns, so resist against the state and all other institutions.

2.Sunset Park And Deleuzian Nomadism

Sunset Park was written by Paul Auster in 2010. It sets in 2008 during the economic crisis period in America. Protagonist Miles Heller has been escaping from his past since seven years. Leaving his young girlfriend behind in Florida due to some annoying problems, Miles comes back to New York temporarily. Plot of the novel covers the events Miles experienced in New York.

Before leaving New York, Miles lives with his father, step mother and step brother. This family is described as “they belonged to an artificial family, a constructed family” (Auster, 2010: 21). In their family “there were invisible fault lines, microscopic fissures to remind them that they were a patched-together entity, something not completely whole” (Auster, 2010: 21). The fault lines grow so much that the family only comes together during dinner or family travels. As a result of it, members of this artificial family start to move away from each other and they withdraw their own inner world.

The fault lines cause the appearance of flight lines in Miles’s character. The flight lines are usually used in Deleuze’s rhizomatic analysis. These lines grow inside the subject and start a break-up in

Miles' personality and the process of deterritorialization. Subject reaches the level of desire as a result of the break-up in his personality. On this level, the subject mobilizes his desires and lives this level effectively. His way of existence now follows flight lines or deterritorialization.

Later in the story, the worst thing that an artificial family can experience happens and Miles accidentally causes his step brother Bobby's death. This death is shown as a road accident but only Miles knows the truth. After Bobby's death Miles hears his father and step mother's words about him. After the speech he hears, Miles is described as: "They were chopping him into pieces, dismembering him with the calm and efficient strokes of pathologists conducting a postmortem, talking about his as if they thought he was already dead" (Auster, 2010: 29). That night Miles walks off his home by leaving a letter behind. He says when he settles somewhere he will inform his family. However, as stated in the novel "over the past seven-plus years he has settled in at any number of new addresses, but he still hasn't been in touch" (Auster, 2010: 30). In his novels, Auster's characters' lives are replete with successive journeys. When Auster's characters set off the mobility, their nomadic way of living also starts. Nomadism can be the most radical decision in characters' lives, because rest of their lives is hugely shaped in the light of this decision. From this perspective, it could be argued that Miles' letter is a manifesto of his nomadic life.

Miles settles Florida after leaving New York and meets Pilar. Miles and Pilar lives in Florida. However, Pilar is under 18 that's why their relationship sometimes causes some problems. Generally, they neglect all these problems. Written codes and traditions in the society prevent Miles and Pilar from acting each other intimately, but Miles and Pilar underestimate these limitations and even they live in the same apartment. In other words, they set their desire free and do not let the authority to limit it. Pilar's eldest sister Angela does not want Pilar to share an apartment with Miles but Miles can persuade Angela by bringing some wares to Angela. Miles takes these wares from the houses he cleans. He works as a trash-out worker. Hence, Miles achieve to persuade Angela. Angela earns money so she has the authority over her sister. Miles gives Angela some materials such as television, coffee machine and wine glasses. As stated in the novel "Pilar now lives with him because he bribed the family. He bought her" (Auster, 2010: 13). In capitalist world order individuals give much importance to materials. As is seen in Angela's attitude, she is ready and hungry to accept some different wares so that Miles can persuade her. Deleuze's schizophrenic individuals are strongly against the capitalism and capitalist way of life in a society encourages schizophrenia. However, Angela continues asking for new materials from Miles because in a capitalist society people's desire for materials never ends. Miles refuses Angela and she threatens Miles about telling his relationship with Pilar to police, because Pilar in under 18 years old. As Angela's threats continue, Miles decides to leave Florida until Pilar turns 18 and he goes back to New York to his old friend Bing's house.

Bing starts to live in an abandoned house with his friends named Alice and Ellen. Alice is a Ph.D student and a writer and Ellen is an artist. The house is located in the Sunset neighbourhood in Brooklyn. Different and problematic situations and events that the residents of the house face help them rediscover their inner world.

It is Miles's old friend Bing who first offers to live in an abandoned house and Bing's description in novel is as such: "He is the warrior of outrage, the champion of discontent, the militant debunker of contemporary life who dreams of forging a new reality from the ruins of a failed world. Unlike most contrarians of his ilk, he does not believe in political action" (Auster, 2010: 71). Bing's stance is personal; he goes on his live according to his rules and borders. He determined his own borders and tries to be an example for the others in the society. This description tells a lot about Bing. Firstly, it is clear that his rejection to any political party of movement can be seen as the rejection of meta-narratives that Lyotard mentions. He is an opponent of settled society and he makes his decisions only for himself not for others. In this sense, it should be noted that in postmodernism the society reduces to individuals. In accordance with the postmodernist point of view, a dark and pessimist world is told

in the description. Bing's choice to live in an abandoned house can also be regarded as a life-saver action for him and shows his nomadic characteristics as Deleuze stated: "nomad occupies, inhabits, holds that space; that is his territorial principle" (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 381). Bing's choice to live that abandoned house sparks Ellen and Alice and they follow him as he wishes. Moreover, when nomadic life is implied the concept of government is also stated to show the conflict between these two. Although he is against the limits and borders that governments draw in his life, his anti-violent stance differs him from other nomads.

At first sight, Bing's decision to squat in an abandoned house seems to affect no one, but as time goes by Ellen and Alice's lives are hugely shaped by his decision. When Bing learns that a house has been given to the municipality due to its unsettled debt, he does not hesitate to move and live there with his friends. His decision is mentioned in the novel as: "The decisions he makes are necessarily small ones, but small does not always mean unimportant, and day after day he struggles to adhere to the fundamental rule of his discontent" (Auster, 2010: 71). This decision can also be seen as an attack to state apparatus as municipalities are state institutions.

Bing does not use technological devices such as mobile phones and computers, he has a shop named 'the hospital for broken things' and he specializes in repairing the artifacts of a vanished world. He wages a war against capitalist understanding of buying a new one as soon as the former breaks down. Similarly, he gets interested in jazz and plays drum in a jazz band against the discourse of 'jazz is already dead'. Bing's interest in music can also be explained with Deleuze's words about desire "sleeping is a desire. Walking is a desire. Listening to music, or making music, or writing are desires, even death. Desire never needs interpreting, it is it which experiments" (Deleuze, 1987: 95). Therefore, it is understood that Bing's decisions about life can be regarded as the reflections of his desire.

For some people in the society, Bing's objection to use of technological devices can mean that he is not someone normal according to today's social norms. However, Deleuze's schizo subjects never worry about being labeled as "not normal". That's why schizo subjects do not have many friends.

Alice and Ellen also live in the house with Bing. Alice, who writes her dissertation about America after World War II, symbolizes Auster's anti-war stance that we see almost all his novels. On the other hand, Ellen works in a real estate agent and she is interested in painting. In the past, Ellen sleeps with one of her students who is only sixteen years old, and then she gets pregnant, has an abortion and commits suicide. Her psychological world is ruined. Ellen knows that she should take antidepressant pills, but instead she sees moving to the abandoned house as a kind of solution –even if it is temporary- for her problems in her inner world. She thinks that moving away from her home where she lives alone can help her cope with the trauma she is in.

Like all other residents of the house, Ellen knows very well that she cannot live there for a long period. This situation is also valid in nomadic life because there is no permanent house in nomadic life. In fact, the sense of deterritorialization is what Ellen really wants to experience. She is on the opinion that her psychological problems can only be solved with deterritorialization. When Ellen sets her desires free for the first time, the result was devastating for her, and now she listens to her desires and disobeys the rules again in order to delete the traces of her former choice.

As already stated, Ellen is interested in painting and she feels like drawing human body. Moreover, she muses on human body and organs separately. Her ideas could be linked with Deleuze's concept 'body without organs'. In this concept, what Deleuze mean is not really a body that does not have any organs, but a body in which the organs are not together. In other words, he means an unorganized body. Similarly, when Ellen draws human body, she draws hands on whole paper and eyes to other paper and arms to another paper. Therefore, the body she thinks and draws is also unorganized, too. From this perspective, Ellen's drawings can be used to comprehend Deleuze's concept of body without organs.

After Miles starts to live in the house his ideas and observation about the house and the Sunset Park is interesting: “He wanders around the streets, trying to familiarize himself with the neighborhood, but he quickly loses interest in Sunset Park. There is something dead about the place, he finds, the mournful emptiness of poverty and immigrant struggle” (Auster, 2010: 132).

Miles is the first person to link the Sunset Park with nomadism. When the mobility starts in a place, there is always emptiness, because nomads never stay in somewhere permanently. New destination for a nomad is another nomad’s previous destination. Also, Deleuze and Guattari describe the nomadic areas “as the backcountry, a mountainside, or the vague expanse around a city” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 380). It is clear from the description that the Sunset Park is far from the city centre and it seems to be abandoned just like the house they live in.

Some time later, when Alice is in the house, municipal police officer, who carries a gun, knocks the door and gives a court order. He formally informs Alice that the residents of the house are outlaw and they must leave the house as soon as possible. This scene is very important, because it is the first time in the novel that nomads face with state apparatus. As Deleuze and Guattari state “state either uses police officers and jailers in place of warriors, has no arms and no need of them, operates by immediate, magical capture, “seizes” and “binds,” preventing all combat” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 352). In this scene, municipal police officer and the court order he brings are a warning for the nomads. The authority tries to stop the combat before it is too late. State officially orders the nomads to leave the house and stop the squatting. But “the nomad is one who does not depart, does not want to depart” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 381). Upon the arrival of fourth eviction notices from the court, Alice and Ellen start to worry for themselves and their decision is mentioned as “Alice and Ellen agreed that they would turn in their squatters’ badges at that point and move on, reluctantly move on” (Auster, 2010: 286). But it is too late for them to take this decision. One day, Miles wakes up with Alice’s scream and Bing’s swearing when the police officers come home suddenly. During the melee, Miles punches one of the police officers and runs away. After a while, he decides to surrender. The negative situation he is in is portrayed as such: “As the car travels across the Brooklyn Bridge, and he looks at the immense buildings on the other side of the East River, he thinks about the missing buildings, the collapsed and burning buildings that no longer exist, the missing buildings and the missing hands, and he wonders if it is worth hoping for a future when there is no future, and from now on, he tells himself, he will stop hoping for anything and live only for now (Auster, 2010: 308)”.

In postmodernism, it is argued that hope no longer exists as seen in Miles’ life. Postmodern subjects have no hope regarding their future, that’s why they do not think about the future, they just live the moment.

As Deleuze and Guattari indicate “it is a vital concern of every State not only to vanquish nomadism but to control migrations and, more generally, to establish a zone of rights over an entire “exterior,” over all of the flows traversing the ecumenon” (Deleuze and Guattari, 2005: 385). Therefore, this final is inevitable, state apparatus uses police officers to stop the nomads and their squatting. When nomads form a war machine against the state or the institutions and they wish to start a disobedience, riot or revolution, state’s response to all these is always same. State always catches the nomads, keeps them under control and limits their area.

3.Result

It is always difficult to analyze a postmodern novel, because they are mostly open-ended and each reader can deduce something different. Ties between literature and philosophy are very close and many philosophical theories are exemplified in literary works. From this perspective, it is claimed in this paper that Paul Auster’s characters in Sunset Park can be taken as the representatives of Gilles Deleuze’s nomadic thought. Many examples from characters’ words and actions were used to support this hypothesis.

Paul Auster's characters usually start a journey and this journey deeply affects their lives. In *Sunset Park*, Miles, Bing, Alice and Ellen's journey reaches their inner worlds and sheds light on them. The nomadism can be considered only when physical journey blends with psychological one. These characters are also schizophrenic subjects according to Deleuze's description. Not because they all have psychological problems but because they resist to social norms, authority, and capitalist world system. Each of them demonstrates their resistance differently, but their stance towards the life is same.

Characters in *Sunset Park* primarily attempt to set their desires free. For Deleuze, social oppression, capitalist system and state apparatus want to keep the desires in an area of which borders are already determined. Once the desires are kept in a limited area, it is easier to control and convert them. Deleuze calls these limited areas as striated and its contrast is smooth. The nomadic movement is carried out from striated areas to smooth ones. Desires can only be set free in smooth areas.

Nomads' lives, their challenges, problems and difficulties are skillfully articulated in *Sunset Park*. No writer can write his works by totally isolating himself from the society he belongs to, so Auster reflects what he experiences and sees in America. Deleuze's terms help us comprehend the novel from all its aspects.

References

- Akay, A. (1996), Yersizyurtsuzlaşma Üzerine, *Toplumbilim* 5 Nov. pp. 19-22.
- Auster, P. (2010), *Sunset Park*, New York: Faber and Faber.
- Best, S. and Kellner D. (1991), *Postmodern Theory Critical Interrogations*. Austin: Macmillian.
- Bogue, R. (1989), *Deleuze and Guattari*. London: Routledge.
- Chambers, I. (2001), *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Colebrook, C. (2001), *Gilles Deleuze*. London: Routledge.
- Deleuze, Gilles. (1987), *Dialogues*. New York: Columbia University.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari F. (2005), *A Thousand Plateaus Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: University of Minnesota.
- Goodchild, P. (1996), *Deleuze and Guattari An Introduction to Politics of Desire*. London: Sage,
- Hitchcock, L. (2008), *Theory for Classics: A Student's Guide*. London: Routledge.
- Maffesoli, M. (2011), *Göçebelik Üzerine İnisyatik Boşluk*. İstanbul: Bağlam.
- Robert, M. (2007), *Capitalism, Psychiatry and Schizophrenia: A Critical Introduction to Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipus*, *Nursing Philosophy*, Vol. 8, no.1, pp.114-127.
- Sarup, M. (1993), *Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Postmodernism*. New York: Harvester.
- Suavagnargues, A. (2003), *Deleuze and Art*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tekeli, İ. (2008), *Göç ve Ötesi*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.

Uzun Özet

Postmodernizm kavramının dünyada ortaya çıkış zamanı konusunda üzerinde uzlaşmış bir tarih yoktur, ancak II. Dünya Savaşı sonrasında dünyada köklü farklılıklar ve gelişmelerin tecrübe edildiği konusunda ortak bir görüş vardır. Postmodernizm yirminci yüzyılın ikinci yarısından itibaren yaygın şekilde dile getirilmeye başlanmış ve postmodernist yazarların eserleri de zaman içerisinde edebi çalışmaların merkezinde yer almıştır. Artık yazılan birçok eser postmodern akımın temsilcisi durumun-

dadır Postmodern edebiyatın son dönem temsilcileri arasında gösterilen Paul Auster'ın eserleri bu alanda çalışma yapan çok sayıda akademisyen için uygun bir çalışma zemini yaratmaktadır. Kitapları Türkçe de dahil olmak üzere çok sayıda dile çevrilmiş olan Auster, çağdaş Amerikan edebiyatının en önemli temsilcilerinden biri olarak görülmektedir. Yazar romanlarında günümüz postmodern bireylerini ele alıp onların iç dünyalarına ışık tutmaktadır. Kurgu ile gerçeği başarılı bir şekilde harmanlayan Auster, romanlarında sürekli hareket halinde ve bir arayış içinde bulunan devingen karakterlere yer vermektedir. Auster eserlerini oluştururken postmodern edebiyat öğelerinin birçoğuna yer vermektedir. Göçebelik, yalnızlık ve bölünmüş aileler yazarın en sık kullandığı temaları olarak gösterilebilir. Yazar bu çalışmada incelenen romanı olan *Sunset Park*'da Amerikan toplumunun zihinsel ve fiziksel hareketliliğini ele almaktadır. Auster bu romanında çeşitli sebeplerden dolayı *Sunset Park* adlı mahalledeki terk edilmiş bir evde yaşamaya başlayan gençlerin başından geçenlerin anlatmaktadır. Auster karakterlerin geçmişlerinde yaşadıkları sorunlara odaklanarak onların iç dünyalarını gözler önüne sermektedir.

Göç kavramı günümüzde postmodern bireyin hayatının bir parçası haline gelmiştir. Göç, en genel şekliyle uzamsal hareket, bir mekândan diğerine, bir toplumsal ya da siyasal birimden diğerine doğru bir aktarım olarak anlaşılabilir. İnsanlar göç ederken buldukları mekânları değiştirerek oraları kendi alanları yaparlar. Bu bağlamda alan ile mekân kavramları arasındaki farka dikkat çekmek gerekmektedir. Alan, hem maddi hem de söylemsel düzlemde ortaya çıkan davranış, eylem, tutum, sözler ile birlikte üzerinde yaşadığımız coğrafyayı ve mekânı içine alır. Göçebelik hareketliliğin temelinde bireylerin güdülerini en yüksek düzeyde gerçekleştirme arzusu yatmaktadır. Birey istediklerinin hâlihazırda bulunduğu mekânda gerçekleşemeyeceğini hissettiği zaman bulunduğu ortamı terk edip yeni yerlere gitmek ister; böylece göçebelik düşüncesi ortaya çıkar.

Göçebeliğin postmodern düşünce tarzında kendine daha rahat ve kalıcı yer bulmasının altında yatan sebepler postmodernizmin bireye geniş özgürlükler tanınması, onu olduğu gibi kabul etmesi ve bireyi belli kalıplara sokma amacı gütmemesidir. Modern devlet anlayışında her şeyin sırada ve düzende olması gerektiği düşüncesi hâkimdir, çünkü bir yerde sabit bireylerin herhangi bir düşünceye yönlendirilmesi, kontrol altında tutulması daha kolaydır. Bu yüzden göçebelik modern devlet oluşumunun karşısında yer almaktadır.

Göçebelik konusu ele alınırken Gilles Deleuze'ün bu konudaki görüşleri önemli bir rehber niteliği taşımaktadır. Fransız filozof kendi türettiği terimler vasıtasıyla göçebeliğin alt yapısını oluşturmuş ve bu kavramın postmodern dünyada yayılmasına imkan sağlamıştır. Paul Auster'ın *Sunset Park* adlı romanındaki karakterler, postmodernizm ile ilgili kavramlar ortaya atan Deleuze'ün Guattari ile birlikte ele aldığı göçebe düşüncesinin örnekleridir. Göçebelik üzerine yapılacak olan çalışmalarda Paul Auster'ın anlatılarının önemli bir işlevi vardır çünkü göçebelerin günümüz toplumunda nasıl yer aldıkları, ne tür mücadelelere giriştikleri Paul Auster'ın romanlarında oldukça başarılı bir şekilde resmedilmektedir. Hiçbir yazar parçası olduğu toplumun etkisinden kendini tamamen soyutlayarak eserlerini oluşturamaz. Mutlaka, çevresinde şahit olduklarını kimi zaman bilerek kimi zaman bilinçaltına attıklarıyla eserlerinde yansıtmaktadır. Paul Auster, Amerikan toplumunda göçebelik düşüncesini benimseyenlerin yanında görünerek eserlerini oluşturmasına rağmen, bu düşüncenin dışında kalmayı tercih edenlere de eserlerinde yer verip okuyucuya bir kıyaslama şansı sunmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı göçebelik temasının ışığında Paul Auster'ın *Sunset Park* adlı romanını incelemek ve göçebeliğin postmodern hayat ve bireylere yansımalarını gözler önüne sermektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Paul Auster, *Sunset Park*, Göçebelik, Amerikan Edebiyatı