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Abstract

This research identifies different viewpoints about the rise of the modernism, modernisation and modernity and its link to the Western countries. Moreover, their connection with each other will be highlighted. Additionally, the relation between these terms and the modern world will be clarified. First of all, in order to establish the relationship between modernism and humanity, it is necessary to be engaged with the concepts of modernism, modernization and modernity.
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Introduction

Until recently, the word ‘modern’ was utilized to point to the contemporaneous in general; all art is modern at the time it is made. It must be said that the concepts modernism, modernisation and modernity are linked to each other, but their sense and applications, are not the same (Linehan, 9). Frederic Jameson identifies these distinctions, and considers modernity as a condition which is new historically. According to him, modernisation is the
procedure via which one can reach modernity. Modernisation is also a response to both procedures and situations. Similarly, modernism is a reaction that can be aesthetic and philosophico-ideological, which can either be negative or positive (Linehan, 9).

Modernism has been defined in various ways; for instance according to Faulkner Peter, modernism means all the different trends of art that appeared in the twentieth century. The term, modernism should be used carefully, especially if the purpose is to assist readers to perceive modernism (Faulkner, VIII). Faulkner has referred to Graham Hough’s book, Image and Experience to support his claim that it takes time for modernism to acquire a name. In his book, Hough Kenner asserts that there was a revolution between 1910 and the Second World War in the English Literature similar to the Romanticism which emerged a century ago, but it did not have a specific name (Faulkner, IX).

There are other interpretations of modernism, for example; the concept of modernism is used in the twentieth century to describe a group, in religious scholarship, but not to pinpoint problems of literature. Modernism was important to the faith because it researched the past to elucidate happenings in the Bible; through modern age science and research. This importance was also believed inside the Roman Catholic Church. Priests were obliged to swear an oath by the Pope not to recognize modernism as a valid movement from 1907. There are some sources to prove these separations; such as ‘little magazine of the time’. Those works were published by some writers that are now known in literary circles as modernist.

It is thought that the concept of modernism first emerged in the US. Critics evaluating Eliot’s works written in 1920s, thought that the UK came second, as they used it via Robert Grave’s title, and Laura Riding’s book, A Survey of Modernist Poetry in 1927 (Matthew, 119).
Some of the American poets who studied comparative religions at university include; religious probability of their knowledge, of the other religious books in the universe. For instance, Eliot’s awareness of ‘Sanskrit Hindu Upanishads’ in the last part of his poem, ‘The Waste Land’ or, Eliot and Pound’s involvement in the works of the Indian poet Rabanindrinath Tagore in 1910s. Yeats via his mystic style and unique interests in religion was similarly interested in ‘Tagore and Hinduism’ (Matthews, 119). Modernism is also explained by Richard when he refers to some critics such as Czech Formalist, Jan Mukařovský, who believes that modernism is very indefinite. Additionally, after more than three decades Monroe K. Spears, restated the same thing after he wrote a preface for a significant book on the subject of modernism, (Richard, 1).

Modernism has reached its peak and matured in 1922 when Eliot wrote the ‘The Waste Land’ and Joyce completed Ulysses. Proust, Woolf, Musil and Lawrence are the novelists and Yeats, Rilke, Pound, Crane are poets, who are also in the mature period of modernism, called ‘high modernism’. Berman has pointed out that the literary modernism first emerged in the United States ‘as Eliot, Pound, Stevens, Frost, Robinson, Cummings, Williams, Aiken, Lindsay, Lowell, Masters, Moore, Sandberg’ were all from America’, (Berman, 60). Modernism is a term which was first used by the British and American critics in 1920s, (Howarth, 4).

It is not easy to set a specific date of the beginning of modernism; in the same way it is as difficult to determine its end because of different viewpoints surrounding it. Two different views were postulated about the rise of modernism, by those who believe that modernism started in the twentieth century (Tratner 14). One of the views is that it started from the America in 1936 and Emerson is its pioneer. The second view according to Nicholls is that the commencement of modernism stems from France, Paris. This was specifically from the works of its pioneers; Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Symons and Mallarme. These two periods are quite close, but perhaps,
the influence of the first one is not clear on T. Eliot. On the contrary, the latter is very much significant for Eliot. Nicholls says that it exactly starts at the moment when in 1840s, two beggars were singing in Paris. The beauty of one beggar, of which is so attractive, made a growing number of French writers write about her in their literary works. Such writers were Theodore de Banville, Emily Deroy and even Baudelaire, who composed a poem about her beauty. It was entitled, ‘To a Red Haired Beggar Girl’ in ‘around 1845/6 (Nicholls, 1).

To some degree, Baudelaire objectified to Nicholls’ saying that the body of the beggar, female representative, in order to enable the poet to gain a contrastive disembodiment. The poem shows a fractured blazon, in each stanza, McCabe states including the eye by ‘mentally undressing’ the eroticized beggar (McCabe, 33). The significance of Baudelaire’s poem is that it has traces of the style of writing which is called modernism. Moreover, the poem is an influence of an incomplete view of the modern society scenes and of Baudelaire as one of its déclassé people. There is no doubt it has to do with the sophistication of tone of his later modernism (Nicholls, 1).

Clearly, certain things developed in various ways in the modern societies, from the seventeenth century forwards; from them emerged knowledge, especially in the field of natural science (Finlayson, 2005). The poet considers the beggar girl, as a girl from high class although she was very poor, this might be one of the characteristics of Baudelaire’s poem which made it a very modern poem, i.e., this method of characterization was very much new for the literary modernism at the time Baudelaire wrote the poem.

Modernisation, however, is a concept derived mostly from, the classical texts of sociology, especially the works of Marx Weber (Habermas, 2). It was described by Jürgen Habermas as,
a bundle of processes that are cumulative and mutually reinforcing to the: formation of capital and the mobilization of resources, development of the forces of production and the increase in the productivity of labor, establishment of centralized political power and the formation of national identities. It is also reinforcing to the: proliferation of rights of political participation, urban forms of life, and of formal schooling; to the secularization of values and forms (Habermas, 2).

Linehan believes that modernisation emerged as a physical process, which left its effect on Western Europe. He believes that it significantly moved outward to bring in other parts of the world, in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Importantly, these modernisation processes did not happen in a uniform manner; in terms of geographical space and social relations, in the framework of a specific social group. This implies that the effect of modernisation during the two centuries was not even (Linehan, 10). According to Jameson, this impact was different from one country in the Western Europe to another; in a way they experienced different rates and kinds of modernisation, around the same time during the late twentieth century (Linehan, 10). Surrette asserts that to be modern does not necessarily mean to be post-classical. But in a modernist view, is to have exceeded the record of past events, ascended into an immediate influence in the field of knowledge, and to have fulfilled the modern history in that way (Surrette, 4). According to Surrette’s understanding of modernism, modernism must enable one to bypass all the records of the past and record a new history in the modern period. Yet modernism is mainly dependent on the past as Michael H. Whitworth in his introduction to Modernism, highlights the paradox of modernism: ‘where writers allude to the literature of the past, they are implicitly addressing the more fundamental question about the relation of the present to the past, though the value they answer their work gives will depend on the context of their allusion’, (2007: 11).
It is obvious that modernism for its sources chiefly depends on the past events, literary works and yet they reject the past as well as tradition. If readers and critics interpret the allusions that modern writers use as a technique in their writings, to help them write effectively and sufficiently, which is a proof of their subordination to the past, in the context of the present modern works or in the context of the past it does not reduce the value and the significance of the past for the modern writers. Eliot in his essay, ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’ further argues that: ‘Whoever has approved of this idea of order, of the form of European, of English Literature, will not find it preposterous the past should be already by the present as much as the present is directed by the past’, (Tradition and the Individual Talent, 153).

Eliot believed that no one can deny the fact that the past was and is always a main source for the present, i.e., the classic is what that modern writers should have sufficient knowledge about as they were the pioneers in the field of literature. Accordingly, the modern writers can find their works very much relevant in some cases when they write about any modern issue. Eliot is the best example, who uses epigraphs as well as allusions in several of his poems, such as ‘The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock’, ‘The Waste Land’, ‘The Hollw Men’, and ‘Sweeney Erect’. Eliot further elaborates his explanation of the undeniable importance of the past, in the modern period. He asserts that Poets, artists of any type, can have a complete meaning with the previous ancestors. His weight, his indebtedness is the appreciation of his link to the dead poets and artists. One cannot appreciate any writer independently he must be set, for ‘contrast and comparison’, amongst the dead writers. This is considered as the aesthetics of literary works, (Tradition and the Individual Talenet: 153).

According to Linehan, modernisation went on to mold centuries that follow up the twentieth century and after, despite the belief of critics that modernisation started in the sixteenth century or seventeenth century (Linehan, 9).
Conversi Daniele states that modernism does not have one single sense, but it has various meanings in different places. This difference is obvious among the art historians, where it is used to specify the similarities and differences. This is particularly seen in art which appeared in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, especially, at the end of the former and the beginning of the latter, (Daniele, 19).

The view which says that modern American poetry was introduced by Ralph Waldo Emerson in 1836 is weak to some extent. This is because it is by some years before Baudelaire’s modernist style of writing. Also, Eliot and Pound were American Poets but they were not influenced by Emerson. Even if Emerson was the first writer who wrote poetry in the modern style, it is still not as important as the French symbolist poets. This is because the French poets, who wrote in the modern style, had their influence emerge soon on the writers from other countries than France; and Eliot is one example. This does not mean that poetry had not been written in America in the modern style before 1836.

A good example is example in 1836, William Cullen Bryant, John Greenleaf Whittier and Edgar Allan Poe tried to write in the modern style. Although, it was not recognized till Emerson declared the independency of American in culture in 1836. This was through his anonymous published essay ‘Nature’, which addresses the purity and spirituality of human being; like the purity of nature but corrupted by some powerful people in the community. Hence, American poetry was born (Herd, 33). Harold Bloom’s view apparently goes against the views of the previous critics who do not consider the influence of Emerson on modernism as an important source. Emerson, who was the product of New England, could give American Romanticism a continuous religious tone. His essays such as, Nature, were very significant in the realm of modernism (Bloom, 2005: 1).
As at the very beginning of his essay, Emerson says,

Our age is retrospective. It builds the sepulchers of the fathers. It writes biographies, histories, and criticism. The foregoing generations beheld God and nature face to face; we, through their eyes. Why should not we also enjoy an original relation to the universe? Why should not we have poetry of insight and not of tradition, and a religion by revelation to us, and not the history of theirs? (Emerson, 27)

This is like a manifesto by Emerson, in which he declares that the new age should not be run by the rules and disciplines of the previous ancestors. Therefore, Emerson believes the relation of the previous humans to the world was original. So he finds it necessary to start a new understanding and interpretation for the world as well as their relations, in terms of faith to God. His perception of life is that people of any age must have their own interpretations of the world, God, and culture. Although, one might ask what is the reason behind searching for everything which is not old, but new. And their answer could be because modern means new.

What about the previous ancestors and previous ages influence, on those who influenced modern humans? How can one know that a certain thing is good or not, if there is not the previous copy or copies of that to compare? Are the new human’s perception and understanding of life, God, and culture thoroughly different from how people sees them, and not influenced by anything written in the past? These are questions that Emerson and those who reject the past, culture, ancestors, and everything that is connected to religious faith, must seek to provide answers.

Emerson further states that the sun shines also today, and there is more wool and flax in the fields. He also states that here are new lands, new men, new thoughts, and we should demand our own works, laws and worship (Emerson 2001: 27).
Emerson brings some examples from nature, the raw materials, to urge modern humans to follow his suggestion; as if the people in the previous ages did not have those things. There might be some changes in the life of human being but not on the basis of asking for everything new; to mean that the previous things all died. But they are numbed, and each model of the past life will reappear every now and then.

During the time of Eliot, Emerson’s influence was eclipsed. Not only was Emerson not influential for Eliot, but also Emerson’s essays were ‘under the ban of Eliot’. This is evident as Eliot believed that Emerson’s essays were previously an encumbrance. The role of Emerson is important in the mid of 1960s in America, as he was a pivotal figure in influencing the American culture and politics, and their unofficial religion; which Bloom regards it more Emerson Ian than Christian. Emerson also influenced the American writers that came after him, in a way that tended to express their views on him either positively or negatively (Bloom, 2003).

Therefore, if modern humans live in a way that is to accept anything in the society but not religion, how can religion remain as an integral part of modern humanity, when it was so significant in the past? Tradition and religion are two intertwined parts of human life. That is the reason Davies believes all the elements of tradition, not only define a religion but also enable its survival (Davies, 30). Davies also considers modernism as the adversary of tradition. Davies furthermore, puts his argument forward about the position of religion amongst the society, and he raises a question about whether religion can resist and preserve itself for a long time, especially in Europe. This question is also raised because of all of the changes which were taking place in the twentieth century (Davies, 30).
Modernism is a broad concept as it has various aspects. Daly points out that Frederic Jameson’s consideration of modernism is mainly about aesthetic pleasures; which have an essential role in encouraging people to stay at home significantly and which according to him is sadly alien reality. Thus, modernism is perceived as an end and a very special stage of that big procedure; whereby residents of the past social formation are taught new skills about the market system once again, in terms of culture and psychology.

Daly argues that the novels written in the late Victorian period and those written in the early beginning of the twentieth century; have helped the readers of their own to adapt to changes recorded in the history. Changes like social organization, imperial power, and commodity culture. Daly suggests that literature and later film have a great role in making modernisation easy (Daly, 1). Peter Nicholls affirms that the shifts which took place in the twentieth century in America are probably best described by Ralph Waldo Emerson, although he is a mid- nineteenth century poet and critic. The new continents are built out of the ruins of an old planet and the new races fed out of the decompositions of the forgoing. Therefore, new arts destroy the old (Nicholls, 6).

It implies that every new age is usually based on the ruins of the previous ages. However, it is not completely dependent; this is on one hand or the other hand, the modern rose as an opposition against the old. It might sometimes be a return to the past. Baudelaire and the avant-gardists did not approve of nature not because of the, poetic taste for trees and rivers, but it was rather due to the link between poetic vision and social transformation. Transformation supported from beneath the political optimism of the Romantic Movement in the nineteenth century. Baudelaire describes it in this way: ‘most wrong ideas about beauty derive from the false notion the eighteenth century had about ethics.'
In those days, nature was taken as a basis, source and prototype of all possible forms of good and beauty’ (Baudelaire’s Selected Writings on Arts and Artists, 425).

The carelessness of modern humanity is shown in a magazine, called Le Decadent. Unquestionably, that community is dismantling under the continuous erosive act of the decline of society; surprisingly the modern humanity is unconcerned about it. The indications of social evolution can be summed up as refinement of appetites, sensations, taste, luxury, pleasures; neurosis, hysteria, hypnotism, morphine addiction, scientific quackery, excessive Schopenhauerism (Nicholls, 47).

The urbanization process brought about many great changes in culture since 1880 (Paschal and Patrick 60). This cultural change is mainly noticed in the life of many famous writers of this period. A growing number of the literary men left the country life, which was said to be empty of literature and fine arts, and instead they started life in the urban areas, in which life is so rapid. This creates a new type of life, which is a mixture of local and national traditions, and their childhood experience; with the invigorating modern world on one hand, and cities on the other hand. Cities witnessed a very quick change due to the developments in technology and industry, which were unlimited and people could bypass borders easily. Many writers came to England; like Ezra Pound, Katherine Mansfield in 1908, H.D in 1910 and T. S. Eliot in 1914. They witnessed that rapid change in the city, with others who lived in the city from their childhood; like Virginia Woolf, E. M. Forster and Wyndham Lewis. Many literacy writers moved to Paris, such as James Joyce in the beginning of 1900s, and then Ezra Pound in 1920. The role of the German thinkers as well as the French Symbolists must be taken into account especially Friedrich Nietzsche, Max Weber, Sigmund Freud and later Henri Bergson who were Germans and Arthur Symons, Baudelaire, Jules Laforgue (Matthews, 3-5), as their writings had left significant influence on Eliot’s works and Eliot might not have become so...
famous in the modern period if he has not familiarized himself with their new techniques and adopt them in his poetry.

The influence that Nietzscheanism and Symbolism left on the European culture, caused worry as it was nearly about to destroy the culture which was already established (Somigli 112). Its influence was also direct and quick on the works of literature, which was known as modernism. Baudelaire’s influence on Eliot’s poems written before his arrival to England proves that fact; that Eliot’s poetry was impacted by Baudelaire’s poetry, which Eliot read about in Arthur Symons’s book on French symbolism (Mathews, 5). Eliot in ‘The Waste land’, ‘Hypocrite lecteur, -- mon semblable, -- mon frère!’, (Part I, L, 76), alludes to the last line of Baudelaire’s poem, ‘Au Lecteur’, ‘To the reader’, ‘Hypocrite lecteur,—mon semblable, — mon frère!’, (L, 40). Eliot did not use one phrase of the poem but he used the exact line of Baudelaire’s poem, which proves his influence of Eliot’s poems.

In the twentieth century modern humans became very doubtful about the existence of God. As Nietzsche in his book, The Gay Science, written in 1882 proclaimed the death of God. The modern uncertainty is similar to an insane man who in the bright morning with a lantern lit in his hand crying near the marketplace:

‘I’m looking for God! I’m looking for God!’ Since many of those who did not believe in God were standing around together just then, he caused great laughter. Has he been lost, then? asked one. Did he lose his way like a child? asked another. Or is he hiding? Is he afraid of us? Has he gone to sea? Emigrated? – Thus they shouted and laughed, one interrupting the other. The madman jumped into their midst and pierced them with his eyes. Where is God?’ he cried; ‘I’ll tell you! We have killed him – you and I! We are all his murderers. But how did we do this? How were we able to drink up the sea? Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the entire horizon? What were we doing when we unchained this earth from its sun? Where is it moving to now?
Where are we moving to? Away from all suns? Are we not continually falling? And backwards, sidewards, forwards, in all directions? Is there still an up and a down? Aren’t we straying as though through an infinite nothing? Isn’t empty space breathing at us? Hasn’t it got colder? Isn’t night and more night coming again and again? Don’t lanterns have to be lit in the morning? Do we still hear nothing of the noise of the grave-diggers who are burying God? Do we still smell nothing of the divine decomposition? – Gods, too, decompose! God is dead! God remains dead! And we have killed him! How can we console ourselves, the murderers of all murderers! The holiest and the mightiest thing the world has ever possessed has bled to death under our knives: who will wipe this blood from us? With what water could we clean ourselves? What festivals of atonement, what holy games will we have to invent for ourselves? Is the magnitude of this deed not too great for us? Do we not ourselves have to become gods merely to appear worthy of it? There was never a greater deed – and whoever is born after us will on account of this deed belong to a higher history than all history up to now! Here the madman fell silent and looked again at his listeners; they too were silent and looked at him disconcertedly. Finally he threw his round so that it broke into pieces and went out. ‘I come too early,’ he then said; ‘my time is not yet. This tremendous event is still on its way, wandering; it has not yet reached the ears of men. Lightning and thunder need time; the light of the stars needs time; deeds need time, even after they are done, in order to be seen and heard. This deed is still more remote to them than the remotest stars – and yet they have done it themselves!’ It is still recounted how on the same day the madman forced his way into several churches and there started singing his requiem aeternam deo [grant God eternal rest]. Led out and called to account, he is said always to have replied nothing but, ‘What then are these churches now if not the tombs and sepulchres of God?’ (qtd. in Depoortere, 1-2).
It is vague what God Nietzsche’s madman is in searched for. The madman criticises the crowd of people for killing God as he says it was soon for that event. The word God is used figuratively rather than taking its literal meaning into account. The insane person who is talking with the crow of people is surprised of how humans committed many crimes and do not care that God will punish the criminals and sinners. When asks them about the place of God, he did not mean the answer, but he would rather intend to show his astonishment at the evil acts of the modern humans. It is like murdering God while not listening to what He orders. The churches, if did not have any positive role, they are like the tomb of God as they were God’s houses and therefore they should have a positive role in the personal and communal level. Subsequently, when modern people do not submit to the will of God and apply their humanistic rules and disciplines that means they are God, themselves. But so many critics took Nietzsche’s proclaim literally, Frederiek Depoortere is one of those and argues that Nietzsche is dead now and God is not, therefore, he says Nietzsche’s proclaim ‘is a bit pathetic or complete passé’?, (Depoortere, 2007: 2).

David Bradshaw is one of those who believe that human behavior did not change in 1910, although Virginia Woolf asserts that many changes took place in 1910. Bradshaw justifies his speech by saying that in the previous age (nineteenth century) nothing significant happened in the world except for the death of Nietzsche. Also in the twentieth century what happened was that Freud’s book, Interpretation of Dreams, was published in Germany (Bradshaw, 2). There are many things that gave rise to modernism and the changes to take place at this period; beginning with Charles Darwin’s Evolution. This was an evolution which became very famous, to the point that Bradshaw says that he replaced Charles Dickens for his reputation, and people were talking about him everywhere.
Darwin explored the law of development of organic nature. Marx later found out the law of development of human history, as stated by Friedrich Engels at Marx’s ‘graveside in High gate ceremony in London in 1883’ (Richardson, 9). Furthermore, Cuddy Louis A, in her book, entitled, T.S. Eliot and The Poetics of Evolution: Sub Versions of Classism and Progress, confirms that the influence of Darwin as specified by John Dewey, in his book, *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays in Contemporary Thought*, is obvious in 1910 when Eliot started composing his well-known poems. The impact of Darwin’s theory was in different approaches, such as ‘intellectual changes’ resulted from Darwinian concepts. Dewey highlights four types of ‘social intellectual tendencies’ in this regard, as the outcome of the ‘evolutionary’ investigation of the world and human beings existence: ‘the experimental method of inquiry’; the application of the historic method to religions and morals as well as institutions’; ‘the injection of the evolutionary ideas into the study of life and society’ and ‘the creation of the science of ‘origins’ and the cultural development of mankind’. Cuddy believed that Eliot studied these ‘tendencies’ at Harvard and even applied the ‘last three’ of these ‘principles’ to the theories he has written about ‘poetry and tradition’. Because Eliot thought that modern humans ‘origins’ must be traced to the ancient Greeks and especially to ‘Homer’ by employing the ‘historic’ approach to religious beliefs and ‘moral, to literature, philosophy, culture and his own life is from’, (Cuddy, 41). Cuddy also asserts that ‘what Dewey called ‘the injection of evolutionary ideas into the study of life and society’ and ‘the cultural development of mankind’ became to Eliot the Western Tradition, which he would bring, up to date through his art’, (Cuddy, 41). In 1926 that the Great Strike took place, and the 1930s Depression which led to the emergence of the modern movement (Thorne, 244).
As modernism is multiregional, it might not be easy to give one definition for it. Some writers such as Peter Nicholls, suggests that modernism is be better to be considered as plural (modernisms) due to its multireginality; but even the singular form could give the meaning that the plural form can give.

Theological modernism which effectively started in Germany in nineteenth century, is dependent on various things such as the Enlightenment, biblical criticism, philosophy of nineteenth century, and both Victorian and Romantic liberal and progressive ideology (McCool 170). It has roots in Kant, Hegel and the higher criticism (Kearns, 164). It also faces dialogue with Darwinian science. On the contrary, literary modernism is purely a phenomenon which emerged in the twentieth century, and it is to some degree focusing on the style and form rather than content and ideas. However, it is much tied to theology, and more related to theological issues; than the high evaluation of literary and cultural critics (Kearns, 164). Vanderlaan in an article entitled, Modernism and Historic Christianity, questions the legitimacy of modernism as a form of Christianity or if modernism is a perversion of it. Is modernism a modern form of the historic doctrine of Christianity, or it is a new religion? Many critics refuse to believe modernism as a new form of the old doctrine of Christianity; For instance, Professor Machen thinks that modernism is another religion as modernism does not possess any kind of ‘revelation’. Furthermore, modernism neither considers the Bible infallible nor does it consider it as absolute truth; as modernists they think that it has been changed and contains human thought. On the contrary Orthodoxy believes that modernism is a new form of the old doctrine of Christianity (Vanderlaan, 225-226). One of the things which had influenced the life of the modern humans is people’s interpretations for religion as many of them might have accepted religion previously without having complete knowledge about it and taking the Bible as the exact words of God, but after the crisis that modern humanity faced, they remain doubtful of their religious beliefs.
The advancement in science and technology has two aspects, one is positive and the other is negative. The positive aspect of it is to make the life of people easier by using the technological discoveries, and the negative aspect of technology is that it makes human beings all day busy and think of how to earn money to maintain life, therefore they would become materialistic and dead spiritually.

Technology and science are two crucial aspects of modern humans’ lives; one cannot neglect their influence on the modern humanity (Sheehan 59). Gladden in articles entitled, ‘In the Image of Technology, Modern freedom and Virtual Reality’, points out that people in the Western countries connect art and sciences, with the response to people’s asking about control of over nature; which is believed that human beings did not possess from the time they were descended from the Garden. That is why Gladden refers to what Sir Francis Bacon statement which Bacon believes that regarding men fall from the Garden, by the fall of man no longer possess that condition of being innocent, also from his ruling power over creation. It is believed as that according to Gladden man’s losing condition can be solved by religion and faith; and his dominant power over nature, which is the second loss, can be restored by art and science. According to Gladden, Bacon’s statement concerning human being’s aspiration to bring back his dominion over creation lacks sincerity; as man wishes to restore his control over creation without restoring man to innocence (Gladden, 210).

Modern human beings are lazy even in committing mistakes; this is because if somebody rejects God, and does not believe that He has power over the universe, then he is allowed to do everything. If the reason behind modern human beings not committing mistakes, is the fear from other human beings, then that means modern people have unknowingly chosen earthly gods (Oesterdiekhoff, 207).

Perhaps the same thing about modern human’s return to religion is applicable to T. S. Eliot; because Eliot could be a modern human being but with a different ideology from those of the modern writes
as Naorem Khagendra Singh sates, Eliot ‘was a modern man, who confronted with the problems of the modern world, felt a two folded disquiet: estrangement and frustration’, (Singh, 2001: 132). Moreover, as Walker thinks that the reason behind Eliot’s accepting Christianity is because it was the only hope in a desolate world. According to him, Eliot also accepted it because of the disillusionment and the despair that the two shattering World Wars brought to modern humanity (Walker, 887). One question that Eliot might have asked himself was, is a Godless universe an alternative to a world where there is a God? Are those, who choose their philosophy as a substitute to religion, happy in their life and do not have the sort of problems that the religious people have? The answer to the above questions about people’s happiness and the meaning of life to people may be the factor behind the poet, Eliot’s conversion to Christianity. Eliot in an essay entitled, ‘Thoughts after Lambeth’ asks for ‘redeeming the time: so that the Faith may be preserved alive through the dark ages before us; to renew and rebuild civilization, and save the World from suicide’, (qtd. in Leavis, 1968: 49).

Russell E. Murphy, makes Eliot’s religious belief very obvious, saying that for Eliot, ‘religion serves a single impulse, the religious impulse, which is itself inspired by the individual’s awareness that here is some purpose to existence that cannot be satisfied or explained by purely social means’, (Murphy, 2007: 54) Eliot also clarifies his belief in religion and says ‘religion became morals, religion became art, religion became science and philosophy’, (qt. in Murphy, 54). In fact, Eliot sees lives of those who reject religion and chose a secular world was not better than the life of those who were believers, but it was even much worse. According to him non-believers were pessimists, alienated and could not face the reality of life as well as spiritually dead; that is why Eliot was happy to enter Christianity and submit himself to the will of God.

Linehan believes that Roger Griffin’s information is significantly helpful. These modernisation processes include, though partly distinct, kingdom of intellect, developments in culture and ideology
and rational dissemination. Modernisation processes also contain individualism, positivism, materialism, literary, secularism, liberalism, the notion of development, nationalism and imperialism. The other processes of modernisation connected with materialism, and the progress of the society were the development of industry on an extensive scale and the rise of class distinctions (7. Mirsepassi, 36). The Enlightenment was emerged due to the influence of the French, and the Industrial revolutions on modernisation. A key to the modernisation processes is capitalism, which started in the eighteenth century up to 1917 in the Western Europe (Linehan, 10).

Culture was marginalised in the modern period, and as a result capitalism was appreciated because modern humans were busy with the materialistic world (Müller-Funk 80). Eliot was against the world of mass production as he found it as a factor of the ever-weakening culture. Eliot opposed to capitalism in 1916, and his opposition to capitalism was mostly realized by 1921 (North, 173). Cuddy Louis A., in this regard points out that the tradition remains like a substance of human nature, as a monument to that development (Cuddy, 32).

Linehan states that, Marshall Berman considers modernity as branch of experience which is special to each person, or awareness that occurred due to a confrontation with the maelstrom caused by modernisation. There is a special state or quality at the personal or social level triggered by modernisation; that modernity sees of the people who witnessed or went through sharp uprisings. The state of modernity for Berman is of its particular traits. According to him, modern life has its own specific environment, with very different features that strongly belong to itself and not similar to those of the traditional ways of life. According to Linehan’s concept, modern world has certain qualities such as domineering power but lacking good qualities, fleeting, ephemeral, contingent and fragmentary (Linehan, 11).
Matthews Steven argues that the emergence of the modern movement was not independent but it was mainly based on history (Matthews 20). Eliot believes that it is very rare to find a work by any writer of complete originality. If any critic or reader reads one of the works which is considered to be original, he can easily find ideas of the previous ancestors in that work. Perhaps Eliot’s stressing of the significance of the classical works is because new, modern and contemporary works certainly carry some of the characteristics of several immortal works written in the mature period of the writers ancestors. Eliot defines tradition as ‘the free appreciation of works belonging to different areas and eras which make the writer ‘most accurately conscious of his place in time of his contemporaneity’, (qtd. in Strickland, 1974: 7). T. S. Eliot further insists on the importance of the past to be taken into account especially in case of the evaluation of any literary work, he says,

No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of æsthetic, not merely historical, criticism (Tradition and the Individual Talent, 17).

If modern poetry is a new style of writing poetry, it does not imply that it is not poetry (Holmes 43). Thus, modern poetry must have benefited from the Classic poetry, Metaphysical poetry and Romantic poetry to build itself as a new genre. What is strange is the modern writer’s rejection of the poetry of the previous ages, and the claim that their work is completely new and different. This is so despite the knowledge that there were some unique works in the past ages. Additionally, if there were not the literary works and talents of the previous centuries works of literature, a movement might not have existed in the name of modernism. This is because those writing modern literary works of the literary figures would not be appreciated as something lofty; even the literary men themselves may not know what they are writing is literature.
This might be the reason that Eliot is the modern poet and critic who is against modernism and interested in certain features which modern humanity does not. In fact, modern poets reject tradition and the past as an important part of the present because as Eliot asserts that ‘Tradition is a matter of much wider significance. It cannot be inherited, and if you want it you must inherit it by great labour’, (Tradition and the Individual Talent: 14). Eliot also believes that great writers must write with a ‘historical sense’. This historical sense is linked to two things; first is the ‘pastness of the past’ and even the pastness of the past’ as Eliot thought that this is the only way that can enable the poet to write with the sense of universe, from Greek writers for example Homer to the present day of his own. This sense of history ‘which is the sense of the timeless as well as the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional, (14) Accordingly, Eliot believes the writer’s knowledge of the past as well as of the present age are what can make a writer conscious of the present, (Tradition and the Individual Talent: 14). Eliot thought that Western culture was a fragmentary chaos. He mentioned the decline of religion, which he views as the source of culture and tradition which will result in the cultural collapse. Nevertheless, he assumed that this decline had progressed too far to be upturned straightforwardly. Even those writers who reject the influence of tradition on them, while they comprise any piece of literary work, unknowingly, use certain words and expressions as well as ideas from the dead poets of the previous ages, (Tradition and the Individual Talent, 15). Eliot further explains that task of the living poet and argues,

To proceed to a more intelligible exposition of the relation of the poet to the past: he can neither take the past as a lump, an indiscriminate bolus, nor can he form himself wholly on one or two private admirations, nor can he form himself wholly upon one preferred period. … The poet must be very conscious of the main current; which does not at all flow invariably through the most distinguished reputations. He must be quite aware of the obvious fact that art never improves, but that the material of
art is never quite the same, (Tradition and the Individual Talent, 16). Eliot always thought that the past must not be neglected and it does not mean that the modern or the present writers or poets must only imitate what the previous dead writers or poets did, but it is to mix the past and the present in their works. Thus, writers must endeavour to build something which neither resembles the past exactly nor it is the pure idea of the writer, yet it is dependent on various sources; the past, the present as well as the hard work of the writer and this makes the work universal. It implies that Eliot insists on the literacy degree of the writer as well as to what extent the writer has knowledge of different parts of the world in different ages so as that he can enrich his work by raising his own awareness of the successful steps of the well-known writers in the world.

The reason behind Eliot’s concentration on the importance of tradition and history is the continuous values of the two if writers of the modern period whether recognized or not. David Chinitz realizes Eliot’s intention in rescuing not only the high culture (which is in danger, according to Eliot) but also some other forms of culture, via his attempt to reconnect the distinct levels of culture (Chinitz, 240). Eliot considers culture as a key point for comparing the past ages to the present age; to show the decadence and meaninglessness of the modern period. Perhaps in which culture is no longer having a very high value due to the deeds of humanity (Matthew, 18). David Ayers also finds culture as an important part in human life, as he links culture with perfection, and even he thinks culture goes beyond religion (Arnold, 62). This is because its approach towards truth is very close to completion, passing through art, science, poetry, philosophy and history as well as religion. Moreover, Arnold in his definition of culture says, its like spirit with poetry follows one law with poetry. Arnold continues to say that the idea of beauty and human nature is the dominant idea of poetry, which is a true and invaluable idea; hence perfect poetry on all its sides (Arnold, 67).
Eliot unlike Arnold believes that no culture has appeared, or developed except together with a religion (Notes towards a Definition of Culture, 2010: xv). Eliot further illustrates it, saying that Religion, whether Christian or non-Christian gives an apparent meaning to life, provides the framework for a culture and protects the mass of humanity from boredom and despair (Eliot’s Notes towards the Definition of Culture, 34). He believes that both culture and religion are important for the society. He also thinks that if religion and culture are related, and not separated but put together, modern human beings will live a happy life together which is empty of despair and disillusion.

Linehan points out that modernisation process mainly relies on people’s wishes for change, from a decay world. This desire for a new world did not happen in historical vacuum, but it occurred in a time of extreme volatility. It also occurred due to the explosive collision of technological, social, economic, epistemological, and temporal trends. This produced what is called over-determined past time of the end of the nineteenth century, which was said to be the consequence of volatility. The motives of some of these volatile times were interior and others were exterior (Linehan, 65). Linehan, states that because modernists consider the society as not healthy, but rather dirty, polluted and many people are sick, they are therefore; busy with health, cleanliness, proper diet and the culture of the body in a more general sense.

The Modernists’ aim was to clean up, sterilize and reorder the society to eliminate chaos and dirt. They did this to rebuild the pure world and to remove all the stains of the past (Linehan, 73). They did so because modernists believed that religion was previously the dominant power occupied everything and made human beings its slave. Thus, modern humans thought it is time for rejecting the past culture, religion and instead build their new culture which is by pursuing their own philosophy of life; by depending of science and technology.
While this was happening, some modernists like Eliot opposed to the new views and ideologies which replaced the past. Probably the most apparent problematic issues of modernism and the mass culture, is its ambivalent set of relations. As the essay ‘The Kitsch Style and the Age of Kitsch’, written in 1935 by Elias, clarifies that this ambivalence is worth mention. This might be the first endeavor to perceive modernity and real problems. The relationship between form and formlessness has changed completely at the time of passing of a central court style in the eighteenth century: almost every piece of writing needed to be moved back by force from abyss; making a continual perception of structure and disintegration, and an impulsive formalistic approach (Elias, 28).

The First World War had significantly influenced modern life as it made many people pessimistic, hopeless and worried (Hanna 1). O’Gorman considers it as the reason behind people’s resorting to religion such as Christianity as a solution for their problems in the twentieth century, (O’Gorman, 5). On the contrary many people rejected religion and became secular. Matthews maintains that Nietzsche’s statement ‘God is dead’ (Nietzsche, 106). Nietzsche’s speech means human being no longer obeys God, (Lewy, 45). Nietzsche’s speech is vague as he has not specified which God died because there are different kinds of God, for instance the God of love, ‘Diana or Luna to the Romans’ (Cavendish, 475), or God of War and God of Peace. Nietzsche’s purpose in choosing this particular expression is Christianity in general; and specifically, the whole moral and ethical system which Christianity has entailed, in his opinion. On the contrary, his claim was not true, as the number of those who visited the Church in America and Britain was not decreasing in the beginning of the modern age. Even the number of those who attended Churches in the UK became ‘3 per cent more’ soon after Nietzsche’s proclamation than in 1860s. Additionally, in the US the number did not fall. The Christian Churches during this period became engaged with people’s problems via its social clubs to alleviate the pain that people had due to daily poverty.
Church attendances during the First World War increased and ‘the alternative practices developed dramatically; like, spiritualism, as the bereaved sought to contact the lost soldiers (Matthews, 118).

Keating states that a French writer of note, Georges Duhamel, and a person, who has characterized modern inventions as scourges rather than as blessings of mankind, has defended the humanities in general and the classics in particular, as of supreme value to modern man by virtue of their complete and utter lack of practicality. (Keating, 1958). Keating’s speech implies that the modern technology has brought evil and sordid things to the modern humanity. Simultaneously Keating urged modern humans to pursue classics and consider it as dignity and high value to follow. Keating also says,

In a sordid world, where man seldom acts or thinks except in response to an outwardly material or inwardly selfish motive; the study of the classics stands forth as the one remaining example of an entirely useless and therefore, spiritually meaningful experience’. In fact, he believes that for this reason the study of the classics is a must in any educational system, (Keating, 1958).

It is obvious that in the modern world, is an evil world due to the evil deeds of modern humans, beings that are spiritually dead. Spirituality is something which is missing in the twentieth century; spirituality related to human faith and belief in religion. The response of the people in the classical world was very unique, implicitly and explicitly; that is why Keating thinks that modern human beings must educate themselves in the classics.

Marx’s Marxism, Freud’s Determinism and Darwin’s Theory of Evolution were three of the key ideologies emerging in the twentieth century. There were a great number of people who were influenced by these three theories of Marx, Darwin and Freud. Under the impact of these ideologies and figures, some people became doubtful of religion and some others even became secular;
because they began thinking of human freedom and dignity. In this regard, Freud believed that the good or the evil of the unconscious constituents of human mind is determined beforehand; in the stage of infancy or the very beginning of childhood. According to Marx human communities in their constitution and improvement in terms of history are determined beforehand; by considering both technological and economic aspects, (Kaplan, 5).

It can be said that modernism is connected to modernisation and modernity and its development is based on the two; this relation is variable and complicated (Gentile, 44). Generally speaking, one can identity certain internal benefits to modernism considering that both modernisation and modernity were globally known, at the late nineteenth century. Modernity modernism like a response to aspects of life; this made modernism reach an pursues international level. However the impact of this was realized in depth in the cities confronting a quick shift, or rather facing a sharp agitation culturally; for instance Paris, Berlin, Prague, Vienna or London (Linehan, 17). Modernism remarkably bypassed that kingdom mentioned in the scholarship-art, literature and avant-garde, to hold both social and political phenomena and movements. Thus, modernism can be regarded as a response to the sharp shifts molded by modernisation and modernity. In brief, modernism recorded the meaning of estrangement of modern humanity, anger, the split of the traditional structure of statement, and official list enclosed the emptying out of both time and space. The feeling of being disorientated is expressed in modern literature; which is an outlet to express literary figures expressions about the chaotic world of the twentieth century. It makes the literary people be free, as well as work below extremely rapid events of history; like the introspective contemplation of Thomas Mann, Yeats or Eliot or the hard-line mental imagery of Dada and Surrealism, (Linehan, 17).
T. E. Hulme, who was one of the pioneers in the field of modernism, argued for imagism. This argument emerged against rules and regulations of ‘meter as rhetorical’ and everything linked to romanticism in 1908. Pound rejected this claim claiming his to be the only basis of the imagist group of 1912. Hulme rejected romanticism, as it was mainly based on Rousseau’s notion about human being; as an absolute powerful living creature, which was turned back by social convention. Accordingly, Rousseau did not approve of classicism as classicism considered human being as an animal; with limited potential, an absolute ‘constant’ and everything that is decent can be easily taken out of man via tradition and organization (Howarth, 34-35). Pound has set three rules for imagism and they are: the poet must be either subjective or objective in the treatment of things, the words they use must be directly related to the presentation and the composition of the rhyme must be in line with the order of the ‘musical phrase, not in sequence of metronome (Howarth, 45).

Howarth believes that the first two letters objectivity and subjectivity are opposite to each other, therefore, how one can become a substitution for the other. He would rather want to say that if the treatment of the thing means poetry for Pound; then that implies that the treatment is rather indirect only. And also, if the treatment direct, it should be a source inside the other sources (Howarth, 45).

The collaboration amongst the modernists of avant-garde, which include Vorticist, Imagist, the Second Viennese School, Dada, Surrealist, and others were causing changes in generations. When some of this modernist collaborated together, as it is seen in the Vorticism, there was a strong connection between Eliot and Pound, and Joyce and Lewis and many others like Hulme and Flint, who were in direct contact with each other. This led to make clear their group self-awareness in a manifesto by one of them; as it is seen in the case of Windham Lewis’s two issues of ‘Blast in London’.
In this way, both Pound and Windham Lewis thought that the time for Christianity came to end by giving rise to a gigantic uprising called modernism; in all arts, against the ‘weeping whiskers and fraternizing with monkeys’ of the Victorians (Butler, 26-27). Matthews also makes it clear that Lewis’s notion is Platonic, as Lewis believes that the time that humanity rejects culture and norms, it implies humanity is moving back towards primal ideas and forms (Matthews, 25).

The overwhelming influence of mythology is attracting the attention of several modernists (Earle 144). They think that mythology has a capability of revealing the hidden meaning of the modern world. They also think that mythology vitalizes the awareness of the outside time, and is behind self-estrangement, linear time of modernity. Many modern literary figures were involved in mythology for instance, Picasso, James Joyce, T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, W.B. and Le Corbusier (Linehan, 19).

The duty of the modernists is not to record cognizance of the unaddressed issues of modernisation and modernity alone (Jernigan 10). Critics should not only see modernism as the disillusionment of the modernists; as through this they discover outlets to flee modern instability in the world. This implies finding methods to flee from the hardship of the modern world, and to implement this is to remove decadent fallout development (Linehan, 19). Clearly, escaping form the difficulty of the modern universe, securing break from the contemporary or the new, seeking for a shelter or suppressing the dictatorship of modern profane time are not the only objects of modernism; but it tries to maintain all of these tendencies. Modernism would rather strive to show all of these opposite impulses; in so doing it grasps the storm, and strives to exploit its powers. Modernism seriously became busy with the contemporary and also tried to provide a contemporary understanding of time (Linehan, 21). Linehan using Marshal Berman’s description, points out the description of being modern; which is to discover a person in a situation, that guarantees adventurous acts, vigor, happiness, and improvement, and
simultaneously that puts everything that the person has, in danger. Modernism is also described as an escape from life and as an interpretation for life, (Linehan, 21). Eliot in his essay, ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent’, explained his viewpoint about the impersonality of poetry. Eliot opposite to the Romantic poets believes that poetry must be empty of emotions. Eliot defines poetry more clearly, according to him; poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion. According to him poetry it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality. But, of course, only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want to escape from these things (Eliot’s Tradition and the Individual Talent, 10).

Martin Scofield asserts that Sigg Eric, finds Eliot ambivalent as Eliot in his essay, ‘Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca’, written in 1927, less emphasizes on emotion, (Scofield, 76). Eliot simply says, what every poet starts from is his own emotions, then Eliot says, ‘Shakespeare, too, was occupied with the struggle, which alone constitutes life for a poet to transmute his personal and private agonies into something rich and strange, something universal and impersonal (Eliot’s Selected Essays, 137).

Readers may misunderstand Eliot’s speech about poetry and probably they suppose that poetry for Eliot means, a dry material, empty of emotion, and feeling. Eliot expected some misunderstandings from the people who do not have that personality and emotions that Eliot knows. Eliot also says that he was not only in reaction against the Romantic poets but also against the Georgian criticism. This was because the critics of the nineteenth century were mostly concentrating on emotion and sensation. According to Plato, sensation and emotion are as he called them the, baser instincts of human being, are not to be shed light on as the Romantic poets did. Eliot’s rejection of emotion and feeling is not against Words Worth’s definition of poetry as poetry is a spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling it takes its origin from emotions recollected in tranquility (Wordsworth’s Preface, 250).
Eliot is rather outspoken, as he speaks about disciplining and calming the overflow of powerful feelings in good poetry (Hanief, 62). Eliot further clarifies his speech and says ‘I was writing in a context which a reader of today has either forgotten or has never experienced’ (Hanief, 61). Matthew Steven stated that modernism was made of two parts. The first section is realism, which is anti-realist, and shows the superficial aspect of life. And the second section, is the depth of everything, and is presented through symbolism which is not very lucid to comprehend (Matthews, 24).

There is no doubt that Eliot’s writing about the impersonality of poetry is controversial. Perhaps, for two reasons Eliot was right when he said that poetry must be empty of personal feelings; firstly, because of the Romantic poets’ too much emphasis on emotion. Secondly, when Eliot shed light on the significance of the impersonality of poetry is to make poetry universal; as it is obvious not all people have the same emotion, and if the whole poems are about emotion it will never be universal. Moreover, if the concentration is mainly on emotion and feeling, then, there would be no room left for objectivity of poetry. Objectivity of the poet makes the poet universal, and at the same time objectivity means keeping balance in describing anything, i.e., being a good maker, (poet) in his judgments.

To encourage people to explore various origins of subject matter and ways of cooperation which reacted to and exceeded the newfound, transfers people to the radical, even to revolutionary, streak within modernism (Linehan, 22). In 1980, a different way of thought emerged, as James McFarlane states that in the European countries with destructive, impious wishes for re-appreciation and substitution. Their wishes for re-appreciation and substitution are caused by an outlook on radical alteration depended on the proposition. This view was taken from Nietzsche’s notion, on the arrival of the registered events at the terminus of a long era of civilization.
One here faces another significant facet of modernisation, which is the idea of considering recorded events of at the cusp of a rapid change dramatically fetched there by attacking technological progress as well as by accompanying destruction of values and culture, (Linehan, 22).

Modern humanity has been entangled in a worse situation by the onrushing secularism and the new progress in technology (Bocola 60). Even secularism dispelled the certainty, which the humanity possessed before the modern age. They dispelled certainty by reassuring that spirits and Gods were desperate feelings of alienation, anomie, dislocation and uncertainty. They also reassured them by convincing them that they were living in a time of perpetual crisis and transition without respite or closure (Linehan, 98).

When looking at Eliot’s poems such as, ‘The Waste Land’ and his later poems such as ‘Ash Wednesday’, one cannot say that the two poems were written by one person. In this regard, Miss Hellen Gardener asserts ‘The change in Mr. Eliot’s poetry’ cannot be discussed without reference to the fact that the author of ‘Ash Wednesday’ is a Christian while the author of ‘The Waste Land’ is not (Walker, 886).

Louis Menand suggests that certain devices in Eliot’s poetry and the formulation of his critical writings are very important as they can simultaneously solve a number of issues raised in the modern period (Menand, 9). Singh’s argument is very significant when he says that, the E. M. Forster wrote about T. S. Eliot in Abinger Harvest should recall the beginning of the World War. Singh also suggests that Foster should conclude by saying that Eliot was one of those who had looked into the abyss and refused, hence forward to deny or forget the fact (Singh, 82). Singh also states that Eliot shows the ‘chaos of modern world and the disillusionment of modern humanity through his unparalleled style and depiction of the metropolitan life (Singh, 82). It is a picture of a weak and decayed civilization.
According to the American Lutheran Survey Modern humans were ruled by selfish exploiters; they and their institutions are similarly rotten (75). Living in such areas normally caused desolation, neurosis and weakness; which is presented in a dramatic way inside the minds of such typical products of this modern life as Sweeney, Prufrock and Gerontion. Accordingly, F. R. Leavis believed that Eliot’s poetry expresses the disillusionment of a generation, the post-war generation in Europe and is a vision of desolation and spiritual draught (Singh, 82). Eliot explained that what he expressed might be the modern, human’s own illusion of being disillusioned, but this was not Eliot’s intention (Eliot’s Selected Essays, 368).

For modernists, childhood is considered as a great period to the future time of human life-cycle; as several constituents of the origin myth can be seen on the modern reflections on childhood (Kennedy 44). Childhood stage is seen as a Golden Age of naturalness and flawlessness. Accordingly, modernism intends to see the sages that come after childhood stage, and regards it as a human failure from the root condition of purity and innocence. Hope stems within modernists, as mature human being can go back to the time of his previous pureness and innocence. This hope springs from the idea that modernists believe that child possesses an incomparable capacity. Hence, from this childhood stage, will disclose a window to spread his purity, innocence and fidelity into the literary world which is the reflection of life (Linehan, 102). Linehan also states that modern human being’s return to the origin, this does not mean to escape from the reality of the modern world. This return to the origin is done by rather trying to be in contact with the unnoticed origins of being; which is special to the world of the childhood intending to urge. Thus, the adult become active as this is a kind of power and strength to the new world; even Benjamin wishes to make the special ‘experience of childhood’ equal to the socialist future (Linehan, 106).
Modernism has diffused both different orientations such as nationalism, liberalism, fascism and communisms as well as all the important parts of social life (Stanley 130). Therefore, Daniele Conversi concludes his discourse about modernism by saying that; modernists believe that whatsoever is modern must be positive, and whatsoever, is opposite to modernism must be refused. This raises the question Nazism and Stalinism as they considered themselves as modern. Are they positive? It seems that the most accurate definition of modern is that; when it is set against the word, which used nowadays, traditional. Therefore, what is modern makes self-conscious development beyond tradition. As a result, by the establishment of modernity everything that is modern becomes traditional. Then modernity must be defined against what had already been considered to be modern. Thus, the status of modern is always jeopardized by more modern ones to come, defined against the traditional. Modern seems to have no definite definition (Mansfield, 259). The viewpoint of Michael Martin is also important. He considers modern, as a desire for all; encompassing mastery of reality by rational and or scientific means (Bremmer, 28). According to Bremmer, what is the basis for modern is merely the scientific understanding and interpretation for everything. The result is to be worked out to discover a person on a wrong side of the modern/anti-modern divide (Conversi 18). Conversi asserts that according to Greenfeld, one cannot grasp modernisation without nationalism because it can provide the ideological forge and shape modernity (Conversi, 18). Daniele also says with modernisation secularization held the state in absolute terms (Conversi, 18).

Gladden in an article entitled, ‘In the Image of Technology: Modern freedom, Virtual Reality’, points out that people in the Western countries connect art and sciences to the response to people’s asking about humanity’s control over nature. It is believed that human being did not possess art and sciences, from the time they were descended from the Garden.
That is why; Gladden refers to what Sir Francis Bacon states regarding man’s fall from the Garden. Bacon believes that because of the fall man no longer possess that condition of being innocent and from his ruling power over creation. Gladden says that man’s losing condition can be solved by religion and faith. Also according to him mans’ dominant power over nature, and the second loss can be restored by art and science. According to Gladden, what Bacon states concerning human being’s aspiration to bring back his dominion over creation lacks sincerity. It lacks sincerity because, man wishes to restore his control over creation without restoring man to innocence (Gladden, 210). The natural world lost its values, as it was replaced by the materialistic and technological world (Abu-Rabi’ 20). Gladden states that Baudrillard believes that the technological world has substituted the pure and natural world. This technological universe has not brought to humanity virtue but instead it brought vice (Gladden, 213 & 214). On the contrary, the idea about technology is that technological world replaces the natural world; yet via the TV screen’s human being is reminded of the beauty and purity of the natural world that the modern humanity no longer owns it.

In 1917 Eliot and Pound started accusing the Georgian contemporaries of being rhetoric. And the two poets promised to eliminate the root of rhetoric in their poetry and return to classics (Howarth, 7). Louis Menand states that classics mean a reaction against modern liberal thought (Menand, 565). Eliot’s disapproval of the romantic poetry is due to their too much concentration on self, which leads to the decay of the Romantic poetry. T. S. Eliot’s poetry is different from the Victorian poetry because the modern age is different from the previous age (Menand, 64). It can be said that the reason behind the different features that Eliot’s poetry has, is the difference in situation, time and milieu of the poet’s life. Accordingly, only a person, who is so delicate to realise things, lived in the same time, situation and milieu of T.S. Eliot; is able to understand his poetry completely.
In fact the person, who denies the value of the poet’s poems and is not ready to read his essays about his works, cannot understand the poet. Eliot’s awareness of the world outside himself such as the literature of Europe and his vigorous support to the Aristotelian idea that poetry is the philosophy of writing and its object is truth.

The problem of gender and sexuality is also part of the twentieth century movement, modernism (Kline 32). A new generation appeared in 1890s called New Women, in which a number of active and feminist liberals were seen. They had a very strong sense of action in ‘public world’. Matthews makes references to literary works, like novels written in the modern period, and says that women are no longer the only object the men writers can gaze. Alternatively, he says that they can now express their own views of the world through female writers. This was a subject that even in the eighteenth’s century male writers such as Oscar Wilde talked about. He shed light on homosexuality in 1895, and their way of living, which was thought to be decadent. It was also understood by the conservative critics at the time with the sudden liberation of women. Another important issue during 1980s is certainly about the role of male and female in the community (Morris 76). Feminist groups and organizations emerged to ask for the rights of women, one of which is to let them vote, and choose their representatives. A growing number of women in the poor classes were not aware of the birth control in both America and Britain. These issues were addressed by women campaigners and led women organizations to try to disseminate information. Information was disseminated to those women, to save them from the lust and desire; which are the baser instincts of men. Consequently the information was to prevent women from no longer being male slaves (Matthews, 92).

There had been questions asked about more than fifty years of Christian faith and doctrine. Anxiousness grasped the loss of Christian faith, and its meanings had been mostly represented by a well-known, Matthew Arnold. Mathew represented this in in ‘Dover Beach’, which is one of his interesting poems written in nineteenth century. Arnold implies one possible implication about
culture; which was the withdrawal of ocean of belief. This might probably mean substitution by literary works themselves, as containers of higher forms of meaning (Matthews, 118).

It is clear that modernism was used on the purpose of refusing religion, as modernists think that religion is old and can no longer address the problems of mankind (Caldarola 14). Because the modern human beings like humanists, deny the existence of God. They have also lost their faith in God’s power, and they seek for an alternative to religion. Modern humans replace religion with human philosophies about their understanding of life, and everything else which is not religion; as if religion is completely discarded from the modern humanity’s world. In this regard Eliot in his essay on Irving Babbitt states,

Humanism is either an alternative to religion, or is ancillary to it. To my mind, it always — flourishes most when religion has been strong; and if you find examples of humanism which — are anti-religious, or at least in opposition to the religious faith of the place and time, then — such humanism is purely destructive, for it has never found anything to replace what it — destroyed. Any religion, of course, is forever in danger of petrification into mere ritual and — habit, though ritual and habit be essential to religion. It is only renewed and refreshed by an — awakening of feeling and fresh devotion, or by the critical reason, (Eliot’s Selected Essays, 437) Eliot criticises humanists as they strove to reject religion without finding an alternative to it and this leads to destruction and decline but not complete decay of religious faith. Accordingly, when religion which is a basis for culture becomes weak, culture will become weak and Eliot believes that culture is not merely to copy what is in the past but it is the combination of the individual talent, the past as well as the present moment. Thus, religion and culture are intertwined and in order to save religion and culture from ‘petrification’ there must be some delicate people to dedicate their time to prove the need and the significance of religion through their deep thinking of religion. Eliot’s earlier poems contained
certain traits of anti-Christian pessimism and disillusionment (Grove 50). This made Eliot a favorite poet by communists and they read his poems with happiness; but this did not last long as Eliot converted to the Anglican Church (Walker, 886). T. S. Eliot in two ways belongs to the modern tradition. Firstly, by his frequent criticism; he was depreciating those whom he (Eliot) owed a great deal of his fame as a poet and as a critic. Secondly, Eliot is actually modern by fate (Menand, 555).

What makes T. S. Eliot prominent is that he lived in the modern period and wrote several works in which he did not praise the modern movement. On the contrary, he opposed the modernists, modernism, and even against the process of modernisation. Additionally, Louis Menand’s description of modernism justifies this fact. Menand states modernism is a reaction against the modern. This definition might not be applicable to all the works of literature and literary criticism which are called modernist; but this that definition is suitable in the case of Eliot (Menand, 554). Eliot’s criticises modern humanity, because of lack of coherent moral ground. He also criticises modern humanity for the idiosyncratic and makeshift value systems it produced to compensate for that inadequacy. He did so in the name of doctrines, royalism (Menand, 555).

Eliot says, poetry perhaps makes its readers occasionally, a little more aware of the deeper, unnamed feelings. Feelings which form the substratum of our being, which we rarely penetrate; for our lives are mostly constant evasions of ourselves, and an evasion of the visible world (Tradition and the Individual Talent, 1920). Perhaps this feature of poetry makes Eliot say that poetry is poetry and it is not like anything else. It is through poetry that one can recognize himself as human being; as there are certain realities of life that human being do not dare approach. Additionally, poetry can express them, as poetry stems from the depth of the heart which is the source of truth. Therefore one may not be able to escape from the reality of life.
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