



PROJECT MUSE®

Turkish Censorship, Cultural Translation, and the Trial of William S. Burroughs's
The Soft Machine

Erik Mortenson

Arizona Quarterly: A Journal of American Literature, Culture, and Theory,
Volume 72, Number 3, Autumn 2016, pp. 47-73 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/arq.2016.0014>

arizona quarterly
a journal of
American
Literature,
Culture
& Theory
vol 72 number 3
autumn 2016

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/634117>

ERIK MORTENSON

Turkish Censorship, Cultural Translation, and the Trial of William S. Burroughs's *The Soft Machine*

CENSORSHIP IS A VOLATILE PRACTICE. CONSIDER THE CASE of Sultan Abdülhamid II (1842–1918), whose reign is considered an especially repressive period in Ottoman history due in large part to his desire to stifle and suppress the written word. Anecdotes of Abdülhamid's absurd practices still abound, the most noted being his interdiction concerning noses. The Sultan banned any use of the word *burun* (nose) because he felt it was a reference to his own particularly large one. This created problems, because in Turkish “burun” has several meanings. Thus, when the translator of Pierre Loti's novel *Le Pêcheur d'Islande* (*İzlanda Balıkçıları* in Turkish or *An Iceland Fisherman*; 1886) wanted to translate the geographical term “cape,” he had “to give a full definition of the term instead of using the word itself” (Boyar 419–20). The irony is that censorship often calls more attention to the very thing that it is striving to suppress, and noses, rap lyrics, pornographic images, and other banned material often find themselves even more well-known in the process. This is certainly true of Abdülhamid. The anecdote of the censored nose has made it certain that the embarrassing member that Abdülhamid fought so hard to conceal has become the very thing that comes to mind when his name is mentioned.

Another instance of censorship in Turkey is the obscenity trial of William S. Burroughs's *The Soft Machine* (1961). The trial process began on April 27, 2011 when Turkey's Committee for the Protection of Minors from Harmful Publications (*Küçükleri Muzır Neşriyattan Koruma Kurulu*) decided that the book is an “account of an undisciplined sex addict that holds no moral principle dear” (Sel Yayıncılık,

“Bir kararımız”). Burroughs’s book, along with Chuck Palahniuk’s equally provocative *Snuff* (2008), quickly became a cause célèbre for publishers, translators, and proponents of what has come to be labeled “underground literature” (*yeraltı edebiyatı*) in Turkey. Though the trial is officially about obscenity, what is really under debate is how much license will be given to works that celebrate provocative sexual practices in a country that is traditional, collectivist, and to many, becoming increasingly religiously and politically conservative. An examination of para-textual material such as personal interviews, book jacket blurbs, government reports, news coverage, and Turkish legal proceedings reveals how the book’s supporters turned the trial into a cultural event in order to raise awareness of repressive government practices as well as the often unmentioned issue of homophobia in Turkey.

Beat scholarship has tended to focus on individual Beat authors and their contributions to particularly American postwar issues. The emergence of the transnational as a rubric has been influenced by this history, with most studies exploring questions of influence, cross-hybridization, and the impact of international experience on the Beats themselves.¹ As a writer who spent much of his life abroad, Burroughs has inspired a number of transnational studies. Many of these read the importance of place as a means to understand his work.² These studies offer invaluable contexts that help to better understand Burroughs and his work. Yet the fact remains that questions of contemporary use get short shrift in the field, despite Burroughs’s ongoing global circulation.

Transnationalism is more than just a question of influence—it also raises interesting questions concerning how texts are used, disseminated, and appropriated. Shelley Fisher Fishkin, in her often-cited presidential address to the American Studies Association, includes studies of cultural translation in her call for a more transnational approach to the field: “We need to understand the cultural work that forms originating in the United States do in cultures outside this country, studying their reception and reconfiguration in contexts informed by a deep understanding of the countries where that cultural work is taking place” (33). The Beats are clearly being reproduced globally, and thus it makes sense to turn a scholarly eye to the ways in which the Beats are re-entering the social field, both in America and outside its borders.³

Tracking the reception of Beat texts outside their American context offers insights into how local contexts shape their reception in new

and interesting ways. For example, the Turkish reception of Burroughs's *The Soft Machine* demonstrates that the image of the rebel so beloved in the American context is downplayed in Turkey. The idea that Burroughs's work poses a challenge to all forms of "control" is a leitmotif in both the scholarship and the popular understanding of his work. In an early study, Timothy S. Murphy argues in *Wising Up the Marks* that "Burroughs's literary career is defined by the central challenge he sets himself: to find an escape route from the linked control systems of capital, subjectivity, and language" (4). This trend continues in Davis Schneiderman and Philip Walsh's more recent *Retaking the Universe: William S. Burroughs in the Age of Globalization*, a collection that frames Burroughs's resistant practices as challenges to global capitalism's various systems of control. In more popular circles, Burroughs's importance for both the Punk movement and cyberculture has contributed to an image of the writer as a sort of "grandfather" of resistance that lingers into today. While Burroughs is acknowledged as an iconoclast in Turkey as well, media coverage tends to downplay such rebellion, preferring instead the image of Burroughs as elder statesman of the Beat generation. But the repackaging of the text through the mechanism of the censorship trial reignites the countercultural importance of Burroughs's text, forcing the more controversial issue of homosexuality to the fore.

Like its textual cousin, cultural translation reconfigures source materials based on interested, local needs of the present in ways that reveal gaps, occlusions, and aporias. One of the ironies of *The Soft Machine's* censorship trial is that a writer marginalized in the American queer community now finds himself an inadvertent activist for gay rights. Jamie Russell observes that the question of Burroughs's homosexuality has been elided both in the popular press as well as in the critical literature. Because of Burroughs's desire to "ape the dynamics of a masculine, heterosexual dominant that ultimately can never accept them," his work has met with resistance within the gay community (7). Burroughs, by positioning himself outside both homosexual and heterosexual traditions, often remains invisible to both.⁴ Yet in Turkey, the championing of *The Soft Machine* as an assault on Turkish heteronormativity has inadvertently reinscribed Burroughs's work within a discussion over homosexuality. Burroughs was not a gay rights activist, but in Turkey his work becomes part of the cause to raise the visibility of a marginalized lifestyle. Thus cultural context has the power to highlight

certain readings that have been occluded in one culture, while downplaying others.⁵ In a way, then, Turkey “outs” Burroughs.

Through the Turkish censorship trial the social critique that the Beats launched against mainstream American culture at midcentury is once again viable. But in Turkey, the nature of that critique has shifted, inflected by local concerns and presuppositions. *The Soft Machine* has become a means of opening up a space for debate and fostering a discussion of issues, rather than a text to be analyzed in terms of its thematic content or admired for its innovative stylistics. This is not to say that all of *The Soft Machine*’s Turkish audience cannot understand or appreciate the book’s thematic or formal aspects. Burroughs has his Turkish admirers and there is a consensus that he is a legitimate author. The censorship trial, however, has given *The Soft Machine* an afterlife. While the trial has made Burroughs’s novel once again provocative, timely, and relevant, demonstrating the continual relevancy of Beat texts for countercultural dissent, it also demonstrates the malleability of the Beat message as it enters the global social field.

THE BEATS IN TURKEY

The sort of cultural revolution that the Beats helped to foment in the postwar period in the United States is arriving belatedly to Turkey. The main reason for this delay resides in Turkey’s turbulent history. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, a highly successful military leader in the First World War, seized power in 1923, effectively ending Ottoman rule and establishing modern Turkey. Multiparty democracy was created in 1945, but with it came unrest; resistance in Turkey played out in direct political conflict that often boiled over into violence. By the late 1970s, violent street clashes between leftist and nationalist students claimed up to twenty lives a day, and the Turkish military stepped in to restore order (Ahmad 146). Although there had been coups in 1960 and 1971, the 1980 coup was a watershed moment in Turkish history. The violence ended, and Turkey jettisoned its state-centered economy and entered the global marketplace. But along with greater economic exchange came an increased cultural exchange. A new generation was able to connect with the world, allowing for the importation of both Western ideas and products. With direct political action suppressed, attention gradually moved toward the cultural as the realm for challenging the establishment.

The cultural rebellion championed by the Beats is now playing out in contemporary Turkey. The rise of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's right-wing Justice and Development Party (AKP), and its increasing ability to implement more conservative policies in the country, demonstrates a renewed push towards political and religious conservatism. In 2011, for example, the government passed ordinances limiting the consumption of alcohol in the Istanbul entertainment district of Taksim, and the following year banned alcohol on college campuses and restricted alcohol company sponsorship for public events. New restrictions continue to occur with regularity. Although given Turkey's traditional and conservative attitude towards gender relations, limits to sexual freedom would have existed regardless of political party, the situation has been made worse by AKP's unwillingness to address social change. Not only does this come from the government itself, but from general social pressure to conform to traditional standards of behavior. In a recent news article, an Istanbul bus driver took it upon himself to remove two heterosexual lovers who were kissing on a bus (Ertem). Women and minority groups have faced similar treatment. In such an environment, there is increased pressure on non-mainstream groups and a lower threshold for tolerating deviant and marginal behavior.

Given the suppression of dissent after the 1980 coup as well as Erdoğan's dominance, Turkish youth has become disenchanted with traditional politics. The Gezi Park protests that erupted in May 2013 over the proposed building of a mall in the park demonstrated this new cultural approach to social justice. The protests included a broad range of social groups, including LGBT protestors and Istanbul's transvestite sex workers, who sought redress not in the political arena, but rather through a public condemnation of what they saw as the ruling party's suppression of their freedom to live their lives as they saw fit. But this restless group of predominantly younger Turks looking for a means of expression is as yet only one faction among many. While only time will tell if this group will crystallize into the sort of juggernaut that was 1960s American youth counterculture, in the meantime it appears as though they will continue to raise their voice against Erdoğan and his repressive policies.

In order to understand the role Beat texts like Burroughs's *The Soft Machine* play in Turkey, it is crucial to trace their initial reception through the concept of the "underground."⁶ While some Beat poetry

was translated as early as the 1960s in Turkish literary journals, the Beats' increased visibility in the culture really began much later, in the early 1990s. Following the easing of restrictions and access to foreign materials in the wake of the 1980 coup, rock-and-roll fanzines began to appear that provided readers with access to information about the Beats and translations of their works. But because the Beats were interspersed among other countercultural texts, editors needed a catch-all term to describe this new form of cultural import, and settled on the "underground." This reception history is important for understanding the subsequent appropriation of the Beats in Turkey. The term "underground," borrowed directly from Western countercultural tradition, describes a range of countercultural products, from bands like Led Zeppelin and Nirvana, to critical theorists such as Guy Debord, to film mavericks like David Lynch, as well as to the Beats and other postwar American countercultural writers and figures. In addition, while earlier underground products were exclusively Western imports, over time a homegrown Turkish variant has flourished, drawing on Western models while amending and updating them for a contemporary Turkish audience.

The importance of the term "underground" is that it signals a challenge to cultural norms. While most coverage in the Turkish media dealt with reviews of new Beat translations, two prominent literary journals, *Varlık* (2005) and *Notos* (2011), ran a series of articles by publishers, editors, critics, and underground writers attempting to define "underground" and establish its importance. Two critical tendencies emerged from these dossiers (*dosyalar*): The underground was seen either as a group of texts with "dark" themes, characters, and storylines that transgress established norms; or, as in the Soviet *samizdat* tradition, as illegally distributed clandestine material. In either case, the term signals a challenge to the prevailing social and cultural norms of Turkish society. The underground is one of the few places where such controversial material surfaces in Turkey, and while its readership is small, it is predominantly young and vocal.⁷ Unsurprisingly, readers and publishers of underground works were important contributors to the Gezi demonstrations, and continue to challenge social norms through the distribution of such provocative literature.

The upsurge in the underground as a locus for dissent is heavily indebted (like the Gezi protests and the Arab spring) to a media-savvy youth culture that readily shares its thoughts and feelings concerning

these works on Facebook, Twitter, blogs, and fan websites—despite the attempts of the Turkish government to ban such online networks. With the rise of globalization and the internet, access to underground texts has increased exponentially. Underground literature will never be the sole catalyst for social change, but it does inspire a growing number of young readers dissatisfied with current Turkish society and its aversion to openly discussing controversial subjects. While homosexuality is only one such issue, the trial heightened awareness of LGBT issues throughout underground online forums and quickly spread to a larger audience concerned with human rights in Turkey.

MENTIONING THE UNMENTIONABLE

Ultimately, the trial is about homosexuality, which is a difficult topic to discuss publicly in Turkey. The prosecution claims that *The Soft Machine* violates Article 226 of the Turkish penal code which prohibits the depiction of “sexual acts performed with the use of force, animals, a human corpse, or in any other unnatural manner” (128–29), specifically citing the depiction of “male-to-male sexual relations” (*erkek erkeğe cinsel ilişkilerin*) in the text as an example of such “unnatural” acts (Sel Yayıncılık, “Bir kararımız”). Although Turkey has a history of accepting homosexual entertainers that dates back to the Ottoman Empire and continues to this day, the issue is not perceived as a polite topic of conversation. Indeed, the Turkish language does not have any neutral terms for homosexual practices. Burroughs’s novel *Queer* (written 1951–53; published 1985) is translated as *top*, a word which literally means “ball” but conveys a pejorative sense of passivity. *İbne*, a term borrowed from Arabic, comes from “iba” or “bin” and is likewise derogatory, translating into “son that is a girl.” “Gay” (*gey*), a term introduced from Western discourse, has a more neutral connotation, but has not been widely adopted. The title “The Soft Machine” is Burroughs’s phrase for the human body, and the novel’s fragmented narrative explores the multiple ways in which this “machine” can be both enslaved and freed. In Turkish, the phrase unwittingly announces its licentiousness in its very title. “Soft” is translated into Turkish as *yumuşak*, which connotes passive homosexuality. Burroughs’s other books that contain homosexual content have not been brought to trial, which seems to suggest that its title may be what drew the attention of the Committee or concerned citizens. Indeed, *The Soft Machine* does deliver the homosexual activity

that its translated title inadvertently announces, confirming conservative fears that the text undermines traditional Turkish values.

While there was no way to know that *The Soft Machine* would become involved in a censorship trial, the decision to translate Burroughs's text was political from the start. *The Soft Machine's* publisher İrfan Sancı, like most publishers of underground texts, started out in politics. A staunch leftist, Sancı was active in radical politics and even spent time in prison as a result of his activities. But with the 1980 coup, the Turkish left was dealt a huge blow from which it never recovered, forcing many on the left to become conservative or quit politics altogether. Others, like Sancı, chose to remain politically engaged by moving into publishing. Sancı founded Sel Publishing in 1990 and initially published political works by journalists. By 1993, it had branched out into literature. Sancı is self-consciously taking on the government by publishing books like *The Soft Machine*, declaring, "I set myself a goal of publishing works that are not easily publishable due to censorship or moral constraints." Despite the fact that he has been engaged in numerous censorship trials in the past and knows that the material he publishes will oftentimes attract the attention of the censor, Sancı refuses to bow to pre-censorship. The back cover of *The Soft Machine*, in fact, includes excerpts from the Committee's decision as a means to heighten awareness of censorship and to display the ridiculousness of the Committee's homophobic position.⁸ As Sancı explains, he wanted "To expose the Committee and to show how useless and even how harmful they are."

THE TRIAL

The prosecution's argument is based on three points: the book is harmful to minors, it has no literary value, and it is immoral. It must be considered harmful to minors in order to fall under the Committee's purview, though as the defense repeatedly states, as did defenders of *Naked Lunch* (1959 in France; 1962 in the U.S.) in its 1966 Boston trial, the book is intended for an adult audience and is not sold in venues marketing to children. The claim that it has no literary value is due mainly to the fact, again as in the Boston and 1959 *Big Table* trials, that literary works are protected under the law so that in order to be considered "obscene" they must be shown to have no literary merit. Ultimately, however, the trial is about morality. Although they invoke the pretense of defending minors, the rhetoric of both the Committee

and the prosecution makes clear that they think the book is unfit for any Turkish citizen.

The prosecution begins by arguing that the publisher of *The Soft Machine* has failed to protect children from this “harmful” publication. Provision seven of Article 226 of the Turkish Penal Code states that “The provisions of this article shall not apply, except section 3, to artistic or literary works where children are prevented from accessing such” (129). The prosecution brackets the question of artistic merit here, focusing instead on the requirement that children be prevented access to such materials: “On the cover of the book *The Soft Machine*, there is no warning regarding this issue. This is one of the reasons the prosecution decided to review this book and send it to the Committee for further review” (Sabitfikir). According to the prosecution, the publishers failed to provide information that would deter children from purchasing the work.

The defense counters that the publishers are not selling to minors. The book is not being sold on the street or at newspaper stands, but only in bookstores that are frequented by adults. As Martin de Haan, President of CEATL (The European Council of Literary Translators' Associations) argues,

It is evident that the novels at stake do not address children, that they are not published as ‘children’s literature’ and that they will not be presented as such. CEATL sincerely hopes that Turkish legislation for the protection of children will not be used to restrict the freedom of expression of translators, publishers, readers or any other actors in the literary field.

The Turkish Association of Literary Translators puts it even more bluntly: “Since it is evident that these publications do not address children, since they are not published as ‘children’s literature’ and since it is out of the question that they will be presented as such, their legal prosecution is the manifestation of a prohibiting mentality that considers every means permitted to interfere in our cultural and social life” (Çevbir). The subsequent arguments of the Committee demonstrate the accuracy of these groups’ claims. The directive to protect Turkey’s youth is simply an excuse—the real goal is to police the general morals of the country.

The question of whether the book is marketed to minors is admittedly a bit more difficult. The packaging is clearly appealing to adults (the cover is an image from the 1966 underground film *Chappaqua*, which includes cameos by Burroughs and Allen Ginsberg) and Sel Publishing's advertising does not appear to target minors. But the publishers are a bit disingenuous here. Sel has partnered with the publishing house 6:45 (also written out as Altıkırkbeş) in order to promote the book and its cause. But 6:45, while not overtly marketing directly to youth, does enjoy a huge popularity with this group, including minors. Warnings of the provocative nature of the material can also be alluring. As *Snuff's* publisher Abdullah Yılmaz playfully remarks, "You announce it beforehand that this book is about porn, what better way is there to protect minors? What better way is there to protect minors than to announce it (in the title)?" But whether such an announcement is a warning or an enticement is not quite clear. As with Tipper Gore's campaign for warning labels for US popular music, this practice could simply become another means of attracting attention.

The Committee, however, is not content to restrict its criticisms to questions of distribution. It also wants to undermine the status of these books as literary works, for two reasons. If the Committee can show that *The Soft Machine* lacks literary merit, they can challenge its status as a protected literary text. Thus the language of the prosecution conflates the stylistic and the thematic continuously:

In this book that holds no moral system dear, an undisciplined, anti-social, sex-addict type is characterized in a narrative that lacks coherence, is randomly written without unity in the storyline, and utilizes slang expressions with a disconnected style. Especially male-to-male sexual encounters are described with descriptions of time and space to such an extent that they are harmful to feelings of morality and chastity. (Sabitfikir)

An assault on narrative style opens the door to a critique of morals. The Committee finds that *The Soft Machine* both "lacks coherence" and is the "account of an undisciplined sex addict who holds no moral principle dear." The unstated assumption is that such an immoral figure is incapable of producing great literature. The narrative, according to the Committee, is more concerned with depicting detailed descriptions of

“male-to-male sexual encounters” than with maintaining “unity in the storyline.” The accusation is that Burroughs, a writer bereft of moral compass, is simply reveling in “anti-social” events depicted in a “dis-connected style” (Sabitfikir). For the Committee, it comes as no surprise that such moral degeneracy would be couched in an incoherent form—both are indicative of corruption.

The defense counters that the Committee is not qualified to judge such literary matters. In a public statement issued by Sel, they state that

The prosecution repeats such baseless accusations as “[the work makes] no additional contributions to the intellectual treasury of readers, it has no value as a literary work, and lacks coherence in subject and narrative” of the Committee which is in no way qualified to evaluate a literary text and only makes subjective evaluations. (Sabitfikir)

For the defense, the Committee is not composed of literary experts, and even the outside readers they choose are oftentimes equally unqualified. Typically, qualified literary experts are not inclined to support the Committee’s objections, but the Committee has oftentimes pressed on despite expert testimony. As the Turkish Association of Literary Translators notes, “In 2010 three books published by Sel Publishers . . . were passed on to the Committee for the Protection of Children from Harmful Publications in spite of an expert opinion which explicitly stated that the three books were literary works and not considered to be obscene” (Çevbir). The Committee’s actions seem motivated more by their own conceptions of morality rather than the legal merits of particular cases.

The defense also points out the Committee’s neglect of social context when targeting works. Focusing solely on words taken out of a larger context has blinded the Committee into branding books obscene when, in actuality, their use of such vocabulary is calculated: “The writings are evaluated by the whole world with respect to political and social background, and they are not branded as pornographic just based on the words” (Sabitfikir). According to the defense, words cannot simply be taken out of context and labeled obscene. Writers like Burroughs purposely counter rules and norms, and such language is an integral part of their project. Burroughs’s cut-up technique, for instance, is meant to challenge accepted notions of language and meaning. To write the

novel off as “fragmented” and “lack[ing] coherence” is to miss the point entirely. *The Soft Machine* is not supposed to read like a standard novel.

The prosecution acknowledges that the Beats challenged social norms, and that Burroughs is a key part of this taboo-breaking group. However, they quickly counter that Turkey is not America, and that morals are relative. Pornography, for example, has a much more limited scope in Turkey. As the prosecution explains, “If the description is erotic it is not a crime, but if it moves away from eroticism and goes into the details of sexuality such as descriptions of sexual organs or intercourse, it becomes pornography and that is a crime” (Sabitfikir). The graphic depictions might be acceptable in more liberal societies like America or Europe, but in Turkey (so the argument goes) it is unlawful. The prosecution invokes a classic example of moral relativism: drug consumption in Holland. They write, “It is a fact that understanding of morality is different in different countries. For example, while it is permissible to consume a certain amount of a certain drug in Holland, it is forbidden in our country” (Sabitfikir). Ultimately, what is at stake here is a discussion over what should be allowed. The defense is purposely pushing these limits in order to raise the question of where Turkey’s social policy should be going.

The real issue with *The Soft Machine* is its graphic depiction of homosexuality. The fourth provision of Article 226 prohibits the depiction of “sexual acts” in an “unnatural manner” (129). In both their rhetoric and emphasis, the prosecution makes the portrayal of homosexual acts the crux of the issue. In a statement by the prosecution the reason for the trial is made clear from the outset: *The Soft Machine* contains twenty pages of detailed descriptions of homosexual acts. As the prosecution’s statement explains, “In the work titled *The Soft Machine*, homosexual relations are included and this inclusion moves away from short descriptions to the details of the relations and their form and this does not occur in a few pages in the book but is observed in twenty separate places” (Sabitfikir). The repeated, detailed descriptions of male-to-male sexual encounters and the fact that the prosecution bothered to tally these instances demonstrates a fixation on homosexuality. As Sancı notes, “It consists of old male members, it is a homophobic committee, and they especially cannot tolerate incest and male sexuality.” In fact, they have only had one female member, and she did not join until 2007. While both the prosecution and the Committee briefly

allude to drug use and Burroughs's anti-social image, the homosexual aspect of the novel receives the bulk of the attention.

In the US trial of *Naked Lunch*, homosexuality emerged as a topic, but soon gave way to discussions of literary style and drug addiction. Although the 1960s were generally a time of sexual exploration, homosexuality was a sensitive topic that only came up sporadically in the book's defense, while the issue of drug use was far more compelling. This is not to say sexuality was elided—obscenity was the reason the book was on trial in the first place. But it was easier to discuss stylistic concerns or drug addiction than male-to-male eroticism. Moreover, since the defense only had to show that the book had redeeming social value, it was free to choose a less sensitive subject such as drug use over homosexuality. Many who defended Burroughs did so under duress; they were not happy with its literary value and thought it close to pornography. As Michael Goodman notes, Burroughs's work "caught the critic between a belief in taste and a traditional revulsion for the censor" (4). Nelson Algren, for example, supported *Chicago Review* but did not like the Beat issue. Many critics, like Lionel Trilling, discussed it as literary event rather than as literature (Goodman 23, 161). Ginsberg, of course, defended it, as did others like Mary McCarthy and Norman Mailer. But critical response was divided and fierce. *Naked Lunch* was either the death knell of humanism or the beginning of a radically new type of novel. The fact that it could be both was perhaps the most troubling thought of all. It would not be until a few years after the trial, with the Stonewall Riots of 1969, that gay rights would be taken up as a battle cry.

The Soft Machine exposes readers to the topic of homosexuality that is repressed in Turkish cultural discourse. The defense, however, is unable to employ this fact in its arguments for fear of undermining its own credibility. This places the defense in a difficult position. Lack of American-style First Amendment guarantees means they are unable to draw on arguments relating to freedom of speech and expression that Western groups have employed when defending the book. Turkish supporters are likewise restricted from providing direct rebuttals to the issue of "immorality" that the prosecution explicitly raises; to do so would unleash a strong reaction by a majority of the population that considers such sexual practices unethical. The irony is that while the publisher, the translator, and the book's supporters privately admit that

the book is important in combating Turkish prejudice, they are unable (or unwilling) to publically invoke this argument in their defense. Instead, they counter the prosecution's arguments according to the letter of the law, arguing that the book is not being read by minors and has internationally recognized literary merit, and not that such a trial should not be conducted or that such accusations reveal a homophobic tendency running throughout the culture. But beyond the courtroom is another matter.

BURROUGHS AS REBEL

The image of the Beat writer taking a heroic stand against the stifling beliefs of mainstream society has become an accepted cultural legacy in America. But it is important to remember that the Beats' texts are not performing the same cultural function in the same manner everywhere. For many outside the American cultural context, the romanticization of the Beat as rebel holds less appeal. One reason for this is because in Turkey, the idea of a "rebel" means something quite different, something far more sinister than celebratory. Implicated as it is in notions of Kurdish resistance best exemplified by groups like the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK), the title of "rebel" is something looked down upon as an aberration to be shunned. Another reason for Turkey's de-emphasizing characteristic American individualism is that Turkish culture is more collective. The importance of familial commitment and traditional neighborhoods, though waning, is still a palpable force in Turkish life. America has a long history of glorifying the myth of the individual who takes it upon himself to challenge the system. But this "go-it-alone" stance is less celebrated in Turkey, a point of view that could help facilitate a reevaluation of the Beats and their function as cultural signifiers.

The Turkish media reception of Burroughs acknowledges his controversial status, offering a sort of "cautious praise" that seeks to present him in the most positive light. Burroughs does not receive as much media attention as figures like Jack Kerouac, Ginsberg, or especially Charles Bukowski, and much of the media coverage Burroughs does receive involves the censorship trial. Reviews of his translated novels, typically written by those with an interest in his work, tend to be positive. Critics routinely address his use of drugs as well as his homosexuality, but it is the issue of violence that garners most attention. An

article in *Birgin*, for example, discusses Burroughs's shooting of his wife Joan Vollmers in a game of William Tell, concluding, "Not a good guy who has good works" (Kırlı). Nevertheless, the majority of articles on Burroughs's life and work shift attention away from such scandalous details to focus on his struggles to live life as he saw fit and to highlight his stylistic contributions. Because of his extreme positions, Burroughs does not garner the sort of unconditional praise allotted to figures like Kerouac, but he is seen as an important and interesting Beat figure worthy of discussion.⁹

The figure of Burroughs as iconic rebel, gun-loving outlaw, wise-cracking Uncle Bill, or *el hombre invisible* is present in Turkey, but the defense wisely tones down this anti-hero message. Burroughs's age and conservative appearance help to make him more of a curiosity than a threat. Although his reputation as provocateur precedes him, the Turkish media mainly provides a deferential treatment of his work and life. In the photographs that appear in Turkish publications, he is inevitably depicted as an older gentleman neatly dressed in suit and tie. Given this image, the supposedly rebellious figure of Burroughs could easily be lost among the tea-drinking Turks playing backgammon in the local café. In the trial and in their media campaign, the defense is savvy enough to play on such depictions, limiting Burroughs's role to the older, wiser "leader" of the Beat Generation. The cultural situation in Turkey demands a different Burroughs than the one cherished in the United States.

The Beats are still viable counterculture figures in Turkey, but their function as such has changed. Beat writers are more important for some of the countercultural positions they hold and less because they exemplify the American ideal of the lone individual fighting the repressive system. Cultural difference demands a rethinking of what it means to challenge society. Burroughs remains a rebel in Turkey, but not due to his innovative style, idiosyncratic character, suspicion of "control," or even his views on narcotics. Instead, his work has struck the sensitive nerve of homosexuality. Like other cultural products, exported counterculture can be employed in unexpected ways in its new cultural home.

A QUESTION OF STYLE

Burroughs's Turkish translation reveals a very different understanding of his literary contributions. Süha Sertabiboğlu, the translator of *The Soft Machine* and other notable English-language works, admits

that he found *The Soft Machine* more valuable as social statement than literary classic, stating, “The book doesn’t have any aesthetical value, it doesn’t give you any pleasure to read it. Whatever there is in literature that is to attract people, they are doing the exact opposite. Everything is dirty here; whatever people would find repulsive and not welcome is here.” Sertabiboğlu is no stranger to Burroughs’s work. On the contrary, he has re-read each book of the trilogy several times and has also translated Burroughs’s book of dreams, *My Education* (1995). Yet Sertabiboğlu dislikes Burroughs’s style.

Sertabiboğlu’s reaction demonstrates the extent to which underground texts such as *The Soft Machine* push literary and social expectations.¹⁰ The expectation that texts are meant to convey fine feelings and to sound pleasant to the ear is one of the major difficulties Beat and other underground works face in gaining acceptance in Turkey. Ozan Marakoğlu, writing in *Notos*, discusses Turkish readers’ perception of the literary and how it impinges on the debate. For Marakoğlu, Turkey’s traditional taste is for a literature that is “overly decent as well as boring” and concludes (sarcastically) that “the shameless literature that the reader with this education feels close to is actually a literature that doesn’t fit to its definition on the syllabus. The thing that doesn’t fit to the definition of literature at school must be something other than literature—something underground” (49). Routinely decried as “dark,” “black,” and “dirty,” such texts are dismissed as unpleasurable, poorly constructed, or simply the negative reactions of unhappy individuals. *The Soft Machine*, which revels in detailed descriptions of acts and characters that many readers would consider repugnant, is exemplary in this regard.

The gap between Turkish and English, both culturally and structurally, is part of the difficulty. Sertabiboğlu uses the idea of “squeezing” (the Turkish here is *sığdırmak*, that is, to make something fit into a container) Burroughs’s text into Turkish. Turkish makes do with fewer words by expanding the range of meaning of existing words, and by combining words to capture slight variations in connotation. Moreover, spoken Turkish favors polite expression and typically avoids the use of harsh language. In order to translate a text replete with slang such as *The Soft Machine*, Sertabiboğlu describes how he was forced to resort to non-polite forms to capture the rough feel of the text. A corollary to this softening of the content is Sertabiboğlu’s attempt to soften the sound as well. As a language that subscribes to the law of vowel

harmony, Turkish often sounds more melodic than some of its European counterparts. When endings are added, a vowel that corresponds to the preceding vowel in the stem is used. Sertabiboğlu notes that “While translating I tried to put in words that are sounding similar next to each other to make it sound not bad on the ear. I also tried to use words that are associated with each other successively so there would be fluidity.” What all of this demonstrates is that Burroughs’s text strikes the Turkish reader as harsh in both tone and content. Although not all Turkish literature conforms to this standard aesthetic, it would be fair to say that underground texts like *The Soft Machine* are received in Turkey as a sort of “anti-literature” which breaks with aesthetic expectations.

Given such differences in aesthetic values, it is unsurprising that Burroughs’s work is less read than that of his underground contemporaries in Turkey. Reviewers such as Fatih Özgün praise his style for its dislocating effects:

Burroughs deals fanatically with language, with pure, clear language, with spoken, preached, delirious language. He’s not interested in the introduction-body-conclusion format. It’s possible to start his books from the middle or the end, or even from the beginning, and ask slightly heatedly, ‘what’s he talking about?’ It’s like a river that flows on its own, concerned about its own flow, not about carrying you somewhere. You are alone as a reader, and must learn to swim. First for dear life, then for pleasure. The Burroughs style is one long, single flow that pulls you in.¹¹

But this lack of structure and attention to the “flow” of language makes for a difficult reading experience. While some may learn to savor such work, others are simply confused. Such difficulty has led to Burroughs being translated into Turkish very late. The first Burroughs novel translated into Turkish, *Ghost of Chance* (1991; *Şans Hayaleti*), was only published in 1996, and even his classic *Naked Lunch* only appeared in 1998, nearly forty years after its initial publication. The majority of translations are put out by 6:45 press, while Kerouac and Ginsberg have been published by larger and more established presses. In a study of Beat and underground readership, Burroughs is the least read of these three Beats, and only 3.3% of respondents claimed to have read *The Soft Machine*,

although the trial came up in several focus groups (Mortenson, Ergun, and Erdoğan 103). Fortunately for Burroughs and those who champion his work in Turkey, audiences do not necessarily need to read the book to get its message.

THE MEDIUM AND THE MESSAGE

In order to take their fight outside the courtroom, the defense has embraced social media. As the entire world witnessed in light of the Arab Spring, a highly connected world has the advantage of disseminating information quickly via the internet, allowing a wide range of geographically-dispersed users to be alerted to unfolding events instantaneously. Just as American editions of *Naked Lunch* incorporated trial excerpts into their introductory material, the book's publisher, Sel Publishing, includes excerpts from the Committee's report on the book's back cover and trial transcripts on its website. By these means, the text incorporates its surrounding controversy. As Goodman notes, "In subsequent printings of *Naked Lunch*, the introductory material has included numerous excerpts from the Boston trial, suggesting that the trial can be considered as a part of the book" (5). In this earlier American context, such a strategy only worked after the trial. With the internet, such dissemination can happen simultaneously, allowing the public to follow governmental attempts to censor the work as they unfold from court date to court date. This study, for instance, relies heavily on documents released by the defense and their supporters on various websites.

Collaborating with others involved in the anti-censorship struggle, the defendants have produced a network capable of disseminating their message effectively. Sertabiboğlu, for example, developed his Facebook page in coordination with the page for Ayrıntı Publishing's translation of *Snuff*, and continues to coordinate efforts for disseminating information concerning the trial for the Turkish translators association. In fact, as Sancı observes, the internet has enabled him to reach out to journalists across the globe. It has brought journalists together in a virtual space for interviews, and allows them to follow the trial from their own countries as it unfolds. Partnering with *Snuff*'s publisher Ayrıntı, Sel has used the internet with a great deal of savvy to promote the cause of anti-censorship and to raise awareness of both government interference and the countercultural works that challenge the accepted pillars of Turkish society.

In a country such as Turkey where the issue of homosexuality is difficult to discuss openly, the internet has taken on an added importance as a facilitator of relatively risk-free communication, allowing such sensitive topics to be discussed with less potential for violence. Sertabiboğlu claims that after the book was on trial many different people contacted him on Facebook—many of whom identified themselves as homosexual. In fact, both publishers claim that there has been a lot of internet support from readers for their cause. Discussing the idea of the “digital closet,” Serkan Gorkemli notes that since its Turkish inception in 1993, the internet “provided the means by which otherwise isolated individuals with nonmainstream gender identities and/or sexual orientations could connect with each other” (73). While this allowed for greater communication between individual users and fostered the expansion of LGBT groups across Turkey, as Gorkemli explains, this reliance on the internet’s anonymity and invisibility also “became a symbol of homosexual oppression for lesbian and gay activists in Turkey” (79). Nevertheless, the internet allows for a means of disseminating information and offers the potential for such a movement to emerge.

One of the reasons many of the older publishers and translators involved in the Turkish underground scene downplay their contributions is that they are still working with an older model of revolt that presupposes face-to-face, real-time encounters. But this model does not take into account the internet’s ability to effect cultural change. The internet also offers a new mode of communication—a model based on the “viral” rather than the “sequential.” Given the internet’s ability to take an issue and distribute it exponentially to a world-wide audience, what might seem like an isolated event can quickly gain widespread support. Older Turkish leftists hold on to a Marxist dream of political struggle that leads to a structural change in society. By continually publishing such underground texts, they lay the seeds for a revolution that could come at any time, or could build faster than pre-internet models of communist cells or party organizations where membership happened slowly, one comrade at a time. The visibility of underground literature, and the issues it raises, is heightened significantly by the numerous Facebook pages, blogs, and websites devoted to its writers and texts.

Many young Americans arriving to the Beats probably do so through social media or other such internet sites. This aligns them more with their young Turkish counterparts than with an older generation whose

introduction to the counterculture was most often through word-of-mouth recommendations or chance encounters at the local bookshop or coffeehouse. This nostalgia of older Turkish leftists for more direct political involvement finds its echo in baby-boomer reminiscences over more immediate connections to the Beats and the countercultural venues in which they circulated. But listening to Burroughs's characteristic drawl as he reads live from a stage or hearing the soulful voice of Billie Holiday singing are, unfortunately, things of the past. With the passage of time and the technological change it brings, the internet will only grow in importance as a tool in disseminating the Beats' anti-authoritarian message. This is especially true outside the United States, where the only means of accessing the Beats and their texts is oftentimes through the screen. For a younger generation, this loss of presence is compensated by the ease in which Beat images, texts, and the countercultural ideas they raise can be disseminated throughout the world.

CONCLUSION

In the end, generational shift is perhaps the most powerful engine of change. The Beats represented a vanguard that sought to inspire change in America. Their contributions should not be minimized, but it is important to remember that they were also at the right place at the right time. Postwar America, with its generational discontent with the lifestyles of its parents, was ripe for a countercultural revolution. American youth was ready to reject the ease and comfort that its mothers and fathers cherished and to challenge the conformism of the times. The Beats were instrumental in disseminating the message, but it had to fall on ready ears. Luckily, it did; otherwise, Beats like Burroughs would be merely an interesting moment of angry rebellion studied as an anomalous movement in twentieth-century literature. But the Turkish case is different. Underground literature, as even its promoters are quick to concede, will not bring about an immediate sea change in Turkish culture. The question for underground literature in Turkey is whether the next generation is ready for its message, and how far the conservative government will go to stop it. Time will tell.

The Beats offer more than just models for emulation. They provide something even more helpful—the possibility to think anew. This is not to downplay the Beats' accomplishment, nor to claim that they are no longer relevant. Beat thinking and concepts are more important and

timely than ever, yet the nature of their challenge to social and cultural models needs to be rethought. More importantly, the purely celebratory tone towards their accomplishments needs to be tempered. Part of this rethinking is already underway, as critics continue to explore gender, race, and class issues and how they might help us to rethink Beat contributions. Examining the Beats outside conventional geographic and cultural boundaries is crucial, not only because it is an inescapable fact that the Beats are no longer simply an American phenomenon, but also because it helps to clarify how we have arrived at our present understanding of the Beats and how we have chosen to frame their social and literary relevance.

Placing the Beats in a global context also provides a novel means of thinking about the importance of language in the reception of Beat texts. The Beats are championed as literary innovators who drew on both high and low culture to craft a new style of writing. But texts change when translated, and what happens when they are can be revealing. Unfortunately, translations have thus far received scant attention in Beat scholarship. But it might be time to discuss what is at stake when a Beat style that is now accepted as formally innovative becomes reformed in another language. Burroughs, for instance, believed that by challenging the reader's linguistic expectations, his cut-up method literarily revealed a deeper truth concealed in his texts. Can the full impact of authorial intention and stylistic innovation be carried over into translation? This is not to say that the Beats are untranslatable, or that Burroughs's claims should always be taken at face value. Translation studies, however, has demonstrated that every translator makes choices that impact a text and its possible interpretations. The Beats in Turkish are not exactly the Beats in English, and that gap highlights the sort of assumptions made about the Beats and their use of language.

The American reception of the Beats is intimately connected to the glorification of their image as rebellious outsiders who purposely transgressed social and literary standards. While this portrayal is accurate and laudatory, it is time to take a broader view of their legacy. The investment in Beat iconoclasm sometimes obfuscates the role that reception plays as an instrument of social change. Perhaps it is time to explore how readers actually use these texts to generate meaning in their own lives. If we want to recapture the earlier spirit of Beat rebellion and save the Beats from what appears to be their fate as

Cold War curiosities, we need to find a way to meaningfully re-deploy them in contemporary American culture. Looking at how the Beats and their works function in countries outside the US could provide just such a start.

CODA: THE VERDICT

The Turkish censorship trial of William S. Burroughs's *The Soft Machine* and Chuck Palahniuk's *Snuff* concluded in a truly inconclusive fashion. Expert opinions for both books were favorable, and the defense expected an acquittal. But fate, or perhaps the Turkish government, intervened. On the day the trial was to be heard, July 5th 2012, a package of laws went into effect that included an article that put all literary obscenity cases on hold for three years. While this would seem to be in Sel and Ayrıntı's favor, the new ruling actually leaves them in an even more precarious position. According to the verdict, if the accused are put on trial again for a similar crime within three years, the case files for this trial will be reopened. The threat is that if they continue to publish such provocative materials, they will be retried not only for the new case but for the old one as well. What makes this decision particularly painful for the defendants is that they stood a strong chance of winning their case. Even the judge admits that if the trial had been conducted a week earlier, or the reader reports had not been so late, the verdict would have been acquittal. Nobody knows for sure whether the timing of this law was intentional or simply bad luck, but the result is the same—Sel and Ayrıntı must continue to operate under the threat of censorship (“Yumuşak Makine ve Ölüm Pornosu”).

Fortunately, both publishers chose to continue the fight. Sancı's response was openly defiant: “This law is not amnesty but a threat . . . When a crime doesn't even exist and we should have been acquitted this judgment only serves to wear us down. Of course we will commit the same ‘crime’ in three years, that's our job. We will keep publishing these kinds of books.” Ayrıntı remained equally contentious, handing the judge their latest Palahniuk translation with the statement “since we will keep doing this job, we are informing on ourselves. We are sending the latest Chuck Palahniuk book to the Committee through your court” (“Yumuşak Makine ve Ölüm Pornosu”). Ayrıntı has stayed out of trouble, but Sel has once again found itself facing trial for an earlier translation of Apollinaire's *The Exploits of a Young Don Juan* (*Les*

exploits d'un jeune Don Juan in French; 1911). That book was deemed a work of literature in 2010 and acquitted, but Turkey's Supreme Court of Appeals (*Yargıtay*) found it obscene during a 2013 appeal. İrfan Sancı and the translator İsmail Yerguz were then charged with the exploitation of minors (*çocuk istismar*). In late 2013, an Istanbul court again postponed the verdict—if Sel is brought to trial in the next three years on a similar charge, the court will re-open both the Burroughs and the Apollinaire cases (Sel Yayıncılık, “Genç Bir Don Juan'ın”). A little over four years after the censorship process began, Sel appears to be back where it started. But some things have indeed changed: the press is a bit wiser, a bit poorer, and *The Soft Machine*, as well as the issues it raises, is a lot better known.

Koç University

NOTES

I would like to thank the numerous friends, colleagues, and assistants who helped make this work possible. Chief among them is my undergraduate research assistant, Rafet Karaoğlu, as well as Dr. Sooyong Kim and Dr. Nazmi Ağıl, who provided valuable feedback. All errors, of course, remain my own.

1. Nancy M. Grace and Jennie Skerl attempt to justify and explain the importance of the transnational rubric for Beat Studies. They argue that the Beats lived in a time when America took on a very active role internationally and, thus, Beat writing is very much responding “to globalizing forces, colonialism, US neo-imperialism, and postwar conformist repression” (7). This claim is undeniable—not only were the Beats absorbing, refracting, and reconfiguring the narratives of American exceptionalism prevalent in the Cold War, their work was also extensively influenced by their travels and sojourns outside of America. This expatriate experience had a lasting impact on both their own work and the artists and intellectuals with whom they came into contact. Given that the Beats and their works were bound up in the international, the editors rightly claim that the transnational approach is a necessary addition to existing scholarship on the Beats, as it helps us to think about Beat texts beyond existing paradigms.

2. The importance of Tangiers for Burroughs has inspired volumes like Greg Mullins' *Colonial Affairs: Bowles, Burroughs, and Chester Write Tangier*, which examines the link between homosexuality and colonialism, and Brian T. Edwards' *Morocco Bound: Disorienting America's Maghreb, from Casablanca to the Marrakech Express*, which explores the importance of Tangiers' political situation on *Naked Lunch*. Jimmy Fazzino's *World Beats: Beat Generation Writing and the Worlding of U.S. Literature* continues this trend with a chapter on the Latin American origins of *Naked Lunch*. Davis Schneiderman and Philip Walsh's *Retaking the Universe:*

William S. Burroughs in the Age of Globalization, as its title implies, updates criticism of Burroughs by demonstrating the global nature of Burroughsian ideas and motifs. Burroughs is likewise prominent in Polina MacKay's and Chad Wiener's 2013 special issue of *Comparative American Studies*, where Rona Cran looks at the role of European art movements on Burroughs's cut up technique.

3. Unfortunately, even when the question of reception is discussed, Beat influence seems to end in the early 1970s, though the Beats and their texts continue to enjoy brisk sales and cultural circulation worldwide. What is lacking in the field is a consideration of what Beat means *today*. As important as past encounters and border crossings are for understanding the Beats and their work, the function that these texts serve in the present is equally relevant if we want to understand how their work is appropriated by other generations in other parts of the world.

4. Russell is reticent about Burroughs's possible inclusion in the queer canon, arguing in the afterword that "his inclusion would be politically problematic and could only ever be regarded as a historical recuperation of a novelist whose work expresses desires that the contemporary gay movement has long since sought to distance itself from" (191). Cultural translation, however, creates new uses out of old texts.

5. For example, the Turkish reception also challenges the primacy of language as a means for understanding Burroughs's oeuvre. *The Soft Machine* employs an aesthetic strategy of favoring chance and juxtaposition over crafted meaning and coherence, and the book's "cut-up" method remains stylistically difficult and challenging today. Burroughs himself viewed the cut-ups as liberating, and went as far as claiming that the method could "show how certain word combinations produce certain effects on the human nervous system" and even predict future events (*The Job* 28). Burroughs's insistence that word is a virus, which Oliver Harris convincingly argues in *William Burroughs and the Secret of Fascination*, "was not, for Burroughs, metaphoric analysis or poststructuralist platitude but an awareness integral and material to the act of writing," calls into question the role of translation in Burroughs's work (38). Can Burroughs's desire to, as Harris puts it, "*present rather than represent*" the idea of "control and terrors" be conveyed in another tongue (37)? Is Burroughs's challenge to systems of control through the materiality of the word possible in translation? In the Turkish context, these questions are ignored, and the importance of *The Soft Machine* as avant-garde aesthetic practice is downplayed.

6. For an extended treatment of the definition, history, and impact of underground literature in Turkey, see Erik Mortenson's "The 'Underground' Reception of the Beats in Turkey."

7. For a detailed analysis of the demographics and opinions of underground literature readers see Mortenson, Duygu Ergun, and Selen Erdoğan.

8. For a discussion of how the *Naked Lunch* trial contributed to the marketing of the book in America, see Meagan Wilson.

9. One important exception to this staid image of Burroughs is Şenol Erdoğan's article in *Radikal's* "Weekend Magazine." Erdoğan portrays Burroughs as a Faustian anti-hero, a dark character whose life is perhaps even more (in)famous than his work. In part as a means to promote *The Soft Machine*, in part as a slap in the face of the Committee and the government it represents, Erdoğan flaunts Burroughs's outsider status, playing up his homosexuality, heavy drug use, and stylistically innovative writing. Erdoğan takes up and expands upon the Committee's accusations, mentioning anal sex, orgasm, and violence in the trilogy in order to shock and entice his audience. This kind of provocative portrayal is typical of Erdoğan's 6:45 publishing house. In fact, the very first page of 6:45's *The Beat Generation Anthology* (*Beat Kuşağı Antolojisi*) boldly announces that the book is a joint project (*ortak yapımı*) between Sel and 6:45. 6:45's journal, *Underground Poetix*, filled with expletives and graphic descriptions, is in much the same vein and has also included advertisements for *The Soft Machine* that utilize the Committee's statements. But even here, the celebration is not as focused on Burroughs as public figure as it is on Burroughs as mythic type—the outlaw who holds nothing sacred. But Erdoğan's article is the exception that proves the rule, since for most involved in the debate the attention is on the issue of homosexuality, and not so much the homosexual writer.

10. In a series of focus groups conducted across Turkey on the subject of underground literature, many respondents voiced similar reservations about Burroughs's work. Mortenson, Ergun, and Erdoğan, unpublished data.

11. American critics like Robin Lydenberg agree with this statement. In an early study of the novel, Lydenberg claims that the text generates "an acute self-consciousness and alienation from the reading process" in the reader (57).

WORKS CITED

- Ahmad, Feroz. *Turkey: The Quest for Identity*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2005.
- Boyar, Ebru. "The press and the palace: the two-way relationship between Abdülhamid II and the press, 1876–1908." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 69.3 (2006): 417–32.
- Burroughs, William S. *The Job: Interviews with William S. Burroughs*. New York: Grove, 1974.
- Çevbir, "Yumuşak Makine' için İngilizce Basın Açıklaması." 2011. Web. 9 Feb. 2013. http://www.cevbir.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=292:yumuak-makine-icin-ingilizce-basin-acklamasi
- Cran, Rona. "'Everything is permitted': William Burroughs' Cut-up Novels and European Art." *Comparative American Studies* 11.3 (2013): 300–13.
- de Haan, Martin. *The European Council of Literary Translators' Associations*. "Letter to Turkish Ministry of Justice." 2011. Web. 9 Feb. 2013. <http://www.ceatl.eu/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/2011-07-01-Turkish-Minister-of-Justice.pdf>

- Edwards, Brian T. *Morocco Bound: Disorienting America's Maghreb, from Casablanca to the Marrakech Express*. Durham: Duke UP, 2005.
- Ertem, Ece. *Cnnturk.com*, "İstanbul'un orta yerinde skandal." 2011. Web. 9 Feb. 2013. <http://www.cnnturk.com/2011/yasam/diger/04/18/istanbulun.orta.yerin.de.skandal/613702.0/index.html>
- Fazzino, Jimmy. *World Beats: Beat Generation Writing and the Worlding of U.S. Literature*. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth CP, 2016.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004." *American Quarterly* 57.1 (2005): 17-57.
- Goodman, Michael. *Contemporary Literature Censorship: The Case History of Burroughs' "Naked Lunch"*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1981.
- Gorkemli, Serkan. "'Coming Out of the Internet': Lesbian and Gay Activism and the Internet as a 'Digital Closet' in Turkey." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*. 8.3 (2012): 63-88.
- Grace, Nancy M. and Jennie Skerl, eds. *The Transnational Beat Generation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Harris, Oliver. *William Burroughs and the Secret of Fascination*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 2003.
- "Kirli, irkiltici ve çekici," *Birgün*. 2012. Web. 6 Feb. 2013. http://www.birgun.net/forum_index.php?news_code=1353317226&year=2012&month=11&day=19.
- Lydenberg, Robin. *Word Cultures: Radical Theory and Practice in William S. Burroughs' Fiction*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1987.
- MacKay, Polina and Chad Wiener, eds. *The Beat Generation and Europe*. Spec. issue of *Comparative American Studies*. 11.3 (2013): 221-342.
- Marakoğlu, Ozan. "Edebiyatın Edepsizliği Ya Da Tutucu Olmayan Bütün Metinler Üstüne." *Notos*. (2011): 47-49.
- Mortenson, Erik. "The 'Underground' Reception of the Beats in Turkey." *Comparative American Studies* 11.3 (2013): 327-41.
- Mortenson, Erik, Duygu Ergun, and Selen Erdoğan. "Underground literature and its influence on youth in Turkey." *New Perspectives on Turkey*. 52 (2015): 77-104.
- Mullins, Greg. *Colonial Affairs: Bowles, Burroughs, and Chester Write Tangier*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2002.
- Murphy, Timothy S. *Wising Up the Marks: The Amodern William Burroughs*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.

- Özgün, Fatih. "Hazlar Bahçesi." *Roll*. 2 December 1996. Web. <http://birdirbir.org/hazlar-bahcesi/>.
- Russell, Jamie. *Queer Burroughs*. NY: Palgrave, 2001.
- Sabitfikir, "Ve Burroughs hakim karşısında." 2011. Web. 9 Feb. 2013. <http://sabitfikir.com/haber/ve-burroughs-hakim-karsisinda>
- Sancı, Irfan. Interview by author. Digital recording. Istanbul, Turkey. 27 Dec. 2011.
- Schneiderman, Davis and Philip Walsh, eds. *Retaking the Universe: William S. Burroughs in the Age of Globalization*. London: Pluto, 2004.
- Sel Yayıncılık. "Bir kararımız bile yok ama iki raporumuz var." 2012. Web. 10 Feb. 2013. <http://selyayincilik.blogspot.com/2012/07/bir-kararmz-bile-yok-ama-iki-raporumuz.html>.
- . "Genç Bir Don Juan'ın Maceraları Davası Ertelemeyle Sonuçlandı." 2013. Web. 25 Sept. 2014. <http://www.selyayincilik.com/duyuru.asp?id=50>.
- Sertabiboğlu, Süha. Interview by author. Digital Recording. Istanbul, Turkey. 26 Jan. 2012.
- Turkish Penal Code. Trans. Edward Grieves and Vahit Bıçak. 2007.
- Yılmaz, Abdullah. Interview by author. Digital Recording. Istanbul, Turkey. 27 Dec. 2011.
- "Yumuşak Makine ve Ölüm Pornosu davasında sonuçsuz karar: beraat yok, erteleme var!" *Edebiyathaber.net*. 2012. Web. 9 Feb. 2013. <http://www.edebiyathaber.net/yumusak-makine-ve-olum-pornosu-davasinda-sonucsuz-karar-beraat-yok-erteleme-var/>
- Wilson, Meagan. "Your Reputation Precedes You: A Reception Study of *Naked Lunch*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 35.2 (2012): 98–125.