Rethinking Marxist Aesthetics: Race, Class and Alienation in Post-War British Literature

SERCAN HAMZA BAGLAMA

Rethinking Marxist Aesthetics: Race, Class and Alienation in Post-War British Literature

Sercan Hamza Bağlama

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English Studies

Durham University

June 2017

Table of Contents

Statement of Copyright

Abstract

A literary text subjectively fictionalizes and narrates one dimension of the total structure of an epoch; it reveals the reciprocal interplay between personal experiences and historical formations through the aesthetic incarnation of a unique personal perspective on the real that is also derived from a social position and origin in relation to a social structure. In order to analyse economic, cultural and political histories in Britain in the second half of the twentieth century mediated through the represented experiences of characters in fictions of the post-war period, this dissertation focusses on the literary works of four different post-war authors, Alan Sillitoe, Sam Selvon, Doris Lessing and James Kelman. Each of these writers depicts a wide range of social, cultural and political circumstances and interactions in their special historical modes in order to expose specific dimensions out of the totality of real life through the depiction of the multifaceted and subjective experiences of fictional characters. Alan Sillitoe's literary works literalize the class antagonism constructed upon the dichotomy of 'them' and 'us' through the inner and outer conflicts of the 'white' working-class characters and portray the socio-historical reality of class consciousness and its emergence as part of the particular and complex historical conditions pertaining in the UK; Sam Selvon's novels provide a different interpretation of migrant-ness and displacement and fictionalize the poverty and misery of his 'black' working-class characters in relation to the mass migration flows facilitated by the Nationality Act of 1948; James Kelman portrays and mediates the disintegrating and alienating impacts of post-industrial capitalism upon the Scottish working-class characters, reveals the victimization process of the Scottish working-class characters by governmental authorities and bureaucracy, and adds a third dimension to the discussion centred around race, nationality and class; Doris Lessing's fiction helps articulate the discussions in the UK regarding the rejection of the dominant orthodoxy in the Labour Party and of the legacy of Stalinism and the employment of a range of reforms on issues like gender, sexuality and civil rights during the formation of the New Left. This dissertation mainly argues that class still matters and that, if it is to be adequately demonstrated, there is, therefore, a strong argument for a return to the writings of Karl Marx, to the Marxist concept of alienation, and to Marxist economics rather than simply drawing on the tradition of Marxist aesthetics – the most pervasive way in which Marxism has entered literary criticism. In this context, I attempt to justify the still valid 'lessons' of Marxism's historically concrete theoretical approach as well as Marxism's still valid historical power. I hope to reveal Marxism's distinctive relevance to the process of estrangement, atomization and reification in post-war society in order as well to offer a refutation of the current standard criticisms and dismissals of Marxism. This dissertation, focusing on prominent new class approaches as well as theoretical studies and debates on race and ethnicity in Marxist literature, will frame an analysis through an approach to the question of estrangement. The overall aim is to reconceptualise the broader economic, cultural and social framework of the processes of alienation and of escape mechanisms employed by *the* individual as defence mechanisms in capitalist cultures. Over the course of the study, it will also be suggested that the concept of identity should be taken into account in a more radically intersectional manner and that one-dimensional postmodern identity politics is unable to give a materialistic articulation of poverty and subordination within the larger context of global economics. The thesis develops an anti-establishment, egalitarian and emancipatory framework in reading its authors: one which might also be

implemented as part of a movement that aims to critique, resist and overthrow injustice and oppression.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my supervisor, Professor Patricia Waugh, whose expertise, generous guidance and intimate support made it possible for me to complete this project. I have benefited from countless hours of her advice regarding both my research and academic life, and she has personally and academically become an inspiring role model for me.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Samuel Thomas for supporting me whenever I needed his help and to Professor Stephen Regan for the chats about Terry Eagleton and Karl Marx during the annual progress reviews.

I would like to thank Professor Abdul R. JanMohamed for finding time to read my dissertation and making constructive comments and suggestions about my research during my visit to the University of California, Berkeley as a research scholar.

Special mention must go to Asst. Prof. Azer B. Kemaloğlu and Assoc. Prof. Dilek Kantar who genuinely motivated and encouraged me to pursue this project.

I also owe my deepest gratitude to my parents and sister for their constant support, love, understanding and encouragement and would like to dedicate this thesis to them.

Anneme, Babama ve Kardeşime…

To my parents and sister…

INTRODUCTION

Althusser's concept of overdetermination, articulated as part of his attempt to combine psychoanalysis and Marxist theory, suggests that any given effect has more than a single cause and that every effect has multiple determinants through which that effect is produced. However, in order not to get lost in a typical poststructuralist worship of difference, Althusser articulates the notion of "determinant in the final instance" (118) and points out that one determinant among multiple determinants will function as the dominant and organizational one and that each determinant's condition of existence – a revelation of a different level of social structures and practices – will actually derive from the relations of production at that given moment (1969, 100). Although this concept/argument may at first sight appear overly grounded in a reductive materialism, the position serves usefully to suggest how individual consciousnesses, experiences and feelings are *mainly* shaped by practical relations under the hegemony of collective and historical processes and how a focus on the particularity and immediacy of lived experience might, for that reason, reveal the complex mediations within a determinate mode of production:

> The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is … interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men ... Conceiving, thinking, the mental intercourse of men, appear … as the direct efflux of their material behaviour … they are conditioned by a definite development of their productive forces. (Marx 1845-46, 9)

Literary texts, aesthetically depicting "structures of feelings"[1] (Williams 1977, 133) and fictionalizing actual as well as reimagined or imagined histories in a given period, are, from this perspective, seen as produced in specific historical contexts and, despite their aesthetic individualization of social reality, are also seen to reflect the material social process with its inherent qualities and tendencies. Fictional texts are therefore regarded as able to mediate an imagined totality of social, cultural, historical and political circumstances and relations in their specific historical forms whilst, as representations, also recognising that any totality is always a selection from a number of possible models. The narratives mediating our existence and exposing social totalities might also be seen to manifest – directly or indirectly – the actualities and socio-economic forces of a particular period as a whole within a larger context: accordingly, "the effort to set art free from life, to declare it a craft self-sufficient unto itself, devitalizes and kills art" (Trotsky 1960, 181).

The creative labour of a writer, the product of his or her 'consciousness', intellectuality, individual experiences, ideology and relation to class and culture, in the last analysis, might be viewed as a concrete articulation of dialectical processes that are made available to be grasped within the social relations of production. A writer – despite having relative autonomy, *not* independence, while creating his/her work – might, for example, directly or indirectly be affected and informed by social relations in a given time period; his/her fictional characters – whose creation is inspired by material life and interconnectedly transmuted into fiction - might therefore manifest the reciprocal interplay between personal experiences and social and historical formations. However, this does not

[1] In *Marxism and Literature*, Raymond Williams discusses that 'the structure of feeling' is "a way of defining forms and conventions in art and literature as inalienable elements of a social material process" (1977, 133). This concept is actually similar to C. Wright Mill's notion of 'the sociological imagination' in which Wright makes the point that the sociological imagination "enables its possessor to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals … [and] to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society" (1967, 5-6).

entail that a writer expresses or confirms a particular formation or a dominant hegemonic position:

> [W]hile we may, in the study of a past period, separate out particular aspects of life, and treat them as if they were self-contained, it is obvious that this is only how they may be studies, not how they were experienced. We examine each element as a precipitate, but in the living experience of the time every element was in solution, an inseparable part of a complex whole. And it seems to be true, from the nature of art, that it is from such a totality the artist draws; it is in part, primarily, that the effect of the totality, the dominant structure of feeling, is expressed and embodied. (Williams and Orrom 1954, 21)

Dialectically responding to the literary work of a writer can primarily reveal and open up a particular perspective on cultural, political and economic contradictions and conflicts and therefore help to articulate *one dimension* of the total structure of an epoch through the aesthetic incarnation of a personal and unique glimpse deriving from a specific social position and origin and its relation to a social structure. This is why the form, aesthetics and content of a literary work require historicisation: "Literary works … have a relation to that dominant way of seeing the world which is the 'social mentality' or ideology of an age" (Eagleton 2002, 6). A literary text from the Romantic era, for example, implicitly or explicitly focuses on the clash between the countryside and overcrowded industrial cities during the Industrial Revolution and promotes emotion in opposition to the components of modernity and the social and political norms of the Age of Enlightenment; a modern novel depicts themes of individualism, isolation and loneliness due to increased machinery and urbanization; a postmodern writer might capture a sense of fragmented, discontinuous, chaotic and multiple reality in its historicity and express it within his or her narrative framework. In other words, despite the fact that literary 'production' is not always an *ideologically* conscious process, tracing existing symbolic details and messages, sign systems and nodal points remaining repressed under the surface of the ideological system of a text will unearth the subjective experience of a writer regarding the social,

cultural and historical whole *mainly* determined by the mode of production. Fredric Jameson, in his quest for a new approach to the Marxist base and superstructure paradigm, juxtaposes a Marxist method of literary and cultural interpretation with the Althusserian concept of overdetermination and similarly points out:

> [S]emantic enrichment and enlargement of the inert givens and materials of a particular text must take place within three concentric frameworks, which mark a widening out of the sense of the social ground of a text through the notions, first, of political history, in the narrow sense of punctual event and a chronicle-like sequence of happening in time; then of society, in the now already less diachronic and time-bound sense of a constitutive tension and struggle between social classes; and, ultimately, of history of production and the succession and destiny of the various social formations. (1981, 75)

Considering these arguments – that literary texts subjectively fictionalize and narrate one dimension of the social whole and, through their content and form having a dialectically inseparable relationship, thereby reveal the basic operations of the socio-economic forces invisibly shaping the lives of individuals – this study aims to focus on and analyse economic, cultural and political histories in Britain in the second half of the twentieth century *mediated* through the represented experiences of characters in fictions of the post-war period. The reflections of the historical circumstances, such as the attempt to construct Britain as a welfare state after the Second World War; the so-called dissolution of the class system and the rise of social mobility in relation to the privatization of the state-controlled industries and to the replacement of manufacturing industry by service sector in the Thatcher era; the prodigious expansion of modern capitalism into what has been termed postmodern/late capitalism; and the subsequent pluralization and reconfiguration of national identity and consciousness as capitalism has taken on a more multi-cultural orientation, will be reinterpreted through a development of the Marxist paradigm in response to recent intellectual discussions and theoretical interventions.

This project, whilst certainly not claiming to be a study of the literary history of class fiction in the period, argues that class still matters and that, if it is to be adequately demonstrated, there is, therefore, a strong argument to *return* to Marx, to the Marxist concept of alienation, and to economics rather than simply drawing on the tradition of Marxist aesthetics which is, indeed, the most common way that Marxism has entered literary criticism. In this context, in the first chapter, I will theoretically attempt to justify Marxism's historical concreteness and its explanatory power regarding the fundamental operation of the money-oriented world and reveal Marxism's distinctive relevance to the processes of estrangement, atomization and reification in post-war society in order to offer a refutation of the standard criticism of Marxism. By synthesizing pro-Marxist and anti-Marxist views, I will also attempt to focus on prominent new class approaches, aiming to extend and reform the Marxist class model in the second half of the twentieth century, and develop my own stance on and articulation of Marxism, which will provide a frame for the analysis of the representations of the mind-sets, attitudes and experiences of the characters and their particular and diverse modes and forms of socio-cultural situatedness in selected post-war British novels. Although the arguments of traditional Marxist theory are still able to articulate the essence of capitalism despite the structural evolution of capitalism, my stance should not necessarily sound like a dogmatic defence of Marxism since traditional Marxist theory, insisting mainly on the primacy of socio-economic class, has, of course, partly been challenged by postmodern concepts like difference and identity. Over the course of this study, however, in suggesting that the concept of identity should be taken into account in a more radically intersectional manner, I will aim to indicate that one-dimensional postmodern identity politics is unable to give a materialist articulation of poverty and subordination within the larger context of global economics and that it is therefore unable to propose an anti-establishment, egalitarian and emancipatory

framework to critique, resist and overthrow injustice, tyranny and oppression. The second chapter will frame an analysis through an approach to the question of estrangement and will aim to reconceptualise the broader economic, cultural and social framework of the processes of alienation in real life by developing a hermeneutic framework entangling Marxist engagement with formalist, phenomenological and existentialist perspectives.

In this thesis, I will focus on the literary works of four different post-war authors, Alan Sillitoe, Sam Selvon, Doris Lessing and James Kelman, since each of these authors depicts a wide range of social, cultural and political circumstances and interactions in their special historical forms and exposes a *different* dimension of the totality of real life in the second half of the twentieth century through the multifaceted and subjective experiences of fictional characters. Delineating working-class existence as socially visible in Britain and literalizing the class antagonism constructed upon the dichotomy of 'them' and 'us' through the inner and outer conflicts of the *white* working-class characters, Alan Sillitoe's literary works portray the socio-historical reality of class consciousness and its emergence as part of the particular and complex historical conditions pertaining in the UK during the 1950s; while Sam Selvon's novels, on the other hand, providing a different interpretation of migrant-ness, displacement and the subsequent sense of alienation to one's own body in a hostile environment in the colonial centre, fictionalizes the poverty, misery and victimization of his *black* working-class characters in relation to the mass migration flows after Britain opened its borders to its colonial and former colonial subjects, facilitated by the Nationality Act of 1948, to be employed in the labour market. This will actually help provide a framework in which the subjective feelings and experiences of the *white* working-class characters of Alan Sillitoe might be compared to those of the *black* working-class characters of Sam Selvon in order to reveal the imaginary dividing line based on colour, race, religion and other affiliations among workers offering the *white*

working-class characters an illusionary comfort zone and particular identity through which they believe themselves to be a part of the ruling nation and, therefore, able to perpetuate and legitimate the fundamental operation of the money-oriented system.

In a similar way, James Kelman, portraying and mediating the disintegrating, alienating and destructive impacts of post-industrial capitalism upon *Scottish* working-class characters through urban realism and seeking to resurrect a national and political identity by linguistic strategies and narrative experiments, adds a third dimension to the discussions centred around race, nationality and class. Kelman, as a Scottish writer, explicitly reveals the victimization process of the Scottish working-class characters by governmental authorities and bureaucracy and – whether consciously or unconsciously – undermines the arguments of the classic mode of political liberal analysis which reductively locates the sources of oppression only within the framework of nationality or race or gender or sexuality. In order to examine the double victimization of the *black*[2] proletarian characters and explore the underlying reasons behind racial antagonisms and self-divisions among workers, I will also focus on the theoretical studies and debates on race and ethnicity in Marxist literature. Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook*, through the depiction of the political activities of Anna Wulf, a communist and a single mother in her thirties, will, in this context, help articulate the discussions in the UK regarding the rejection of the dominant orthodoxy in the Labour Party and of the legacy of Stalinism and the employment of a range of reforms on issues like gender, sexuality and civil rights during the formation of the *New Left*.

[2] This is not a biological or racial signifier, instead it refers to a political category including those oppressed and otherized groups such as Africans, Indians, gays, Muslims and women and so on in the heart of the colonial centre.

CHAPTER I: MARXISM AND CLASS

Since its inception, Marxism has always been one of the most controversial political theories in existence as a consequence of its progressive, oppositional and revolutionary structure, and its challenge to fundamental assumptions about human nature. There is not a single body of writing about Marxist theory since it was gradually developed and enriched through the contribution of revolutionists (e.g. Vladimir Lenin, Mao Zedong), scholars (e.g. Georg Lukács, Herbert Marcuse, Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser and Antonio Negri) and schools of thought (e.g. The Frankfurt School), which subsequently led to many different interpretations of the Marxist heritage. Daniel Bensaid, one of the most prominent French Marxist philosophers, comments on the diversity of Marxism as such:

> There is not one heritage, but many: an "orthodox" (Party or State) Marxism and "heterodox" Marxisms; a scientistic (or positivist) Marxism and a critical (or dialectical) Marxism; and also what the philosopher Ernst Bloch called the "cold currents" and "warm currents" of Marxism. (Bensaid 2010)

Marxism, in its most simple definition, is the worldview, philosophy, social theory and system of thought based on the writings and ideas of Marxism's founding thinkers, Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895). Marxist philosophy, the antithesis of capitalism, essentially focuses on the concepts of class relations and social conflicts in society by making use of a dialectical analysis of social, political and cultural transformations and employing a materialist interpretation of historical development through economic and socio-political inquires. The basic objective of Marxism is to reveal the economic and political contradictions inherent in capitalism in order to change and transform society through prioritizing class struggle and to create a classless society for the emancipation of the working class: "A fully worked-out basis for the struggle of the

working class to attain a higher form of human society – socialism" (Sewell and Woods 2000). In other words, Marxist theory

> … provides a richer, fuller, more comprehensive view of society and life in general, and clears away the veil of mysticism in understanding human and social development … explains that the driving force of history is neither "Great Men" nor the super-natural, but stems from the development of the productive forces (industry, science, technique, etc.) themselves. (Sewell and Woods 2000)

Given my intention to employ Marxist literary criticism in order to analyse a number of post-war British novels, **"Why Marxism?"** is a crucial question for this thesis since it has become standard to label Marxism as an obsolete ideology, the predictive power of which is no longer relevant as the political and economic system has unrecognizably 'changed' since the days of Marx. The argument is that Marxist politics is based on an over-deterministic view of human nature, that it belongs to a past of terror, tyranny, inequality, famine and torture for millions of people, and that a Marxist revolution is a utopia which cannot be achieved because of the impossible gap between theory and practice. Considering such anti-Marxist arguments, critiques of Marxism can be classified into two main strands. The first concerns the theoretical position of Marxism. Discussions here focus on Marxism as an outdated, anachronistic, historically irrelevant, utopian and mechanical ideology which is deterministic and marginalizes the feelings of ordinary people:

> Marx passed away 101 years ago, his works are more than a century old … some were his visions of that time, after which the situation changed greatly. Some of his ideas are not necessarily appropriate … there are many things that Marx, Engels and Lenin never experienced or had any contact with. We cannot depend on the works of Marx and Lenin to solve our modern questions … Using some theories of Marx and Lenin to define an abundant, rich modern life can only impede the advance of history. (*People's Daily*, 7 December 1984)

The second is related to the impracticality of Marxism, and it is often put forward that socialism, aiming to create a society without suffering, rivalry, egoism and inequality, cannot be created and that it is, therefore, a utopia. As W. H. Mallock, an English novelist and economist, argues, "socialism is fundamentally impractical … its principles, even its good ones, are allied to means which rob them of their worth and make them impractical" (cited in the *New York Times*, 10 February 1907). There are also debates regarding the practical dimension of this argument which alleges that Marxism has always been a disaster whenever it has been put into practice. Such narratives of the 'practical' failure of Marxism implicitly aim to condemn the Marxist worldview by only making use of some examples from the despotism and dictatorship of the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union, even though it is an accepted fact that Stalinism has been condemned as a pervasive system of one-party dictatorship by socialists themselves:

> In the Western, capitalist, telling of history, "Stalin" and "Stalinism" almost invariably equal "socialism/communism, which, of course, equal bad," and beyond that, it/they could never work … Anticommunism and anti-Sovietism have been deliberately cultivated by Western leaders for generations. Stalin's controversial image has been used as a convenient battering ram. (Steven Jonas, 3 June 2014)

In this respect, in order to attempt to disperse the fog of confusion about what Marxism is and what it really aims to achieve, the *first* aim of this part of the chapter is to attempt to present a justification for Marxism's historical concreteness and its explanatory power with regard to the *fundamental operation* of the money-oriented world, including the destructive polarization between the exploiter and the exploited in contemporary society by returning to the basic writings and fundamental arguments of Marx and Engels. In this way, I also intend to deliver a brief, judicious account of Marxism, to reveal Marxism's distinctive relevance to contemporary commodified societies and to offer a refutation of the standard criticisms of Marxism.

This should not necessarily sound like a *dogmatic* defence of Marxism. Traditional Marxist theory, primarily focusing on a class-centred analysis, has of course *partly* been 'challenged' by postmodern concepts like difference and identity which identify forms of oppression based on gender, sexuality, colour and/or nationality, particularly so since capitalism has taken on a more multi-cultural orientation. Over the course of this study, however, I aim to reveal that *one-dimensional* postmodern identity politics fails to give an adequate articulation of poverty and subordination within the larger context of global economics. Considering the dialectics of time and space, expecting Marx to precisely predict and articulate historical and cultural circumstances in the twenty-first century is not realistic either, despite the fact that Marx provided a sizable number of theoretical studies on race and ethnicity by putting the totality of the social relations of production within capitalism into question (see the fourth chapter). Marx was not an oracle who provided prophetic predictions; Marx, above all, was a scholar and a theorist who attempted to rationalize the functioning of capitalism systematically. For that reason, it seems that the inspiring arguments of traditional Marxist theory regarding the essence of capitalism are still able to articulate how the exploitation of human labour, despite the structural evolution of capitalism, has continued even today and that the physical, psychological and alienating impacts of factory work upon wage-earners in modern capitalism has perpetuated itself in the working experiences of all unproductive workers in the banking, education, science and technology sectors in postmodern capitalism.

In this chapter, I will mainly make use of Alex Callinicos' *Is There a Future for Marxism* (1982) and *The Changing Working Class* (1987), Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire* (2001), Erik Olin Wright's *Approaches to Class Analysis* (2005), and Terry Eagleton's *Why Marx Was Right* (2011) in order to legitimise the still relevant arguments of classical Marxism concerning the nature of capitalism, and I will draw upon

Ronald Aronson's *After Marxism* (1995) to lay out anti-Marxist sentiment. These academic works produced by scholars from a wide range of disciplines, including sociology and the political sciences, are useful in pointing to the relationship between Marxism and the dominant social, cultural and political circumstances of the periods during which they were published. For example, in *Is There a Future*, Alex Callinicos, a Trotskyist political economist, aims to vindicate the arguments of classical Marxism and, in doing so, raises key questions about the nature and modes of the applicability of Marxism even before the collapse of the Soviet Union by discussing the theory of dialectic materialism, the nature of crisis in capitalism, and the concepts of base and superstructure:

> [T]his book is devoted to the clarification of concepts rather than their utilization … [it is] a work in Marxist philosophy, an attempt to isolate and examine some of the presuppositions of Marxist theoretical discourse … a contribution to the already vast literature in which contemporary Marxism has feverishly examined its entrails, taking the epistemological auguries. (Callinicos 1982, 2)

In *The Changing Working Class*, Callinicos defines the boundaries of the working class from a Marxist perspective by stating that Marx "treats class as a relationship" which is "antagonistic" and "formed in the process of production" within "objective relationships" (Callinicos and Harman 1987, 6). He also examines what class means by giving a detailed account of working-class reality through statistics from the neo-capitalist era[3] and concludes that the working class has not disappeared and that old class divisions remain as they were despite having some minor structural changes:

---

[3] It mainly corresponds to capitalism from 1940 onwards. Some terms like late-capitalism and post-capitalism can also be used to refer to neo-capitalism. In his work entitled *Late Capitalism* (1975), Ernest Mandel, a Marxist economist, focuses on three distinctive phases in the development of the capitalist mode of production which are respectively competitive capitalism, monopoly capitalism and late capitalism. According to Mandel, "the early capitalist era of free competition" was "characterized by a relative international immobility of capital ... because there were not as yet any critical limits to the expansion of capital accumulation on the home market" (312-313). This first stage was followed by "the classical era of imperialism" as a consequence of which "the concentration of capital became increasingly international in character" (313). Then, "late capitalism" in which "the multinational company" became "the determinant organisational form of big capital" replaced the stage of imperialism (316).

> … the Marxist approach to class is part of a dynamic theory … the central antagonism defining class relations in capitalist society is … between capital and wage-labour … The working class consists of those whose lack of control over the means of production forces them to sell their labour-power to the capitalists, the class of those who do control these means … The crucial conclusion we draw … is that the growth of this third group [whiter-collars] represents the expansion, not the decline, of the working class. (Callinicos and Harman 1987, 7)

Laying out the parameters of "a new radical project", however, *After Marxism* discusses the 'failure' of the Marxist experiment and declares that Marxism has been dead (1995, 179) ever since the demise of the Soviet Union. In this book, unlike those of Callinicos, Aronson, an ex-Marxist scholar and a professor of the History of Ideas, explains that Marxism *was* a project of historical transformation binding theory and practice and that the working class *did not* play its anticipated role by Marx and *was* not able to achieve a socialist revolution and that Marx's predictions *were* not accurate:

> Marxism has been a project … [which] united a certain philosophy of history with a specific ethical outlook; with an analysis of societal dynamics based on the centrality of class and the economy; with an understanding of how capitalism functions; with a partisanship on the side of a particular social class, the proletariat; and with a revolutionary vision of that class achieving power and then abolishing classes … A Marxism that is not taken up by workers or is not embodied in a movement stops beings a distinctive project of social transformation, and becomes something else … Marxism is over. (Aronson 1995, 3-4)

In *Empire*, Hardt and Negri, a Marxist sociologist and a political philosopher, analyse the concept of Empire in the neo-capitalist era in relation to multinational capitalism by theorizing the transition from imperialism, the sovereignty of individual nation-states in which such countries have "power to regulate ... flaws and impose [their] authority over the economy", to Empire (with capital E) which is the dominant economic and political form indicative of transnational capitalism functioning through a "decentered and deterritorializing apparatus of rule" incorporating "the entire global realm within its

open, expanding frontiers" (Hardt and Negri 2011, xii). This concept of Empire is basically clarified as such:

> [Empire] is characterized fundamentally by lack of boundaries … [it] posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or reality that rules over the entire civilized world … [it] presents itself not as a historical regime originating in conquest, but rather as an order that effectively suspends history and thereby fixes the existing state of affairs … [it] operates on all registers not only manages a territory and a population, but also creates the very world it inhabits … the object of its rule is social life in its entirety, and thus Empire presents the paradigmatic form of biopower. (Hardt and Negri 2011, xiv-xv)

Bringing together a number of theorists from different intellectual backgrounds in the field of class analysis, Eric Olin Wright's *Approaches to Class Analysis* focuses on social, economic, political and cultural processes through which Wright, an American analytical Marxist sociologist, reformulates and re-conceptualizes the concept of class by locating it within economic productive relations in the modern and postmodern world. The central objective of the book is "to clarify the complex array of alternative conceptualizations of class rooted in different theoretical traditions of class analysis" (Wright 2005, 2). In *Why Marx Was Right*, by mapping out the framework for Marxist literary criticism, Eagleton, a British literary theorist, proceeds to debunk and undermine "ten of the most standard criticisms of Marx" that argue how Marxism is irrelevant in the 20th and 21th centuries, that it is practically a disaster and impossibly utopian in spite of being outstanding in theory, that it is deterministic nature reduces everything to economic bases, and that its obsession with class is already outdated in the 21st century (Eagleton 2011, x).

In this regard, my aim in this section is to attempt to synthesize both pro-Marxist and anti-Marxist views presented in the books listed above and to develop my own theoretical stance and intended articulation of Marxism. This will subsequently provide a framework for the analysis of the representations of the mind-sets, attitudes and

experiences of the characters and their particular and diverse modes and forms of socio-cultural situatedness in the selected post-war British novels whose analysis comprises the remaining chapters of the thesis.

As I argued in the introduction to the chapter, Marxism or socialism[4] has always been under bitter attack by other political ideologies as well as from ethical, cultural, social, economic and empirical perspectives. The first argument against Marxism concerns the fact that millions of people living under socialist regimes had to face hardship, poverty, broken economies, oppressive states and forced labour: "The inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries." (Churchill 1945). As Mark J. Perry similarly states in his article entitled "Why Socialism Failed":

> Socialism is the Big Lie of the twentieth century. While it promised prosperity, equality, and security, it delivered poverty, misery, and tyranny. Equality was achieved only in the sense that everyone was equal in his or her misery … In the long run, socialism has always proven to be a formula for tyranny and misery. (1995, 1)

First of all, it is arguable that a true socialism has never been achieved in any of the so-called socialist countries since none has ever been able to proceed to the concrete material conditions (e.g. bourgeois revolution and enlightenment, the emergence of a true working class, the dispossession of the working class, the rise of working-class consciousness) necessary for the construction of a true socialism. Socialism was indeed 'attempted' and 'tried' because socialism is not simply about overthrowing the ruling class and gaining power, it is more about the internalization of socialist and humanistic values by the majority, and this cannot be accomplished immediately. As Oscar Wilde indicates, "the

[4] Marxism and socialism can be perceived as two different concepts. However, they are not basically different although there are some minor differences in their dictionary descriptions. Socialism can be defined as a Marxist political and economic system characterized by the social and co-operative ownership of the means of production for the emancipation of the working class. Marxism actually constitutes the ideological layer of the socialist worldview. For that reason, I will use some terms like Marxism/socialism and Marxist/socialist interchangeably.

trouble with socialism is that it takes too many evenings" (qtd. in Sharpe 2012, 324). At this point, judging socialism by only considering the social, cultural, political and economic events in isolated 'socialist' countries (USSR, Cuba) is hardly persuasive since 'socialist' nations always failed to acquire international support from other nations and did not therefore gain the opportunity to attain essential global resources in order to abolish scarcity and sustain productive wealth. According to Eagleton (2011, 12-16), 'developed countries' were also responsible for famine, lack of material goods and tyranny, to a certain extent, because they imposed sanctions on 'socialist' countries and 'socialist' countries had to invest their limited sources in defensive wars during the Cold War.

Nevertheless, 'socialist' regimes were able to provide cheap housing and transport systems, full employment and free health services for their citizens. To give an example, communal apartments and Khrushchyovka buildings were the two instances of cheap housing in Soviet Russia. Adele Barker and Bruce Grant (2010) remark that communal buildings including a living room, dining room and bedroom for each family and kitchen and bathroom for all the residents appeared following the Russian Revolution and were shared between two to seven families, while Khrushchyovka buildings were constructed during the 1960s and had a similar architectural structure to the communal buildings. They also add that the two types of constructions belonging to the Soviet Russia were relatively cheap and attainable for the working class.

People living in socialist countries enjoyed a high level of health, education and physical quality according to a study carried out by Howard Waitzkin and Shirley Cereseto (1986). This study compares low-income, lower-middle-income, upper-middle-income and high-income socialist and capitalist countries in terms of health and health services, nutrition and education. These counties including India, Indonesia, Kenya,

Egypt, Nigeria, Colombia, Turkey, Brazil, Ireland, Japan, Finland, Canada, United Kingdom, China, Cuba, Yugoslavia, Hungary, USSR and East Germany are classified in accordance with the data of the World Bank, and the result of the study indicates that socialist countries outperformed capitalist countries according to nearly all statistical data:

> [S]ocialist countries had infant mortality and child death rates approximately two to three times lower than the capitalist countries … [they] consistently showed higher numbers of health professionals per population than capitalist countries … [they] provided a higher daily per capita calorie supply as a percentage of requirement … [they] showed favourable adult literacy rates. (Waitzkin and Cereseto 1986, 662-63)

Full employment in socialist states was also guaranteed by Soviet-type economic planning which eliminated unemployment and improved working conditions throughout the country. Detailed information about this process was first given in *The Soviet Union: Facts, Descriptions, Statistics* (1929):

> [T]he length of the normal working day... was reduced to 8 hours ... and for dangerous occupations to 6 hours ... no children under 14 years may be employed in industry. Between the ages of 14 and 16 a 4-hour day is permitted, and between the ages of 16 and 18 a 6-hour day … Women workers receive from six to eight weeks' vacation with pay before and after childbirth ... The special benefits and services provided by employers under the law include free or nominal rentals for housing, free fuel, water, electric light, transportation, special working clothing, dental and medical service, social insurance.

More evidence can be given about how ‘socialist’ countries tried to enhance the quality of life in spite of many difficulties they had to endure. However, foregrounding narratives of how developed capitalist countries ‘cared about’ others in the world can reveal more compelling arguments about the true nature of capitalism.

There is mounting evidence that the history of capitalism is a history of imperialism, global warfare, exploitation, genocide, violence, horror and avoidable famines (Eagleton 2011, 12-16). The European colonial period during which many countries such as

Portugal, Spain, Britain and France established colonies in different continents is a good starting point for this argument. Colonialism, which was "not merely a system of exploitation, but one whose essential purpose was to repatriate the profits to the so-called mother country" (Rodney 1973, 231), resulted in slave trade, warfare, mass imprisonment, massacres, bloodshed and crime against humanity in the colonized countries. Between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, more than 11 million people were taken into slavery from the West African coast[5], and indigenous people were subjected to genocidal extermination and ethnic cleansing in the continents of Australia and America[6], while tens of millions of black people[7] were brutally wiped out in the name of civilization. Recent examples of the reality of the money-oriented world are arguably an extension of the effects of this colonial history. For instance, in the last 25 years, hundreds of thousands of people were terrorized, killed and displaced in the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan[8] that were launched by the US-led coalition powers having the same economic interests over the sources of raw material and investment. This system, capitalism, has already "proved incapable of breeding affluence without creating huge swathes of deprivation alongside it" (15) in the sense that one in three children in Britain lives below the breadline (Eagleton

[5] See http://discoveringbristol.org.uk/slavery/routes/from-africa-to-america/atlantic-crossing/people-taken-from-africa/

[6] See Russel Thornton's *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: ˜A Population History Since 1492* published in 1987.

[7] See Adam Hochschild's *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* published in 1999.

[8] See http://costsofwar.org/article/civilians-killed-and-wounded

2011, 13) and one out of seven people in the USA lives in poverty[9]. A minority earning billions of dollars in a year also supports this argument[10]:

> In Britain, just before the agricultural crisis of the 1880s, four thousand families owned 43 percent of the nation's wealth. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, inequality was different in context but equally pronounced. In both Britain and America, the wealth of the top fifth of families grew during these decades, the top tenth grew greatly, and the top 1 percent grew exponentially. (Sennett 2006, 16)

Barbara Ehrenreich uncovers similar social and economic peculiarities of capitalism in the USA in *Nickel and Dimed* (2010). In order to reveal widespread, growing and inescapable poverty, Ehrenreich, attempting to survive on a minimum wage, sets off to work in a variety of different jobs, and in the book, she shares her experiences between the years 1998 and 2002 and depicts her experience of the major inequality between the rich and the poor in American society:

> ... the underlying inequality between rich and poor continues to grow here. One third of the workforce earns below the European decency threshold of 60% of average earnings, and there is little mobility up and out of the bottom two deciles. People in low-paid, insecure jobs fall in and out of absolute poverty but rarely rise far above it. (xi-xii)

It is often argued that many socialist leaders have become dictators, ruling through an 'iron fist' as a consequence of the intrinsic propensity to authoritarianism, the facilitation of the rise of despotic power and the dictatorship of one person inherent in Marxism. As John Howkins[11] states:

---

[9] See http://www.nclej.org/poverty-in-the-us.php

[10] 83.4% of all household affluence including property and financial assets are owned by 8.4% of 5 billion adults. 3.2 billion adults have almost nothing while 32 million people own 98 trillion dollars. See http://thenextrecession.wordpress.com/2013/10/10/global-wealth-inequality-10-own-86-1-own-41-half-own-just-1/

[11] See http://townhall.com/columnists/johnhawkins/2014/02/25/5-ways-socialism-destroys-societies-n1800086/page/full

> … socialism requires protection, propaganda, intimidation, and darkness to survive. Socialism can't survive honest, informed debate about its merits among people who are free to choose or reject it because it would not survive the conversation ... The more socialism you have, the less freedom you will have because socialism can't survive if people are free to choose whether they want socialism or not. People who are free to say what they want will criticize socialism's many failures ... socialism requires a massive bureaucracy that almost inevitably grows. As government grows, it inevitably becomes more centralized, more distant from the people and ultimately more menacing.

There are actually two main reasons for the appearance of such arguments against the Marxist worldview. The first draws on specific examples from the bloodstained past of despotism and the dictatorship of Stalin, whereas the second arises more as a consequence of confusion regarding the concept of the dictatorship of proletariat in Marxist terminology. The Stalinist regime in the USSR was essentially characterized by a one-party system, forced labour, violent repression that killed millions of people and imposed restrictions on any sort of freedom of speech, and the dissemination of the idea of 'communism' through military power (see the fifth chapter about Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook*). Even though it is a well-accepted fact that socialists have been opposed to the one-man rule of the Stalinist regime, named as "a whole river of blood" by Trotsky (1937), the name of Stalin is deliberately manipulated and linked with socialism in order to implicitly attack and charge Marxism with inherent despotic inclinations:

> Stalin represents one of the most powerful arguments against socialism ... How can we champion a system that tolerated and encouraged numerous forms of oppression--based on race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, nationality and ethnicity, to name a few? ... So-called "socialism" in Stalin's Russia--and other countries, like China and Cuba, that modelled their systems on the USSR--is diametrically opposed to the basic principles [of socialism]. The rulers of the former USSR under Stalin used the rhetoric of socialism and Marxism to justify a different reality--an exploitative system, run by a minority, using forms of authority not that very different to capitalism in the West.[12]

[12] See http://socialistworker.org/2003-2/462/462_08_Stalin.shtml

As I briefly emphasized above, the concept of a proletarian dictatorship is a misleading one since the word 'dictatorship' has always been identified with coercive associations. For that reason, this term has been manipulated by anti-Marxists to indicate that the dictatorial inclinations of some so-called socialist leaders are intrinsically related to Marxist ideology. In order to prevent such confusions and manipulations, the dictatorship of the proletariat needs to be focused and clarified by considering the Paris Commune of 1871 which is central to its understanding. The Paris commune of 1871, in which revolutionary working-class people ruled Paris from 18 March until 28 May 1871, is an example of Marx's self-government model on behalf of *the* people. In this model, local councillors, mostly consisting of persons from a working-class background, were elected by vote, and their constituents had the right to recall those elected councillors. Judges and public servants were also elective, and it was possible to recall them. The powers which were previously exercised by the French government were used by the Communards (Eagleton 2011, 203). At this point, the government no longer functioned as the business agent of the bourgeois class, and working-class people could enjoy self-government and, subsequently, self-actualization, instead of the alienated power of the ruling class. Marx described this situation as the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' which meant 'rule' in accordance with the consent of the majority:

> The commune to consist of the municipal councillors of the different *arrondissements* . . . chosen by all citizens, responsible, and revocable in short terms. The majority of that body would naturally consist of workmen or acknowledged representatives of the working class. It was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time. The police agents, instead of being the agent of a central government, were to be the servants of the Commune, having, like the functionaries in all the other departments of the administration to be appointed and always revocable by the Commune; all the functionaries, like the members of the Commune itself, having to do their work at workmen's wages. The judges were also to be elected, revocable, and responsible. ... In one word all public functions, even the few ones that would belong to the Central Government, were to be

> executed by communal agents, and therefore under the control of the Commune. (Marx 1871, 35)

This 'dictatorship' obviously has nothing to do with despotism or tyranny and is not similar to how Stalin or other so-called socialist(!) dictators acted in the name of socialism in their own countries. It is basically a form of self-government which is a revelation of the class nature of a possible socialist regime. The dictatorship of the proletariat is essentially a transition period corresponding to "a normal regime type with its own standards, rules, laws, aims, and long-term plans for transforming society into communism" (Tabak 2000, 335). Likewise, Marx, in his letter to Joseph Weydemeyer, points out that "the dictatorship itself constitutes no more than a transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society"[13] (5 March 1852). Commenting on the positive aspects of the dictatorship(!) of proletariat, Hal Draper epitomizes the misunderstanding of the concept and justifies it:

> … in the middle of the nineteenth century the old word 'dictatorship' still meant what it had meant for centuries, and in this meaning it was not a synonym for despotism, tyranny, absolutism, or autocracy, and above all it was not counterposed to democracy. (1987, 110)

The Marxist conception of democracy in which individual free will is not curtailed by pervasive systematic control in the service of the bourgeoisie is similar to the Paris Commune of 1871. Marxism has addressed some significant flaws in the bourgeois democratic ideal and practice. So-called representative democracy within capitalism operates through 'fair and free' elections and draws on a written constitution. However, the implicit functioning of its nature is quite different. In reality, working-class people who cannot actualize their intrinsic qualities/themselves in a free, creative and spontaneous way are brought to believe that they can contribute to the processes of

[13] See page 387 on https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Engels_Correspondence.pdf

democratic government. This essentially creates an illusion of freedom and self-actualization for exploited people, resulting in the legitimization of the prevailing mode of production through the manufacture of consent as, from a Marxist perspective, people are basically only given a vote for despotic power and dictatorship of capital and choose which rich family or international company will rule them. As postulated by Eric Olin Wright, "in a *non*hegemonic system … class relations are sustained in significant ways through the active consent of people in subordinate classes" (2000, 964).

Marxism's tendency towards scientism, determinism, positivism and objectivism and its neglect of subjectivity are also a part of the Anti-Marxist critique resting upon three related arguments which are successively "the issue of science", "the question of inevitability or necessity" and "the problem of Marx's view of the proletariat":

> Marx is often accused of writing and thinking as if events and trends could bring about the revolutionary transformation all by themselves, without an active, subjective human force … [of] acting as if the process leading to its decision and action were unproblematic, being essentially the subjective result of objective workings … as if history itself, all by itself- that is, virtually without human intervention except to lessen the new order's birth pangs- was bringing about the proletarian revolution and the new social order. (1995, 98)

Considering these arguments, it should be emphasized that there is not a secret agenda or prescription for a socialist revolution in Marxism. In other words, Marx does not argue that socialism will be achieved at a certain date no matter what individuals do. Marx indeed describes the overthrow of the bourgeois class and the triumph of the working class as equally inescapable in the *Communist Manifesto* and, therefore, indicates that the outcome of class struggle cannot be predicted. As Eagleton remarks (2011, 46-47):

> Marx does not think that the inevitability of socialism means we can all stay in bed … rather that once capitalism has definitely failed, working people will have no reason not to take it over and every reason to do so. They will recognize that it is in their interests to change the system, and that, being a majority, they also have the power to do so. So they will … establish an alternative.

In order to develop a counter argument against the argument that Marx is a causal determinist and a reductionist, his conception of historical materialism needs some clarification since it has been manipulated and associated with economic determinism in which all human actions including their political, moral, religious, cultural, social and intellectual inclinations are alleged to be controlled and shaped only by economic factors that are wholly beyond their own control. Indeed, the central analytical foundation of the concept of historical materialism lays out the fact that individual consciousness is generally a reflection of the prevalent social consciousness which unfolds the economic base in a certain prevailing mode of production. In a similar way, in his book entitled *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx states:

> In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. (1859, 4)

In this quotation, instead of implying philosophical determinism, Marx contends that the totality of economic circumstances dominates individual consciousness through ideological illusions sustained by means of social relations in material life and that such a situation prevents individuals from achieving a meaningful life and actualizing themselves. The word ‘determine’ as used above literally means “to set limits to” and emblematizes the fact that “modes of production do not dictate a specific kind of politics, culture and set of ideas” (Eagleton 2011, 114). For Marx, it is class struggle which is the driving force shaping the course of human history and the results of class struggle cannot be predicted since it involves interrelated social, cultural, political, economic and

ideological processes and, for that reason, "moves often in leaps and bounds and in zigzag line"[14] (Engels 1859). In Marxist dialectical thinking, as history progresses and conditions are ripened, productive forces and social relations are accordingly inclined to change and develop, and subsequently an epoch of social revolution is experienced. As Eagleton remarks (2011, 37):

> There comes a point … when the prevailing social relations … begin to act as an obstacle to them [productive forces]. The two run headlong into contradiction, and the stage is set for political revolution. The class struggle sharpens, and a social class capable of taking the forces of production forward assumes power from its erstwhile masters. Capitalism, for example, staggers from crisis to crisis, slump to slumps, by virtue of the social relations it involves; and at a certain point in its decline, the working class is on hand to take over the ownership and control of production.

Here, it is implicated that society moves through types or modes of production and that the character of productive forces determines the character of the relations of production. Marx, in this regard, identifies five main modes of production which are, respectively, ancient or tribal society, feudalism, capitalism, socialism and communism. In each of these stages, the relations of production, the nature of productive forces and the interaction of people with nature and each other are different. For example, ancient or tribal society is based on slaves and slave owners and feudalism consists of landowners and serfs, whereas the inherent nature of capitalist society is characterized by two clashing forces, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Social and political circumstances should ripen in order to run through a certain historical tendency – in other words, what is necessary for a socialist revolution within a capitalist mode of production is working-class consciousness or what is necessary to overthrow feudalism is capital accumulation, private property and the emergence of the bourgeois class. This does not necessarily mean that such transitions between the modes of production can be universalized considering that

[14] See https://www.marxists.org/subject/dialectics/marx-engels/review-political-economy.htm

the Soviet Union was founded from a part-feudalist Russia without experiencing a "prolonged interlude of extensive capitalism" (Eagleton 2011, 56). In this respect, Hubert Kay makes use of the example of a river in order to explain dialectical historical materialism and its indeterminist nature:

> In the Marxian view, human history is like a river. From any given vantage point, a river looks much the same day after day. But actually it is constantly flowing and changing, crumbling its banks, widening and deepening its channels. The water seen one day is never the same as that seen the next. Some of it is constantly being evaporated and drawn up, to return as rain. From year to year these changes may be scarcely perceptible. But one day, when the banks are thoroughly weakened and the rains long and heavy, the river floods, bursts its banks, and may take a new course. This represents the dialectical part of Marx's famous theory of dialectical (or historical) materialism. (1948, 66)

From a different standpoint, it should also be underlined that historical materialism primarily focuses on cultural and political circumstances and socially prevalent ideologies within a teleological (final causality) perspective and seeks to reveal how these contribute to social and historical inclinations in a society:

> Materialist explanations are teleological explanations … generally focus attention on the contribution made by elements of an organized system to its global tendencies … tend to ignore the properties of these elements which are not relevant to their function in the system [and] historical materialism proposes a teleological theory about the careers of social forms, political movements and prevalent or influential ideas. Its aims and methods require historical materialism to view individuals from the perspective of their relations to these social forms. (Wood 2004, 118)

When Marxism is at stake, the fact that the world has considerably changed since Marx wrote his widely known book *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* is often *recited*. Such anti-Marxist views are grounded in two main arguments. The first concerns the transition to a post-capitalist society, the social, economic, cultural structure of which is different from that of the former mode of production, capitalism; the second is related to the structural evolution of capitalism including the transformation in the nature

of labour and the working class. It is pointed out that significant processes such as urbanization, globalization and postmodernism (neo-liberalism/neo-capitalism) have transformed the lifestyles, socio-economic realities and mind-sets of individuals as well as their class boundaries. In this sense, Marxism is asserted to be finished, outdated and obsolete, and a need to *completely* overview and re-evaluate Marxism is put into words, as Aronson lays out:

> [A]s we look around us and look back, what conclusions can we draw about the Marxist reality that has unfolded in the century since Marx's death? … if after a reasonable length of time, socialism has been nowhere achieved, if historical trends are moving away from, rather than toward socialism … if we cannot find a successful socialism as we near the twenty-first century … these facts can only undermine Marxism's claim to be true … The centrality of Marxism's cardinal category, class, has been placed in question by capitalism's own evolution, as has the primacy of class. Capitalism's evolution has not only transformed the nature of labour and the nature of the working class, but also the character of its experience. (Aronson 1995, 43-53)

It is true that capitalism runs through a constant renewal of certain aspects of its dynamics and main structure in order to survive even after economic and structural crises. In one form or another, different phases of capitalism, agrarian capitalism, mercantilism, industrial capitalism and late capitalism, function to restore the hegemony of capital by moving on to the next step. To illustrate, capitalism experienced two main crises in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which prompted a major transformation of the prevailing mode of production. The crisis at the end of the nineteenth century led to a "managerial revolution" creating "new social configurations" in which "large firms were managed by an enormous staff, extremely hierarchal in character, of managers and employees" and consequently a "growth in the number of public-sector managers and employees" was observed (Dumenil and Levy 2009, 98). The crisis faced from the post-war decades to the 1980s gave birth to the "information revolution" (98), as an outcome of which "new techniques of production and financial institutions", "changes in property

forms and managerial modes", "the retreat of the working class in the advanced capitalist countries" and "the dissolution of old class boundaries into new intermediate strata" were ensured (Dumenil and Levy 2009, 95).

Fredric Jameson focuses upon the shift from capitalism to a post-capitalist knowledge society by focusing on three fundamental moments of capitalism which are "market capitalism, the monopoly stage or the stage of imperialism, and our own … what might be better called multinational" and remarks that each of these stages has inherent and distinctive dominant cultural forms (1984, 78). Realism, modernism and postmodernism are successively the dominant cultural forms of market capitalism, the stage of imperialism (capitalism) and neo-capitalism. In this regard, anti-Marxist critics, building their arguments on this, argue that Marxism is actually a critique of capitalism and the twentieth century and that Marxism cannot, for that reason, interpret the contemporary postmodern world. As Aronson (1995, 68) indicates:

> Marxism was very much alive as long as it was spreading in the world and being adapted to a variety of conditions, as long as it was being recast in response to previous disappointments and new possibilities. Only at this historical moment is it clear that these are exhausted. I emphasize this historical moment: our generation has seen the definitive end of the several twentieth-century incarnations of the original Marxian project.

Although their arguments seem to be quite consistent, what they gloss over is that the basic characteristics of the money-oriented world such as "private ownership of the means of production", "concentration of income and wealth", "exploitation at national and international levels" and "a dynamic change directed towards perpetuating the privileges of a minority", remain fundamentally similar (Dumenil and Levy 2009, 95). The internal contradictions of capitalist society such as "the unequal distribution of wealth and income", "the persistence of racism and women's oppression", "the increasing role of the state on behalf of capital", "the de-industrialization of the domestic economy", and

"increasing indebtedness and impoverishment of the working class", have not undergone a substantial change either (Berberoglu 2007, 56). On the contrary, the external contradictions of contemporary global capitalism have increased more as a consequence of the nature of capital which is "an organism that cannot sustain itself without constantly looking beyond its boundaries, feeding of its external environment" and therefore results in "a kind of imperialism characterized by pillage and theft" (Hardt and Negri 2000, 224-25). The growth of the capitalist relations of production and the expansion of capitalist exploitation throughout the world over the course of the past century have also led to economic decline, imperialist wars and class conflict across the whole world.

Before moving on to discuss the so-called 'changing' boundaries of capitalism in the second half of the twentieth century, I would like to focus briefly on the views of Marx and Lenin concerning the expansion of capitalism that brought about imperialism; it is here that Marxism's purported predictive power can relevantly be revealed. According to Brewer (1990, 25), the word 'imperialism' was not used by Marx; however, his theory of capitalism and of its development in the nineteenth century covered and condemned the colonization process of the Non-European world in relation to the formation of a capitalist world economy although this is rather scattered in his writings: "The need of a constantly expanding market chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere" (Marx 1848, 16). In the twentieth century, these views of Marx were developed and enriched by V. I. Lenin in his *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Lenin, in the book, gives a definition of imperialism by arguing that the concentration and centralization of capital gave rise to the transnational rivalry for power and profit and that this resulted in a territorial division of the world among the capitalist powers:

> (1) the concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this "finance capital", of a financial oligarchy; (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; (4) the formation of international monopolist capitalist associations which share the world among themselves, and (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed. Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed. (Lenin 1999, 92)

Focusing on these theories of Marx and Lenin as they elaborate recent historical conditions such as the new world order and global warfare, Hardt and Negri accordingly re-conceptualized the concept of imperialism in the twenty first century and laid out the transition from imperialism to Empire:

> First and foremost ... the concept of Empire posits a regime that effectively encompasses the spatial totality, or really that rules over the entire “civilized” world ... Second [it] presents itself not as a historical regime originating in conquest, but rather as an order that effectively suspends history and thereby fixes the existing state of affairs for eternity ... presents its rule not as a transitory moment in the movement of history, but as a regime with no temporal boundaries ... Third, the rule of Empire operates on all registers of the social order extending down to the depths of the social world. Empire not only manages a territory and a population but also creates the very world it inhabits. (2000, xv)

These arguments, revealing that the Marxist articulation of the world is not obsolete and outdated, are important because they explicitly suggest ways in which the basic structure of the money-oriented world including its internal and external contradictions have not considerably changed since the death of Marx and that the argument that Marxism is today unable to explore contemporary economic and political issues might thoroughly be challenged.

1) The Concept of Class from Capitalism to Neo-Capitalism

The arguments regarding the concept of class are often employed to indicate that Marxism is obsessed with archaic issues and cannot explain and clarify the circumstances in a contemporary society in which class mobility is possible, class struggle has disappeared without trace, and class no longer matters much. Subsequent to the structural 'evolution' of capitalism over the course of the past century, the nature of labour and of the working class has been questioned, and it has been discussed that the number of the working class has shrunk in contemporary society and that the Marxist class model is no longer applicable:

> If we cannot find a successful socialism as we near the twenty first century, can we at least find a working-class majority, struggling toward socialism? If not a majority, a significant movement? The fact is that nowhere in the world has the industrial proletariat even been the numerical majority. Moreover, industrial working classes everywhere seem to be shrinking under the new techniques of advanced capitalist production ... In the West, contemporary workers no longer work like Marx's workers, no longer live like Marx's workers, no longer suffer like Marx's workers (Aronson 1995, 43-58)

It has also been suggested that the industrial workers of the 'developed' societies have struggled and won an acceptable level of living which could not be predicted by Marx[15], that the unity of the workers has been fragmented and their consciousness reduced or blurred[16], and that the experiences of the workers have changed to the extent that they have started not to identify themselves as workers[17].

Taking such anti-Marxist arguments into account, this section of the chapter will focus on the concept of class from capitalism to neo-capitalism in an attempt to legitimise the explanatory and predictive power of Marxism – even in the contemporary world – by

[15] See Ronald Aronson's *After Marx*

[16] See Andre Gorz's *Farewell to the Working Class*

[17] See Claus Offe's *Disorganised Capitalism* published in 1985

synthesising and re-conceptualizing the views of different scholars including Alex Callinicos and Erik Olin Wright about class structure in advanced capitalist societies. This discussion will establish the means to analyse the treatment of class in the selected novels of post-war British literature in the following chapters.

1.1. What is Class?

The concept of class remains controversial and requires a multi-perspectival approach. Max Weber, who developed the social stratification theory known as three-component stratification theory, defines class as "a number of people" having a similar "chance for a supply of goods, external living conditions and personal life experiences ... in the same class situation" (Weber 2009, 181). He points out that the class position of an individual is determined by an interplay among his class, referring to his economic position, his status, referring to his social prestige, and his party, referring to his ability to carry out what he wants in spite of the resistance of others (Weber 2009: 181). In a similar way, Anthony Giddens (1973) argues that individuals having similar economic interests and opportunities can be identified within the same class. W. L. Warner (1960), however, writing earlier, explicates that class refers to a group of individuals sharing similar positions within a status hierarchy; R. Dahrendorf (1959) describes it more broadly as a category determined by an individual's position within a certain power structure.

Contrary to such interpretations, the traditional Marxist analysis of class gives a definition of class with respect to an individual's position within the relations of production. G. E. M. De Ste. Croix (1981, 44), for example, states that class is "a group of people in a community identified by their position in the whole system of social production ... according to their relationship ... to the conditions of productions ... and to other classes" while E. P. Thompson (1980, 9) in *The Making of the English Working*

Class discusses how "the class experience is largely determined by the productive relations in which men are born – or enter involuntarily". Charles Loren describes class as "groups of people which ... differ in relation to the surplus labour of society, generally either providing it to another group, disposing of the surplus labour to another group, or disposing only of its own surplus labour" (1977, 9). Likewise, Lenin identifies class with a group of individuals who have common positions within the means of production. As he puts it:

> Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy. (1965, 421)

In the light of these interpretations, what seems significant concerning the concept of class in Marxism is that classes are categorized in relation to distribution of the means of production. According to Erik Olin Wright (1977, 33), "ownership of the means of production", "purchase of the labour power of others", and "sale of one's own labour power" are the three significant criteria underlying the class structure of a society, and these characteristics frame the *basic* categories in a capitalist society which are, respectively, the bourgeoisie (the capitalist), the petty bourgeoisie, and the proletariat (the workers). The capitalist class owns the means of production, purchases labour power in return for a low wage and does not sell its labour power whereas the petty bourgeoisie owning the means of production work together with the workers they employ and the working class only sells its labour power to the capitalist. In a similar way, Alex Callinicos (1987) argues that class is an "objective relationship" (6) which is "formed within the relations of production" (14) and that the Marxist conception of class has a

number of unique qualities having relational characteristics which are antagonistic and structured during the process of production:

> [Marxism] treats class a relationship. A person's class position ... consists in his or her relationship, as a part of a social group, to other social groups. Secondly, this relationship is antagonistic: it consists above all in the extraction of surplus-labour from the direct producers by the minority ruling class controlling the means of production. Thirdly, this antagonistic relationship is formed in the process of production: exploitation and class struggle arise from the efforts of the ruling class to secure their control over the means of production and the labour itself of the direct producers. (6)

Another distinctive feature of Marxist class analysis is that it has nothing to do with an individual's consciousness. In other words, the subjective feelings, level of income, lifestyle or patterns of consumption of an individual do not locate his class position (Callinicos 4-6). A worker who thinks himself to be a member of the middle class cannot be located within that class. Instead, what determines his class position is his objective place within the social relations of production and whether he owns the means of production or not:

> Marxism does not define class in terms of style, status, income, accent, occupation ... Class for Marxism ... is not a matter of how you are feeling but of what you are doing. It is a question of where you stand within a particular mode of production – whether as slave, self-employed, peasant, agricultural tenant, owner of capital, financier, seller of one's labour power, petty proprietor and so on. (Eagleton 2011, 160-61)

Marx, in a chapter of *Capital* in which the manuscript breaks off, basically offers these definitions –bourgeoisie, petit-bourgeoisie and working class – despite the fact that he himself "never gave a formal definition of [class]" and indeed "employed it in very different senses at different times" (Ste. Croix 1981, 16):

> The owners merely of labour-power, owners of capital, and land-owners, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit and ground-rent, in other words, wage-labourers, capitalists and land-owners, constitute then three big classes of modern society based upon the capitalist mode of production. (qtd. in Elster 1986, 181)

Marx then points out that the landlord class gradually lost its significance and a new class referred to as the petit-bourgeoisie emerged as a consequence of the development of capitalist society: "In countries where modern civilisation has become fully developed, a new class of petty bourgeois has been formed, fluctuating between proletariat and bourgeoisie, and ever renewing itself as a supplementary part of bourgeois society" (1848, 29). In this sense, from a classical Marxist perspective, it is not wrong to indicate that there are three basic classes – the bourgeois class, the petty bourgeois class and the working class – within a capitalist society: "Every capitalist country ... is basically divided into three main forces: the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat" (Lenin 1964, 202).

1.2. Different Class Models After Marx

As discussed above, the class model of Marx, based on the dichotomy of the exploiter and the exploited[18], has been widely accepted as adequate to analyse the class structure of capitalism in the nineteenth century. However, some changes such as "the progressive loss of control over the labour process on the part of the direct producers", "the elaboration of the complex authority hierarchies within capitalist enterprises and bureaucracies" and "the differentiation of various functions originally embodied in the entrepreneurial capitalist", which occurred in the course of the twentieth century, resulted in a structural transformation of capitalism (Wright 1976, 28-29). To be more precise, some traditional occupations disappeared and new occupational groups, including white-collar employees and mental labourers such as technicians, supervisors, managers and academics, emerged subsequent to the transition from traditional industrial production

[18] In *Communist Manifesto*, it is stated that "society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing another: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat" (1848, 15).

(small-scale and non-hierarchical enterprises) to information technology and service industry (multinational corporations): “The transition from industrial to “late”, “consumerist”, “post-industrial” or “postmodern” capitalism has indeed involved some notable changes” (Eagleton 2011, 171).

In this respect, new strategies concerning the re-conceptualization of class in the second half of the twentieth century were developed, and these theoretical strategies essentially aimed to extend and reform the Marxist class model in accordance with the economic, cultural and social circumstances of contemporary society. Erik O. Wright (1980) divides such strategies into three basic aspects which are successively “the simple polarization of the class structure of advanced capitalism”, the concept of a “new petty bourgeoisie”, and the theory of the “Professional and Managerial Class” (327). After giving a detailed discussion of these approaches, he develops his own theory of “contradictory class locations within class relations”. This section of the chapter will examine these new class models by giving a brief account of them.

The model of the simple polarization view of the class structure in capitalist society is genuinely in line with the Marxist conception of class in the nineteenth century. This class model is based on the polarization between the capitalist class and the working class and puts forward the view that the members of the petty bourgeois class steadily shrank as a consequence of the development of capitalism and that the class structure of society, therefore, became more polarized between workers and capitalists. James F. Becker in (1973) focuses on “the managerial phase of capitalist development” (1973b, 445) and points out that the technical developments and changes within capitalism led to the emergence of new divisions of labour. He analyses the class positions of administrative labourers and managers identified with the so-called middle class and concludes that the

administrative labourers are a part of the working class, whereas the class position of the latter one hinges on the managerial level of their occupation:

> [The changes in the nature of capitalism are] evident also within the so-called "middle class" of society, in the sharpening tension between the managers, as executives of the ruling class, and the labour over which it rules directly, administrative labour ... it is not accurate to distinguish the managers from administrative labourers in all instances since so many of the latter share so many of the managerial qualities. Nevertheless, a firm and clear-cut distinction between the two may be drawn. In general, it is their differing relationships to means of production that separates them economically and, hence, politically … Administrative labour is in principle productive labour … Administrative labour is merely a part of the working class which emerges as a portion of that class in the managerial phase of capitalist development. (1973b, 437-444)

In a similar way, Ernest Mandel (1969) argues that the non-ownership of the means of production, and the sale of labour power in order to attain the necessary means of livelihood, are the basic characteristics of the proletariat, and that all productive and unproductive wage earners can be classified as a part of the working class as long as they are subject to such fundamental constraints. However, a chief manager or an army general earning thousands of pounds in a year cannot be categorized as a part of the working class since their salary levels enable them to have a standard life as well as permitting them accumulation of capital (47).

Unlike Becker and Mandel, however, Cutler et al. in *Marx's Capital and Capitalism Today* (1977) argue that all the employees in a capitalist company, including managers, are a part of the working class in contemporary society because they are wage labourers and cannot control the means of production:

> Managers … do not exercise this function by reason of possession of the means of production which they direct, rather they are combined with the means of production by an economic decision … made on the part of the capital. In respect of the mode of combination with the means of production they are in the same position as wage labourers ... Although managers direct the actions of a capital, it and not they is the legal subject responsible for the

> obligations and the possessor of the receipts which follow from their actions. (304-305)

The economic relations between classes have not *structurally* changed in the second half of the twentieth century; however, the emergence of new divisions of labour and of new occupational groups including high-technology, administrative and professional employees have created new fractions within classes and necessitated the development of new class models in order to *precisely* articulate some occupational positions within information technology and service sector although the basic arguments of Marxism regarding the dichotomy of the exploiter and the exploited still seem to be relevant. Considering the economic productive relations in the era of neo-capitalism, the second approach, the theory of the new petit-bourgeoisie, might, in this context, help us contextualize the concept of class more accurately.

This theory uses the term 'new petit-bourgeoisie' in order to reveal its distinction from the traditional petty bourgeois class. In *Class Analysis: The United States in the 1970s* (1975), Judah Hill points out that a new class, the members of which include professionals, managers, technicians, engineers and so on, appeared as a consequence of the changes in capitalism, that the members of this class own intellectual knowledge which is, in a way, a sort of property and that they are therefore property-owners like traditional petty-bourgeois class.

In another version of this approach, it is assumed that all unproductive earners are a part of the new petty bourgeois class since they do not produce surplus value and capital despite the fact that they are employed by the bourgeoisie. This is actually more related to the concepts of productive and unproductive labour in Marxism. According to Marx, productive labour is "wage-labour which, exchanged against the variable part of capital (the part of the capital that is spent on wages), reproduces not only this part of the capital

(or the value of its own labour-power), but in addition produces surplus-value for the capitalist" (Marx 1863, 144), and produces capital directly. However, unproductive labour is not "changed with capital, but directly with revenue, that is, with wages or profit" (Marx 1863, 144). In this respect, the basic motivation of this approach is the claim that the source of the income of unproductive labourers comes out of the surplus value produced by productive labourers, that unproductive labourers live on the labour of the working class, and that they consequently have an intermediate position between the working class and the bourgeois class as they also help the rate of exploitation increase in an indirect way: "A great number of people who produce no commodities for profitable sale ... fulfil a function in the vast system of financing, distributing, exchanging, improving and maintaining the commodities produced by the proletariat and appropriated by the capitalist class (Nicolaus 1967, 39).

Martin Nicolaus (1967) adopts this approach and points out that an entirely new class between the working class and the capitalist class came into being in relation to the rise of surplus and productivity and the appearance of the new categories of unproductive work in banking, insurance, advertising, science and technology sectors: "These [developments] make up what I have called the 'law of the surplus class', that is, the law of the tendential rise of a new middle class" (40).

Nicos Poulantzas in *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism* (1975) also supports this theory in advanced capitalist societies. By pointing out that the increasing number of non-productive wage earners like commercial and bank employees has allegedly created an embourgeoisement process, Poulantzas centres upon the extensions within classes, resulting in a more complex and heterogeneous structure. He posits three distinctive economic, ideological and political characteristics, separating the working class from the

new petty bourgeois class, in order to present the structural determination of a new petty bourgeois class, and relocates the "new wage-earning groupings" into the category of "new petty bourgeoisie" (204). For Poulantzas, the fundamental economic criterion is the distinction between productive and unproductive labour, and this new class, including all unproductive labourers, is different from the traditional working class, producing surplus value, because it is not situated within the circle of the basic capitalist relations of exploitation and indirectly sustains the redistribution of the surplus-value:

> From the standpoint of the individual capitalist, these wage-earners do appear to be the source of his profit. But from the standpoint of social capital and its reproduction, the profit of commercial and banking capital does not derive from a process of value creation, but from a transfer of the surplus-value created by productive capital. These wage-earners simply contribute towards redistributing the mass of surplus-value among the various fractions of capital according to the average rate of profit. Of course, these wage-earners are themselves exploited, and their wages correspond to the reproduction of their labour-power ... Surplus labour is thus extorted from wage-earners in commerce, but these are not directly exploited in the form of the dominant capitalist relation of exploitation, the creation of surplus value. (212)

'Political relations' is another criterion through which the structural dimension of the new petty bourgeoisie is determined. The basic assumption for this is the fact that there is a distinction between supervisory and non-supervisory positions, that supervisory and managerial labour coordinates and integrates the production process in the name of the bourgeoisie and that it consequently symbolizes the political domination of capital over the proletariat within the social division of labour (Wright 1976, 78). Another distinctive feature of the structural determination of the difference between the proletariat and the new petty bourgeoisie is the ideological criteria defining the differences between mental and manual labour. For Poulantzas, there is a relationship between knowledge and the dominant ideology since the knowledge of the production process is possessed by the bourgeoisie while manual workers are excluded from this knowledge; mental labourers

(e.g. technicians and engineers), on the other hand, become a part of this process, materialize the dominant ideology through the technological application of scientific knowledge and subordinate labour to capital:

> Technicians and engineers do tend to form part of capitalist productive labour, because they directly valorize capital in the production of surplus-value ... they maintain political and ideological relations of subordination of the working class to capital. (242)

Relocating underexploited wage earners as the members of the new petty bourgeois class is also another example of the re-conceptualization of class in contemporary capitalism (Wright 1980, 350). Christian Baudelot et al., making use of this approach, point out that unproductive labourers produce surplus-value, that underexploited wage earners play an implicit role in the exploitation of the proletariat and occupy an antagonistic position to the working class and that all wage earners whose income is above the value of their labour power can, thus, be categorized as a part of the petty bourgeois class:

> [Petty bourgeois class include] all those who, by virtue of the place which they occupy in the relations of production, receive from the bourgeoisie a fraction of the social surplus value. That is to say: the petty bourgeoisie are those who are not capitalist and who receive as income –through whatever from (salary, commercial profit, commissions) a sum of money greater that the value of their labour power. (Baudelot et al. 1974, 224)

The Professional-Managerial Class is an alternative conceptualisation of class useful in defining the class structure of advanced capitalism. This theory argues that developments in capitalist society have created a new class as a consequence of "the deskilling of manual work", "the introduction of scientific management", and "the attainment of economic dominance by monopoly capitalism" (Callinicos 1987, 25) and also that wage earners falling outside the working class should be relocated within this

new class structure which is distinct from the working class and the petty bourgeois class. Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich (1976) posit the existence of this class and state:

> We argued that advanced capitalist society has generated a new class, not found in earlier stages of capitalist development. We defined the Professional-Managerial Class (PMC) as consisting of salaried mental workers who do not own the means of production, and whose major function in the social division of labour may be described broadly as the reproduction of capitalist culture and capitalist class relations. The PMC includes such groups as scientists, engineers, teachers, social workers, writers, accountants, lower- and middle-level managers and administrators. (7)

The approach of contradictory class locations is very often employed to investigate some ambiguous class positions in contemporary capitalism. In this method, the fundamental argument is that certain occupational categories, torn between classes, can objectively be situated within more than one class instead of being situated in a single class. This perspective has systematically been theorized by G. Carchedi in "On the Economic Identification of the New Middle Class" (1975). In the article, Carchedi basically defines two main classes, the working class and the bourgeois class, by considering four dichotomies which are successively producer/non-producer, owner/ non-owner, labourer/ non-labourer and exploited/ exploiter:

> ... under capitalism, within the production process, there is a class which always produces and another class which does not produce ... since the capitalist production process is essentially production of surplus value, the producer is regarded ... as productive labourer ... the non-producer is considered as appropriator of surplus value. Thus, [this] also implies another dichotomy: the exploited/ exploiter ... [another] element focuses on the ownership of the means of production or on the owner/non-owner dichotomy ... [another] element focuses on the separation between the labourer and the non-labourer. (1975, 10-11)

Carchedi subsequently argues that a new middle class came into existence in relation to the advent of monopoly capitalism, and his analysis of the new middle class revolves around two functional elements, the "function of the collective worker" (19) and the

"function of capital" (26). The traditional working class performs the function of the collective worker whereas the traditional bourgeois class performs the function of capital:

> ... the term 'function of the collective worker' [is] related to ... capitalism characterized by real subordination of labour to capital ... with the introduction of the technical division of labour within the labour process ... the labour-process is subdivided in a number of fractional operations ... all agents performing one of these operations perform one of the functions of the collective worker ... the capitalist can perform not only his function as a capitalist, a function which corresponds to the maintenance of economic exploitation and oppression, a function which is one aspect of his work of supervision and management and which we call work of control and surveillance. (1975, 19-24)

In order to reveal the contradictory nature of the new middle class, the members of which perform both 'the global function of capital' and 'the function of the collective worker', Carchedi gives the example of the labour process in a construction yard. Here, an engineer is not only responsible for inspecting technicians and workers under him for a higher productivity, including the subordination of labourers to capital but also for taking part in the labour process himself (1975, 32). The nature of his job, for that reason, has double content since he functions both as a part of the working class and the agent of the capitalist class. In this respect, Carchedi defines the new middle class as such:

> ... the function of capital only pertains to those who have the real ownership of the means of production; capital takes on a global function and is no longer concentrated in the capitalist class but is diffused among those who are neither the legal or the real owners of the means of production. That is, the function of capital ... performed not only by the capitalist class (at this level of abstraction, the managers) but also by another class the characteristics of which are: (i) it does not own either legally or economically the means of production (ii) it performs both the global function of capital and the function of the collective worker (iii) is therefore both the labourer (productive or unproductive) and the non-labourer and (iv) is both exploiter (or oppressor) and exploited (or oppressed). It is this class which I call the ***new middle class***. (51)

In this respect, Eric Olin Wright takes the theory of Carchedi, revolving around only one contradictory position, one step further, and introduces three distinct contradictory class locations in order, alternatively, to analyse the ambiguities in the class structure of

contemporary capitalism. The basic point of Wright's approach is that some interconnected structural changes like the "loss of control over the labour process", "the differentiation of the functions of capital" and "the development of complex hierarchies" regarding economic ownership and possession have been experienced (Wright 1976, 28-29) and that such circumstances have ultimately led to some *new* occupational positions within the class relations which do not correspond to the central class forces of the capitalist society, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, or to the petty bourgeoisie within simple commodity production:

> They are not contradictory simply because they cannot be neatly pigeonholed in any of the basic classes. The issue is not one of typological aesthetics. Rather they are contradictory locations because they simultaneously share the relational characteristics of two distinct classes. As a result, they share class interests with two different classes but have interests identical to neither. It is in this sense that they can be viewed as being objectively torn between class locations. (Wright 1980, 331)

The first contradictory class is 'managers and supervisors' occupying a location between the working class and the capitalist class. They share similar characteristics with the working class since they cannot control capital, whereas they are also like the bourgeoisie in having relative control over the means of production and the labour process of the workers. For example, occupational groups within this position range from top managers having partial control over investment and resource-allocation and complete control over the labour process (Callinicos 1987, 28) to technocrats having "a limited degree of autonomy over their own work ... and a limited control over subordinates" (Wright 1976, 34). 'Small employers' also have a contradictory class position between the petty bourgeoisie and the capitalist class. This class is different from the traditional petty bourgeois class and the traditional bourgeoisie since they employ some employees, whose productive labour is exploited, but are themselves also engaged in the production process

along with their workers. Another contradictory position is 'semiautonomous employees' occupying a location between the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This class does not have control over capital and the labour process of others like the members of the working class although they have real control over their physical means of production and their direct engagement in the labour process like the petty bourgeoisie class:

> ... there are still categories of employees who have a certain degree of control over their own immediate conditions of work, over their immediate labour process ... even though such employees work for the self-expansion of capital and even though they have lost the legal status of being self-employed, they can still be viewed as occupying residual islands of petty-bourgeois relations of production within the capitalist mode of production itself. In their immediate work environment, they maintain the work process of the independent artisan while still being employed by capital as a wage-labourer. (Wright 1976, 36)

A researcher in a laboratory or a lecturer in a university is a good example of this contradictory class position. To be more precise, let us focus on the case of academics. Academics are not "subject to continuous surveillance and control at work", and "how they teach their courses" or "what they teach is a matter for them to decide" and "long vacations and short teaching hours gives them plenty of time to pursue their own research" (Callinicos, 1987: 32-3). However, despite having a considerable degree of freedom at work compared to other wage-labourers, they are still wage-labourers selling their labour power and are not free of constraints such as monitoring, the constraints on what is regarded as publishable or significant research, the rise of the business model within the academic sector and the pressures of control arising "from the need to obtain tenure, and from subsequent efforts to climb the career hierarchy" (Callinicos 1987, 33).

After clarifying the contradictory class positions, Wright underlines the fact that a majority of white-collar labourers can still be categorized as a part of the working class since they do not have real autonomy over their labour process: "It seems almost certain

that the large majority of white collar employees, especially clerical and secretarial employees, have – at most – trivial autonomy on the job and thus should be placed within the working class itself" (1976, 36-7). A. Callinicos (1987) similarly indicates that the decline in the proportion of productive workers is in relation to the structural transformation of the working class, that this is a revelation of the capitalist accumulation and that most of the white-collar workers are still a part of the proletariat even though they are not a heterogeneous group:

> The decline in the proportion of productive workers has been accompanied by the expansion of other forms of employment. Effectively, women in particular have been transferred from manual jobs (especially in the textile and clothing industries) to white collar clerical jobs, to public-sector manual work ... In terms of their relation to the means of production, they are still compelled regularly to sell their labour-power. At work, they have little or no control over the work they do. They are very low-paid. In all these respects, the shorthand typist, or checkout girl, or school cleaner is as much part of the proletariat as the horny-handed male engineer or miner. (23)

The proletarianization of the while-collar workers is also referred to as the "industrialisation of clerical work" (231) by Harry Braverman in his *Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century* (1974), largely referring to the "industrialization of office work" in which clerical work is carried out through "semi-skilled, repetitive and manual operations" (Callinicos 1987, 22).

In his "Foundations of a Neo-Marxist Class Analysiss" (2005), Wright focuses on individuals holding two different jobs who might be categorised within different class positions in contemporary society. To give an example, a person can work as a manager in a firm, while he can be self-employed in another job, or a person can work as a worker within a capitalist company and can have his own stock in the company in which he works. In such a case, individuals can simultaneously be located within two different class locations in accordance with the work they perform. The class positions of individuals

working in jobs with career opportunities are similarly problematic in advanced capitalist societies. For instance, managers mostly do not begin work in managerial positions; instead, they climb up the ladder of a career hierarchy over a period of time. Locating their class positions therefore includes some indeterminacy and uncertainty despite the fact that they might even be working alongside ordinary workers:

> ... the location within class relations of people within such careers has what might be termed temporal complexity ... since the future is somewhat uncertain, the temporal dimension of class locations also means that a person's location within class relations can have a certain degree of temporal indeterminacy or uncertainty. (Wright 2005, 17-18)

In the article, Wright also analyses different stratifications within a certain class location. In terms of class relations, a capitalist owning and controlling a huge amount of capital and employing thousands of persons is not so different from a capitalist employing a small number of workers in a single location; similarly, an unskilled worker has the same class position as a skilled worker since they do not own the means of production and have to sell their labour power. In this respect, such quantitative variations among individuals occupying a similar class positions are referred to as "strata within class locations" by Wright (2005, 18). The relationship between family relations and class location is another complex issue. Wright investigates a number of different marriages within contemporary society and theorises the concept of mediated class location. For example, a female worker who is married to a senior manager actually has a mediated class position because she is a wage-labourer and her direct class position can, therefore, be located within the working class, while her husband belongs to another class. Such situations actually create further complexity for class analysis:

> Mediated locations add particularly interesting complexities to class analysis in cases in which a person's direct class location – the way in which they are inserted into class relations through their own jobs – and their mediated class locations are different ... As the proportion of married women in paid

> employment and the length of time they spend in the labour force increases, the existence of such "cross-class households" ... becomes a more salient form of complexity in class locations. (Wright 2005, 18)

Considering all these arguments and analyses concerning the concept of class in contemporary society, to argue that capitalism has unrecognizably changed over the course of fifty years, that there is no longer a real working class, and that left-wing movements should not therefore be concerned with class politics is not coincidentally one that is mostly asserted within a European or American context. Class is harder to disavow from a global perspective since there is a substantially growing working class in 'underdeveloped' countries, and Empire ensures that the exploitation of human beings has increased across the globe. Marxism's basic arguments concerning the dichotomy of the exploiter and the exploited are still relevant to theorise and explain the current structural operations of capitalism, although this does not necessarily mean that the traditional class analysis of Marxism can articulate every single issue in contemporary capitalism.

CHAPTER II: ALIENATION

Have you ever questioned the reason why so many people monotonously use their smart phones as soon as they get on the bus and sit down? Have you ever wondered why people no longer talk to each other and smile intimately? You might also have come across many people who value others according to what they wear or eat or drive. It is also probable that you might have met some people who would like to add you as a friend on Facebook or Twitter before even trying to learn your name properly. What about a great many people who prefer a single chair with an armrest marking off an illusory 'dominance and possession' on a bus? What about a young person linking freedom with driving a car fast or dancing like crazy in conformity with the 'rhythm' of music? If you have not seen such a person, then you may have bumped into a youngster listening to music on his/her MP3 player. You might also have been surprised at the fact that employees are no longer happy no matter how high their incomes are. What about old couples who try to find peace by living in architecturally-alienated cottages in a remote place far away from 'civilization'? These are some snapshots from the money-oriented post-industrial era in which relationships are commodified, alienated and based on instrumental and narrowly personal interests. Post-war British literature, since it mediates different dimensions of economic and cultural histories and is "a form of literature that has responded symbiotically with social and political movements" (Bentley 2008, 2), might, in this context, offer an appropriate written archive through which such cultural and social manifestations could be reflected.

This thesis proposes to examine these tendencies and the portrayal of the attitudes of characters in relation to the rise of the money society in key post-war novels by framing an analysis through an understanding of the alienation process and an approach to the

question of estrangement. One major focus of the thesis will be to discuss ways in which recent writers of fiction have represented and mediated the disintegrating and corrupting impacts of industrial capitalism and the post-industrial wasteland upon ordinary people. The objective of this chapter is to examine the concept of alienation and to deliver a brief overview of its evolution from Hegel and Feuerbach to Marx and Seeman. Other Marxist terms such as commodity fetishism, division of labour and self-actualization will also be introduced in order to set up a theoretical framework through which the atomization processes of industrial capitalism and increased urbanization might be understood. This will provide a framework for the analysis of the representations of such processes as they are seen to shape the experiences of the alienation of the characters in the fictions of the second half of the twentieth century. Over the course of the thesis, the concept of alienation will be refined and developed, and the domestic, cultural, social and political inclinations of the characters in the post-war novels selected will be reinterpreted through this reconceptualization of alienation in response to recent intellectual and political histories and theoretical interventions. In this way, the broader economic, cultural and social framework of the process of alienation in real life will be revealed through Marxist analysis, while the mediation of this process through the lives of the ordinary people in the novels will be investigated through the development of a hermeneutic framework that entangles Marxist engagement with formalist, phenomenological and existentialist perspectives.

1.1. Introduction

Arguably, interest in the concept of alienation has not diminished despite its long and honourable genealogy. On the contrary, there is an ongoing theoretical and existential awareness of and sympathy for the concept apparent in writers of fiction, in particular in

the post-war period. Indeed, I will argue that the concept of alienation is reflected as strongly in the work of writers of post-war fiction, as it is in political theorists of the period. In philosophy, there is now a voluminous literature that has been produced around the theory of alienation since Marx. Along with classical sources such as G. W. Friedrich Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Ludwig Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity* and Karl Marx's *Grundrisse* and *the Paris Manuscripts*, key influential examples include Erich Fromm's *Marx's Concept of Man* (1961), Herbert Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (1955), Georg Lukacs' *History and Class Consciousness* (1971), Bertell Ollman's Ali*enation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* (1971), Istvan Meszaros' *Marx's Theory of Alienation* (1970) and Allen W. Wood's *Karl Marx* (2004). In these pioneering works that lean heavily on Hegel, Feuerbach and English political theory that helped to shape Marx's own theory of alienation, the process of estrangement is thoroughly investigated and key terms such as reification, commodity fetishism and commodification are clarified. For instance, Lukacs (1967) outlines how alienation is experienced within the money-oriented world and how this leads to mystified consciousness militating against workers' developing class consciousness. Likewise, Ollman (1971), Fromm (1961), Meszaros (1970), Wood (2004), chiefly focus on another aspect of alienation by amplifying the idealized view of human nature with respect to alienation. To Herbert Marcuse (1955), capitalism creates a one-dimensional man as capitalism and industrialism cause labourers to see themselves as extensions of the objects they produce, so their relationship with each other is commodified, leading to alienation.

However, the critique of alienation has continued to be extended and modified as it has entered a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary domains. In the 1950s, it became a cornerstone concept in psychiatry and psychology. By the 1970s, various

conceptualisations of alienation were available and now with major discrepancies in their conceptual bases and assumptions. To exemplify, Amitai Etzioni (1968) claims that alienation occurs because inherent human needs are not fulfilled satisfactorily, while George Novack and Ernest Mandel (1970) point out that alienation is an objective expropriation at work or elsewhere. In a similar way, Richard Jessor et al. (1973) state that loss or a sense of frustration in an individual as a result of previous negative experiences causes estrangement. Alain Touraine (1973) also reveals that alienation is a part of social class relations, that individuals internalize orientations and cultural practices ascribed by the prevailing mode of production and that a contradiction between attitude, corresponding to individual's true situation, and behaviour, determined by the institutions of the dominant order, is, for that reason, experienced, resulting in estrangement. Similarly, Eric Josephson and Mary Josephson (1962, 16) emphasize that an individual no longer finds the "aim of his conduct in himself" and that he, understanding that "he is the instrument of a purpose greater than himself" and is not significant at all, consequently becomes alienated. Arnold Kaufman also asserts that claiming that a person is alienated is to claim that "her relation to something else has certain features which result in avoidable discontent or loss of satisfaction" (Kaufman 1965, 132). By synthesizing all these views about alienation in order to cast new light on alienation in the post-industrial era, Melvin Seeman (1975) concentrates on five varieties of alienation which are successively powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and social isolation. After Seeman, the upsurge of interest in the concept of alienation has continued. Kalekin-Fishman (1996, 97), for example, focuses on the fact that an individual "suffers from alienation in the form of powerlessness when she is conscious of the gap between what she would like to do and what she feels capable of doing". While mentioning a new type of powerlessness related to that of Seeman, Geyer (1996, XXIII) also indicates that "the

core problem is no longer being unfree but rather being unable to select from among an overchoice of alternatives for action, whose consequences one often cannot even fathom". Commenting upon the concept of social alienation in the modern world, Neal and Collas (2000, 114) argue that the sources of social alienation are "deeply embedded in the social organization of the modern world" and that "with increased isolation and atomization, much of our daily interactions are with those who are strangers to us and with whom we lack any ongoing social relationships". Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2004, 65-6) also contend that "when our ideas and affects, or emotions, are put to work, for instance, and when they thus become subject in a way to the command of the boss, we often experience new and intense forms of violation or alienation".

Despite all such current developments in the concept of alienation, in the last fifty years, much of the discussion around the concept of alienation has basically centred around Karl Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844,* one of the first attempts in his systematic theory of capitalism: "The theory of alienation was brought into contemporary philosophy by the mediation of Marx … [It] has achieved unusual triumphs during the past few decades" (Schaff 1980, 87). The book, also referred to as *The Paris Manuscripts*, is a series of notes expressing Marx's analysis of economics, chiefly that of Adam Smith, and the critique of Hegel. Covering a wide range of topics from private property to communism and money, it includes workers' fourfold alienation in terms of production and Marx's arguments about the conditions of modern industrial societies in which wage-workers are alienated from their own human essence. However, it should not be overlooked that the theory of alienation does not belong to Marx, that, in one form or another, the basic principles of the concept of alienation appeared earlier in European thought and that the evolution of this concept can be traced from its Hegelian roots to its reformulation by Feuerbach.

Strictly speaking, the origins of alienation theory go back to Plato's view of the natural world in which there can only ever be an imperfect picture of the perfect world of Ideas; but Hegel's conception of nature as self-alienation from Absolute mind is strikingly resonant with Plato's natural world (Doğan 2008, 9). G. Lichtheim argues that the concept of alienation can also be found in the writings of Plotinus, the founder of Neo-Platonism, who lived between 204 and 70 A.D, and that Neo-Platonism's doctrine of emanation assumed "a procession from an ultimate indefinable source or principle to a multiplicity of finite beings" in which "the undivided One unfolds into its various manifestations by a downward process linking the supersensible Being with a hierarchy of lower stage of the universe and the antithesis of One" (1968, 264). Erich Fromm, too, makes the point that the concept of alienation can be viewed in the story of the golden calf of the Old Testament and its subsequent discussion by the Hebrew prophets as a mode of idolatry:

> The essence of what the prophets call 'idolatry' is not that man worships many Gods instead of only one. It is that the idols are the work of man's own hands -- they are things, and man bows down and worships things, worships that which he has created himself. He transfers to the things of his creation the attributes of his own life, and instead of experiencing himself as the creating person, he is in touch with himself only by the worship of the idol. He has become estranged from his own life forces ... and is in touch with himself only in the indirect way of submission to the life frozen in the idols. (1961, 44).

The Christian doctrine of sin can be interpreted as an earlier paradigm of the modern alienation doctrine because divine order in the doctrine of Judeo-Christian mythology has been violated, and this reveals human beings as alienated to themselves as a result of their inability to conceive "the ways of God, whether simply 'by the fall of man' or later by the dark idolatries of an alienated Judah, or later again by the behaviour of Christians alienated from the life of God" (Meszaros 1970, 28). This approach to alienation might be seen as the means whereby the ruling class, in pre-medieval times, were able to sustain

social hierarchy, handle their internal conflicts and build their lives on a consoling falsehood. As Meszaros points out:

> Judaism and Christianity are complementary aspects of society's efforts to cope with its internal contradictions. They both represent attempts at an imaginary transcendence of these contradictions, at an illusory "reappropriation" of the human essence through a fictitious supersession of the state of alienation. (1970, 30)

Bernard Murchland remarks that "the distinctive modern flavour of our experience of alienation" can be analysed "in the transitional period of the late Middle Ages and Renaissance", which is mainly a consequence of "the rise of atomistic nominalism and the subsequent pulverization of being" (1969, 434), while Gerhart Ladner similarly states that the "theme of alienation is intrinsic to Medieval Christian thought" (1967, 236). These arguments suggest that rather than a concept closely tied with the rise of modernity, as often assumed, the sources of later theories of alienation are rather to be found during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. In the early modern period, even Descartes might be seen to engage with a version of alienation, well before before Hegel. Separating soul and mind and differentiating consciousness from the external world as a different kind of substance, Descartes points out that the outside world cannot directly be expressed by means of sensations and that body and mind are, therefore, alienated from each other. Although Hegelian thought claims that this dualistic perception can be overcome through the process of dialectic movement, Hegel does not necessarily reduce the sphere of consciousness to the sphere of the external world in the way traditional idealists do (Doğan 2008, 10-11).

1.2. Hegelian Alienation

For Hegel, alienated life is related to the concept of the unhappy consciousness which refers to the self's inability to grasp the spiritual essence and its reality as immanent

in the world of becoming, while the reality, the equivalent of actuality, is the manifestation of Spirit (Geist) which is the synthesis of consciousness and reality:

> … the special mode of mental being is 'manifestation'. The spirit is not some one mode or meaning which finds utterance or externality only in a form distinct from itself: it does not manifest or reveal something, but its very mode and meaning is this revelation. And thus in its mere possibility mind is at the same moment an infinite, 'absolute', actuality. (Hegel 2008, 7)

What produces the natural and social world is this Spirit, and Spirit reveals its own nature, objectifies itself by means of the products of its own labour through outward activities like art and religion and, therefore, actualizes and externalizes itself: “Spirit expresses itself by creating the world and attains full knowledge of itself as it identifies the world as its own creation” (Bogardus 1973, 8). However, Spirit, taking itself to be in conflict with its own essence, regarding itself and the natural world as “inessential” and feeling “itself, its activity, and the whole sphere of its finite temporal existence to be empty, worthless and devoid of true reality” (Wood 2004, 10), becomes alienated to itself since it is not able to recognize its own potentials and creative powers immediately. Experiencing self-alienation, Spirit gains self-consciousness, overcomes this objectification process, becomes aware of its own potentialities and comes to know the object it produces as itself. By means of this process, including a twofold activity for Spirit, the activity of self-expression and of self-interpretation, Spirit also actualizes itself through the integrity of human community. Each person is, for that reason, a revelation of Spirit, and the natural world which is transformed by human activity has a spiritual character as pointed out by Hegel:

> This world is a spiritual reality; it is essentially the fusion of individuality with being. This existence is the work of self-consciousness, but likewise an actuality immediately present and alien to it, which has a peculiar being of its own, and in which it does not know itself. (Hegel 1910, 488)

In Hegelianism, another essential quality associated with Spirit is the concept of universality. According to the Hegelian idea of the nature of man, individuals have both the character of individuality and the character of universality, and this universality can only be sustained through an individual's unity with the social substance referring to social, political and cultural institutions in which Spirit can attain self-actualization: "Individuals as a mass are themselves spiritual natures and they therefore embody a dual moment, namely the extreme of individuality … and the extreme of universality" (Hegel 1991, 287). In this context, an individual should be aware of himself as a separate individual before uniting with others, creating universality and enriching Spirit. There are also some instances in which an individual cannot become aware of his/her potentialities, and this results in his/her inability to identify himself/herself with the social substance. In such a situation, self-identification is limited to one's own person and the individual perceives the social substance as being external and other, which indeed creates self-alienation (Bogardus 1973, 9). As stated earlier, the social substance is both the creation and objectification of Spirit, and an individual who is alienated from the social substance is indeed alienated from the objectification of Spirit, in other words, from actuality and spiritual essence and "arrives at the extreme of discordance with [himself]" (Hegel 1910, 519). This "refers to a perceived rift between the individual and the social substance, so that self-identity is confined to that of the particular person. Solidarity with the other persons is abandoned and Spirit finds itself in a state of self-alienation" (Bogardus 1973, 9). Richard Schacht similarly points out that there are two aspects to Hegelian alienation. The first is the estrangement experienced between the individual and the social substance while the second is about one's sacrificing oneself in order to internalize the values of the social substance for the sake of universality:

> [Alienation] … a separation or discordant relation, such as might obtain between the individual and the social substance, or (as self-alienation) between one's actual condition and essential nature … [Hegel] also uses it to refer to a surrender or sacrifice of particularity and wilfulness, in connection with the overcoming of this alienation and reattainment of unity. (Schacht 1970, 35)

In order to get over this process of alienation, the dislocation of the individual and the social substance leading to the alienation of an individual might be prevented by means of an alteration in individual consciousness. A person estranged from the social substance can overcome alienation by renouncing the particular self and sustaining reconciliation with the social substance, whereas an individual alienated to universality and actuality can get rid of the alienation process by uniting himself/herself with the social substance once more since the estrangement process that the particular self runs through produces the negation of negation (Bogardus 1973, 11). Likewise, Wood (2004, 11) states that the unhappy consciousness, referring to the alienation process of an individual, is created as a consequence of the fact that individuals, unable to recognize that the natural realm is the revelation and objectification of the divine world corresponding to Spirit, cannot interpret the world; this process can be overcome by attaining self-knowledge through which the particular self can align himself/herself with the social substance and universality:

> The alienation of the unhappy consciousness is consequently just a matter of the finite spirit's imperfect knowledge of its own finite essence. The only remedy for alienation is the attainment of a higher stage of self-knowledge, where God and humanity, the universal essence of spirit and its particular self-consciousness, are seen to be fundamentally in harmony or identical with each other. (Wood 2004, 11-12)

In this context, the process of the negation of negation in Hegelian dialectics, including "conflict and antagonism" (Hardimon 1994, 121), basically functions in two stages: an individual, becoming alienated from himself/herself in the first stage, regains actuality and freedom by means of spiritual reconciliation in the second stage.

1.3.Feuerbach and Alienation

Feuerbach is another significant philosopher who was tremendously influential upon the formation of Marx's theory of alienation. In particular, his theories about religion, alienation and human essence and nature penetrated into the discourse of Marx and Engels in such a direct way that Engels even stated that they (Marx and himself) "all became at once Feuerbachians" upon reading Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity* (Engels 1946, 9). Feuerbach's materialistic view of alienation, however, is actually in opposition to Hegel's metaphysical concept of alienation since Hegelian philosophy, indicating that "absolute Spirit is the last realization of pure philosophy" (Khan 1995, 30), does not assume that man in his determination embodies his universal essence. On the contrary, Feuerbach (1881) criticizes the particularized determination of man in the Hegelian worldview and points out that an individual is a particular example of the life of the species and can be aware of his potentials to possess self-conscious knowledge of his own essence and species-being. As Karl Löwith states:

> The fact that man can be discussed in so many different ways -- as a legal "person", as a moral "subject", and so on -- implies that the whole human being is referred to, although each time in a different sense. It belongs to the very character of man that he can be defined as this one and as that one, as a private person, as a public person, as a citizen, by his social role and by his economic relations. Feuerbach thus guards himself against Hegel's idea of particularity, though he does not show us how to reintegrate the particularised humanity of the modern bourgeois into the whole humanity of man. This indeed could not be achieved by the humanitarian communism of Feuerbach, by the love of "I and thou", but only through social criticism of the division of labour in general and of its class character in particular, as undertaken by Marx. (1954, 207-8).

According to Feuerbach, religion is essentially what causes individuals to be alienated from themselves. The notion of the divine or God is associated with a human projection in which human beings create God in their own images, and this presupposes a critical reassessment of the relationship between the divine and the non-divine. The image

of God basically refers to an idealized concept of human nature and is attributed with some qualities which are not attainable by human beings, which, in return, results in the denial of our own nature: "To enrich God, the human being must become poor; that God may be all, the human being must be nothing" (Feuerbach 1881, 26). Conceiving God, an imaginary being, as an entity highly superior to them and longing for security, comfort and meaning, human beings actually degrade and debase themselves and try to objectify their own nature in the figure of God: "God springs out of the feeling of a want; therefore, conscious, or an unconscious need – that is God. Thus the disconsolate feeling of a void, of loneliness, needed a God in whom there is society, a union of beings fervently loving each other" (Feuerbach 1881, 73). The perception that the physical world is likely to be hostile, discouraging and chaotic and that human beings are displaced and, therefore, have to face the realities of this world leads individuals to seek shelter, stability, hope and fulfilment and to create the divine by projecting their own nature into the image of God. As S. Paul Schilling (1969, 24) argues:

> Man's earthly existence is filled with pain, frustration, failure, anxiety, heart-breaking injustice, and the awareness of his own finitude and approaching death. But he longs for unlimited fulfilment, perfect happiness, and everlasting life. He therefore posits a God who will realize for him in another world the wishes which are thwarted on earth and the evils which are so devastating here. But this God is nothing else than the illusory externalization of human hopes.

The concept of alienation in Feuerbachian theory is more about revealing the psychological and social consequences of religion and its subsequent self-alienation stage. Human beings, discovering their own potentialities, realize their own nature through the external objects that they produce. In this process, described as "a being becoming objective to itself" (Feuerbach 1881, 6), self-consciousness is sustained and human beings become aware of the fact that they are species-beings. What human beings experience at

this stage of self-consciousness is that they get confused as they become both the subject and the object, and they displace their own objective nature with something corresponding to the image of a creator, namely God (Jones 2006, 5). In this context, alienation is mainly conceived as an erroneous conception of human nature and a form of false consciousness. In order to overcome alienation within Feuerbachian philosophy, a theoretical victory of a true species consciousness over a false one should be achieved (Wood 2004, 12) and human beings should affirm and become aware of their own essence as a species being so that they might ensure a satisfying human life and unite with other human beings by renouncing their religious illusions.

1.4. Karl Marx and The Concept of Alienation

After Hegel's death, the followers of Hegel were divided into two: Left Hegelians and Right Hegelians. H. F. W. Hinrichs and Johann Erdmann were among the Right Hegelians who mainly defended traditional Christianity by making use of Hegelian philosophy, whereas Strauss, Feuerbach and Bruno Bauer were among the Left Hegelians who made radical critiques by deriving atheistic and humanistic conclusions from Hegelian philosophy (Wood 1993, 414). Marx was also a Left Hegelian although he separated himself from them by pointing out that they still remained "wholly within the confines of the Hegelian logic" (Marx 1844, 63).

Despite Marx's harsh criticism of Hegel, the basis for the framework of his thought and theories is provided by Hegelian ideas: "[Hegelian ideas] provide the organizing principles and theoretical framework for whole project of *Capital*, the summation of Marx's life's work and the major undertaking of his later years" (Sayers 2001, 367). However, the more Marx's ideas developed, the more his ideas were in contradiction with those of Hegel. In his book entitled *Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of*

Right, Marx, commenting upon the dichotomy of the political state and civil society, criticizes Hegel's metaphysical political philosophy by investigating Hegelian idealism in detail and, unlike Hegel, he indicates that overcoming the tension generated by this gap between political and civil society is not possible unless the state is abolished as a separate realm. This materialistic perspective of the concept of alienation is also very different from that of Hegel as Hegel contends that the process of alienation occurs in the realm of thought and that it is a kind of alteration in the consciousness of an individual confronting the phenomenal word.

In his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx, on the other hand, criticizes Left Hegelians since they were still under the influence of Hegelian dialectic. Instead, Marx implies that the superiority and accomplishments of the theories of Feuerbach were as a consequence of the fact that Feuerbach differentiated himself from the dialectical approach of Hegelian philosophy:

> Feuerbach is the only one who has a serious, critical attitude to the Hegelian dialectic and who has made genuine discoveries in this field. He is in fact the true conqueror of the old philosophy. The extent of his achievement, and the unpretentious simplicity with which he, Feuerbach, gives it to the world, stand in striking contrast to the reverse. (Marx 1844, 64)

In his *Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx identifies the basic achievements of Feuerbach as a philosopher. Feuerbach's revelation of Hegel's philosophy as the rationalization of religion – referring to the mode of alienation of human essence – is, for Marx, a key example of one of these successes. That Feuerbach is a materialist is stated as another accomplishment, although Marx later charges Feuerbach with having a 'contemplative materialistic perspective'. For Marx, what is also worth mentioning in relation to Feuerbach is that Feuerbach negates the negation of negation corresponding to "the

absolute positive, the self supporting positive, positively grounded on itself" (Marx 1844, 64).

As in the example of Hegel, however, Marx was also critical of Feuerbach, and he developed a more thoroughgoing critique of Feuerbach in his work, *Theses on Feuerbach*. Analysing Feuerbachian philosophical humanism based on the abstract perception of individuals, Marx states that "the thing, reality, sensuousness are conceived only in the form of the object, or of contemplation, but not as sensuous human activity, practice, not subjectively" and that, in contradiction to materialism, "the active side was developed abstractly by idealism – which, of course, does not know real, sensuous activity as such. (Marx 1997, 92). In this sense, Marx does not accept Feuerbachian humanism and rejects his "contemplative materialism" in which the essence of an individual is viewed in isolation (Marx 1997, 13-15). What Marx argues instead – separating himself from Feuerbach's ideas, by accusing Feuerbach of thinking everything in spiritual terms within Hegelian philosophy and not going beyond it as with other Young Hegelians – is that the human essence of an individual can only be grasped within the context of economic and social relations.

1.4.1. The Conception of Human Nature

Marx's theory of alienation is founded upon the idea that human beings pass through the process of alienation, referring to dehumanized life in the money-oriented world, since existing social conditions prevent them from leading a meaningful life which corresponds to the satisfaction of human essence or human nature. In order to overcome alienation, these basic needs of human beings would have to be met, and an atmosphere in which individuals might actualize their own selves would have to be sustained. Concerning this point, Marx mentions two concepts: 'natural man' and 'species man'. The natural powers

and needs of an individual are those which are shared with every living entity, while species powers and needs are those which are only shared by human beings, and these species powers are what makes human beings unique in nature and what sets them apart from the rest of the animal world (Ollman 1971, 76). While characterizing the features of natural man, Marx makes use of two terms: 'power' and 'need'. In Marxist philosophy, the powers of man are similar to those of animal functions such as eating and having sex while the physical needs of man stand for desires or actions essential for human beings to be alive and functioning. As pointed out by Olmann (1971, 79):

> [A]nimal functions are the processes that living creatures undergo and the actions they undertake in order to stay alive, while physical needs are the desires they feel for the objects and actions required to keep them alive and functioning. With certain qualifications ... we could say that natural powers are similar to animal functions and the relation between both of them and physical needs is similar to the relation between power and need.

The concept of species being is another aspect of Marxian human nature, and it puts forward that what makes human beings distinct and unique is their self-consciousness and awareness as well as their mutual recognition of all human beings and of the cooperative relationships possible. Within this context, Marx argues that an individual is a species being because he, having a conscious life-activity that distinguishes him from animal life-activity, "makes his life-activity itself the object of his will and of his consciousness" (Marx 1844, 31) and that his actions are, therefore, in a close relationship with those of others.

Another feature of human essence is the purposive need for productive activity through which man creates items or objects in nature through free, spontaneous, conscious and creative activities and thereby satisfies his instinctual human essence. Actualizing themselves through the objects that they produce without being subordinated to someone else is one of the other basic needs of human beings. To comment, human beings are

endowed with certain tendencies and abilities and can realize and actualize their needs and powers through those natural impulses, but the objects that a man, a natural, corporal, sensuous and objective being, and, for that reason, a suffering, conditioned and limited creature, needs in order to manifest and confirm his essential powers in relation to his instincts are not independent of him. If an atmosphere in which he can create objects productively on his own and see the objectified form of his labour is not sustained, he experiences alienation. Despite sounding somewhat reductionist, this theory fundamentally suggests that the underlying causes behind the alienation of human beings in the post-industrial/postmodern era are a consequence of conditions wherein human beings cannot fulfil their instinctual desires and actualize themselves as a consequence of the division of labour or the appropriation of that labour.

Self-actualization, the instinct of human beings leading them to create physical items and objects, is found at the collective unconscious level of human beings, and individuals have a feeling of self-actualization when they freely create items, which is, in a way, the symbol of the meaningfulness of their lives and corresponds to the process of the objectification of labour in Marxist terminology: "[T]he product of labour is labour which has been embodied in an object, which has become material: it is the objectification *of* labour" (Marx 1844, 29). Human beings try to fulfil themselves by means of the objects they create through mentally and physically free, flexible, conscious, creative and spontaneous activities, and these objects, the apparatuses through which workers can get an opportunity to confirm the significance of their lives, are actually a sort of evidence for the actualization of their abilities and self-meaningfulness. Labour is, in this regard, a means to attain self-fulfilment in order for human beings to be aware of their potentialities; however, labour, in its current form, crippling "all human faculties and enjoin[ing] satisfaction" (Marcuse 1968, 227), causes estrangement:

> Under these economic conditions this realization of labour appears as loss of realization for the workers; objectification as loss of the object and bondage to it; appropriation as estrangement, as alienation… So much does the appropriation of the object appear as estrangement that the more objects the worker produces the less he can possess and the more he falls under the sway of his product, capital. (Marx 1844, 29)

When the conditions of self-actualization are hampered, man cannot develop and exercise his essential functions and capacities and subsequently becomes alienated to his natural functions, productive pleasure and enjoyment.

1.4.2. Marxist Alienation

The current intellectual construct of the theory of alienation is basically centred on Marx's arguments about the conditions of modern industrial societies in which workers are alienated from their own human essence. In his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Marx, revealing how capitalist production devastates the mental, physical, economic and social states of human beings, focuses on a wide range of topics from private property to communism and money and reveals the fourfold alienation of workers in terms of production which is, successively, alienation to the product of work, to the working process, to human nature and alienation of man to man.

In the first type of estrangement, the worker is alienated from the product/object of his own labour. The relation of the worker to his own product as an alien object dominating him is related to the fact that what is produced by the worker is appropriated by the capitalist and that the worker cannot even have a license to lay hands on what he produces. In this process, in which the worker does not have the possibility of possessing or making use of things he produces no matter how much he uses his creative abilities, the estrangement of the worker from what he produces is intensified and the worker is exploited both qualitatively and quantitatively:

> [T]he worker is related to the *product of his labour* as to an alien object … the more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself – his inner world – becomes, the less belongs to him as his own… the *alienation* of the worker in his product means not only that his labour becomes an object, an *external* existence, but that it exists *outside him*, independently, as something alien to him. (Marx 1844, 29)

The subservience of the workers is one of the key conditions in this stage of alienation since, in an industrial institution, the worker produces objects/products which come to have a control over him. The worker basically needs the products he produces for consumption and survival; however, he is mandated to accept the existing 'rules' of the material conditions and objective relations because he cannot take part in the decision-making process and does not have the power to make what he produces available to himself: "[H]is products face him as something given, both as to amount and form … the resulting interaction between the worker and his product, therefore, becomes one of total adjustment on the part of the former to the requirements of the latter" (Ollman 1971, 146). This exchange of the roles between the worker and his products, the 'displaced relation', results in the fact that the worker, who is supposed to employ the means of production, is ironically employed by the means of production and consumed by the material elements of his own productive labour (Marx 1867: 214). The worker, unable to realize his instinctual potentials through the objectified forms of the objects he produces in order to manifest and confirm his essential powers, experiences abstraction and impoverishment and becomes a victim of reification and commodity fetishism in which everything related to human beings becomes an extension and function of money for an illusionary self-fulfilment, which essentially drains the productive potential of the worker off into a product without any concrete returns. As argued by Schacht (1970, 93):

> Product ceases to be the objective embodiment of the individual's own personality and the distinctive expression of his creative powers and interests.

> On the contrary, it is not all distinctive, and has no relation to his personality and interests. He does not choose to make it, but rather is directed to do so. He does not even choose *how* to make it; he is compelled to suppress all individuality in the course of its production. And when its production is finished, it is not his to do with [it] as he pleases. In reality, it never is *his* product at all; he is merely the instrument of its production. In a word, it is *alien* to him.

The second aspect of the alienation of the worker from his labour process is that the worker does not have any control over his working conditions, working hours and how the work is organized. Everything related to his work is determined, measured and laid out by property owners, and the worker, denying himself in his labour, experiences passivity, impotency and emasculation since his capacity is transformed into its opposite:

> The relation of labour to the act of production within the *labour* process … is the relation of the worker to his own activity as an alien activity not belonging to him; it is activity as suffering, strength as weakness, begetting as emasculating, the worker's *own* physical and mental energy, his personal life – for what is life but activity? – as an activity which is turned against him, independent of him and not belonging to him. (Marx 1844, 31)

Capitalist work does not actually belong to man's human essence since productive activity within industrial capitalism no longer reflects the operation of all man's powers because the worker does not have any control over the form of labour, its duration and intensity and the kind and number of products and surrounding conditions (Ollman 1971, 138-140). The development of the division of labour and the highly repetitive character of each productive task prevent the worker from producing in a mentally and physically free, flexible, creative and spontaneous manner, and the worker, unable to actualize his inner instincts, becomes alienated to the labour process. Commenting on this, Marx states:

> My work would be a free manifestation of life, hence an enjoyment of life. Presupposing private property, my work is an alienation of life, for I work in order to live, in order to obtain for myself the means of life. My work is not my life. Secondly, the specific nature of my individuality, therefore, would be affirmed in my labour, since the latter would be an affirmation of my individual life. Labour therefore would be true, active property. Presupposing private property, my individuality is alienated to such a degree that this activity is instead hateful to me, a

> torment, and rather the semblance of an activity. Hence, too, it is only a forced activity and one imposed on me only through an external fortuitous need, not through an inner, essential one.[19]

The fact that man can only satisfy his animal functions like eating, drinking and having sex results in a reversal of man's human and animal functions, and the necessities of man's human nature cannot be fulfilled since man, feeling himself to be anything but an animal, does not feel himself to be freely active: "What is animal becomes human and what is human becomes animal … in the abstraction which separates them from the sphere of all other human activity and turns them into sole and ultimate ends, they are animals" (Marx 1844, 30).

The alienation of man from his species being, human nature, is the third element of alienation. Marx attributes two characteristics, self-consciousness and universality, to man as a species-being (Marx 1844, 31); labour, for human beings, is instinctually about satisfying a need, a conscious life activity carried out voluntarily, in order to maintain physical existence. However, the division of labour and forced labour under capitalist production are necessarily opposed to man's personal tendencies and collective interests, and the instinct to create things in a spontaneous and free activity is transformed into an unfreely maintained activity under the service and dominion of another man, the capitalist, which consequently leads man to become alienated to his own body, external nature and human aspect. Marx similarly points out:

> The object of labour is, therefore, the *objectification of man's species life*: for he duplicates himself not only, as in consciousness, intellectually, but also actively, in reality, and therefore he contemplates himself in a world that he has created. In tearing away from man the object of his production, therefore, estranged labour tears from him his *species life*, his real species objectivity. (Marx 1844, 32)

[19] See Marx's "Notes on James Mill" on https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_James_MIll.pdf

Estrangement of man from man is the fourth and final aspect of alienation, which occurs as a consequence of the antagonism with its source in the class structure of society. Man, becoming alienated from those exploiting his labour and what he produces, also becomes alienated in relation to those around him since they can only 'know' each other through the objects they buy and consume. Instead of viewing each other as fellows having equal rights, they see each other as "superiors or subordinates, as holders of a rank, as a small or large unit of power" (Fischer 1996, 63) and consider each other not as individuals, but as the extensions of the money-oriented world. The estrangement of man from man is, therefore, realized and expressed in their relationships to others, and estranged man under industrialism only cares about his own situation and interest:

> An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labour, from his life activity, from his species-being, is the *estrangement of man* from *man*. When man confronts himself, he confronts the *other* man. What applies to a man's relation to his work, to the product of his labour and to himself, also holds of a man's relation to the other man, and to the other man's labour and object of labour. In fact, the proposition that man's species-nature is estranged from him means that one man is estranged from the other, as each of them is from man's essential nature. (Marx 1844, 32)

Capitalists, the owners of the means of production, also run through the process of alienation within industrial capitalism in the sense that non-workers, the capitalist class, having a theoretical attitude towards production compared to the workers' real and practical attitudes, appropriate the work of another person by trying to extend it rather than contributing to it in a joint effort. Conceiving of the object of another man's life activity as something to sell and make profit, the capitalist class do not have a direct relationship to production and cannot decide what to produce, when to produce and where to produce since they, under the control of their 'own' products, are forced to act in accordance with the demands of a bigger market laying down the rules. In this context, they, unable to

realize the objectified form of their one-sided activity, cannot actualize and fulfil the instinctual needs in their species-being and, therefore, experience alienation.

1.4.3. Division of Labour

The concept of the division of labour in Marxist terminology is closely associated with alienation theory since it is an inclusive social expression of the alienated productive activity of man. The division of labour, forced upon man as a particular and exclusive sphere of activity from which he is not able to escape, operates as the basic principle of the capitalistic mode of production and expresses the social character of labour: "[T]he division of labour [is] nothing else but the estranged, alienated positing of human activity as a real activity of the species or as activity of man as a species being. (Marx 1844, 55). The division of labour, the crippling impacts of which are viewed upon the worker, brings alienation in its wake since smaller tasks are assigned to each individual. For instance, in a large-scale manufacturing industry, the worker does only one kind of work and relies upon others to carry out whatever else is essential for production, after which he gradually becomes mechanized and monotonous and acts as a cog in a machine due to increased mechanical automation. This particularism, reducing the individual to a one-sided being and setting him against *the* other, promotes antagonism rather than mutuality, negates the universality of man and "shuts him within his own partial self" (Avineri 1970, 122). The worker, mechanically producing in order to satisfy his elementary needs rather than 'creating' useful products that will affirm his existential being, is, in return, fragmented, degraded, atomized and isolated: "[T]he capitalist system prefers a stupid, mechanized worker who has no human skills beyond ability to perform the task imposed upon him" (Kolakowski 1981, 286). Considering Marx's conception of human nature, the worker, carrying out a single activity commanded by a senior 'fellow' and becoming unaware of

his true creative potentials, cannot find an opportunity to realize the objectified form of his labour and to see the real organic whole, surrounding conditions and results, which indeed disrupts his human existence and alienates him since his own work does not belong to him and he, for that reason, does not have the means to actualize his abilities and self-meaningfulness.

1.4.4. Commodity Fetishism

Commodity fetishism, having an important place in Marx's critique of political economy, is a mode of reification and corresponds to the misconception of individuals about the products of their labour and to the transformation of human relations into thing-beings in accordance with the laws of the money-oriented world. In his well-known work, *History and Class Consciousness*, the Hungarian critic Georg Lukács points out that commodity fetishism or reification is one of the specific problems of our age and that commodity fetishism is not a marginal but a central structural problem for capitalist societies. In order to analyse how far commodity fetishism influences the outer and inner lives of society by sinking into the consciousness of human beings, Lukács distinguishes two sides of reification:

> Objectively – a world of objects and relations between things springs into being … Subjectively – where the market economy has been fully developed – a man's activity becomes estranged from himself, it turns into a commodity which, subject to the non-human objectivity of the natural law of society, must go its own way independently of man just like consumer article. (Lukács 1971, 87)

At this point, both of these sides run through the same processes and are subordinated to the same laws, and capitalist commodity production, reproducing the relations of production, continuously imposes the qualities of reification on the consciousness of human beings.

Many Marxist theorists focus on the concept of commodity fetishism within the boundaries of alienation despite the fact that the discussions about it have never been as extensive and detailed as those around alienation. To give some examples, Petrovic (1965) makes the point that commodity fetishism is a special case of alienation, while I. I. Rubin (1972) points out that it is a scientific reconstruction of alienation theory. M. Kangrga (qtd. in Petrovic 1965) similarly indicates that reification "is a higher, that is, the highest form of alienation". Considering these arguments, the relationship between alienation and reification can be articulated through the fact that man is alienated to his fellows since everything related to human beings is conceived with a materialistic point of view. An individual cannot find an opportunity to intellectually reproduce himself in a conscious, free and active sense since the process of alienation, taking away the object of his production from man, also takes away his human nature, dominates his consciousness and transforms his existence into a means of physical existence, which subsequently leads individuals, working 'independently' from each other because of the division of labour, to fulfil their intrinsic needs through the products in the market. Their social status, their standard of living, the satisfaction of their needs, their freedom, and their power are all determined by the value of these commodities they own (Marcuse 1955), and the state of class consciousness is replaced by the state of false consciousness.

Although they are perceived as trivial and unimportant at first sight, these products/commodities, having the social character of an individual's labour, practically have mystical qualities and are presented as a social relation, existing not between individuals, but between the products of their own labour, as they gain their peculiar nature in relation to market exchange:

> A commodity is … a mysterious thing … the products of labour become commodities, social things whose qualities are at the same time perceptible

> and imperceptible by the senses. … A definite social relation between men … assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things … This I call the Fetishism which attaches itself to the products of labour, so soon as they are produced as commodities, and which is therefore inseparable from the production of commodities. (Marx 1867, 47)

The value of a commodity is, in this regard, not set by its usefulness, but by its ability to create exchange and affluence, and man's labour, the social character of which comes to be seen as a set of material relationships between 'things', becomes a commodity which is sold and bought (Marx 1867, 48). In commodity fetishism, human powers are attributed to inanimate objects since the intrinsic qualities of a product under capitalist production conditions are not important and the value of a product is actually created by its social value determined by exchange value and society. In the capitalist mode of production, taking over the totality of an individual, subordinating them to the market and reshaping them in accordance with the needs of capital (Braverman 1974, 271), everything related to human beings, human relations, social status, living standards, freedom and power, becomes an extension and function of money since the process of reification irreversibly objectifies the actual social relations of human beings and commodifies intimacy and genuineness.

1.5. Melvin Seeman and his Theory of Alienation

After Marx, there have been many academic studies regarding the concept of alienation from a number of different disciplines. Some of these academic studies, including Erich Fromm's *Marx's Concept of Man* (1961), Herbert Marcuse's *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (1955), Georg Lukacs' *History and Class Consciousness* (1971), Bertell Ollman's Ali*enation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society* (1971), Istvan Meszaros' *Marx's Theory of Alienation* (1970) and Allen W. Wood's *Karl Marx* (2004), are explicitly elaborations of Marxist alienation and

further analyse the process of Marxist estrangement. But the critique of alienation has also acquired new dimensions in relation to more recent historical and cultural shifts and has become one of the key concepts in a variety of disciplines from psychology to sociology. These studies (Etzioni 1968, Novack and Mandel 1970, Jessor et al. 1973, Josephson 1962, Kaufman 1965, Kalekin-Fishman 1996, Geyer 1996, Neal and Collas 2000, Negri 2001) generally focus on loss, discontent and frustration, and examine the alienating social and cultural orientations ascribed by the prevailing mode of production.

In this context, the theoretical contribution of Melvin Seeman, identifying five dimensions of alienation which are successively powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and social isolation, is particularly useful as a tool for analysing individuals alienated as a result of social, political and cultural circumstances after the 1950s, for this is the period on which Seeman reflects. At first glance, the alienation theory of Seeman seems to be different from that of Marx, but Seeman's theory is basically a follow-up on Marx's alienation theory but theoretically more appropriate to circumstances after the 1950s. Seeman's argument, however, is that individuals are still as unable to be aware of their human potential or to actualize themselves under the hegemony of capital even in the post-industrial/postmodern era with its celebration of individualism, creativity and freedom.

Seeman's first dimension of alienation is powerlessness which corresponds to "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behaviour cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks" (Seeman, 1959, 784). When individuals realize that there is a gap between what they want to achieve and what they can achieve, they suffer from alienation in the form of powerlessness (Kalekin-Fishman 1996, 97). In post-industrial societies, external agencies, shaping the lives of individuals,

even control how individuals can construct their intimate lives instead of allowing them to regulate their own time, and links between the goal-oriented actions and perceived outcomes become further obscured since individuals can neither dominate nor even participate in the decision-making process; bureaucratized and isolated individuals are consequently led to be convinced of their powerlessness and therefore become indifferent and uninformed. This notion of Seeman is actually similar to the second aspect of the alienation theory of Marx in which a worker is unable to actualize himself through the objects he creatively produces without being subordinated to another agency.

The second dimension of alienation is meaninglessness which is experienced when an individual cannot decide what to believe or trust since there is a huge world of opposing ideas and confusing options in the post-industrial era and the minimum standards for clarity in terms of decision making cannot be sustained. According to Seeman (1959, 786),

> [Meaninglessness] is characterized by a low expectancy that satisfactory predictions about the future outcomes of behaviour can be made. Put more, simply, where the first meaning of alienation refers to the sensed ability to control outcomes, this second meaning refers essentially to the sensed ability to predict behavioural outcomes.

In the presence of such complex affairs, inaccurate information and external control mechanisms, individuals run through a process that prevents them from feeling confident and self-assured. Reinterpreting the concept of meaninglessness in the postmodern period, Geyer similarly remarks:

> With the accelerating throughput of information ... meaningless is not a matter anymore of whether one can assign meaning to incoming information, but of whether one can develop adequate new scanning mechanisms to gather the goal-relevant information one needs, as well as more efficient selection procedures to prevent being overburdened by the information one does not need, but is bombarded with on a regular basis. (Geyer 1996, xxiii)

Within this information overload which is controlled externally, individuals feel worthless and meaningless and cannot predict the results of their actions, behaviours and what or whom to trust, as a consequence of which they become estranged in a similar way to that of the experience of the process of disempowerment. The notion of meaninglessness can also be interpreted as an extension of Marxist alienation since individuals, estranged from their human nature and fellows in the industrial era, become further alienated as a consequence of the data overload that is a key feature of the post-industrial era.

Normlessness or anomie, referring to situations "in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down or are no longer effective as rules for behaviour", is the third aspect of alienation (Seeman 1959, 787). Humanist traditions in post-industrial Western societies are losing their significance owing to the rise of individualism, 'instability', excessive competition and interpersonal mistrust, and authority is more and more transferred from religion and family to political institutions. The process of normlessness, for that reason, quickens the process of the alienation of man from man as individuals are also estranged from the traditional values which have held them together in previous epochs. This shift of authority in post-industrialism undermines traditional moral values and implicitly imposes competitive individualism, basically functioning to prolong the life of capitalism – although this does not of course mean that traditional moral values, which also led individuals into alienation and hampered the process of self-actualization essential for the development of concrete individuals – were intrinsically superior. As Kalekin-Fishman (1996, 97) states:

> Anomie, or normlessness, the bewilderment that may accompany a rapid change in position or status, is a type of alienation with which people in modern society often have to cope … Paradoxically, however, the opposite of normlessness is a slavish commitment to conventional means to achieve conventional goals, which is also a sign of alienated affect.

In this context, the concepts related to 'normlessness' reform and legitimate the prevailing mode of production by pumping new hopes and creating an illusory freedom for individuals just as traditional moral concepts and norms do.

Self-estrangement, the failure of an individual to realize his own nature and potential, another characteristic of alienation, corresponds to the perceived discrepancy between the preferred qualities and the actualized qualities and reveals that "the individual's engagement in activities that are not intrinsically rewarding vs involvement in a task or activity for its own sake" results in his self-alienation (Seeman 1975, 105). This concept is reminiscent of the third stage of Marxist alienation in which individuals are doomed to be alienated from their human nature and subsequently from themselves mainly due to the division of labour at the workplace. In post-industrialism, individuals, not acting freely and creatively in order to fulfil the needs related to their human nature, denying their own potential and trying to actualize themselves through extrinsically satisfying escape mechanisms, become the victims of powerlessness, meaninglessness and normlessness and cannot identify themselves with others in the society, which, in return, results in self-estrangement. Commenting on this, Seeman (1975, 105) inventively voices two aspects of alienation, depersonalization and reification, which are also descriptive of self-estrangement:

> [C]omplaints are often advanced concerning the treatment of others instrumentally, as objects or abstract means rather than intrinsically as human or whole persons, such instrumental treatment being one of the signs of alienation; and … there is considerable talk about succumbing to the reification process, meaning essentially to a distortion of experience wherein interaction and institutions are transformed into objects and commodities- into thing.

Individuals, feeling segregated and estranged from their own communities, consequently experience social isolation, the fifth aspect of Seeman's alienation theory, which is

revealed in daily relations that are depersonalized, commodified and based purely on personal interests. The post-industrial era, lacking any ongoing intimate and genuine social relationships, provides fertile ground for social isolation, atomization, and its sources are, in this context, deeply embedded in the functioning of the money-oriented world.

CHAPTER III: ALAN SILLITOE

Born in Nottingham on 4 March 1928, Alan Sillitoe spent most of his childhood in a working-class vicinity of Nottingham. His mother, Silvina Burton, worked in a lace factory in Nottingham, and his father, Christopher Sillitoe, was a tanner until he became unemployed due to the economic collapse caused by the Great Depression of 1929-34 (Hanson 1999, 3). During Sillitoe's childhood, his family existed in dire poverty: "We lived in a room on Talbot Street whose four walls smelled of leaking gas, stale fat, and layers of mouldering wallpaper" (Sillitoe 1978, 76). In an interview, Sillitoe recalls those days as such: "My strongest memory is anxiety about money, of the misery it caused, of my father's depression of and the quarrels between him and my mother" (1961, 5)[20]. The start of the Second World War, though intensifying national anxieties, paradoxically brought one kind of relief for many working-class men and women for it created new jobs in the factories and mines. However, people were living constantly in fear of their lives despite the temporary prosperity they experienced (Hanson 1999, 3). Sillitoe was no exception: "I lived, in a house only a hundred yards from a vast factory engaged on full war production, which the Germans constantly attempted to bomb and machine-gun" (Sillitoe 1975, 16). When Sillitoe failed at school, he became a labourer and worked in different factories at the age of fourteen, which was, according to him, "marvellous after this long period of misery without any money and so on" (1973: 38). At seventeen, he joined the army, and started seriously writing literary works towards the end of his military service.

[20] Anonymous Reporter. "Says Alan Sillitoe: Nottingham Has Not Changed Since Film", *Nottingham Evening News*, April 6, 1961.

Sillitoe's output was hugely prolific, with novels, short stories, poems and dramas amongst his outputs. In his works, he rendered the themes of hunger, poverty, escape, war and even the threat of death, which was constant during his childhood; his characters, whose attitudes develop on the basis of their social and cultural milieu, draw closely on autobiographical experience and his political reflection on the situation of his class, often looking back on his own experiences and social consciousness as a former factory worker in post-war Britain. Perhaps, not surprisingly, the literary works of Sillitoe in the 1950s, depicting and analysing individual lives situated within a distinctively evoked and detailed socio-historical process[21], have, for the most part, been regarded as falling within the conventions and constraints of literary realism[22]. David Lodge, for example, discusses how Sillitoe can be included in a group of realist writers in the 1950s who were "content to use, only with slight modifications, the conventions of 1930s and Edwardian realism" (1979, 213), while Stanley S. Atherton (1979) makes the point that the narrative style of Sillitoe is apparently realistic. In a similar way, Ronald Dee Vaverka argues that "it is through the method of [social] realism that Sillitoe is able to produce successful works of art" and that "the treatment of [his] characters is not static; on the contrary, they live in an interactive relationship with their social milieu" (1978, 24-8). Christopher Taylor suggests

---

[21] Gillian Mary Hanson in *Understanding Alan Sillitoe* argues: "Nottingham and its natives gave him his subject matter, but the indelible two-edged endowment of freedom from hunger and possible destruction presented by the war must have suggested to this writer the related themes of entrapment and escape, agitation and peace, love and hate, madness and mitigation, and movement and inertia so frequently present in his works" (1999, 4).

[22] Although the concept of realism is subject to constant change and can therefore be highly confusing, it basically refers to the accurate, faithful and straightforward portrayal of events in human life through an artistic and literary manner. It attempts to reflect reality as it is without literary conventions and misplaced aesthetic beautification or imagination. In *Social Realism: Art as a Weapon* (1973), David Shapiro divides the concept of realism in the twentieth century into two, social realism and socialist realism: "Social realism, opposed to the ruling class and its mores, predominantly selects as its subject matter the negative aspects of life under capitalism: labour conflicts, poverty, the greediness of capitalists, the nobility of long-suffering workers. Socialist realism … selects as its subject matter the positive aspects of life under socialism: happy, cooperating workers, the beauty of factory and countryside, well-fed, healthy children, and so on" (20). In this respect, the works of Alan Sillitoe can be categorized as an example of the social realism of the 1950s.

that the dominant form of the Sillitoe's fiction is realism despite the fact that his realism is structurally different to its nineteenth-century conventions (1986). However, some critics have taken issue with this assessment: despite bearing the aspect of realism in terms of apparent treatment of his subject matter, Sillitoe, according to Sally Minogue and Andrew Palmer (2002), "does violence to the standard modes of realism, thus challenging the formal and representational constraints of the tradition of working-class fiction in which he is working" (127). Moreover, simply reading Sillitoe as a conventional realist, for these critics, undervalues his achievements as a writer. Sillitoe's narrative techniques in his fiction, "the fluid relationship between the third-person narrative voice and the central character", "the use of free indirect speech and internal monologue", ideologically functioning to represent the internal thoughts of an under-represented class in literary texts, and "the rejection of linear plot construction", go beyond the usual bounds of realism, disrupting the traditional classification of his text as realist and therefore helping us to locate Sillitoe's work as more representative of modernist fiction (Bentley 2007, 206; Lodge 1979).

Sillitoe's most acclaimed work, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, however, was largely praised on publication for its ability to precisely provide a realistic snapshot of working-class life in Nottingham during the 1950s, focalised through the eyes of Arthur Seaton, its protagonist, a man in his mid-twenties, working as a lathe operator at a bicycle factory who spends his weekends dressing up, drinking excessively, falling into occasional fights and brawls and always hoping for opportunities to sleep with married women. Published in England in 1958, the novel earned the Author's Club Award for the best English first novel of that year. In one of his interviews, Sillitoe explains how the novel came into existence:

> I started it in 1955 while living in Majorca. I'd already written some novels at that time – which were neither good nor publishable because I hadn't really learned how to write. The best thing I'd done were a few short stories, and after a while I saw that they were centred around one character, whom I called Arthur Seaton. Then I saw him in terms of a novel –which I spent the next 18 months putting together, finishing the final draft in 1957. (1973, 42)

Like most first novels, this novel attracted little critical attention at first although the *Observer* listed it as one of the best books of 1958 by the end of the year, and *Books and Bookmen* announced it as the best first novel of 1958 in 1959 (Atherton 1979, 110). However, over time, the importance of the novel was recognised, and it was subsequently subjected to widespread critical examination in numerous journals and daily newspapers. In the *New Yorker*, Anthony West wrote: "Sillitoe has assured himself a place in the history of the English Novel … there have been novels about working-class life in England before … [but] *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, carries a disturbing jolt" (1959, 100). What almost all critical responses shared in their appreciation of what seemed hugely innovative in this novel was Sillitoe's ability to authentically portray working-class life within the aesthetic structures of the novel. In his review, Roy Perrott remarked that Sillitoe had "faithful social observation which made [the novel] likeable" (1959), whereas Richard Mayne in the *Sunday Times* admired its "very outspoken and vivid glimpse of working-class life" (1958, 18). Likewise, John Wain in the *Observer* emphasised the fact that the novel depicted a social reality which was not disassociated from its cultural context: "I know nothing about the interior life of a typical lathe operator, and not very much about his exterior life; but I felt confident reading Mr Sillitoe's book, that I was getting a truthful account, it felt solid and accurate" (1958, 20). In the *New York Times Book Review*, Malcolm Bradbury similarly stated:

> Alan Sillitoe … has caught much of the mood of the present-day working-class in England – its half-conscious spirit of rebellion, its exploitative laziness

> and non-co-operation, its uneasy respect for law and order, its secret sympathy for the clever rogue and the army deserter. (1959, 4-5)

This authenticity of the novel, which makes "an immediate impression of being very much the real thing" (Allen 1962 5), was also echoed by Maurice Richardson: "[w]hat is good about the book is the vividness of the detailed description of pub, factory and kitchen life" (1958, 539-40). In this sense, the novel was categorically labelled as a true working-class novel. For example, Peter Green in the *Daily Paragraph* wrote that *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* was "that rarest of all finds: a genuine, no-punches-pulled, unromanticised working-class novel" (1958, 15), while Anthony West claimed the novel to be a "genuine working-class novel" (1959, 100) and Hitchcock discussed how it was "an articulation of the strength and dilemmas of the very possibility of a working-class fiction" (1989, 57). However, in an interview, Sillitoe himself said "I don't see myself as a working-class novelist. I see myself as a novelist and I always have" (Sillitoe in Lefranc 1973, 39) and described the novel as "simply a novel" by pointing out that "the greatest inaccuracy was ever to call the book a 'working-class novel' for it is really nothing of the sort" (qtd. in Billington 2010); he referred to it instead as a "picaresque novel" (Sillitoe in Lefranc 1973, 42).

Subsequent to such reviews, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* has been analysed and interpreted in more detail by academic critics and, over time, through a number of different critical theories and perspectives, including feminist, Bakhtinian, cultural materialistic and existentialist perspectives. A very brief overview of some of these approaches will give a flavour of how critical writing on the novel has developed since its first publication. In his *Working-Class Fiction in Theory and Practice: A Reading of Alan Sillitoe*, for example, Hitchcock makes use of Bakhtin's concept of dialogism in order to examine the verbal discourse of the novel:

> A consideration of the dialogism of the oppressed with respect to Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* requires careful exegesis of Bakhtin's particular claims for dialogism in the novel … Sillitoe's text will throw some light on Bakhtin's problematic formulations which will in return reassert the dialectical nature of this textual analysis (1989, 58)

Stanley S. Atherton in *Alan Sillitoe: A Critical Assessment* (1979) analyses the physical conditions and attitudes of working-class life in the UK in the second half of the twentieth century through a materialist reading of Sillitoe's literary works:

> [This book] examines a number of relevant criteria, including the social and political background, biographical material, the author's views on the nature and function of literary art, the place of a working-class frame of reference in the tradition of the English novel, and independent sociological evidence to provide an assessment of Sillitoe's early works. (7)

In *Understanding Alan Sillitoe* (1999), Gillian Mary Hanson explores the existential struggle of Sillitoe's heroes by focusing on their self-actualization processes during the course of their development throughout the novels. In a similar way, Anna Ryan Nardella in "The Existential Dilemmas of Alan Sillitoe's Working-Class Heroes" (1973), examines the attempts of Sillitoe's heroes to find "the vital self" and to define themselves "as being or nonbeing in a chaotic, disturbed universe" in which "life and identity are constantly threatened by personal and/or impersonal forces" (469). William Hutchings, in "Proletarian Byronism: Alan Sillitoe and the Romantic Tradition" (1993), unveils the existential nature of the novel in which marginalized individuals resisting dominant society are presented. In his article, proposing a reading of Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* that centres on "the abilities and the limits of male speech in the construction of a working-class masculine gender identity", Daniel Lewis, from a feminist point of view, examines the utterances of the working-class characters and explains how the male speech "creates and establishes different hierarchical relationships between men and women in the novel" (91).

So, *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* has evidently been approached through a wide range of different theories; however, it is, surprisingly enough, barely possible to find studies that focus on the novel from a Marxist perspective. Such literary analyses that do exist tend to focus on the formal characteristics of the novel rather than its content. For Example, Ronald Dee Vaverka in his *Commitment as Art: A Marxist Critique of a Selection of Alan Sillitoe's Political Fiction* (1978) emphasizes "the profound dependence of the creative process upon social reality", examines "the relevance of artistic creativity to reality", and attempts to determine to what extent the political fiction of Sillitoe succeeds in aesthetic terms if approached through a framework of Marxist aesthetics (1978: 1). Vaverka focuses on the interaction between the decisive significance of reality and artistic production, but his style-oriented approach falls short of offering a satisfactorily Marxist analysis of the novel which might offer a more dialectical reading, focusing on form and content as indissociably related in the production of the work.

Taking this observation further, the aim of this chapter is, therefore, to propose a Marxist reading of Sillitoe's fiction[23], particularly *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, through deployment of the Marxist concepts of class and class consciousness, alienation, mechanization, reification, false consciousness and petty-bourgeois morality in order to elucidate the metaphors of mental and physical rebellion against the Establishment and the escape mechanisms of the characters from the estrangement process of the workplace/industrialism within the dichotomies of appearance/substance and 'them'/'us'. Over the course of the chapter, the domestic, cultural, social and political tendencies of the characters will be reinterpreted with an attempt to lay out critically the novel's authentic portrayal of the socio-historical reality of class consciousness and its emergence as part of

[23] This chapter will also focus on Sillitoe's *Key to the Door* and "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner".

the particular and complex historical circumstances pertaining in the UK during the 1950s. The novel will therefore be approached in conjunction with other key texts that engage with history and class consciousness, including, most significantly, Richard Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working- Class Life*. In this way, the atomizing, commodifying, alienating and victimizing influences of industrial capitalism in historical actuality will also be investigated through the examination of the ways in which Sillitoe mediates the subjective experiences of the working-class characters in the novel. My reading will further engage formalist, phenomenological and existentialist perspectives.

1. The Dichotomy of 'Them' and 'Us'

In one of his articles published in a special Nottingham issue of *Anarchy* (1964), Sillitoe focuses on the psychology of being poor with an attempt to analyse the conditions of working-class life. Condemning petty-bourgeois morality and discussing the differences between the working class and the upper class in terms of lifestyle, mentality and cultural and political tendencies, Sillitoe explores the central bias of working-class life, theorizing the dichotomy of 'them' and 'us'[24] by asserting that, in order to define themselves, working-class people have developed a simple sociological perception about the world which can be divided into two:

> The poor know of only two classes in society … [They] are *them* and *us*. Them are those who tell you what to do, who drive a car, use a different accent, are buying a house in another district, deal in cheques and not money, pay your wages, collect rent and telly dues … can't look you in the eye … hand you the dole or national assistance money; the shopkeeper, copper, schoolteacher, doctor, health visitor, the man wearing the white dog-collar.

[24] In Benjamin Disraeli's novel entitled *Sybil, or The Two Nations* (1845), Stephen Morley, a worker, states: "Two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts, and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by a different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws" (66). This actually shows that such a dichotomy has always been a part of the history of human beings.

> Them are those who robbed you of your innocence, live on your backs, buy the house from over your head, eat you up, or tread you down. Above all, the poor who are not crushed in spirit hate the climbers, the crawlers, the happy savers, the parsimonious and respectable –like prison. (1964, 127)

Sillitoe's insistence on such an explicitly class-conscious attitude towards dominant groups in his culture is highly reminiscent of Richard Hoggart's discursive construction of 'them' and 'us' in *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life*[25] in which Hoggart gives a powerful, honest and subjective account of the experiences of working-class people in the urban centres of Northern England like Leeds, Hull and Sheffield between the 1930s and 1950s. In order to reinforce working-class solidarity and to sustain a sense of being a member of a group in a "friendly", "cooperative and "neighbourly" (2009, 65) way, this discursive rhetoric is relatively functional for working-class people, according to Hoggart, and 'them' includes a variety of occupations including "policemen", "civil servants", "local-authority employees" and "foremen":

> The world of 'Them' is the world of the bosses … 'Them' may be, as occasion requires, anyone from the classes outside other than the few individuals from those classes whom working-people know as individuals … 'They' are 'the people at the top', the people who give you your dole, call you up, tell you to go to war, fine you, made you split the family in the thirties to avoid a reduction in the Means Test allowance … 'aren't really to be trusted', 'talk posh', 'are all twisters really' … 'will do y' down if they can' … 'treat y' like muck'. (2009, 57-8)

This class antagonism constructed upon the binary opposition between 'them' and 'us' is one of the basic political motivations of narration in Sillitoe's literary works; indeed, it reflects how Sillitoe's working-class characters perceive and comprehend the

[25] In "The Historical Context of Post-War British Literature" (2010), Patricia Waugh states that Hoggart's book seeks out "both to attack the parochialism of British society and to expose as a myth the tendency of the Left-leaning middle-classes to sentimentalize the working classes as a species of 'noble savage'" and that Hoggart actually delineates "an authentic portrayal of working-class life by accentuating tactile and sensory experience: what it feels like to live in back-to-back housing alongside thundering railway lines, to walk everyday along littered streets spattered with dog dirt, drawing in smells of gasworks and bombarded by screams of street urchins with pasty faces. What it feels like to remain anchored all one's life to one small locality and never to experience a world outside" (42).

world around them – understood more abstractly as 'British society' – as divided between 'them' and 'us'. The working-class characters feeling themselves neglected, exploited and rejected, particularly in the early fiction, align themselves with their own class by revealing antipathy and hatred towards the oppression and the repressive mechanisms of the dominant social order and non-working-class individuals and institutions. And a them-us contradiction is expressed through the inner and outer conflicts of the characters which are unfolded in relation to their social, cultural, moral and personal experiences. Commenting upon this, Malek M. Salman (1990) states:

> Sillitoe infuses an overt language and class consciousness into his early work as his characters' sentiments are pervaded with an overt and undisguised animosity towards the world of 'them' … Sillitoe's characters are motivated by a common set of assumptions and attitudes. Their background is clearly defined, and they are fully aware of their identity and where they belong … they are presented as sharing a developed sense of social awareness, an awareness that established the society divided between 'them' and 'us' as a battleground on which both sides perpetually confront each other. (203-4)

The destructive, chaotic and anarchist tendency of Arthur Seaton in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* is a precise example of the rebellious nature and anger against 'them' – or the Establishment. Despite being self-centred and primarily concerned with how to spend his fourteen-pound wage on dapper suits, Arthur, feeling trapped within the mechanisms of this alienating and dehumanizing money-oriented world, rages against the system and stands "for his rights" (33): "I'm a bloody billy-goat trying to screw the world, and no wonder I am, because it's trying to do the same to me" (203). Conceiving his world as a hostile place in which "there had never been any such things as safety, and never would be" (9), Arthur revolts against the institution of family, law, government, army and industrial capitalism in an individualised way: "Don't let the bastards grind you down" (38).

The metaphors of mental rebellion against 'them' are relatively visible in Arthur's free-floating interior monologues while working as a lathe-operator at a bicycle factory: "This lathe is my everlasting pal because it gets me thinking" (202). His discomfort with his stifling and repetitive working conditions and consequent questioning of his exploitation and victimization with respect to the factories and governmental institutions and policies are convincingly rendered by Sillitoe:

> It's best to rebel so as to show 'em it don't pay to try to do you down. Factories and labour exchanges and insurance offices keep us alive and kicking … factories sweat you to death, labour exchanges talk to you to death, insurance and income tax offices milk money from your wage pockets and rob you to death. And if you're still left with a tiny bit of life in your guts after all this boggering about, the army calls you up and you get shot to death. And if you are clever enough to stay out of the army you get bombed to death. (202)

Arthur's personal aversion towards army and war is also explicitly suggested in the novel. He recalls his experiences in the army – one of the institutions classified as a part of 'them': "When I'm on my fifteen-days' training … the bastards … put the gun into my hands" (132). One day, Arthur is conscripted again after the war and ironically becomes a Redcap due to his physical characteristics. As a military policeman, his objection to a possible war between Britain and Russia is worth focusing on:

> Let them start a war … [but] 'Them at the top' must know that nobody would fight … they were angling for another war now, with Russians this time. But they did go as far as to promise that it would be a short one … What a lark! We'd be fighting side by side with the Germans that had been bombing us in the last year … They think they've settled our hashes with their insurance cards and television sets, but I'll be one of them to turn round on 'em and let them see how wrong they are. (131-2)

Arthur's rebellion against a capitalist war of 'them' regarding the "territorial division of the whole world" and "the dominance of finance capital" and of "international monopolist capitalist associations" (Lenin 1999, 10) is a clear reflection of the fact that he is essentially opposed to being a soldier of the ruling class: "I tell you I hate the army, and I

allus have done … I'm not daft enough to like it" (134). Arthur locates his position against the war in accordance with the impulses driving his personal and social experiences rather than taking up or reflecting on more abstract political ideas in their distinct theoretical and historical context. In *Key to the Door*, Mary, the grandmother of Brian Seaton, similarly stands up to the war of "them Italians" against the "poor black people" in Addis Ababa and makes the point that "nobody" won the war as she, "not wanting to be fobbed off with any point", lost uncle Oliver in the last war (90). These examples, indeed, support Hoggart's arguments in *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life* in which he points out that working-class people are more inclined to follow ideas having their root in something real[26], personal and concrete instead of theories and that working-class people are, in fact, anti-militarist:

> Working-class people are not, we know, particularly patriotic: they have streaks of insularity, of Francophobia and Americanophobia; but if put to the question they will soon say that working-class people are the same the world over. They remain confirmed anti-militarists; the memory of the old days, old brothers going into the army through lack of a job or to escape some trouble, and having to be bought out at great sacrifice [is still alive]. (2009, 92)

The episode of "Rat Face"[27] in the novel is particularly striking in terms of comprehending the attitude of the working class towards the agents of the Establishment. While walking with Fred, Arthur hears the sound of breaking glass and encounters a woman holding a man by his wrist since he broke the window of a shop with a beer mug.

[26] In *Key to the Door*, while inspecting the class of Mr. Bates, Mr. Jones, the headmaster of the school, explains the painful impacts and consequences of war to the students including Brian through realistic imageries: "It is hard to tell you what war is, but I can promise one thing: there'll be plenty of pain flying about. I suppose the easiest I can think of in war is when you have to queue all day in snow for food or coke, and when you have to eat horse flesh at the end of it, and when you have to listen to the noise of sirens. Not much pain there, is there? However ... one of the hardest pains perhaps is when one is left wounded after a battle without water or food ... war means nothing but pain. Some people escape it, but don't let that be a comfort to you, because during a war the earth will convulse with pain, and it will get you and me and possibly everyone else" (184).

[27] The longest published poem of Sillitoe is also called "The Rats" in which rats refers to "all the agents of organized political, religious, and governmental society who prey upon and try to devour the individual" (Gindin 1962, 43).

The woman, aligning "herself with order and law" (108), wears an army uniform which "immediately prejudiced him [Arthur]" (108) while the man is an "odd, lonely person who gave off an air of belonging nowhere" (109). The woman, whose face is like "Old Rat Face" (109), refuses to release the man and waits for the police. Although the crowd shouts that "he be set free" and Arthur passes him a lighted cigarette and whispers to him to "run", the man, having petty-bourgeois tendencies, does not run and prefers to answer the questions of the police "truthfully" and with "clarity" to "satisfy the police" (112). In this respect, the woman in khaki/army clothes acts as an agent of the army collaborating with the police; she is another agent of 'them'. She can, therefore, be seen to symbolize an "inhuman figure of authority" and represents oppression and "institutionalized violence through her pitiless treatment of the window breaker" (Vaverka 1978, 43). The reaction of the crowd and Arthur, on the contrary, suggests the solidarity of 'us' against 'them' the strength of which comes from "the close, huddled, intimate conditions of life" indicating that they "are, in fact, all in the same position" (Hoggart 2009, 65). In a similar way, Bentley argues:

> These acts of violence, focused on emblems of the consumer society, reproduce for the protagonist an inverse image of 'power', 'value' and 'achievement' normally associated with the act of work. As these individuals are alienated, in Marxist terms, from the produce of their labour in the factory, the pleasure of achievement is projected upon this act of vandalism. It is also significant that Arthur and Fred act with 'team-spirit', producing a communal solidarity in their 'illicit' actions. (216-17)

In *Key to the Door* (1961), the characters share a similar anger against the police officers who also stand for 'them'. In a conversation in which Brian and Bert, who would "still vote red for Labour" even if they had "ten trillion pound notes", have an argument about whether they would save a drowning policeman or not, Brian Seaton says "if a copper got cramp and I was near, I wouldn't help him to get out" whereas Bert declares

"Coppers is bastards" (156-7). Brian and Bert subsequently compare coppers with schoolteachers and reveal the reason why they do not like them: "They [coppers] are worse than schoolteachers … It's all part of the gov'ment. They're all Conservatives, as well" (156). Including teachers as a part of 'them' also reinforces the argument that 'them' represents "anything foreign, official, or bureaucratic" while 'us' represents "everything local and familiar" (Kalliney 2001, 109). In "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner"[28] (1959), Smith similarly describes policemen as "dirty bullying jumped-up" (29) and "big headed stupid ignorant bastards" (32) with a "Hitler"-like face and "illiterate blue eyes" (28), and rebelliously reacts against the threat of oppression and torture of the police officer: "I hoped one day though that him and all his pals [police officers] would be the ones to get the black-eyes and kicks; you never knew. It might come sooner than anybody thinks" (29-30). When a copper comes to question Smith about a robbery, Smith does not invite the copper in; instead he keeps the copper outside not to make the copper suspicious since "they know we ['us'] hate their guts and smell a rat if they think we're trying to be nice to them" (27). This hostility and demonstration of mistrust towards the agents of the Establishment justifies Hoggart's observations again:

> They [the working-class people] tend to regard the policeman primarily as someone who is watching them, who represents the authority which has its eye on them, rather than as a member of the public services whose job it is to help and protect them. 'Oh, the police always look after themselves. They'll stick by one another till they're blue in the face, and the magistrates always believe them', they have said for years, and go on saying. (2009, 58)

[28] When asked what inspired him to start writing the story, Sillitoe remarks: "While on a visit to England in the spring of 1957 I stayed in a country cottage, and one afternoon, idly looking out of window, I saw a man in white shorts and vest running by outside. He vanished around the bend of a tall hedge and headed towards a wood at the lane-end. I took out a blank sheet of foolscap and wrote on it a single sentence: The loneliness of the long-distance runner. Then I put the paper away and forgot all about it. A year later I was living in the Spanish seaport of Alicante, but had just given up my flat and was packing my things in order to come back to England. I was sorting through manuscripts and papers, throwing out much in order to lighten the suitcases. Then I saw this sheet of paper with 'The loneliness of the long-distance runner' written along the top of it, and without bothering anymore about packing I wrote eight thousand words of the story which was given that title when finished, the other half being completed after I got to England" (1968, 126).

In much of the early fiction of Sillitoe, the hatred of working-class people towards the government is mostly directed against the Conservatives or the Tories. The ruling government which is conceived as an extension of 'them' is blamed for the war and dire poverty, and conservative politicians are constantly mocked by the working-class characters. In *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, Arthur describes the Conservatives as "big fat Tory bastards in parliament" since "they rob" the workers' "wage packets every week with insurance and income tax" and try to tell the workers that "it's all for" the workers' "own good" (36). In *Key to the Door*, Brian Seton remembers his father claiming that "coppers" and "schoolteachers"[29] are "all Conservatives" and advising him not to vote for the Conservative party: "If ever yer vote conservative … I'll smash yer brains out" (156). Being aware that "millionaires vote Conservative", Brian also calls himself a "communist" (439) and emphasizes the association between 'them' and conservatives by stating that conservative is "an official word to be distrusted, hated in fact" (157) and that wars are indeed in the service of the ruling-class and have nothing to do for the working-class people: "He [Churchill] didn't give a bogger about us. It was all his bleeding factory-owners he saved, the jumped-up bags like owd Edgeworth who's making a fortune" (366). In "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner", Smith, implicitly criticizing the mass culture of the 1950s, similarly ridicules "some Tory [on TV] telling us about how good his government was going to be if we kept on voting for them – their slack chops rolling, opening and bumbling, hands lifting to twitch moustaches and touching their buttonholes

[29] In *Key to the Door*, Mr. Jones, the headmaster of the school, constantly tyrannizes and victimizes the students. "[A] gett, a four-eyed twopenn'orth o' coppers, a sludge-bumbing bastard who thumbed Brian six times across the shoulder with a hard knotty fist because he didn't open a book quickly enough" (115), Mr. Jones stalks the corridors during school hours in order to make sure that the teachers have the students well controlled. In an episode, Mr. Jones asks the students to draw "a pen-picture of the Old Sea Dog, when he comes to the Admiral Benbow Inn" (126). Unable to understand what Mr. Jones means, Brian starts drawing a picture instead of writing a description of what the captain looks like. Then, Mr. Jones notices the "mistake" and humiliates and hits Brian in front of the class. Brian, on the other hand, says under his breath: "I wish old Jones would die ... why don't he die? Why don't the old swine die?" (127).

to make sure the flower hadn't wilted, so that you could see they didn't mean a word they said" (20).

Although Hoggart points out that "most working-class people are non-political and non-metaphysical in their outlook" (86) since they think "there's no future in it for them" and "politics never did anybody any good" (85), Sillitoe's working-class characters, being opposed to being governed by the Conservative Party, actively align themselves with the Labour Party as well as having a certain tendency towards and sympathy with communism. In *Key to the Door*, young working-class people regularly visit a local club supported by the Labour Party (363), whereas Bert insists on voting for the "Labour" even if he had "trillion pound notes" and Brian, influenced by his father who was "red Labour" (157), thinks that labour is the best thing. In *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, in spite of having inconsistent political ideas and indicating that he does not believe in equal share, Arthur illegally votes for the communists:

> I don't believe in share and share alike … I like to hear 'em talk about Russia, about farms and power-stations they've got, because it's interestin', but when they say that when they get in government everybody's got to share and share alike, then that's another thing … I did it because I thought the poor bloke wouldn't get any votes. I allus like to 'elp the losin' side" (35-6).

The political alignment of Sillioe's working-class characters against a traditional conservative government associated with privilege, tyranny and authority indicates how they comprehend and interpret English society divided between 'them' and 'us'. Having sympathy for "the losing of resentment at being perpetual underdogs in society" (87), feeling themselves rejected and facing nothingness in a chaotic world because of the ruling government, which is actually a "committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie" (Marx and Engels 1848, 15), these characters "constantly search

for ways to redress the balance" and "feel justified in stealing from them and frustrating their agents, the police, whenever the opportunity presents itself" (Atherton 1979, 87).

Violating laws is another mental motive for rebellion against 'them' since laws function as "the manipulating forces of control and repression" for the working-class characters (Vaverka 1978, 42). According to Hoggart, courts, liable for enforcing the laws, explicitly illustrate the division between 'them' and 'us, and have negative connotations upon the perceptions of working-class people:

> It [court] has an air of sour, scrubbed, provincial puritanism and mortification, from the stench of carbolic which meets you at the door, past the lavatories still marked MALES and FEMALES, to the huge pitch-pine bench lighted by high and narrow windows … to the working-class people in the well of the court they [superior officials] look like the hired and menacing … assistants of that anonymous authority (2009, 59-60)

Acting against the law therefore functions as a sort of illusory self-actualization for the characters, whereby they discharge anger and suppressed frustration against the repressive and alienating social order and restore and maintain a sense of dignity. The awareness of the working-class characters in the novel concerning the relationships among war, capital, laws and 'them' leads them to challenge the position of 'them' and to question their victimization, oppression and exploitation within a class-ridden society. Losing their trust in the force of the laws of 'them' and understanding the fact that laws function as a tool of the repressive state apparatus to dominate and suppress them, the working-class characters are inclined to sustain their own justice through explosions of physical rebellion which they regard as "perfect justice" (115). The episode in which Arthur is run over by a car is a precise instance of this argument. While walking along the road, a car hits Arthur, and the driver of the car starts shouting at and blaming him for the accident. In order to punish "the cranky driver leaning against the wall" (116) and "his four-seater friend" (114) which struck him, Arthur and Fred tip the car over and implement their own justice instead of

pursuing legal proceedings. The collective action of Arthur and Fred against the driver, symbolizing the wealthy class, and the car, alluding to the materialistic relations of the middle-class within the money-oriented world, is, perhaps, a reflection of the rebellious nature of the working-class characters against the unavoidable antagonism between 'them' and 'us' and a proof of the "self-conscious sense of community" (Hoggart 2009, 66) and potential solidarity that working-class characters can share in hope of a better future: "They felt a sublime team-spirit of effort filling their hearts with a radiant light of unique power and value, of achievement and hope for greater and better things. The weight was enormous at first, then became lighter and lighter, until the car was held gently" (*SNSM* 116). The working-class characters are shown as believing in a kind of 'natural justice' which is outside the law because the law claims to be fair and equal but is instituted in an economic context which is deeply unequal and therefore already unjust. Importantly, however, none of them 'theorises' the position in conceptual political terms. Commenting on this, Salman (1990, 205) points out that this tendency of the characters towards fighting against those controlling and perpetuating unjust social order is, in fact, more instinctive rather than expressive of an explicit ideological standpoint:

> Sillitoe's characters are not concerned with any kind of a united action motivated by political belief; they simply recognise that others are caught in the same trap as they are. The major achievement of this perception and representation of working-class solidarity lies … in the way Sillitoe's work shows the historical inevitability of this solidarity, one that is necessitated by shared social, economic and political conditions of living.

In "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner", the fundamental metaphor of the mental rebellion of 'us' against the laws of 'them' is described through the dichotomy of "in-law blokes", representing the governor, and "out-law blokes", representing Smith: "The rebellion is effectively dramatized through the conflict between the governor, and all the middle-class values he stands for, and Smith, and all the working-class values he

stands for" (Lockwood: 1966, 246). Functioning as an agent of the Establishment, the governor of the Borstal is descriptively depicted as a conservative person training Smith into adaptation to a society, the rules and laws of which are already rejected by him:

> A certain consistency of impression is immediately evoked in the manner of description such as the formal euphemistic expression "this establishment", the gesture of "smoothing out" his newspaper, his "lily-white workless hands", and the conservative *Daily Telegraph*. (Vaverka 1978, 60)

The first step of this 'integration' to the mainstream values in the society is based on the ideological-political problem of the concept of honesty. In the story, the governor wants Smith to be "an honest man" and win the cross-country race through "hard honest work" and "good athletics"; however, Smith refuses to compromise:

> I'm a human being and I've got thoughts and bloody life inside me that he doesn't know is there, and he'll never know what's there because he's stupid … Another thing people like the governor will never understand is that I am honest, that I've never been anything else but honest, and I'll always be honest … I know what honest means according to me and he only knows what it means according to him" (12-4)

Aware that he is used by the governor for his own interests; recollecting the "out-law death" of his father who did not want to die in a hospital like a "bleeding guinea-pig", and therefore refusing to sell his soul to the governor; and losing the race intentionally at the end of the story, Smith challenges the ideological hegemony of the status quo and debunks the myth of the morality of the "in-laws"[30].

Considering the material and political background of this conflict, it is noticeable that such moral codes, unconsciously shaping individuals, are historically conditioned[31]

[30] 'In-laws' refers to "the cops, governors, posh whores, penpushers, army officers, Members of Parliament" ("The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner", 14).

[31] Friedrich Engels points out that men, consciously or unconsciously, derive their moral ideas "in the last resort from the practical relations on which their class position is based – from the economic relations in which they carry on production and exchange" (Engels 1876/78, 53).

and are implicitly enforced by the institutions of the ruling class. From a Marxist perspective, the concept of morality is underpinned by a specifically bourgeois framework of what constitutes a moral action, and bourgeois morality is satirized on the basis that it serves the interests of the bourgeois class and status quo: "Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests" (Marx and Engels 1848, 20). For Friedrich Engels, the moral concepts and norms of 'them', hampering the development of human essence and self-actualization, necessary for the development of concrete individuals, should consequently be rejected, and working-class people should roof their morality upon working-class morality:

> [A]s society has hitherto moved in class antagonisms, morality has always been class morality; it has either justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or ever since the oppressed class became powerful enough, it has represented its indignation against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed … we have not yet passed beyond class morality. A really human morality which stands above class antagonisms and above any recollection of them becomes possible only at a stage of society which has not only overcome class antagonisms but has even forgotten them in practical life. (Engels 1876/78, 53)

In Marxist terminology, Marx's treatment of moralistic values and norms is also relativist. The moral value of an action or attitude hinges on whether it will hamper or promote the process of self-actualization and self-realization. To illustrate, there are basically moral and nonmoral goods in Marxism (Wood 2004, 129). Moral goods promote the class interests of the ruling class while nonmoral goods help create an atmosphere of freedom through which individuals can solidify their intrinsic qualities[32]. Moral goods include values like grace, fulfilling duties and possessing praiseworthy, admirable, respectable, benevolent and righteous character in accordance with social norms. On the

[32] It refers to the purposive need for productive activity carried out in a free, spontaneous, conscious and creative way.

other hand, nonmoral goods consist of what is good and beneficial for basic human needs and human essence. Allen Wood, in this sense, argues:

> Moral goods include such things as virtue, justice, the fulfillment of duty, and the possession of morally meritorious qualities of character. Nonmoral goods, on the other hand, include such things as pleasure and happiness, things which we would regard as desirable and good for people to have even if no moral credit is accrued from pursuing and possessing them. (Wood 2004, 129)

Failing to provide human beings with the nonmoral goods, capitalism injects moral goods like social hierarchy, philistinism, virtue, individualism and honesty. These moral standards, functioning through a mystifying ideology, primarily provide "a religious, metaphysical or bogus humanitarian rationale for observing morality's commands" (Wood 2004, 152). The followers of such moral codes and norms internalize the values of the ruling class and start acting in contradiction to their class interests and values.

In this context, for his own beliefs, values, and sense of honesty and pride, Smith deliberately loses the cross-country race and rejects the prospect of a comfortable prison life with easy jobs in Borstal[33] which indeed functions as a form of repressive state apparatus, imposing the moral codes of the 'in-laws' and creating "a sterile moral code that an authoritarian middle-class British society officially decrees all men shall uphold and live by" (Denny 1965, 3)[34]. Disobediently opposing the petty bourgeois norms of the Establishment which "trained and ordered and jailed him" (Gindin 1962, 40), Smith can therefore be viewed as a revolutionary person: "Inequalities in the distribution of wealth, the obvious gulf between the possessors of property, position and power of the working

[33] In "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner", Smith states: "What it does do is show me what they've been trying to frighten me with. They've got other things as well, like prison and, in the end, the rope … That knife is Borstal" (15).

[34]In "The Achievement of the Long-Distance Runner" (1965), N. Denny remarks: "For Borstal merely reflects in extreme form the regimen fondly devised by British society for the achievement of its official ideal, the 'gentleman', or, in more prosaic terms where the general populace is concerned, the 'good citizen', who can be relied upon to do nothing to upset the status quo" (7).

class, have given Smith both target and weapon in his war against them" (Atherton 1979: 74). However, his resistance and rebellion are practically defiant rather than revolutionary since he is substantially individualistic and self-oriented. His egoistic revolt against the cultural, social, political and economic extensions of 'them' cannot, in fact, result in any sort of real change in his social situation because the codes of his resistance remain within an isolated, self-centred and private sphere: "You see, by sending me to borstal they've shown me the knife, and from now on I know something l didn't know before: that it's war between me and them … I know who my enemies are and what war is … I knew I already was in a war of my own" (15).

Arthur's "rebellious individualism" (Bentley 2007, 201) and "defiant" attitudes (Waugh 2010, 36) against the mechanisms of the class-ridden society are essentially not so very different from those of Smith. His anarchic and egoistic tendencies are exercised in his own interests in spite of the fact that he has an awareness of the clash between labour and capital. The tension based on class antagonism[35] between Arthur and the rate-checker, the foreman, and the tool-setter, seeming to be "at each other's throats except when they ganged-up to get at yours" (32), which does not evolve into a political struggle, exemplifies this argument. In the novel, Arthur considers Robboe, the foreman[36], as "the enemy's scout"[37] (61) because Robboe, having a "car … and a semi-detached in a posh district" (42), is a careerist who regards the fourteen-quid wage as a "fortune" (61) and

[35] Nicos Poulantzas in *Class in Contemporary Capitalism* (1975) posits three different characteristics in order to locate the class positions in advanced capitalism. In his criteria of 'political relations', he points out that there is a distinction between supervisory and non-supervisory positions since supervisor and managerial labour coordinates the production process in the name of the bourgeoisie and integrates it to the political domination of capital (Wright 1976, 78). In this point, Robboe is viewed as an agent of 'them'.

[36] In *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life*, Hoggart points out that foremen are also a part of 'them': "When working-class people are asked to become foremen or N. C. O.s they often hesitate. Whatever their motives, they will be regarded not as on the side of 'Them' (2009, 59).

[37] In *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, foremen are stated to be "cursed as public enemy" (32).

tries to persuade Arthur of the fact that the firm has nothing to do with the income tax: "When I first started here I went home … with seven-and-tuppence in my pocket. And now look at you. Fourteen quid. It's a fortune … You can't blame the firm for that [income tax]" (61). However, an explicit conflict never flares up between Robboe and Arthur although Arthur thinks that they are of equal stock and Robboe is "no way better than him" (42), which is basically related to the fact that his wage is much higher compared to the other workers' wages in the factory and that Arthur does not want to lose his "good, comfortable life" in which there is "nothing to worry about" (48). Arthur's personal traits such as thinking in terms of money, peace at any price[38], individualism[39] and stability are about Arthur's sense of protecting his personal worth within the dynamics of an oppressive society, which makes him the representative of the petty-bourgeoisie[40] in terms of morality[41]. Arthur, not aligning himself with his working-class 'comrades', is, in some respects, neither *them* or *us*; he is just *him*. So too, Arthur's existentialist dilemmas, constructing a vicious circle for himself, perpetuates the existence of the social forces creating his own desperate situation instead of changing it radically.

[38] Thinking of his "good" and "comfortable" life, Arthur does not want to lose his "untroubled" and peaceful working conditions: "[H]is wages would not suffer, and he always kept his work at the factory at least one day's supply ahead of those who waited for it. So there was nothing to worry about" (48).

[39] Lenin, in *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*, comments on individualism as such: They surround the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat, and constantly causes among the proletariat relapses into petty-bourgeois spinelessness, disunity, individualism, and alternating moods of exaltation and dejection" (Lenin 1920, 23).

[40] In *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Lois Bonaparte*, Marx points out: "What makes them representative of the petty-bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not get beyond the limits which the latter do not get beyond in life, that they are consequently driven, theoretically, to the problems and solutions to which material interests and social position drive the latter practically" (Marx 1852, 23).

[41] In her book entitled *Bourgeois Morality* (2004), Maria Ossowska discusses how egoism, selfishness, mediocrity, respect for hierarchy, philistinism, thinking in terms of money, thrift, peace at any price, the quest for safety, individualism, instability are among the characteristics of the petty-bourgeois morality (Ossowska: 20).

Unlike Arthur and Smith having "the political ambivalence of the contemporary, rebellious working-class youth" and rejecting "mainstream politics" and "the main form of organized radical discourse against the dominant power group" (Bentley 2007, 201), the social and political maturation of Brian Seaton, the protagonist of *Key to the Door*, evolves on the basis of his childhood experiences, political contacts, intellectual and cultural activities and military service in Malaya, which, in the end, result in revolutionary consciousness. In school, Brian confronts the socio-economic realities of extreme poverty[42] during the depression years of the 1930s and becomes aware of the fact that there are other "ragged-arsed down-at-heel and often unwashed kids" (121) apart from him. His interest in foreign languages, geography and history and his habit of reading literary works such as "Chang the Hatchet Man" (152) and *The Count of Monte Cristo* and of watching films like Buck Jones, Jungle Jim and The Three Stooges (154) contribute to his intellectual growth. After leaving school at fourteen, Brian starts working in different factories during which he regards himself "as an experienced member of the labour market, a man of the factory world already smoking and passing himself off for eighteen in pubs" (241). His awareness of the contradiction between labour and capital and of the exploitation of workers for the sake of more profit helps him reach political maturation: "Wage rates at Robinson's had been carefully regulated – set at a fraction above the dole money, enough to give the incentive of a regular job, but hardly enough to keep its employees far from harrowing exercise in near starvation" (249). Brian's involvement in political conversations within a local group run by the Co-op and Labour party and his introduction to the *Daily Worker* of the Communist Party and the *Soviet Weekly* also reinforce his political perspectives. However, despite labelling himself as a "communist"

[42] Even a simple breakfast seems to be "magnificent" for Brian: "The breakfast, when it did come, was magnificent: three thick half-slices of bread and butter each, and a mug of milky cocoa. There was no breakfast to beat it, as far as Brian knew, except tomatoes and bacon, but that was dinner" (125).

(439), Brian's socio-political views actually mature during his military service in Malaya. The close relationship with a local girl, Mimi, and encountering the oppression of the British colonial presence lead Brian to question the incidents and to sympathize with the struggle of the people in Malaya:

> I come from a scruffy old house in Nottingham, and before the war I remember seeing my old man crying—in tears—because he was o' wok and unemployed. He hadn't worked for years, and there was never any dough and hardly enough grub in the house. The kids were better off, mind you, because they had free milk and a hot dinner everyday – they had to mek sure we'd be fit for the war and to fight communists, the sly bastards. It's a bit better now, but why should I be against the communists? (237)

The scene in which Brian avoids shooting a Communist guerrilla in the jungle and decides to let him go manifests how Brian "proves his beliefs by transforming them into direct personal action" and represents "a high point as well as a turning point in the development of Brian's political consciousness" (Vaverka 1978, 98): "I let him go because he was a comrade! I didn't kill him because he was a man" (416-7). In fact, Brian's basic resistance is to the war of 'them' which is justified through the neo-orientalist myth of democracy. In the novel, Baker, the airman, utters the anti-Communist sentiment of the British Empire: "The Chinese communists, Baker went on, reacting as expected to the emergency, were a small minority who wanted to get rid of the British and set up their own dictatorship. If you believe in democracy you've got to do what you can to put down these terrorists" (223). Brian's response, towards the end of the novel, to this neo-colonialist civilization argument of Baker, referred to as a "poor bastard" by Brian (443), is worth considering:

> The communists aren't weary and that's a fact, never will be either because they've got an up-and-coming vision that our side can never have anymore. They used to spout outside the factory ... which is more than the conservatives dare do, because a lot of the communists are working-men like ourselves and know what's what. (433)

Brian's revolutionary actions concerning the merits of an alternative social order in which "them days is over" (250), indeed, undermine the hegemonic political opposition of Britain in the 1950s and articulate the fact that Sillitoe's working-class characters in *Key to the Door* are consciously a part of working-class culture and do not accept the cultural and political codes imposed by the status quo.

2. Alienation and Escape Mechanisms

In *Capital*, Marx focuses on the physical and psychological effects of factory work upon workers and states that "factory work exhausts the nervous system to the uttermost ... does away with the many-sided play of the muscles, and confiscates every atom of freedom, both in bodily and intellectual activity" (1867, 285). This is exactly what is exemplified in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*. Arthur's inability in his work to actualize his purposive needs for productive activity and to develop his talents and capacities lodged in him in a free, spontaneous, conscious, creative and organic way gradually results in a state of alienation in relation to his product of work, his working process, his human nature and to others around him. Unable to express his needs and powers in his human species through the products of his conscious labour activity, Arthur similarly cannot actualize but can only deny these intrinsic qualities and potentialities. More precisely, the relationship of Arthur to the product of his work as an alien object dominates him since he is exploited qualitatively and quantitatively in the factory. He cannot either possess what he produces by making use of his creative abilities or take part in the decision making process or realize the objectification of his work: "The more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself – his inner world – becomes, the

less belongs to him as his own" (Marx 1844, 29). Vaverka (1978), in a similar way, proposes:

> Although Arthur works at a capstan lathe producing bicycle parts at his own pace ... the labour process fragments his existence rather than contributes to his being as a whole. Not only must he produce in the interests of capital, but very little of himself goes into producing the bicycle parts, which is inevitable, since these parts are identical and only entail a part of the finished product ... He has the function of a living tool, since his work is only a means for survival and not a means to satisfy basic creative needs. His job, which is external to his being, does not give him any genuine possibility for creative self-realization. (37)

The division of labour in the factory, causing Arthur constantly to produce a single part of a bicycle at his capstan lathe by cutting the same piece of steel in the same way over and over again[43], also results in Arthur's alienation as he cannot have any control over the form of labour, its duration, intensity, and the kind and number of products and surrounding conditions (Ollman 1971, 138-140). He cannot, therefore, operate his powers as a man: "The division of labour, too, is therefore nothing else but the estranged, alienated positing of human activity as a real activity of the species or as activity of man as a species being" (Marx 1844, 55). As argued by M. Keith Booker in *The Modern British Novel of the Left* (1998):

> ... it is not the work itself that makes him angry, but the factory system in which that work must be performed. He remains radically alienated from the products of his labour and knows that most of the benefits of his work go to his bosses, not to him. He thus views his highly regimented workplace as a sort of prison despite the pleasure he takes in his craftsmanship. (260)

Arthur's instinct in his collective unconsciousness as a human being to create things as a free and spontaneous activity is subsequently transformed into an unfreely maintained

[43] Sillitoe's description of how Arthur works mechanically is worth quoting: "Turn to chamfer, then to drill, then blade-chamfer. Done. Take out and fix in a new piece, checking now and again ... Turn to chamfer and drill, then blade-chamfer, swing the turret until my arms are heavy and dead. Quick as lightning. The out and fix in, shout for the trolley to take it away and bring more on, jotting down another hundred, not noticing the sud smells anymore and belts over my head" (*Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* 37-8).

activity under the service of other agencies[44], as a result of which he is alienated from "his own body, as well as external nature and his spiritual aspect, his human aspect"[45] (Marx 1844, 32). And the final stage of alienation – that of man from man – manifests itself in Arthur's relationships based on his own self interest in relation to the other fellows around him[46]. To give an example, in one episode, Arthur and his cousin, Bert, bump into a man lying on the street "drunk as a lord" with old clothes "worn at the elbows", and they try to get him on his feet and take him home. When they arrive at his home, Arthur and Bert "push" the man inside, and Arthur frisks the man and passes his "wallet" over since it was "stone empty" and "a cheap blue one, smelling of sweat" (83). In the abortion scene, Arthur is relatively indifferent to what Brenda feels and does not "care ... whether the

[44] In the novel, the harsh working conditions in which workers cannot produce in mentally and physically free and flexible conditions are depicted through the conflict between the workers and Robboe, the gaffer: "Though you couldn't grumble at four-and-six a hundred the rate-checker sometimes came and watched you work, so that if he saw you knock up a hundred in less than an hour Robboe would come and tell you one fine morning that your rate had been dropped by six pence or a bob. So when you felt the shadow of the rate-checker breathing down your neck, you knew what to do if you had any brains at all: make every move more complicated, though not slow because that was cutting your own throat, and do everything deliberately yet with a crafty show of speed" (31- 2). As James Gindin explains: "The workers in the bicycle factory are paid by the piece, but, should they work at full speed, management would lower the amount paid per piece. The workers, with nothing to gain by increased effort, fear that management will discover their elaborate stalling devices, management, on the other hand, is vigilant, always ready to pounce on the worker slow enough or unlucky enough to be caught" (1976, 16-7).

[45] The class nature of labour in "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner" is symbolically revealed through the relationship between Smith and the governor in Borstal. Having a training session on his own to represent the Borstal prison in the Long Distance Cross Country Running, Smith is depicted as working actively and productively for the profits and interest of the governor whereas the governor is metaphorically described as a person who intends to expropriate the wealth (prestige and dignity) produced by Smith. Like Arthur at this lathe, Smith subsequently becomes alienated to his work and working process while mechanically running in nature: "I go my rounds in a dream, turning at lane or footpath corners without knowing I'm turning, leaping brooks without knowing they're there ... I forgot I was running, and I was hardly able to know that my legs were lifting and falling and my arms going in and out ... all I knew was that you had to run, run, run, without knowing why you were running ... Flip-flap, flip-flap, jog-trot, jog-trot, crunchslap-crunchslap, cross the middle of a broad field again, rhythmically running" (10-37-39).

[46] Thinking that the money "paid-out on clothes" is a "sensible" investment as it makes him feel "good as well as look good" (*Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* 66), Arthur materialistically fulfils his intrinsic needs through expensive suits providing him a compensatory sense of value: "[A] relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a 'phantom objectivity'" (Lukacs 1971, 128). In order to escape from the dire realities in his life and attain an illusory happiness, Arthur creates his own reality, "a kind of second nature", evolving around the value of the commodities he owns (1971, 128). By means of this self-created 'second' nature, Arthur finds himself distanced from his 'first' nature, the qualities in his human nature, and subsequently runs through alienation.

night's work [the abortion] had been successful or not". Instead, he tries to decide "on the best direction to the nearest pub" (92-3) where he meets Winnie, Brenda's young sister, and has sex with her: "Never had an evening begun so sadly and ended so well, he reflected, peeling off his socks" (97). In another chapter, Arthur asks Fred, reading a newspaper, whether there is any news or not, and Fred answers: "Not much. A kid was drowned in Wollaton Cut. A man got three months hard for shoplifting. There was a road-smash at Radcliffe. A collier got killed in the pit, and there's going to be a Three Power meeting" (122). However, Arthur's reply to such bad news is quite striking: "Is that all?" (122). All these incidents, related to Arthur's individualism, negligence, interpersonal irresponsibility, insensitivity and apathy, reveal the fact that Arthur, because of his state of alienation, considers others not as individuals or "fellow-men having equal rights", but "as superiors or subordinates" (Fischer 1996, 63) who can be exploited.

In the novel, the presence of the factory, "an institution that regularizes man's struggle against his fellow, and pits foreman against manager, worker against foreman, workers against one another" (Gindin 1962, 42), literally casts its negative impacts on Arthur's life, and its pressure and frustration are felt in most areas of his life, affecting him both physically and psychologically. Inside the factory, the infernal noises of the "belts and pulleys turning and twisting and slapping" and the "machines with their own small motors" which "started with a jerk and a whine under the shadows of their operators" make Arthur's brain "reel and ache". Outside the factory, the presence of the generators, whining all night, and the giant milling-machine, working during the day, gives the terrace "a sensation of living within breathing distance of some monstrous being", which is directly felt by the working-class characters living "in four-roomed houses built around the factory" (27). Even after working in dire conditions, the sounds of the factory and the "disinfectant-suds, grease, and newly-cut steel" permeate the air outside the factory and

affect Arthur physically: "The factory smell of oil-suds, machinery, and shaved steel that surrounded you with an air in which pimples grew and prospered on your face and shoulders, that would have turned you into one big pimple if you did not spend half an hour over the scullery sink every night getting rid of the biggest bastards" (29). Marx in *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* clarifies the underlying reasons for this kind of situation:

> Labour is *external* to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his intrinsic nature; that in his work, therefore, he does not affirm himself but denies himself, does not feel content but unhappy, does not develop freely his physical and mental energy but mortifies his body and ruins his mind. The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He feels at home when he is not working, and when he is working he does not feel at home. His labour is therefore not voluntary, but coerced; it is *forced labour*.

Since Arthur cannot reassert his basic recreational functions and becomes aware of his nothingness, in order to compensate for this sense of meaninglessness, he seeks refuge from "the workaday monotony, fragmentation, and dreariness of factory-bound life in a class-ridden society" (Hutchings 1987, 35) and tries to escape from the perceived unpleasantness of his life which "reduces" him "to mere operative extension of the factory's machinery" (35). Drinking excessively, having sex with two married women, watching football games, retreating into nature, living beyond his means and daydreaming about all these pleasures while working at his lathe in the factory, are the key escape mechanisms through which Arthur nullifies the negative impacts of such entrapments and exerts, albeit through an illusory fulfilment, his intrinsic values and existential being in a meaningless world. Marx, commenting on the relationship between religious suffering and escapism in *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, points out that "religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions" and that "it is the opium of the people and the abolition of religion as the *illusory*

happiness of the people is the demand for their *real* happiness" (Marx 1970, 3). Basing my argument on Marx's statement, I refer to this process as "illusory" because it functions like 'opium' and prevents Arthur from "feeling empty" (136), but prevents him too from proclaiming his human nature and becoming aware of the realities within the capitalist mode of production.

Analysing the existentialist struggle of Arthur, Hanson (1999) discusses how Arthur's twofold escape, outward and inward, is presented in a series of stages through some specific symbols:

> The physical part of the escape builds up over the weekends as he carries on his affairs with married women and drinks himself blind, and the escape inward takes place when he is working at his monotonous task at the factory and his mind is free to wander. The inner escape gradually takes precedence in the story as Arthur begins to contemplate his relationships with women and ends by accepting the responsibility of marriage and a job as a charge hand (foreman) at the factory, actions that suggest his new desire to participate in society. (34)

In this context, Arthur's boozing, feeling the beer "going beneficially down into the elastic capacity" of his guts and following the "motto of 'be drunk and be happy'" (9), sets him into motion "like a machine" on Saturday nights, "the best and bingiest glad-time of the week, one of the fifty-two holidays in the slow-turning Big Wheel of the year", and swills "the effect of a week's monotonous graft in the factory" out of his system "in a burst of good will" (9). His drunkenness[47] functions as "time-out" through which the "imperative demands of everyday life" are put aside and conventional social expectations are temporarily suspended (MacAndrew and Edgerton 1969, vi): "Arthur was drunk every night. The fifteen days was a long time, insupportable if sober" (137). In "'Various pubs gave signs of life': Of Drink and Time in Alan Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday*

[47] The working-class characters in the novel usually have heated discussions about football games while drinking in the pub, which also functions as an outward escape mechanism: "He was easier in his mind that Jack had forgotten his troubles and was arguing on football. Life indeed seemed to be more rosy" (59).

Morning", Lewis Macleod similarly indicates that Arthur's state of drunkenness absolves him from guilt and downgrades the seriousness of his transgressions and that his reluctance to accept the notions of personal liability and to defer enjoyment indeed aims to prolong the duration of "time-out", to extend "the limited and socially sanctioned freedoms of temporary drunken irresponsibility to every aspect of his life" and to treat "the suspended, commitment-free conditions of Saturday night as a steady state rather than a tolerated aberration" (2012, 116). Arthur's estrangement from "calendar" and "clock" and his impatience for sudden and peak experiences rather than envisioning a distant future also exemplify his desire for momentary pleasure and drunken "time-out" (Macleod 2012, 116-7). One illustration of this, is how, in the novel, while serving in the army as a soldier, Arthur goes out with Ambergate to get drunk every night, and, in his long walks, fantasizes about many different things just as he does while working in the factory:

> He plotted private war and revolution, arson and plunder ... bringing to the surface impossible dreams and treating them like jokes ... they forgot everything in the world but their own existence, the now, the this minute of their filled bellies and walking legs and chafed thighs on khaki serge ... they passed cottages bolted and barred to them, doors and windows spurning Arthur's made-up songs that tolled and roared along like the explosion of some half-forgotten voice in the world. (139)

This "nowness" of Arthur, which is divorced from reality, totality and "time-in" and seeks to "abolish time" and to reconfigure "each moment as a self-contained eternity" (Macleod 2012, 117), therefore, helps Arthur escape from his atomized and fragmented routine and attain an illusionary happiness in his discontinuous and episodic moments of drunkenness.

Arthur's sexual affair with two married women is another example of 'outward' escapism. In the novel, Arthur struggles to actualize his instinctual impulses and to restore his manhood by rejecting being a part of the conventional family structure and embracing instead the cult of defiant masculinity: "Like gettin' married, you mean? I'm not that daft

... Married? Me? No fear" (36-135). Splitting married men into two different groups as "those that looked after their wives" and "those that were slow" (44), Arthur has a relationship with the wife of one of his co-workers, Jack, whom he categorizes as "weak" because of allowing his wife "to go off with other men" (53). Yet, Arthur himself, revealing that he would "give her the biggest pasting any woman ever had" and "kill her" if he were similarly married and had "a wife that carries on like Brenda and Winnie carry on" (145), is actually depicted as conservative and having strong authoritarian and patriarchal tendencies. According to Vaverka (1978, 44), there are two basic reasons for the unrestrained relationship of Arthur with married women: "First, carrying on with a married woman is his particular way of demonstrating a disregard for established codes of conduct, and secondly ... he has had the 'idea that married women were certainly the best women to know'". In a similar way, MacLeod (2012) points out that Arthur's preference for having affairs with married women indicates "the impossibility of advancing his relationship with them" and that Arthur, refusing to take responsibility and to admit "futurity" (118), is committed to "discontinuity" and temporary freedom and the pleasure of "time-out" (117). However, Arthur's relationship to Brenda, lacking real depth and spiritual connection, provides sensual and momentary pleasures that help Arthur to enjoy his Saturday nights away from his "drugged life at the lathe" after a long and hard week:

> It was possible to forget the factory, whether inside it sweating and straining your muscles by a machine, or whether swilling ale in a pub or loving Brenda in her big soft bed at the weekend. The factory did not matter. The factory could go on working until it blew itself up from too much speed, but I, he thought, already a couple of dozen above his daily stint, will be here after the factory's gone, and will Brenda and all women like her still be here. (45)

The social and discursive establishment of gender roles through domestic relations and language in the novel is significant because the cult of masculinity within the institution of the family functions as a means through which Arthur's anger against the

prevailing mode of production, capitalism, is absorbed and suppressed so that Arthur fulfils his natural 'being' in an illusory way. In "The Subjugation of Women under Capitalism: The Bourgeois Morality", Marlene Dixon discusses how the idea of marriage and of the institution of family is explicitly supported and promoted by the ruling class as it ensures the myth of motherhood, regulates the re-production of human labour and imposes the significance of the concept of private property and the superiority of men over women:

> It does so by mystifying the real meaning of married women's labour, convincing a wife that her labour is valueless, a mere service to compensate her husband for her dependency upon his valuable labour power. In the same way, the bourgeois morality emphasizes monogamy, chastity, modesty and obedience. These serve to ensure a woman's subservience by convincing her that it is "God's law" and "Nature's intent" that her labour power is valueless and her children, by right, belong to her husband. (1977, 23)

Creating an atmosphere in which the time and energy of male workers are directed to productivity and preventing them from becoming aware of alienation and frustration, the institution of family disciplines male workers by means of their wives, responsible "for getting their husbands to work on time, properly dressed and well fed, ready for a hard day's work" (Heywood 1992, 223), and provides them with compensations: "He [male workers] enjoys the status of being the 'breadwinner' and is granted leisure relaxation at home, while housewife-mother is employed in 'trivial' domestic labour (Heywood 1992, 234).

In this respect, the construction of Arthur's masculinity is delineated through his physical actions and "performative speeches" within the institution of his family and the physical space of the 'idealized' concept of home (Lewis 2012, 105); his inclinations towards sex-oriented attitudes, domestic harmony, monetary responsibility and bellicosity reveal the way he achieves self-fulfilment and meaningfulness. To comment, Arthur drops

out of school at the age of fourteen, starts working in the factory, and helps his family. In the episode in which Arthur has a conversation with his sister about the irresponsibility of his sister's husband, "the drunken swine" (64), Arthur passes three pound notes from "the clean wage-packet from his overall pocket" to his mother and says to his sister: "I'll drop him one, one day" by thinking that "it's bad luck when you marry a man that drinks too much and knocks you around" (64). Here, aligning himself with the role of an authoritarian 'breadwinner' and a patriarch maintaining a family, Arthur takes 'control' of the situation, consolidates his authority and dominance, gets rid of the sense of his ineffectiveness that he experiences in the factory, and performs his masculinity. Upon learning that Brenda is pregnant, Arthur, in a state of alienation and self-interest, takes two "crumpled" pound notes from his pocket and folds Brenda's hand over them to show that he also suffers with her although it is Friday night and he needs "a ton of dynamite" to blast himself out of that "tragedy" (68). During the abortion scene, Arthur takes a pound and attempts to give it to Em'ler, who also rejects taking the money by saying: "No, I don't want any of your money. You keep it" (91). Acting like a traditional financial provider for his 'lady', Arthur, in these two instances, tries to reinforce his power and authority and affirm his status: "The point of departure for an understanding of the position of the working-class father in his home is that he is the boss there, the 'master in his own house'" (Hoggart 2009, 34). Arthur, holding the supreme power in the house, as a "provider, whether that be the providing of sperm cells during the act of sexual intercourse, or the providing of money, food, and shelter if the decision was made to keep the baby" (Lewis 2012, 103), in this way, escapes from the realities of the factory sweating him to death and of the income tax offices milking money from his wage packets and robbing him to death, which results in Arthur's acting as a cog in the grinding mechanisms of capitalism and subsequently dehumanizes him and his values and alienates

him to himself and to everyone around him: “But I’m having a good life and don’t care about anything … I don’t’ feel bad at all. It’s an act of God, like a pit disaster” (40-69).

The Goose Fair, “the great time of the year, the one place when you met people you hadn’t seen for years”, is one of the most crucial social occasions in the novel, also functioning as a carnivalesque façade through which working-class people, moving in “uneven intermingling streams”, are dressed in their best and enjoy themselves: “Sanity was out of reach: They were caught up in balloons of light and pleasure that would not let them go. The four-acre fair became a whole world ... and a crowd that had lost all idea of time and place locked in the belly of its infernal noise” (159-61). The activities in the fair function as “time out”, helping the working-class characters live “in the moment”, escape from the unpleasantness of their lives and actualize themselves (MacLeod 2012, 120). For instance, while riding the Ghost Train with Brenda and Winnie in the fair, Arthur stands up in the carriage, wanders in the dark and frightens a woman called Lil. Arthur also attacks a skeleton and ‘defeats’ it: “He shouted through the hole in the cloth: ‘Fire! Fire! Run for your lives ... I’ve won ... I beat that bloody skeleton” (163). An example of false-consciousness, Arthur’s victory against the “darkness” (163) symbolizes the instinctual will in his sub-consciousness to “plant a thousand tonnes of bone-dry TNT” (72) and “blow up” (40) the system which victimizes him. However, his individualistic and egoistic tendencies, making collectivist orientation towards any political movement impossible, display his “lack of proportion and ... inflated and under-differentiated sense of his own oppositionality”:

> It shows his inability to distinguish between real problems as they are situated in linear time ... and safe and sanctioned, pantomimed stand-ins for those problems ... in contending with the skeleton, Arthur neither defeats death nor contends with any real darkness ... he masters only the petty ‘terror for which [customers] paid a shilling’ ... when Arthur contemplates a violent worker’s

> rebellion, he does so while eating ice-cream and excitedly considering which amusement park ride he will try next (Macleod 2012, 121).

An archaic leisure time pursuit, the Goose Fair is a significant turning point at the end of the novel in which Arthur encounters the squaddies, the husband of Winnie and his friend, representing "the raw edge of fang-and-claw on which all laws were based", and ends up "in a dead faint, feeling the world pressing its enormous booted foot on to his head, forcing him away from the lights, down into the dark comfort of grime". But after this episode, he starts to be more concerned about his future by gradually conforming to the idea of getting married and succumbing "to the security offered by Doreen" (Minogue and Palmer 2002, 132), metaphorically suggesting his inevitable defeat by the "prison-like system" against which "he had been fighting all his life" (130-180)[48]. As argued by Bentley (2007):

> [This] represents the institutionalized power of the system defeating the existential hero, and it is after this event that Arthur resigns himself to marriage with Doreen, and finishes his affairs with Brenda and Winnie. This episode can be read ... as the ultimate victory of the ideological state apparatuses over the rebellious and wayward individual. (202)

Finding peace and tranquillity in nature[49] away from the deadening and mechanizing routine of the factory is the fourth outward escape mechanism presented in the novel

[48] Gary Day in *Class* (2001) similarly states: "[A]t the end of *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* Arthur is compelled to submit to the community he has fought against for so long." (185).

[49] Reflecting the dichotomy of nature and industrialism through distinctive imageries, D. H. Lawrence's characters also take comfort in living closer to nature. In *Sons and Lovers*, the industrial places are presented through dark, queer and dire symbols and associated with "the jaws of the dragon" (112) while nature is described as a source of nourishment, serenity and happiness. In one episode, Gertrude Morel, comparing the peaceful and tranquil time in nature to the hellish atmosphere of the mining town she lives in, aligns herself with nature and enjoys the restful and quiet environment, the sense of peace away from her husband: "With Mrs. Morel it was one of those still moments when the small frets vanish, and the beauty of things stands out, and she had the peace of the strength to see herself" (46).

through the dichotomy[50] of the countryside and town. On Sunday mornings, Arthur, living in a town and working in a factory, straddles his bike and rides along the canal bank into the country to fish. Sitting on the front doorstep with a penknife and a piece of wood, carving the replica of a fish for his float, holding "the half-shaped fish lightwards to gauge the proportions of head, body, and tail" and colouring it "with intricate designs, grey and red, orange for its eyes, and a belly of duck-egg blue", Arthur hopes to attract fish to his baited hook. He enjoys the "brief glimpse of sky", "silence" and "peace" with a cigarette "between his fingers watching the float near the far bank, concentric rings of water ... and water-beetles skating gracefully like tiny rowing boats between broad-leaved water-lilies" (129-30): "As soon as you think of fishing, you think of things that don't belong to the modern world" (Orwell 1939, 91). Arthur's closeness with nature, "man's inorganic body" (Marx 1844, 31), actually offers him a refuge through which he can actualize "the natural desires" of his muscles (*SNSM* 130), develop self-realization, ensuring the "meaning of life and the joy we experience in living" (Naess 1995, 226) and realize the objectified form of his work (creating the bait himself): "The worker can create nothing without nature, without the sensuous world. It is the material in which his labour realizes itself" (Marx 1884, 29). In other words, the immediacy of the relationship of Arthur to the

[50] In *Key to the Door*, Brian expresses his desire to go to "Sherwood Forest" and live there away from factory life in town, while Bert, the cousin of Arthur, daydreams about having a hut in the middle of nature and having a peaceful life: "I want to get an 'ut when I grow up, because then you can get your own snap and you don't need to go to a factory or some new 'ouses to get a job because you can grow all your own grub. And if you do that you never 'ave owt do di wi' gettin' the dole. That's why l'd like an 'ut. It is the best way to live, if yer ask me" (108).

natural world[51], reconnecting him with "the transitional mechanisms of each season only at the weekend" (*SNSM* 129), makes him "happy" (*SNSM* 205) unlike the "sleepy afternoons" at this lathe. Arthur's inner monologues, revisiting the details of his love affairs with Brenda and Doreen, symbolically set "the country in opposition to the encroaching town, locating there an archaic, pre-industrial working-class identity unsullied by the reification of factory work" (Minogue and Palmer 2002, 139-140). To exemplify, in the novel, Arthur usually takes Doreen to the countryside, "with sun shining on ground" and "the air smelling cool and fresh" (204), while he meets Brenda in the town, with red-ochre "blackened by soot" and paint "faded and cracked" (28). This actually suggests how Doreen becomes a symbol of pastoralism and serenity to which Arthur is more attracted and so agrees to get married, whereas Brenda appears to emblematize industrialism, which Arthur 'unconsciously' dislikes because of its subjugation of nature:

> He remembered his grandfather who had been a blacksmith, and had a house and forge at Wollaton village. Fred had often taken him there, and its memory was a fixed picture in Arthur's mind. The building – you had drawn your own water from a well, dug your own potatoes out of the garden, taken eggs from the chicken run to fry with bacon off your own side of pig hanging salted from a hook in the pantry – had long ago been destroyed to make room for advancing armies of new pink houses, flowing over the fields like red ink on green blotting paper. (205)

[51] The identification of man with the natural world is one of the most recurrent themes in the literary works of George Orwell. Orwell's *Coming Up for Air* (1939), focusing on the transition period from a traditional agricultural society to urbanization and industrialization by delineating the major cultural, social and political changes of British society between the wars, depicts the mechanization, alienation and meaninglessness of the life routines of George Bowling, the protagonist of the novel, feeling "entrapped in an urban environment" similar to "a prison with the cells in a row" (14). In order to recuperate "a kind of peaceful feeling" (164) and happiness, Bowling interacts with nature and recognizes the interconnected relationship between nature and himself just as Arthur does in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*: "That pool, for instance-all the stuff that's in it. Newts, water-snails, water-beetles, caddis-flies, leeches, and God knows how many other things that you can only see with a microscope. The mystery of their lives, down there under water. You could spend a lifetime watching them, ten lifetimes, and still you wouldn't have got to the end of that one pool. And all the while the sort of feeling of wonder, the peculiar flame inside you. It's the only thing worth having, and we don't want it. But I do want it" (164).

Fishing by the canal is, on the other hand, an inward escape mechanism that reveals the complex and ambiguous position and duality of Arthur as he is straddled between the two different worlds, industrial capitalism and the dream of a pastoral life. Catching a fish at the end of the novel, however, Arthur more intimately questions the events of his life away from work through a more introspective internal journey as he aligns himself with a fish in the canal that has taken bait, implicitly suggesting the relationship between marriage and castration:

> Everyone in the world was caught somehow ... as soon as you were born you were captured by fresh air that you screamed against the minute you came out. Then you were roped in by a factory, had a machine slung around your neck, and then you were hooked up by the arse with a wife. Mostly you were like a fish: you swam about with freedom, thinking how good it was to be left alone ... when suddenly ... the big hook clapped itself into your mouth and you were caught. (217)

According to D. J. Taylor (1993), the word 'caught' stands for two different meanings. Specifically, it can refer to "his [Arthur's] impending marriage, or at least to the prospect of a steady and non-illicit relationship", whereas, from a more general perspective, it reflects "his status as a tiny component in a vast machine whose revolutions he has no power to alter or even influence" (115). Recognizing his own potential as a conscious individual, Arthur, in the end, chooses to take the 'bait' of money, dragging himself to the factory every Monday morning, and he capitulates to the vicious circle of sweating in a factory, grabbing a drink in pubs, being dragged into war and having a "good life" (219): "[Arthur] acknowledges his position within the production process of capitalism, trapped by marriage as a fish is by bait, since domesticity will render him financially dependent on the system which uses his labour" (Bell 2000, 158). In other words, by reconciling himself

to the social norms and accepting the responsibility of a new job as a foreman[52], Arthur "transforms the metaphor from one connoting entrapment to one connoting the seizing of new opportunities for vitality through conflict" and conceives of the fact that the cycle of destruction within various repressive forces is inevitable and continual (Minogue and Palmer 2002, 141): "If you went through life refusing all the bait dangled before you, that would be no life at all. No changes would be made and you would have nothing to fight against" (217).

Arthur's "everlasting pal" (202), the lathe, is another inward escape mechanism, and a visible sign of his "fixedness in reality, and the begetter of his inner life" (Minogue and Palmer 2002: 129). While automatically cutting and drilling steel cylinders at his lathe in the factory, Arthur daydreams about "pleasant events" and steps into "a cosy world of pubs and noisy tarts" (39) that help him forget the conflicts and problems in his life:

> ... you forgot all about the machine and the quick working of your arms and hands and the fact that you were cutting and boring and rough-threading to within limits of only five-thousandths of an inch. The noise of motor-trolleys passing up and down the gangway and the excruciating din of flying and flapping belts slipping out of your consciousness after perhaps half an hour, without affecting the quality of the work you were turning out, and you forgot your past conflicts with the gaffer and turned to thinking of ... things that you hoped would happen in future. (39)

Also symbolizing Arthur's estrangement from his working processes, the lathe gets Arthur thinking, during which time flows while wearing out "the oil-soaked floor", and Arthur springs his actions into "a favourable rhythm" and becomes "happy" through "a compatible world of pictures" passing through his mind like a "magic lantern, often in vivid and glorious loonycolour" (39). In this sense, Arthur's free-floating internal thoughts

[52] From a different perspective, Nick Bentley (2007) makes the point that Arthur finds himself rejected within the boundaries of the system despite struggling to attain happiness within it through "social advancement as exemplified by the character Robboe, Arthur's foreman; crime, as represented by the deceased Doddoe and his sons; or conformity, as represented by his work colleague Jack" (2007, 201).

at his machine, indeed, serve as a means of escape from his “his basically drab and unstimulating existence” (Vaverka 1978, 38) in the factory and again, therefore, result in his submission to the social and economic circumstances and prevent any chance of his fortifying his true and creative abilities. They take their place in the rhythmic inner and outer cycle that disguises his atomized and alienated nature from himself.

CHAPTER IV: SAM SELVON

In need of an expanding labour force to take up jobs in the manufacturing and service industries[53], Britain opened its borders to its colonial and former colonial *subjects*, facilitated by the Nationality Act of 1948[54]. On 22 June 1948, the *SS Empire Windrush*, "a decommissioned troop transport ship" (Brown 2013, 20), docked at Tilbury Dock, and four hundred and ninety-two West Indian emigrants arrived in Britain. This journey rapidly became a national media event and was reflected in various themes in the British popular imagination: "The 'coloured' trickle that became a black flood, the encounter with the 'motherland', the arrival of coloured neighbours or workers, the subsequent discovery of the 'colour bar'" (Hesse 1993, 161). This was an "initiatory" rather than an "originary" moment that changed the entire social map of Britain as it evolved into a multi-racial society. The arrival of *Windrush* not only symbolized "the 'beginnings' of a post-war black British history" (Procter 2000, 2), but also "the inauguration of large-scale migration from the territories of the British Empire that led inexorably to Britain's contemporary self-presentation as a multicultural polity" (Brown 2013, 20), although there

[53] George Glmech in *Double Passage: The Lives of Caribbean Migrants Abroad and Back Home* argues that the conditions of the migration of West Indians were set during the war although it actually began in the early 1950s: "[T]he enormous loss of human life, the devastation of many British cities, and a blacklog of neglected work all required additional labourers. A booming economy in the post-war years added to the need for additional manpower to assist in the reconstruction of the economy began to recruit workers from its former imperial territories, particularly from the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent" (1992, 42). In a similar way, R. B. Davison traces West Indians who were recruited in the army of Britain and brought in to be employed in the war factories: "At the end of the war, these men returned home to find a disappointing situation. Jobs were hard to find and the standard of living they could expect in their home islands was much lower than that which they had enjoyed in Britain. There were no restriction on their entry into Britain … they began to trickle back to Britain to seek their fortunes and began to write home glowing accounts (backed up by cash remittances) of the varied opportunities available in the booming post-war British economy. Shipping companies, sensing a new avenue for profit, began to offer cheap fares to Britain in vessels returning to Europe, and the migration developed rapidly" (1962).

[54] This act was passed during the Labour government of Clement Attlee, and everyone living in the Commonwealth countries were granted British citizenship and rights of entry in order to encourage mass migration to be employed in the labour market after the Second World War.

had already been many migration flows[55] from the West Indies to Britain even before the Second World War. Meanwhile, it should not be glossed over that 'black' here is actually not a biological or racial signifier but a political category including African, Asian and different ethnicities such as Indo-Caribbean, Bangladeshi, gay, women, Muslim and so on[56] (Procter 2000, 5-6). Kobane Mercer in *Welcome to the Jungle* similarly articulates the concept of 'blackness' within this particular context:

> When various peoples – of Asian, African, and Caribbean descent – interpellated themselves and each other as /black/ they invoked a collective identity predicated on political and not biological similarities. In other words, the naturalized connotations of the term /black/ were disarticulated out of the dominant codes of racial discourse, and rearticulated as signs of alliance and solidarity among dispersed groups of people sharing common historical experience of British racism. (1994, 291)

Samuel Dickson Selvon (1923-1994), in Maya Angelou's words, the "father of black literature", was himself a part of the first-generation of writers who emigrated from the economically isolated West Indies to Britain after the Second World War. George Lamming, Derek Walcott, E. K. Brathwaite, V. S. Naipaul and Andrew Salkey were also a part of this writer group. In spite of becoming aware that Britain was a "symbol of a perennial exile, imposed on [them] as the descendent[s] of the rigid strictures of a Manichean colonial historiography born out of [their] New World Caribbean experience" (Nasta 2002, 58), these first-generation immigrant writers were able to exert a huge impact on the London literary scene since the aesthetic merits and technical accomplishments of

[55] One of them is the arrival of nearly ten thousand West Indian emigrants to Britain during the Second World War, and this number was more than the entire black population in Britain at that time (Collins 2001, 391).

[56] Defining the term 'black' in the UK in the second half of the twentieth century, Karis Campion states: "'Black' as a descriptor emerged … out of black political projects of the 20th century. The civil rights and black power movements that swept across America in the 1960s challenged European aesthetics which had continuously conjured up negative connotations of the Negro slave. Black became beautiful – a symbol of power and resistance. The momentum of the American Black Power movement was later felt on the other side of the Atlantic. In the UK, throughout the 1970s, the term black was increasingly used as an umbrella term for ethnic minority groups in their collective resistance racism" (06 March 2015).

the Caribbean writers distinguished them "from many of the more superficially accomplished but less adventurous and less promising of their English contemporaries" (Wyndham 1958, 94). The works of these writers are unsurprisingly preoccupied with the issue of exile leading to hopeless alienation and fragmentation and to loss of authentic identity and social isolation.

Hailed, therefore, as one of the key figures in the representation and articulation of the experiences of the *Windrush* generation of immigrants, largely consisting of young and working-class 'blacks' struggling to achieve economic and cultural stability, Selvon influenced the evolution of Caribbean and black British writing through his "acuity of vision, intellectual rigour and sheer beauty of the inventiveness of language" (Phillips 1999). The fiction of Selvon is basically concerned with the concepts of race and ethnicity and portrays the anxieties and concerns of marginalized 'black' subcultures in Britain. This is dialectically worked out through different types of communities ranging from "the unconscious communal village", in which membership is sustained by race; to "the creolized town" with temporary neighbourhoods; to "the city" with a sense of community based on racial, ideological and monetary solidarity and completion; to "immigration abroad" resulting in irretrievable loss of cultural roots and traditions (Rothfork 1991, 9). In this respect, the corpus of Selvon, a Trinidadian novelist, short story writer, poet and playwright, can actually be divided into three categories: peasant novels, middle-class novels and immigrant novels. The peasant novels of Selvon focus on "the individual and communal life of Indo-Trinidadian peasantry", working in the large scale sugarcane plantations or private gardens, whereas his middle-class novels concentrate on the lives of bourgeois and educated Trinidadians, and his immigrant novels reveal the experiences of the Caribbean diaspora in London, the *colonial* centre (Salick 2001, 7-9). Contrary to the 'didacticism' of the middle-class novels and the 'seriousness' of the peasant novels, the

immigrant novels have a distinctive form, structure and content imbued with a sense of humour reflecting a desire to help immigrant readers to actualize themselves spiritually and to establish a deeper social and cultural nexus with other fellows. Commenting on the works of Selvon, Susheila Nasta likewise states:

> … Selvon writes in his fiction about three kinds of people. Firstly, there are the East Indian peasantry in Trinidad who figure in *A Brighter Sun*, its sequel *Turn Again Tiger* and *The Plains of Caroni*. Secondly, there are the novels and short stories focusing on the urban trickster or 'calypsonian' figures … novels including *The Lonely Londoners*, *The Housing Lark* and *Moses Ascending* … fall into this category. But there is a further more introverted and reflective aspect of Selvon's writing which … is explored more extensively in his second novel *An Island is a World*. It appears also in Selvon's later work *I Hear Thunders*, which deals … with the existential and metaphysical crises of an educated and professional group of middle-class Trinidadians in the post-war years. (1988, 5)

In his London-set fiction, Selvon provides a vivid description of the daily lives of the diverse 'black' migrant community in London and explores the relationship between race and class. His representation of the under-represented groups and working-class experience in his immigrant novels distinguishes[57] him from the other writers of the period like Walcott and Naipaul although Lamming labelled Selvon as "the least political of us all" and somewhat dismissively suggested that Selvon wrote novels only "for a little rent money, and the chance to change the monotonous half pint for a little shot o' whisky from time to time" (Lamming 1960, 43). In fact, Selvon's own subjective experiences in London and his discovery that a majority of white Londoners had no desire to build a racially heterogeneous city contributed significantly to his ability to develop a more

[57] According to Nick Bentley (2007), the fiction of Selvon should be read against the dominant trends and movements such as the Angry Young Men, the New Left, and the Movement in British literature in the 1950s as Selvon's literary work "intersects with contemporary debates in the fifties novel concerning authenticity, representation of marginalized subcultures, commitment in the novel in relation to the literary modes of realism and modernism, and specific sub-genres of the novel such as the 'documentary' novel" (264).

profound understanding of his own culture, roots and people in the Caribbean, and to form a new identity as a writer in London, which subsequently debunked the colonial discursive construction of the myth of 'Mother Country' in his subconscious. As Selvon emphasises in "Finding West Indian Identity in London" (1988):

> … more than anything else, my life in London taught me about the people from the Caribbean … I was discovering a pride, a national pride, in being what I am, that I never felt at home. That was one of the things that immigration meant to me … far from assimilating another culture and manner I delved deeper into an understanding of my roots and myself. (60- 1)

Yet, Selvon is described as "the greatest and therefore the most important folk poet the British Caribbean has yet produced" by George Lamming, despite his earlier comments (*The Pleasure of Exile*, 1960). His novel, *The Lonely Londoners*, his most popular and best-known immigrant/urban novel, was published six years after he arrived in Britain. *The Lonely Londoners*, a bold success, focuses on the day-to-day experiences of a number of marginalized 'black' immigrants, mainly Moses and "the boys". Taking place in London, the indisputable "West Indian literary capital" (Ramchand 2000, 365), the novel presents London as an exilic space of the West Indian hinterland of the formative post-war years in Britain where Selvon's boys, engaging in "psychic rituals of survival", are "unmoored from the structures of civil society" and "cast adrift from all known boundaries and landmarks" (Forbes 2005, 77). Wittily revealing the specific problems of the characters, which range from racial prejudice to unemployment, by interweaving individual stories within episodic structures, *The Lonely Londoners* provides a different interpretation of migrant-ness and displacement and the subsequent sense of estrangement from one's own body in a hostile environment dominated by the 'pioneers of civilization'. The novel also expresses the desire of West Indians to be regarded as equal contributors in the British capital city:

> [T]his novel, while certainly gesturing in both language and content toward an articulation of something distinctly West Indian, also takes considerable steps to indicate the need for rapprochement, for a recognition of the efforts necessary for a mutually achieved understanding between 'the boys' of the novel and the other inhabitants of their newly adopted home. (Brown 2013, 124)

Selvon's novel is a linguistic achievement thanks to its success at "capturing both oral tradition and the calypso tradition in writing" (Okawa 2013, 18). Through drawing "expertly upon the whole linguistic spectrum available to the literate West Indian, ranging from English Standard English to West Indian Standard English to differing degrees of dialect" (Ramchand 1985, 13), Selvon constructs a distinctive modified Trinidadian vernacular and uses its amusing vivacity in order to inform a wide range of readers about the authenticity of the Caribbean culture and life: "… what I try to do with my works is to try to universalize it … I never wrote for Caribbean people, I wrote to show Caribbean people to other parts of the world and to let people look and identify" (quoted in Clarke 76). Selvon's linguistic experiment, mixing Standard English and the Trinidadian dialect, which he started in *A Brighter Sun*, therefore makes the novel more inventive and more revolutionary as he reveals the insufficiency of Standard English in terms of representing the diverse experience of immigrants in Britain, and "affirms the versatility and flexibility of dialect, using it as the language of narration, of dialogue, of description, and of philosophizing (Salick 2001, 120).

Despite being a pioneering text in terms of its social commentary, innovative use of language, striking narrative technique and *balladic* and *calypsonian* episodic structure, the novel did not initially attract the critical attention it deserved: "Selvon in the 1950s and 1960s was himself largely disregarded as a serious writer" (James 2001, 104). However, over time, its importance was recognised, and the novel was critically examined in many different journals, newspapers and academic studies. The ability of Selvon to authentically

portray the poverty, deracination and discrimination from which these new waves of Caribbean immigrants suffered was highly appreciated by his contemporaries. To exemplify, Susanne Pichler stated that *The Lonely Londoners* was "a milestone in the development and growth of 'black' writing in Britain" (2004, 48), and Nick Bentley remarked that the novel was "one of the key literary texts in the representation of the Windrush generation of immigrants from the Caribbean to Britain in 1950s" (2003, 41). S. Dickinson recognized the novel as "a literary landmark" due to its outstanding "reliance on Caribbean English as a medium of narration" and its treatment of the reality of the new immigrant life in Britain (1996, 69), whereas, in the *Guardian*, Helon Habila, a Nigerian novelist and poet, made the point that *The Lonely Londoners* was the first novel to take the task of representing the 'black' diaspora, living on London's fringes, and to bring this fringe into the centre through multi-dimensional characters:

> … Selvon, more than the others, specialised in telling the stories of working-class black characters and their experience of discrimination in the big city. Some critics have described *The Lonely Londoners* as really nothing more than a collection of mini biographies, a group of lives interacting with each other. But what makes this collection stand out is how painstakingly the author has drawn them; Selvon has a way of investing the most tiny, insignificant detail with a universe of meaning. (2007)

David Dabydeen also wrote: "*The Lonely Londoners* resonates [with] all sorts of stories … of exodus or salvation; these West Indian characters venture into perilous regions facing 'dragons' and 'green man' … in pursuit of the 'holy grail' of daily survival" (quoted in Ingrams 2001, 34). In his review in the *Independent*, Naseem Khan similarly pointed out that *The Lonely Londoners* was a true record of London life through the eyes of 'the boys', the picaresque characters in the novel: "There's 'Galahad' [surviving] by perfecting a patent method of trapping and eating seagulls … Captain [accepting] the invitation of a

husky-voiced woman, to be told by the whooping boys later that he'd screwed a man … Harris, the would-be Englishman, whose posh do is disrupted by the boys" (2011).

This chapter, focusing also on Selvon's Moses Trilogy[58], but mainly on *The Lonely Londoners*, is divided into two main sections. In the first section, I will interpret the fiction of Selvon in terms of its relationship to currently established constructions of realism and modernism; secondly, I will analyse Selvon's use of language, especially the manipulation of Standard English through a Creolized vernacular, as an effective form of subversive resistance to the colonial language of the Establishment by means of subtle ironic and self-mocking strategies. In order to examine whether traditional Marxist theory can articulate the concept of race solely through objective economic relations, the second section will discuss the relationship between class and race through an examination of the alienation, atomization and victimization of the 'black' and working-class characters in the novel within the context of the philosophical and cultural debates propounded by critics and theorists such as Paul Gilroy, Alex Callinicos, Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. Over the course of the chapter, the ideological forms of representation will also be elucidated by considering the arguments of Stuart Hall, Edward Said and Homi Bhabba in an attempt to contextualize critically authentic portrayal of the socio-historical reality of the identity formations of the characters.

1. Form and Language

Selvon, manipulating Standard English with a creolized narrative voice in order to capture the spoken language of Caribbean migrants, was able to render the experiences of the Caribbean settlers in Britain by making use of linguistic strategies and narrative

[58] Moses trilogy of Selvon includes three novels, successively *The Lonely Londoners* (1956), *Moses Ascending* (1975) and *Moses Migrating* (1983).

experiment to develop new capacities for the novel genre. Aiming both to narrow the bridge and highlight tensions and differences between the West Indian consciousness and the European reader, Selvon's London-set novels essentially address two distinct groups: "[T]he Caribbean subcultural groups that were beginning to establish a distinct black British identity in the late 1950s" and "a mainstream white audience that receives the text as a kind of reportage novel" (Bentley 2005, 68). As Selvon comments in one of his interviews regarding *The Lonely Londoners*: "I wrote a modified dialect which could be understood by European readers, yet retain the flavour and essence of Trinidadian speech" (quoted by Fabre in Nasta 1988, 66). This addressivity of his narrative actually orientates the novel not only towards certain receivers or addressees but also, self-reflexively, towards its own language and form, resulting in some problems and dilemmas in terms of the representations of the texts (Connor 1996, 10).

Although what might be interpreted as an authentic melding of the techniques of realism with those of modernist narrative seems to create a characteristic ambivalence in the London-set novels of Selvon, the effect is basically to disrupt the traditional opposition between modernism and realism that continued to provide the dominant critical taxonomy of fiction in the immediate post-war period. Selvon's experimental techniques ideologically function to represent the internal thoughts of an under-represented class in the mainstream British novel, and like Alan Sillitoe's, combine the techniques of modernism and those associated with realism in order to create a new representational form to convey his political stance. Critics like Bentley have recognised how Selvon represents identifiable characters through non-linear narrative structures by making use of free indirect speech and how he incorporates the narrative techniques of both modernism and realism in order to produce a radical fiction in terms of the representation of the alienation felt by the black working class in London in the 1950s (Bentley 2007, 267-70).

Selvon similarly indicates that the writing process of *The Lonely Londoners* was "an experimental one" and that although his approach included the literary modes of realism and modernism, "I just attempted to write the way people spoke and to render their language out of a desire for verisimilitude, or realism" (quoted by Fabre in Nasta 1988, 65-6).

One view of modernism that became associated with writers such as William Cooper, C, P. Snow and Pamela Hansford Johnson in the 1950s was that it was the product of an elite coterie of inward-looking aesthetes who wrote about and appealed to a narrow class of upper middle class literati. In "Reflections on Some Aspects of the Experimental Novel" (1959), William Cooper remarks that modernist writing, also referred to as experimental writing, carries ideological assumptions which exclude particular groups, including working-class, other socially marginalized groups, and minorities. The argument, in other words, is that experimental writing essentially reflects the outlook of an elite group with educational privileges: "[T]he Experimental Novel was about Man-alone: We meant to write novels about Man-in-Society as well … The novel is being made emptier and emptier … [since] in present day industrialized society … few people … through loss of privilege, have less scope than formerly" (40-41). But Selvon's novels, especially the Moses Trilogy, seek to disrupt this narrow association of modernism with a specific white and middle-class reader group in the Western world, and his intention in them is to reach out to and represent the collective experiences of black working-class life. Commenting on this, Nick Bentley states:

> The use of modernist techniques supports the progressive content of the novel [*The Lonely Londoners*] and, therefore, undermines the argument that these techniques are restricted to the articulation of middle and upper-middle-class experience, reclaiming the form for a marginalized subcultural group. The text also disrupts the claim that modernism represents an inherently isolationary and individualistic discourse ... the use of stream of consciousness style by

> which Selvon represents a liberating and ultimately empowering technique for the representation of black identity. (2007, 270).

The long sections of prose with no punctuation marks are intended to reveal the ambivalent feelings and "great aimlessness" of Moses towards London and demonstrate the way in which Selvon appropriates modernist stream of consciousness for his own ideological purposes in *The Lonely Londoners*. Using this experimental/modernist technique in order to reflect the isolating, atomizing and objectifying atmosphere of London on "the boys", to wittily emphasize the stereotypical images of black sexual identity in the dominant culture and to reinforce social and cultural solidarity by means of storytelling as an antidote to alienation, Selvon succeeds in communicating the anecdotal stories of "the boys" to the same subcultural group through interior monologues[59] (Bentley 2005, 72; Pichler 2004, 52):

> In the big city the sex life gone wild you would meet women who beg you to go with them one night a Jamaican with a woman in Chelsea in a smart flat with all sorts of surrealistic painting on the walls and contemporary furniture in the G-plan the poor fellar bewildered and asking questions to improve himself because the set-up look like the World of Art but the number not interested in passing on any knowledge she only interested in one thing and in the heat of emotion she call the Jamaican a black bastard though she didn't mean it as an insult but as a compliment under the circumstances but the Jamaican fellar get vex and he stop and say why the hell you call me a black bastard and thump the woman and went away all these things happen in the blazing summer under the trees. (*The Lonely Londoners* 101)

From a structural perspective, this long quotation, written in a non-standard Caribbean variation of English, can also be identified with a variety of linguistic forms that basically challenge the cultural and linguistic hegemony of the colonial centre. To exemplify, the verb conjugations syntactically do not fit into the rules outlined by

[59] In another interview, Selvon associated his narrative technique with modernism: "I think I can say without a trace of modesty that I was the first Caribbean writer to explore and employ dialect in a full-length novel where it was used in both narrative and dialogue. I was boldfaced enough to write a complete chapter in a stream-of-consciousness style".

Standard English, as in the case of subject-verb agreement in the sentences like “the set-up look like” where the suffix –s, as an indicator of the first person singular agent, is omitted; of the inconsistency of the choice of tense where one sentence is inflected in present tense while the next one takes the form of past tense as in “thump the woman and went away”; and of the omission of auxiliary verb in the sentences like “the poor fellar bewildered and asking questions” and “she only interested in one thing”.

Beyond this micro-level of basic syntax, Selvon’s appropriation of the aesthetics of the traditional Caribbean calypso is another of the pioneering strategies deployed in the narrative structuring of *The Lonely Londoners*. Having its roots in the stick fighting of the rival groups of slaves in colonial Trinidad, the calypso music is a significant oral tradition inherently including improvised satirical verses sung by the chantwell or a chorus in order to challenge and belittle their opponents. Becoming an integral part of the carnival tradition, the calypso songs expressed the discontent and anxiety of the local people and used satire and implicit insult in order to challenge British colonial power shrewdly (Dawson 2007, 31-2). As stated by Okawa (2013):

> Born out of colonialism and the conditions of slavery, the humorous calypsonian forms of song and dance first emerged on the plantations in the Caribbean as a way to alleviate the suffering of the slaves, and also to rebel against the colonial authority of their masters. The formal humour of the calypso – its satirical edge and its fondness for wordplay and banter – is best exemplified by *picong* or a type of verbal combat between two calypsonians on stage through ridicule or *mepris* (insult) … “throwing” *picong* functions as a verbal weapon and response to the unequal power relations between African slaves and European masters. (19)

In this respect, the calypso offered a cultural and political opportunity for the Caribbean migrants to express themselves and construct an autonomous postcolonial black identity in Britain in the 1950s. *The Lonely Londoners* was written in this cultural context, and the adaptation of the aesthetics of the calypso is evident in the music-like flow of language

and fragmented narrative of the novel: "I experimented with the language as it is used by Caribbean people. I found a chord, it was like music, and I sat like a passenger in a bus and let the language do the writing" (Selvon 1995, 60). Selvon's recurrent use of the word "ballad" for "story" and portrayal of serious problems faced by the immigrants through irony, melodrama and humorous and exaggerated anecdotes indicate that his fiction is modelled on the oral tradition of the calypso (Dryer 2002, 119). The "old talks or conversational feel", "the episodic 'ballads' or tales", "the narrator's resemblance to the important role of the calypsonian figure as a social commentator in Caribbean culture", "the verbal teasing that occurs between Moses and the boys" also reflect the influence of the calypso on the form and tone of the novel (Okawa 2013, 18-9). To exemplify, the scene in which Selvon satirizes[60] the perception of white Britons regarding the probability of bouncing up "a spade" around every corner reveals how Selvon, by means of the calypso tradition[61] and creolized narrative voice, produces a politically engaged literary work challenging the dominant political practices in the mainstream society:

> This was a time, when any corner you turn, is ten to one you bound to bounce up a spade. In fact, the boys all over London, it ain't have a place where you wouldn't find them, and a big discussion going on in Parliament about the situation, though the old Brit'n too diplomatic to clamp down on the boys or to do anything drastic like stop them from coming to the Mother Country. (*The Lonely Londoners*)

The fragmented narrative of the collective experiences of the characters through an episodic structure also represents Selvon's attempt to "to integrate the novel with an oral tradition" (274). According to Bentley (2007), the deployment of this narrative technique

[60] In "Samuel Selvon: Interviews and Conversations" (in Nasta 1988), Michel Fabre makes the point that Selvon's fiction is "an achievement because it maintains a mellow, humorous, mildly satirical tone which manages to endear the West Indians to the reader without ridiculing the British too much" (217).

[61] Commenting on Selvon's use of the calypso, Ashley Dawson states: "Selvon's calypso aesthetic offered a paradigm for a populist cultural nationalism that resonated strongly with the intellectual of his generation. Selvon's appropriation of calypso allowed him to commandeer the British novel and transform it into a vehicle for the expression of postcolonial Caribbean identity" (33).

in the novel has two basic functions. The first is to reveal the experience of estrangement as fragmented expression while the second is to produce "a collective narration of minority representation" and to promote the Caribbean black identity through disparate narratives expressing the experience of 'exile' through the themes of estrangement, racial hatred, and survival (276). Having the characteristics of different modes and traditions of narration, including the Caribbean oral tradition, realism and modernism, the literary style of Selvon, therefore, has a hybrid structure formally. This form is essentially a revelation of the fact that postcolonial writers needed to develop narrative styles in order to represent the complex identity formation process and the quest for self-being of marginalized voices in their literary works:

> The novel …negotiates a linear and episodic narrative structure to produce a hybrid form that reveals its connection to Westerns modes of realism … and to the Caribbean oral tradition … This hybrid form is again related to the double sense of addressee the text projects and indicates Selvon's awareness of the need for a complex narrative style to articulate the specific concerns of postcolonial literature (Bentley 2007, 277)

Selvon's creation of a modified creole narrative voice, by incorporating the Trinidadian vernacular into the text through the deployment of strategic deviations from Standard English, establishes *The Lonely Londoners* as one of the major texts of postcolonial fiction in terms of linguistic aesthetics. In postcolonial studies, the use and choice of language is fundemental, since colonizers imposed the dominance of their own language and even forbade natives to speak their indigenous languages. Language is actually the medium "through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated" and the "conceptions of 'truth', 'order', and 'reality' become established" (Ashcroft 1989, 7). In order to resist the systematic imposition of colonial language, some postcolonial writers support a return to the use of mother tongues, therefore, while some see the language of the colonizers as a pragmatic way of enhancing international communication and refuting

monocentric orientalist views or of countering a colonial past by means of deformation of Standard English or reformation of it in new literary forms (Margulis and Nowakoski 1996[62]). Despite starting his writing career in English, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, for example, is one of those radical writers who preferred to write in his native language in order to decolonize the language of his own people and preserve the specificity of the pre-colonial culture, language and presence of his own nation: "Language carries culture, and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature … Language is thus inseparable from ourselves as a community of human beings with a specific form and character, a specific history, a specific relationship to the world" (2006, 267). Salman Rushdie, on the other hand, makes the point that a colonial language can be used to debunk the discourses of orientalism and, internationally, to reveal and work out the problems confronting 'colonies':

> I hope all of us share the opinion that we can't simply use the language the way the British did; that it needs remaking for our own purposes. Those of us who do use English do so in spite of our ambiguity towards it, or perhaps because of that, perhaps because we can find in that linguistic struggle a reflection of other struggles taking place in the real world, struggles between the cultures within ourselves and the influences at work upon our societies. To conquer English may be to complete the process of making ourselves free. (1992, 17)

In *The Empire Writes Back* (1989), Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin alternatively focus on the intentional manipulation of the linguistic forms through which postcolonial writers experiment with and manipulate a standard language and replace it with local vernacular languages, which is symbolically a resistance to the power relationship between the colonizer and the colonized: "The crucial function of language as a medium of power demands that postcolonial writing define itself by seizing the language of the center and replacing it in a discourse fully adopted to the colonized people" (38).

[62] See https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/postcolonialstudies/2014/06/21/language/

This subversion is mainly achieved through linguistic strategies such as abrogation and appropriation: Abrogation is the "denial of the privilege of 'English'" and "rejection of the metropolitan power over the means of communication", whereas appropriation is the "reconstitution of the language of the centre, the process of capturing and remoulding the language to new usages" (38).

Considering the arguments of Ashcroft et al., Selvon's experiment with language, manipulation of linguistic forms, and use of creolized speeches[63], make him a postcolonial writer because Selvon expresses the experiences of a subcultural group by constructing a distinct identity as a reaction to the dominance of the imperial centre through a number of techniques such as "abrogation", "appropriation", "the concept of a polydialectic continuum"[64] and "syntactic fusion" (Bentley 2005, 75). The incorporation of Caribbean slang words like "fellar", "rab", "skin", "spade" and "test", and the manipulation of the syntactical and grammatical rules of Standard English, as in the omission of auxiliary verb and possessive pronouns ("He don't know how he always getting in position like this") reflect the fact that abrogation and appropriation are simultaneously present in the novel. The abrogation of the colonizer's language represents "the rejection of the cultural assumptions and power relations on which it rests" while the process of appropriation "functions more as an empowering strategy by establishing a specific subcultural identity, and by taking control and subverting the colonial language" (Bentley 2005, 77). The use

[63] In an interview, Selvon explains how he decided to use a creolized vernacular: "When I started to work ın my novel *The Lonely Londoners* I had this great problem with it that I began to write in Standard English and it would just not move along … it occurred to me that perhaps I should try to do both the narrative and the dialogue in this form … I started to experiment with it and the book went very rapidly along … wit this particular book I just felt that the language that I used worked and expressed exactly what I wanted it to express" (in Nazareth 1979: 421).

[64] Analysing the polyglossic communities of the West Indies, Jean D'Costa in "The West Indian novelist and language: a search for a literary medium" (1983) points out: "The [Caribbean] writer operates within a polydialectical continuum with a creole base. His medium, written language, belongs to the sphere of standardised language which exerts a pressure within his own language community while embracing the wide audience of international Standard English" (252).

of untranslated slang words without a clarification in the novel, on the other hand, creates a political discourse emblematic of the cultural distance between 'the periphery' and 'the centre'. In other words, the emergence of a distinct and separate 'e'nglish from Standard English through linguistic variances constructs a counter discourse against the colonial centre, which primarily signifies a sort of cultural distinctiveness. As argued by Ashcroft (1989):

> The 'cultural space' is the direct consequence of the metonymic function of language variance. It is the 'absence' which occupies the gap between the contiguous inter/faces of the 'official' language of the text and the cultural difference brought to it. Thus the alterity in that metonymic juncture established a silence beyond which the cultural Otherness of the text cannot be traversed by the colonial language. By means of this gap of silence the text resists incorporation into 'English literature' … not because there is any inherent hindrance to someone from a different culture understanding what the text means, but because this constructed gap consolidates its difference. (54-5)

The manipulation of Standard English through linguistic strategies also corresponds to the concept of heteroglossia[65] suggested by Bakhtin. Identifying two linguistic forces, defined as 'centripetal' and 'centrifugal', in literary works, Bakhtin points out that the dominant culture exerts 'centripetal' pressure in order to standardize language into a unified system, whereas a 'centripetal force' counters this process of homogenization by means of grammatical and syntactical deviations and subversions. The use of a creolized language,

[65] In *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), Bakhtin refers to the coexistence of distinct varieties such as different styles of speeches and cultural languages and dialects as heteroglossia: "Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear. The process of centralization and decentralization, of unification and disunification, intersect in the utterance; the utterance not only answers the requirements of its own language as an individualized embodiment of a speech art, but it answers the requirements of heteroglossia as well; it is in fact an active participant in such speech diversity … Heteroglossia, as organized in these low genres, was not merely heteroglossia vis-à-vis, the accepted literary language … that is, vis-à-vis the linguistic center of verbal-ideological life of the nation and the epoch, but was a heteroglossia consciously opposed to this literary language" (272-73).

the Caribbean dialect[66], in *The Lonely Londoners*, therefore, functions as a medium for the evolution of a local variety of english and as a centripetal force against the power relationships and cultural assumptions of the imperialist/metropolitan centre (Bentley 2007; Lashley 1984).

2. Class and Race

The class theory of Marx based on the dichotomy of the exploiter and the exploited was arguably no longer adequate, in its original form, to the task of effectively analysing the class structure in the second half of the twentieth century since some traditional occupations had already disappeared and new occupational groups such as technicians, supervisors, managers and academics had emerged. The structural transformations within capitalism, caused by "the progressive loss of control over the labour process on the part of the direct producers", "the elaboration of the complex authority hierarchies within capitalist enterprises and bureaucracies" and "the differentiation of various functions originally embodied in the entrepreneurial capitalist", resulted in a transition from traditional industrial production including small-scale and non-hierarchical enterprises to information technology and service industry including multinational corporations (Wright 1976, 28-29). In order to re-conceptualize the concept of class, new strategies, aiming to extend and reform the Marxist class model by considering the economic and social circumstances of contemporary society, were developed in the second half of the twentieth century. As discussed in the first chapter in detail, the challenge to older models of simple

[66] Analysing the cultural position of Kafka as a Jewish Czech author writing in German, Deleuze and Guattari develop the model of minor literature: "A minor literature doesn't come from a minor language; it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language … the three characteristics of minor literature are the deterritorialization of language, the connection of the individual to a political immediacy, and the collective assemblage of enunciation" (1986, 16-18). Considering this argument, *The Lonely Londoners* bears the characteristics of a 'minor language'. Writing in 'e'nglish as a 'black' Caribbean writer symbolizes the process of deterritorialization, whereas creating a literary work depicting the collective experience of a minority group in the colonial centre signifies the process of "political empowerment" rejecting "the cultural centrality of Englishness" (Bentley 2007, 282).

polarization, the rise of a new petty bourgeois class, the professional and managerial and new and contradictory class locations are among the foci of prominent new class approaches, indicating that a revisionist Marxism is still relevant as a key instrument in offering an explanation of the current structural operation of the money-oriented world.

In this respect, in order to focus on another controversial debate around the argument that Marxism has a tendency to overlook radical social movements centred around 'marginalized' identities and their subsequent subordination[67] and how the notion of class struggle in Marxist terminology should therefore be redefined, this part will examine the approach of traditional Marxist theory to capitalism taking on a more multi-cultural orientation. It will also take account of the conflicts regarding race, ethnicity, nation and class as the concept of the pluralization of national identity started to emerge as a consequence of the immigration of many 'black' and Asian communities to the *colonial* centres after the process of decolonization in the 1950s (Gilroy 2002). This will contribute to the setting up of a theoretical framework through which the theoretical and historical relevance of Marxism to the concepts of race and ethnicity can be revealed and the 'double victimization' of the 'black' proletarian characters in the novel can accordingly be examined.

Marxism has provided a sizable number of inspiring theoretical studies on race and ethnicity and influenced contemporary debates in a variety of ways. Marx and Engels themselves focused on the dialectics of race and class, putting the totality of the social relations of production within capitalism into question. Defined as "the generalized and

[67] In *Black Marxism* (1983), Cedric Robinson argues that Marxism is inextricably tied to Eurocentric ideology and cannot confront the reality of racism in Europe: "[I]t is still fair to say that at base, that is at its epistemological substratum, Marxism is a Western construction – a conceptualization of human affairs and historical development that is emergent from the historical experiences of European peoples mediated, in turn, through their civilization, their social orders, and their cultures. Certainly its philosophical origins are indisputably Western. But the same must be said of its analytical presumptions, its historical perspectives, its points of view" (43).

final assigning of values to real or imagery differences, to the accuser's benefit and at his victim's expense, in order to justify the former's own privileges or aggression" by Memmi (2000, 169), racism is sustained and reproduced in modern capitalist societies in order to maintain racial antagonism and division among workers in accordance with the notion of 'divide and rule'. Setting workers against each other and preventing them from unitedly standing up against the ruling class, racially structured social relations are considerably functional in terms of the preservation of the interests of the bourgeoisie. In his letter[68] of 9 April 1870 to Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt, Marx similarly associates racism mainly with economic terms and sketches out a materialist explanation of how racism functions in capitalism:

> Every industrial and commercial centre in England now possesses a working class divided into two *hostile* camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he regards himself as a member of the *ruling* nation and consequently he becomes a tool of the English aristocrats and capitalists against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination *over himself*. He cherishes religious, social, and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude towards him is much the same as that of the "poor whites" to the Negroes in the former slave states of the U.S.A. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He sees in the English worker both the accomplice and the stupid tool of the *English rulers in Ireland*. This antagonism is artificially kept alive and intensified by the press, the pulpit, the comic papers, in short, by all the means at the disposal of the ruling classes. *This antagonism* is the secret of the *impotence of the English working class*, despite its organisation. It is the secret by which the capitalist class maintains its power. And the latter is quite aware of this.

The tendency of the capitalist class to replace skilled workers with cheaper and unskilled workers deepens the economic competition and racial antagonism among workers during the restoration periods of capitalism since 'white' workers are likely to be displaced by immigrant workers, usually employed in low-paid and dirty jobs. This, in

[68] See https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1870/letters/70_04_09.htm

return, leads to the alignment of 'white' workers with the white supremacy myth of the ruling class, which is indeed an illusionary means to reassert their own beings and instinctual human qualities under the alienating conditions of capitalism: "[R]acism offers for workers of the oppressing 'race' the imaginary compensation for the exploitation they suffer of belonging to the 'ruling nation'. It is, moreover, an objective fact about capitalism that racism helps keep capitalism going by dividing and therefore weakening the working class" (Callinicos 1993, 39). Commenting on the relationship between the 'white' working class and their supremacy illusion, E. San Juan in "Marxism and the Race/Class Problematic" explains:

> Marx sketches three parameters for the sustained viability of racism in modern capitalist society. First, the economic competition among workers is dictated by the distribution of labour power in the labour-market via differential wage rates. The distinction between skilled and unskilled labour is contextualized in differing national origins, languages and traditions of workers, which can be manipulated into racial antagonisms. Second, the appeal of racist ideology to white workers, with their identification as members of the "ruling nation" affording… Third, the ruling class reinforces and maintains these racial divisions for the sake of capital accumulation within the framework of its ideological/political hegemony in the metropolis and worldwide.

Likewise, in his articles on the Civil War in the U.S., Marx focuses on the relationship between race, class and nationalism and discusses the socioeconomic and political dimensions of the war between the North and the South by pointing out that this war is basically a tariff conflict concerning "the Northern lust for sovereignty" and does not therefore touch upon the question of slavery (1861). Analysing the economic implications regarding land and property and making the point that the Civil War is a bourgeois democratic revolution rather than a communist one and that this war might be the harbinger of a socialist revolution in Europe as it will be a great example of the

expropriation of private property[69] in economic terms, Marx supports the emancipation of nearly four million slaves and underlines the fact that many millions of poor whites in the U.S. might benefit from racism materially and align themselves with the slaveholders:

> Only by acquisition and the prospect of acquisition of new Territories, as well as by filibustering expeditions, is it possible to square the interests of these poor whites with those of the slaveholders, to give their restless thirst for action a harmless direction and to tame them with the prospect of one day becoming slaveholders themselves. (1861)

W. E. B. Du Bois, drawing on the orthodox Marxist view of the nexus of race and class, also gives a detailed account of the appeal of the superiority complex to white workers and of the division between black and white workers after the civil war. In his *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935), Du Bois, like Marx, investigates the psychological aspects of this fragmentation and concludes that, despite having practically identical interests, these two groups deeply feared and hated each other and that this racial antagonism fuelled exploitation and led to the failure of them to transcend the 'colour line':

> [T]he white group of labourers …were compensated in part by a sort of public and psychological wage. They were given public deference and tides of courtesy because they were white. They were admitted freely with all classes of white people to public functions, public parks, and the best schools. The police were drawn from their ranks … White schoolhouses were the best in the community, and conspicuously placed, and they cost anywhere from twice to ten times as much per capita as the coloured schools. The newspapers specialized on news that flattered the poor whites and almost utterly ignored the Negro except in crime and ridicule. On the other hand … the Negro was subject to public insult; was afraid of mobs; was liable to the jibes of children and the unreasoning fears of white women; and was compelled almost continuously to submit to various badges of inferiority. (700-1)

[69] In his letter of 28 December 1846 to Pavel Annenkov, Marx considers modern slavery as an inextricable constituent of capitalism: "Direct slavery is as much the pivot upon which our present-day industrialism turns as are machinery, credit, etc. Without slavery there would be no cotton, without cotton there would be no modern industry. It is slavery which has given value to the colonies, it is the colonies which have created world trade, and world trade is the necessary condition for large-scale machine industry. … Slavery is therefore an economic category of paramount importance (in *Marx Engels Collected Works* published by International Publishers in 1975, Vol. 28, Page 95).

O. Cromwell Cox describes this situation as "bipartite" (1959, 365), referring to the perception of the whites that the whole nation is persistently "a white man's country" (369) although everyone, blacks and whites in the U.S.A., lives in the same geographical place. The insistence upon a bipartite system of social segregation of races basically facilitates the exploitation of labour in favour of the bourgeois class: "[R]ace prejudice is not simply dislike for the physical appearance … it rests … upon a calculated and concerted determination of a white ruling class to keep peoples of colour and their resources exploitable" (1959, 349).

In fact, the primacy of production relations lies in the fact that they determine the character of the politics of race. An integral part of the capital accumulation process, racially structured social relations are imposed by the prevailing mode of production, capitalism, and deepened by the institutions and agencies of state, resulting in the regulations of the tides of the black labour force in the market for the sake of capital, and this consequently fractures the unity and reproduces the fragmentations within the working class. The discursive construction of the concept of race functions as an ideological façade masking the contradictions resulting from the contradictory relations of production, and this discourages a deeper class unity: "The political and ideological reaction of those who remain the object of racism will be increasingly a movement towards a complete break with the struggles and institutions that arise out of production relations" (Miles 1984, 231-2). In "The Ideological Tension of Capitalism: Universalism versus Racism and Sexism" (1991), Immanuel Wallerstein similarly investigates the sources and consequences of modern racism and sexism and remarks:

> [I]f one wants to maximize the accumulation of capital, it is necessary simultaneously to minimize the costs of production (hence the costs of labour-power) and minimize the costs of political disruption (hence minimize – not

> eliminate, because one cannot eliminate – the protests of the labour force). Racism is the magic formula that reconciles these objectives. (33)

Contrary to the classical Marxist analysis, neo-Marxism or post-Marxism calls for a radical revision of the relationship between race and class in order to theorize the complexities of racism and incorporate political movements mobilizing around different forms of identity other than class. Putting forward that Marxism was not able to distinctively analyse the phenomena of race and ethnicity and that Marxism, with its commitment to the concept of historical materialism, which is indeed reductive, became anachronistic and increasingly peripheral to the theoretical reconsideration of the recent social mutations like neo-capitalism and multiculturalism[70], the neo-Marxian approach aims to struggle for a free, democratic and egalitarian society. This approach, rejecting the theory of socialism based upon the ontological centrality of a unitary and homogeneous will of the working class, lays greater emphasis on the pluralistic character of contemporary social events and movements such as "the rise of the new feminism", "the protest movements of ethnic, national and sexual minorities", "the anti-institutional ecology struggles waged by marginalized layers of the population", "the anti-nuclear movement" and "the atypical forms of social struggle in countries on the capitalist periphery" (Laclau and Mouffe 2014, xxi). Instead of amalgamating these new social movements under the title of 'class struggle', in order to radicalize and mobilize masses through new 'antagonisms', this approach makes use of different social conflicts and new

[70] In "Marxism, Racism and Ethnicity" (1995), John Solomos and Les Back argue: "Marxism as a method in sociological research fails to provide substantial explanation to problems pertaining to race and ethnic relations. Assumptions which can explain economic relationships fail to explain contemporary racism and problems associated with it. Advocates of Marxism face the challenge of showing the relevance of their theoretical and historical views to contemporary forms of race and ethnic relations" (1). In a similar way, Simon Watney states: "Available theories of class could not even acknowledge the existence of desire, let alone explain it, as a constitutive force. Marxist culture theory had traditionally tended to regard cultural production in direct instrumental terms as an agency of class consciousness, supposedly 'true' or 'false' … In this respect, Marxism offers a social picture of what amounts to an 'empty machine' – empty, that it, because uninhabited by desiring, motived human beings, who have been theorised away as no more than agents of class struggle" (quoted in Evans and Hall 1999, 42).

forms of subordination taking place after the Second World War as a consequence of the consolidation of a new hegemonic formation and a series of changes in social relations, transforming society into a vast market by creating new needs and commodity relations. As argued by Laclau and Mouffe:

> [N]ew antagonisms are the expression of forms of resistance to the commodification, bureaucratization and increasing homogenization of social life …the new struggles – and the radicalization of older struggles such as those of women or ethnic minorities – should be understood from the double perspective of the transformation of social relations characteristic of the new hegemonic formation of the post-war period, and of the effects of the displacement into new areas of social life of the egalitarian imaginary constituted around the liberal-democratic discourse. It is this which has provided the framework necessary for the questioning of the different relations of subordination and the demanding of new rights. (2014, 149)

Pointing out that different patterns of racial movements have appeared in the historical conditions of late-capitalism, that the traditional Marxist theory of race should be inverted and that political struggles articulated through identity concepts might potentially be more influential in radicalizing certain 'peripheral' groups than those based on class politics, Paul Gilroy focuses on a crisis of representation in the trade unions (2002, 20-3). Gilroy, similar to Marx (1861; 1870), Callinicos (1993) and Du Bois (1935), lays out that the 'white' working class benefits from the operation of the exclusionary practices of racism in order to accrue economic interests and that 'white' workers, instead of defending the interests of every member of the working class, failed to challenge racism in the post-war epoch: "[Trade unions] have failed to represent the interests of black workers, both abroad and at home, where black rank-and-file organisation has challenged local union and national union bureaucracy since the day the *Empire Windrush* docked" (1982, 305). In this argument, Gilroy suggests that the notion of class-based political struggles should be redefined through a contextualization of the 'black' struggle against

racism along with the other 'heterogeneous' movements like the feminist, ecology and youth movements in the 1980s:

> The obvious alternative, pending the replacement of class as a category in the long term, seems to be to reserve the concept for those elements within the politics of social movements which relate to the contradiction between capital and labour and to the mode of production which makes that contradiction intelligible. Social movements centred on the experience of subordination as well as exploitation include class but are not reducible to it. Where it enables political action and organization, 'race' falls into this category. (2002, 30)

Stuart Hall, in a similar way, examines the interweaving relationship between the capitalist crises and deployment of racialist arguments by analysing the material conditions of the working class in British society. Hall, tracing the history of racism in Britain back to the reign of Elizabeth I., draws attention to the economic and psychological benefits of the 'white' working class having a 'stake' in the system. By creating a new hegemony leading to the assumption that 'blacks' are dangerous[71] and responsible for the loss of employment, economic stability and security, the ruling class ideologically pitches the white working class against the black working class in order to exploit racial tensions, functioning as an "ideological conductor", and to ensure its basis of legitimacy through "the construction of an authoritarian consensus, a conservative backlash" (viii):

> So the crisis of the working class is reproduced, once again, through the structural mechanism of racism, as a crisis within and between the working classes … In these conditions blacks become the 'bearers' of these contradictory outcomes; and black crimes becomes the signifier of the crisis in the urban colonies. (1978a, 339)

[71] Hall points out that, through its ideological apparatuses including newspapers, police documentation, television news, public debates and crime statistics, the state constructs an image of 'mugging', "a relation between crime and the reaction to crime" (viii), and associates "a specific fraction of category of labour (black youth)" (1978a, 338) with it in order to mobilize a 'popular racism' in times of economic crisis: "Racism represents the attempt ideologically to construct those conditions, contradictions and problems in such a way that they can be dealt with and deflected in the same moment. That instead of confronting the conditions and problems which indeed do face white and black in the urban areas, in an economy in recession, they can be projected away through race" (1978b, 35).

In his later works, Hall, however, adopted a more postmodern approach[72] in order to question the concept of identity, "endemic in cultural studies", despite the fact that he still insisted on the significance of the fundamental links between capital, culture and class relations (Davis 2004, 161). Recognising the significance of class and engaging it with cultural studies, Hall explores the functions of race and identity within a new conceptual space:

> [C]lass, as the 'master category' was obliged to take its place alongside other 'primordial' social divisions, like race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality. These had been treated as subordinate or dependent variable in classic Marxist analysis – subeconomic or superstructural. This was impossible, theoretically, after the rise of the anti-racist, gender, and sexual liberation movements of the 1970s. (Quoted in Essed and Goldberg 2002, 451)

In this context, Hall proposes that race, ethnicity and identity operate in a mutually reinforcing hegemonic fashion to ideologically position 'blacks' towards challenging dominant structures and, therefore, towards rebellion and resistance. Finding themselves ethnically, socially and economically oppressed and marginalized, as a 'class', 'blacks', are, for that reason, potentially inclined to stand up to exploitation and injustice:

> [R]ace performs a double function. It is also the principal modality in which the black members of that class 'live', experience, make sense of and thus come to a consciousness of their structured subordination. It is through the modality of race that blacks comprehend, handle and then begin to resist the exploitation which is an objective feature of their class situation … It is in the modality of race that those whom the structures systematically exploit, exclude and subordinate, discover themselves as an exploited, excluded and subordinated class. Thus it is primarily in and through the modality of race that resistance, opposition and rebellion first expresses itself. (1978a, 361-2)

The social movements, arising mostly from exploitation, poverty and racial subordination, are not understood here as a phenomenon of class but as a means to

[72] In *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identiting in Late Capitalism* (2000), R. Hennessy argues: "We can see this trajectory quite distinctly in the work of Stuart Hall himself, who finally abandoned his always somewhat tenuous endorsement of historical materialism by the late 1980s in favour of the post-Marxism of Foucault and Laclau and Mouffe" (82).

universalize the subject of emancipation beyond the particular demands of the working class, which is substantiated through the fact that the number of the working class has shrunk in the advanced capitalist countries. In "The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach", Alberto Melucci analyses the theoretical content of the new forms of collective action and suggests a number of common characteristics concerning the disparate new social movements which are respectively a) "the end of the separation between public and private spheres", opening up sexual and interpersonal relations and biological identity, formerly belonging to the zone of the private sphere, to public scrutiny; b) "superposition of deviance and social movements", resulting in social demands and needs basically taking the form of marginality and deviance; c) "not [being] focused on the political system", asserting that these movements are not oriented to capture the control of political power or the state apparatus, but to gain autonomy or independence; d) "solidarity as an objective", stressing the significance of group identity; and e) "direct participation", rejecting any kind of authorial and hierarchical representation (1980, 219-220). In a similar way, Manuel Castells, in *The City and the Grassroots* (1983), develops a theory of urban-oriented social movements and argues that, despite having major differences, urban social movements basically mobilize around three distinctive characteristics: a) collective consumption, standing for the services provided by the state; b) cultural identity, referring to a common body of plural meanings and symbols constructed around race, ethnicity, identity, locality and religion; c) political self-determination, aiming to gain a degree of autonomy from the local administrations (1983, 300-9). Making the point that the number of urban social movements increased compared to that of the working-class movements and that "the philosophical rationalism of the political left and the one dimensional culture of the Labour movement … ignore[d] subcultures, gender specificity, ethnic groups, religious beliefs, national identities and

personal experiences" in developed countries, Castells, by combining the three goals of urban social movements, emphasizes the possibility of a social change and transformation of urban meanings, which will, in return, undermine social hierarchies and create a city on the basis of use value, autonomous local culture and decentralized participatory democracy (1983, 315-20). The recent history of the 'black' communities in Britain shares similar features, according to Gilroy (2002, 314-5). Instead of using the language of class, these communities, seeking for opportunities in order to be provided high-quality services by the state, cohesively strengthening solidarity through dynamic and distinct cultural and racial ties, and demanding to have control over the processes shaping their day to day experiences by means of community organizations, make use of identities and try to control the immediate conditions of their own communities free from the intervention of the state. In these organizations, collective identities, "spoken through race, ethnicity and locality", are undeniably functional as they are "powerful means to co-ordinate action and create solidarity", subsequently leading to the articulation of "personal autonomy with collective empowerment focused by a multi-accented symbolic repertoire and its corona of meaning" (2002, 339).

3. Racism, Alienation and Victimization

Set in the period after the end of the Second World War, *The Lonely Londoners*, as discussed above, fictionalizes the misery, poverty, emotional turmoil and victimization of the 'black' immigrant population, the Windrush generation, in London. Making use of humour, wit, political satire and an inventive narrative style under the influence of the Trinidadian calypso, Selvon undermines the myth of civilization and takes a major step forward in terms of linguistic, mental and cultural decolonization through the ballads which are intimately narrated with an oral spontaneity in a loose and episodic structure

through the non-judgmental manner of his central character, Moses, within the heart of the colonial centre. The survival struggle of the 'boys' from Galahad to Harris, driven by a possibility of social mobility and desire for material wealth as a consequence of the 'illusion' that "the streets are paved with gold" (2), is rendered in a 'black' metropolitan subjectivity, which subsequently evokes different moods such as despair, disillusion, frustration and hopelessness.

In an interview, by rejecting the didacticism of socialist realism in the 1950s and, therefore, the idea of being a politically committed writer, Selvon points out that freedom of perspective should be essential to the writer: "Being a committed writer does not appeal to me because it often amounts to limiting your scope and range … Too often so-called commitment restricts the quality and universal scope of the work" (quoted in Nasta 1988, 71). This lack of political articulation, in fact, reflects itself in the characters of *The Lonely Londoners* in which "the boys" are motivated by their individualistic impulses, rather than an organized and collectivized politics, in order to survive within the harsh and dehumanizing life conditions of London. However, the novel is still able to foreground the marginalisation process of the 'black' minority group in the mainstream white culture and produce its own political commentary by unobtrusively instilling suspicion and mistrust, which makes it, discursively, a radical political commentary: "The political tendency must emerge unobtrusively from the dramatized situations; only in this indirect way could revolutionary fiction would work effectively on the bourgeois consciousness of its readers" (Eagleton 2002, 43).

Paul Gilroy, in *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (2002), examines the imagery of black criminality and the archaeology of the representation of black identity

and points out that the construction of the 'black' identity in Britain operates through the discourses of criminality, sexuality and miscegenation:

> The idea that blacks are a high crime group and the related notion that their criminality is an expression of their distinctive culture have become integral to British racism in the period since the 'river of blood' speech … As culture displaced anxiety about the volume of black settlement, crime came to occupy the place which sexuality, miscegenation and disease had held as the central themes and images … of race. Crime … was gradually identified as an expression of black culture. (140)

Considering this argument, the issue of the representation of "the boys" in *The Lonely Londoners* is ambiguous and problematic because of the complex addressivity of Selvon's narrative. On the one hand, *The Lonely Londoners* foregrounds and empowers the cultural practices and differentiation of the 'black' minority group for the 'black' addressee, but on the other hand it reproduces, rather than undermines, many of the stereotypical images of black identity for the addressee belonging to the mainstream white culture and which actually therefore reinforces the cultural and racial prejudices and anxieties of British society in the 1950s through a black perspective (Bentley 2003, 43). To exemplify, Captain, the Nigerian "fellar" who "would do anything to get a woman" (33), does not work, borrows money from and constantly sleeps around with white girls; Big City gambles and is hopelessly addicted to lottery; Lewis beats up his wife, Agnes, in order to assert his masculinity; and Five Past Twelve smokes weed. Such a portrayal of "the boys" within the text, therefore, supports the stereotypical image in which the 'black' presence in post-war Britain is identified as the main source of the problems and the 'black' settlers are innately viewed as the perpetrators of crimes. However, Selvon simultaneously debunks such racial significations by contextualizing the acts of "the boys" within a specific set of social, historical and cultural circumstances and by implicitly characterizing "the boys" as individuals with different traits rather than as the representatives of a certain

racial or subcultural group as in the examples in which Bart moves from place to place week after week, pays rents regularly and is "too afraid to get into trouble in this country" (49); Galahad is so scared of the policemen as if they "would find something wrong that they do and want to lock them up" (24); and Tanty is so respectful to the policeman while asking "where Greatport Street is" (69). Commenting on this, Bentley (2003) states:

> [T]his is not the fault of Selvon's novel, but reveals the specificity of the cultural understanding and construction of racial identities in the fifties. The text displays these (sub)cultural practices without projecting value judgements upon them, thereby persuading the reader to make his/her own value judgements and ultimately to analyse the bases on which those judgements are made. The process of empowering therefore becomes problematic, as the very aspects of cultural practice Selvon celebrates in black culture could very easily be used by dominant white culture to confirm prejudices about black identity. (43)

Creating sympathetic characters through whom readers are exposed to how 'blacks' are treated by white Londoners is one of the strategies Selvon subtly makes use of in order to criticize racism and xenophobia in British society through commentary. In the white metropolis, the identities of the 'boys' are reduced to their colours and pigmentations irrespective of their personalities, desires and actions. Despite being aware of the fact that they "bleed to make this country prosperous" and that they "have more right than any people … to live and work in this country" (21), "the boys" have to deal with the racist stereotypes of migrants as well as British racism which functions with a politically correct rhetoric and discourse: "The thing is, in America, they don't like you, and they tell you so straight, so that you know how you would stand. Over here is the old English diplomacy …when you go in the hotel or the restaurant they will politely tell you to haul – or else give you the cold treatment" (21). The scene in which Moses takes Galahad to the Ministry of Labour to get him registered reveals how racism implicitly prevails even

within the established institutions of Britain and how "the boys" are stigmatized in accordance with 'colours' and 'backgrounds':

> [O]n all the records of the boys, you will see mark on the top in red ink. J-A, Col. That mean you from Jamaica and you black … suppose a vacancy come and they wat to send a fellar, first they will find out if the firm want coloured fellars before they send you … they don't tell you outright that they don't want coloured fellars, they just say sorry … on the whole they treat you decent. (28-9)

The status of being an 'outsider' is indeed related to the corporeality of blackness, and the ideological self-image of British people as civilized and superior, the monologic discourse of orientalism[73], is constantly exposed to "the boys" through different encounters in the metropolitan centre. In a "ballad", a friend of Moses reads "in the window about rooms to let and things to sell" and notices a remark saying "Keep the Water White" (77); Galahad meanwhile, tells "one of the boys" to listen to a man talking about "how colonials shouldn't come to Brit'n" as "the place overflowing with spades" (78). On another occasion, Galahad tries to catch a bus and pushes his way to the front of the bus queue. While standing up and watching all the people who get on the bus, an old lady looks at him and loudly tells her friend that "they'll have to learn to do better, you know" (25). Being an apparent outcome of the binary dichotomy between the civilized and the savage, this orientalist perception essentially functions to marginalize "the boys" and subsequently leads to inferiority complexes and self-abjection. The internalization of the values of colonial discourse based on racial origin, for example, results in the self-otherization of Galahad's own 'black' body, the process of disembodiment, since he questions the

[73] In *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said focuses on the orientalist perception and theorizes the so-called epistemological and ontological distinction between the Orient and the West: "Orientalism can be discussed and analysed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient –dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (2003, 3).

practices of the dominant racial significations and assumes that his skin colour is inherently the problem:

> [Galahad] was in the lavatory and two white fellars come in and say how these black bastards have the lavatory dirty, and they didn't know that he was there, and when he come out they say hello mate have a cigarette. And Galahad watch the colour of his hand, and talk to it, saying, 'Colour is you that causing all this, you know. Why the hell you can't be blue or red or green, if you can't be white … Look, at you, you so black and innocent, and this time so you causing misery all over the world … 'ıs not we that the people don't like ... 'is the colour Black'. (77)

Marcus Collins in "Pride and Prejudice: West Indian Men in Mid-Twentieth-Century Britain" (2001) states that West Indians regarded British men "as archetypical gentlemen: sporting, leisured, well-bred, well-read, reserved, and assured authority figures" while West Indians were attributed to laziness and lack of ambition (394-7). Galahad's illusion that "misery all over the world" is caused by 'blackness' can, therefore, be articulated through this orientalist perception in the colonial Caribbean, which actually enabled the colonizers to construe "the colonized as a population of degenerate types … in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction" (Bhabha 1994, 70). Commenting on the self-estrangement of Galahad from his own, M. H. Msiska, in a similar way, elucidates:

> [T]he dissociation from his body serves as a way of protecting the ego from its corporal embodiment and in the process preserving a deep sense of selfhood that cannot be reached by the external negative stimuli … In accepting the dominant racial semiotics and cathecting his self outside that system, Galahad redeems himself from being a victim, mobilising his agency in the process of producing the terms of a new identity that is located outside the frame of the received racial signification. (16-7)

In the nineteenth century, Britain was imagined to be a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant nation, and the British working class, after the collapse of the Chartist Movement, was gradually incorporated into this conception of British nationalism

underpinned by race and religion (Virdee 2014). The Irish workers[74], one of the racialized minority groups in Britain, for example, experienced discrimination and exclusion, and an anti-Irish sentiment was reinforced through both popular press and written and visual media in order to deepen the racial conflict between the two groups of workers with identical interests. In *1848: the British State and the Chartist Movement* (1987), J. Saville focuses on a caricature emphasizing "the prognathous features of the Irish labouring class: a bulge in the lower part of the face, the chin prominent, the mouth big, the forehead receding, a short nose, often upturned and with yawning nostrils: the simianising of the Irish" (38). In a similar way, Arthur, an Anglo-Saxon white English worker in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, describes the Irish workers as "hard-headed bastards with no feeling" fighting for "each other's wagepackets in some corner of the nearest field" (146). Even after the decolonization process in the second half of the twentieth century – the period of the new waves of immigration from Africa, Asia and the West Indies – the racialization of the working class continued in order to prevent and divide multi-ethnic class solidarity through the "pseudo-scientific mythology of race" (Callinicos 1993, 17). As briefly summarized by Raymond Williams: "[A]n English working man (English in terms of sustained modern integration) protest[ed] at the arrival or presence of 'foreigners' or 'aliens' and … [specified] them as 'blacks'" (quoted in Gilroy 2002, 52).

Comparing the subjective feelings of the white characters in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* with those of the black characters in *The Lonely Londoners*, in this sense, reveals this imaginary dividing line among workers based on colour, race, religion and other affiliations. The scene, in which Jonny's friend, Sam, "a coloured soldier from the

[74] The first single-authored book of Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* focuses on the different aspects of the industrial working class in Victorian England and identifies the Irish workers as the most militant part of the working class in Britain by referring to them as "hot Irish blood that flows in the vein of the English working class" (97).

Gold Coast" (191), visits Aunt Ada and her family during his mechanics course in England, lays out the traditional orientalist perception of the white working class towards Africans:

> Arthur sat at the table with a cup of tea, enjoying the banter, and the questions showered on simple and unselfconscious Sam. Could he read and write? Who taught him, then? Did he believe in God … Did Sam miss West Africa? Of course, Bert said in a loud whisper, he misses the tom-toms … And do you have a girl-friend on the Gold Coast? Is she nice? Is she as black as the ace of spades … Will you get married at the church … Sam knows how to eat. (*SNSM* 192-8)

Despite being friendly to Sam, structurally a member of the working class as well as being a colonial subject of Britain, the attribution to Africans of inferior intelligence, over-sexualisation and savageness offers Arthur an illusionary comfort and particular identity through which he believes that he is a part of the ruling nation, "an imagined political community" in which "regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail … the nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal comradeship" (Anderson 2006, 7). This, in return, justifies the fact that black workers are doomed to work in the worst jobs with lower wages, which is essentially a consequence of the "pseudo-scientific biology of races", drawing on "a vulgarised version of Darwin's theory of natural selection" (Callinicos 1993, 29).

The Lonely Londoners vividly presents this inequality and injustice through the daily life experiences of its black characters. To exemplify, in one episode, Moses complains about "getting the worse jobs" and explicates "a big ballad" regarding how "all the people" in the railway company "say they go strike unless the boss fire Moses" and how

he was 'kindly' fired from his job because of the "colour bar"[75] (8). In another scene, Tolroy takes Lewis to the factory and easily gets a job for him in which "mostly is spades they have working in the factory, paying lower wages than they would have to pay white fellars" (52), whereas Cap, the Nigerian character, talks about the fact that "they want put [us] in the yard" and that "they think that is all we good for, and this time they keeping all the soft clerical jobs for them white fellars" (35). In *Moses Ascending*, Moses, commenting on the working hours of "the spade" (11), also draws attention to the fact that 'black workers' work in the worst jobs and are treated "unfairly" (11) by "the civilized world" (10): "If they had to get their arses out of a warm bed in the wee hours, if they had to come out of cosy flat and centrally-heated hallways to face the onslaught of an icy north wind and trudge through the sludge and grime of a snow-trampled pavement, they would encounter black man and woman by the thousands" (9). These snapshots reveal that the illusion of a superiority complex appeals to the white workers and that the material interests of white workers indispensably necessitate the exploitation and degradation of the 'black' working class in order to maintain a standard living, which subsequently creates racial antagonisms and an "ethnically distinct class fraction" within the working class itself (Hall et al. 1978, 331). Referred to as "the ethnicization of the work force" by Immanuel Wallerstein (1991), this is a different expression of racism, one based on an "occupational-reward hierarchy" (33). As A. Sivanandan, one of the most important scholars within the radical black tradition, comments in "The Liberation of the Black Intellectual" (1977):

---

[75] In *Mongrel Nation: Diasporic Culture and the Making of Postcolonial Britain* (2007), Ashley Dawson states: "Black workers were consistently downgraded and deskilled following their arrival in Britain. In addition, British labour unions were uniformly hostile toward black workers, despite the rhetoric of working-class solidarity articulated by national union leaders. Black workers tended to be accused of undermining the unions' closed shop policy and of helping employers break strikes by working as 'black legs'" (37).

> [The 'white' worker] is a party to his (i.e. the black worker's) oppression. He too benefits from the exploitation of the black man, however indirectly, and tends to hold the black worker to areas of work which he himself does not wish to do, and from areas of work to which he himself aspires, irrespective of skill. (339).

In order to reinforce multi-ethnic class solidarity, the English working class, at this point, started to challenge its long-standing indifference to racism, and labour and youth movements promoted anti-racist and anti-fascist social movements in the aftermath of the revolutionary generation in the 1960s (Virdee 2014). The articulation of the fact that the capitalist exploitation of blacks should be understood through race and class simultaneously, indeed, unveiled racial oppression and politicised the black communities in Britain. In other words, the black working class "arrive[d] at a consciousness of class" by means of "the consciousness of their colour" (Sivanandan 1982, 17).

As in Alan Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, the class antagonism in *The Lonely Londoners* is constructed through the dichotomy of 'them' and 'us', which functions to reveal the neglected, exploited and alienated nature of "the boys" within the colonial centre. Referring to rich people as "them" (60), the 'black' characters align themselves with the working class and the Labour Party despite not being class consciousness. The section of the novel describing where Tolroy and his family live, for instance, unfolds the differences between "the boys" and 'them'. The poor neighbourhoods, "the real world" (59), are depicted through negative images such as "old", "grey", "weatherbeaten" and "dirty" (59), while the rich neighbourhoods, the "plush places" (60), are associated with "them people" having a "car", "going to cinema and ballet in the West End", attending "premiere with the royal family" and not knowing anything about "hustling two pound of Brussel sprout and half pound potato" or "queuing up for fish and chips in the smog" (60-1). In a "ballad", Galahad loses his job and feels so desperately hungry that he decides to eat "a fat fellar" pigeon in the park. "Watching them

with envy" and thinking that "[British] people prefer to see man starve than a cat or dog want something to eat" (117), Galahad attempts to snatch the pigeon, but he is noticed by an "old geezer" (118) feeding the pigeons with small pieces of bread. In another episode, Cap, likewise, decides to snatch seagulls in his room in Dawson Place while dreaming of "big meals at Chinese and Indian restaurants" (131). After trying a number of strategies, Cap takes up an old cardboard box, takes his clothes off the hanger, ties the twine to the hanger, opens the window, props up the box with the hanger, puts bread in the space under the box and holds "the other end of the twine in his fingers" and catches seagulls. Finding themselves ethnically, socially, culturally and economically oppressed, marginalized and otherized and being "racialized outsiders" (Virdee 2014), "the boys", afterwards, question the discrepancies through the them-us contradiction, which can actually be contextualized within "the modality of race" as their racial consciousness helps them to discover themselves as a part of "an exploited, excluded and subordinated class" (Hall 1978a, 361-2). In return, they feel "a kind of communal feeling with the Working Class and the spades" (61) and ideologically position themselves towards challenging exploitation, injustice and dehumanization within the so-called paradisiac circumstances of London:

> [T]hey come to kind of accept that is so the world is, that it bound to have rich and poor, it bound to have some who live by the Grace and other who have plenty. That is all about it, nobody does go into detail. A poor man, a rich man. To stop one of them rich tests when they are going to a show in Leicester Square and ask them for a bob, they might give you, but if you want to talk about the conditions under which you living, they haven't time for that. (61)

Towards the end of the novel, "the boys" politically become more mature and explicitly take sides with the Labour Party and socialism: "We had better chances when the Socialists was in power, you know" (129). In an episode, while having a conversation about "them fellars" who have "their bread buttered from home" (129), Galahad and Moses even question for which party Daniel and Harris vote. Suspecting that Harris could

vote for the Tories as "he always talking about the greatness of the old Churchill and how if it wasn't for him this country go right down" (129-30), Galahad and Moses, in a way, exemplify another snapshot of how "collective identities spoken through race, community and locality" might function as a spontaneous and powerful means to "coordinate action", "create solidarity" and systematically anchor the dynamism of 'blacks' in leftism (Gilroy 2002, 339).

In *Moses Ascending*, reaping "the harvest of the years of slavery" (4) and purchasing a house belonging to Tolroy, Moses distances himself from Galahad and his other "fellars" as a "landlord" (3) and assumes that he has become an integral part of the colonial centre: "[I]n my way I am as much part of the London landscape as little Eros with his bow and arrow in Piccadilly, or one-eye Nelson with his column Trafalgar Square, not counting colour" (44). Despite claiming that he will not be "one of them prejudiced landlord what put No Kolors on their notices" (5), Moses states that he would have "preferred a mansion in Belgravia or a penthouse in Mayfair, without too many black people around" (6). Running the house like a typical wealthy Englishman in the nineteenth century, Moses allows a penniless white man from the northern part of England, Bob, to stay in one of the rooms in return for "dutifully" (15) cleaning the house, cooking and sorting out tenant problems and he refers to him as "my man Friday" (4), "footman" (25), "servant" (5), "au pair" (9), "a willing worker" (10), "loyal and true" (11), "faithful" (134) and "lackey" (75). Although such a hierarchal power relationship between Moses and Bob, evoking the relationship between Crusoe and Friday in *Robinson Crusoe*, might be interpreted as a subversion of the systematic interpellation of the Orient as the subordinate and the marginal within an Occidental episteme, an interruption of "the imperial structures and tropes of Western domination" and a re-definition and re-construction of Moses' own identity through "counter narrative" (Chakraborty 2003, 61-56), it actually perpetuates the

hegemonic discourse of Euro-capitalism rather than undermining its binary paradigms. Moses, though working as a manual labourer for more than twenty years and being double-victimized because of both his class and his colour, is able to become a victimizer himself since his humanity has been insidiously transformed and his unconscious has been colonized by the individualistic values of the money-oriented world, leading Moses to internalize the desire to be "at the top of all" (5) and live "in the highest flat in the house" (4). In this respect, *one-dimensional* identity politics, ignoring the issues of economic justice, exploitation and class politics and solely based on a particular form of oppression, might not challenge or shake up the status quo or emancipate oppressed groups; on the contrary, as in the example of the Black Power movement in *Moses Ascending*, such social movements, despite their potentially progressive and revolutionary nature, might absorb the anger of oppressed groups and integrate them into the neoliberal capitalist system by functioning as a sort of façade, so masking the root cause of the problems: "As soon as a black man start to get out of the ghetto and into the castle, he turn a blind eye to the struggle" (12).

The institutionalized cultural and educational colonial framework in the West Indies led immigrants to identify British culture with civilization, moral virtue, progress, enlightenment, wisdom and refinement. Regarding their own culture as an indication of lower emotions, the dark side of soul, evil, backwardness, irrationality and wretchedness[76], West Indians were subjugated by the "narcissistic myths" of the cultural imposition of the "White cultural supremacy" in their collective unconscious (Bhabha in Fanon 1986, ix). The rationalization of the 'natural' domination of the 'civilizing' power

[76] Referring to orientalism as an "archive of information" which is unanimously bound together and explained through a set of values, manipulations and generalizations, Edward Said states: "[The West] supplied Orientals with a mentality, a genealogy, an atmosphere; most important, they allowed Europeans to deal with and even to see Orientals as a phenomenon possessing regular characteristics" (2003, 42).

of the colonizers degraded the colonial subjects to the point of nonexistence: "When I was a little boy in Trinidad, the old ones use to tell the children to try and live and behave like white people, and I used to imagine that white people live in Paradise, and it was so nice there that they didn't want no black people to enter and muddy up the water" (*Moses Ascending* 106). When reduced to its simplest form, the situation, in which 'whites' consider themselves superior whereas 'blacks' want to prove their own vital being and the richness of their culture and thought at all costs, subsequently resulted in the internalization of inferiority complexes. In other words, intrinsically accepting the cultural codifications of the colonizers and a sovereign Western consciousness immobilized, denigrated, dehumanized and victimized the colonial subjects. As noted by Nelson Mandela in his Rivonia speech of 1964, "the lack of human dignity expressed by [the colonizers] is the direct result of the policy of white supremacy … white supremacy implies black inferiority"[77].

The Lonely Londoners, in this respect, vividly reveals the instances of such feelings of inferiority in many different forms through the confrontation of "the boys", the so-called primitive men, and the 'whites', the so-called civilized men. When Tanty first arrives at Waterloo, a reporter wants to take her picture. In order to 'prove' that "we have good manners", Tanty opens up her cardboard box on the platform, takes out a straw hat with a wider brim, puts it "on she head" (11) and poses with her family. By imaginatively, ideologically, sociologically and militarily creating a colonized mind-set through a body of theory and practice, orientalism restructured the epistemological and cultural boundaries of the 'Orient'. This occasion, in which Tanty affiliates civilization, the interpellative discourse of the colonial sovereignty in colonial Trinidad, with British-like

[77] See http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Human%20Rights%20Documents/Mandela_RivoniaTrial.html

high table manners within the heart of the colonial metropolis, virtually reflects how the 'subject races' internalized the core British values as dignified, true, normal and real: "The wearing of European clothes, whether rags or the most up-to-date style; using European furniture and European forms of social intercourse … all these contribute to a feeling of equality with the European and his achievements" (Westermann qtd. in Fanon 1986, 25). In another "ballad", Moses and Galahad have a conversation about Cap, "a worthless fellar" who "mudd[ies] the water" for "the boys", and Moses condemns Cap since he "give[s] the wrong impression for all the rest" (34) by sleeping around with white girls and never paying back what he borrows from them. This essentially reflects the fact that "the boys" have already internalized the collective guilt of being 'black' and that "the boys", associating themselves with the civilizing power, victimize another fellow as a scapegoat in order to justify their 'existence' in the mainstream white society.

In *Black Skin, White Masks* (1986), Frantz Fanon points out that "every colonized people …finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country" and that "the colonized is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards" (19). This argument manifests itself in the scene of the "fete" organized by Harris. The fete takes place in St Pancras Hall, and Harris, "standing up by the door in a black suit and bow tie", greets English people with "a pleasant good evening … and a not so pleasant greeting for the boys" (104). Before the fete starts, Harris tells "the boys" to act "like proper gentlemen" (104), to "watch" their "language" (116) and not to "make [him] ashamed of [himself]" (111) because he has "distinguished" (105) and "decent" (116) guests and they should not think that "[they] are still uncivilized and don't know how to behave properly" (116). The patronizing approach of Harris to his 'fellars' is based on "his phobia of his friends' behaviour reflecting badly on his image in London society" (Okawa 2013, 21).

The self-esteem of Harris[78], a mimic[79] man, is, indeed, reduced to the approval of 'the civilized white men', and his pathological obsession to be recognized as a 'civilized' and 'cultured' 'black' elite in the zone of nonbeing metonymically stands for the collapse of his own actuality and ego. When Harris is in contact with the 'white' world, his psychic structure becomes weaker, he stops behaving as an "actional person" and, in the guise of a 'white man', he mimics or acts like "the Other" since only "the Other" can give him the worth he longs for (Fanon 1986, 154). Attempting to create a dialogic cultural space between the 'black' community and the colonial centre and to assert that a 'black' civilization exists, Harris basically regards "his role as … that of civilizing his countrymen into the ways of the dominant White world and … as that of educating the Whites about Black people" (Msiska 2009, 21). Unlike "the boys", manipulating Standard English through a Creolized vernacular, Harris, who "like English customs", "does be polite and say thank you" and "does get up in the bus and the tube to let woman sit down" (103), exerts himself to speak in 'perfect' Queen's English to his guests, which is also a 'natural' outcome of the assumption that he will be 'whiter' and closer to being a 'real' human

[78] "Swinging she fat bottom left and right", Tanty Bessy wants to dance with Harris in the fete; however, Harris feels embarrassed, "gets so vex" and kindly asks her to stop since he dances with one of his "distinguished" guests. According to Rachelle Okawa (2013), posing a threat to Harris's securing a prominent position in London society, this incident can be traced back to the Sunday slave dances held in the colonial plantations of the Caribbean: "Though tolerated, these Sunday dances were viewed with mistrust by the slave masters and were considered sacrilegious and contrary to the beliefs of the established Church … [Tanty's] physical transgressions on the dance floor … mark her as culturally 'different' and 'other' [and] such a mark of cultural difference is precisely what Harris is trying to avoid" (21).

[79] In *The Location of Culture* (1994), Homi Bhabha focuses on the concept of mimicry in relation to the metonym of presence, the desire for a recognizable other, and explicates it as follows: "[I]n order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is, thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of the inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an immanent threat to both 'normalized' knowledges and disciplinary powers" (86).

being in direct ratio to his mastery of English[80] and that he will enjoy a certain position of dignity, recognition and honour.

After immigrating to London, "the boys" have to get adapted to a society in which "fellars don't see one another for years" (25), "everyone is your enemy and friend" (27), "everybody look so busy" (23), "people … don't know what happening in the room next to them" (60), "every man [is] on his own" and has "matters on the mind" (17). Internalizing the social and cultural orientations ascribed by the prevailing mode of production, capitalism, and feeling "powerfully lonely" (29), homesick, mechanized, "miserable" (126), "desperate" (27) and atomized in London, "the boys", subsequently, run through a state of loss, discontent and frustration, which, in return, leads to alienation in the form of meaninglessness, powerlessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and social isolation (Seeman 1975): "From winter to winter, summer to summer, work after work. Sleep, eat, hustle pussy, work" (124-5). Unable to dominate and participate in decision-making process, to feel confident, self-assured and intimate enough due to interpersonal mistrust, excessive competition, instability and individualism, to fulfil the needs related their human nature, to assert themselves through their own identity and to become integrated to the mainstream society, "the boys" have to have a life within the boundaries of social isolation:

> [Moses] could see a great aimlessness, a great restless, swaying movement that leaving you standing in the same spot as if a forlorn shadow of doom fall on all the spades in the country. As if he could see the black faces bobbing up and

[80] In his essay "Imaginary Homelands" (1992), Salman Rushdie states that "to conquer English may be to complete the process of making ourselves free". The episode, in which Galahad and Big City go to the coast by Marble Arch at Orator's Corner on a summer evening in order to listen to some "fellars" talking about the political issues, justifies this argument. While having an argument against the government and the police, Galahad goes up on the platform and tries to speak. Meanwhile, Big City asks Galahad to speak louder, to "talk good English" and to tell the crowd about the time the foreman called him a nigger, which, in fact, reveals that a colonial language can be used to debunk the discourse of the white supremacy myth and unearth the problems confronting immigrants within the cradle of 'civilization'.

> down in the millions of white, strained faces, everybody hustling along the Strand, the spades jostling in the crowd, bewildered, hopeless. As if, on the surface, things don't look so bad, but when you go down a little, you bounce up a kind of misery and pathos and a frightening – what? (139).

This sense of dislocation, disorientation, un-belonging and atomization separates "the boys" from each other as well as from society and concretely leads to the ghettoization of their life spaces in London "divide[d] up in little worlds" in which "[the boys] stay in the world [they] belong to" (60). As Susanne Pichler (2004) convincingly states:

> [This] automatically increases the ethnic ties among the immigrants and at the same time understandably also reduces the likelihood of an understanding between the ethnic minorities and the majority population. As a consequence, Selvon's characters hold on to what is familiar and known, articulating a sense of home amidst homelessness and living an alter-Nation apart from and/or within the nation. (51)

One of the central metaphors in the novel, the "grim" weather of London, at this point, reflects the alienation process experienced by "the boys" and represents the emotional distance between "the boys" and the inhospitable and cold culture of the colonial centre, which starkly reminds "the boys" of the fact that they exchanged the green and warm life of the West Indies for this "strange place on another planet" (1) with its 'fragile' security. The recurrent fog, disorienting "the boys" and blurring their consciousness, symbolically impedes them in finding meaning and purpose in the middle of endless and monotonous activities in London: "The sun shining … no heat from it, it just there in the sky like a force-ripe orange" (23). Similarly, in *Moses Ascending*, Moses sometimes looks through the window, but he "can't see nothing, only smog and frost out there, and the sky so grey and gloomy it look as if it join-up with the earth and make one, you does wonder what crime this country commit that it have to punish so with this evil weather" (7). In order to escape from the unpleasant weather of London and to find an opportunity through which they can actualize their essential human capacities, displace their state of unhappiness and attain self-fulfilment, "the boys" dream of going back to

Trinidad, living in a small village, having some cattle and goats, lying down in the sun, sleeping under tree and eating a fish broth (125): "The old home is now paradise … the dream of metropolitan life is replaced by that of a rustic existence and the very things [they] had once abandoned for the promise of a better life in London" (Msiska 2009, 23). "The boys", gradually losing any hold on the values related to social cohesion, kinship and fellowship and becoming more individualistic and self-oriented, get rid of their sense of alienation and homesickness through pastoral memories that essentially bind them together socially and mentally: "This is a lonely miserable city, if it was not that we didn't get together now and then to talk about things back home, we would suffer like hell. Here is not like home where you have friends all about" (126). In *Moses Migrating*, the natural longing for "the land of milk and honey" (7) comes true, and Moses, in order to escape from London, the place "full of sin and transgression" (167) with no excitement, novelty and hope, migrates to Trinidad and fulfils his early dream in *The Lonely Londoners*.

Transformation of social relations into properties and commodities, the process of reification, functions as an outward escape mechanism for "the boys" in order to nullify the negative impacts of alienation and nothingness in the colonial centre. They struggle to re-assert their existential being and intrinsic values through 'commodities' and objects since their human nature has been taken away, their consciousness has been reshaped and they have been transformed into thing-like beings within the spheres of mainstream 'white' society. After getting a job, Galahad, for example, does not stint on spending money, stocks up with clothes, learns "all the smartest and latest cut" (75), "dress up good" (73), buys "a bottle of French wine" (81), tells the waiter to bring "the best" (81) and walks "like a king with money in [his] pocket, not a worry in the world" (75). In order to feel "big", "important" and "like a new man", whenever he talks to "the boys", Galahad

uses the names of places[81] "as if to say 'I was in Oxford Street' have more prestige than if he just say 'I was up the road'" (71). Despite 'enjoying' the pleasant side of London, Galahad is reminded of the fact that he is racially the 'other' when he bumps into a child telling his mother to "look at [the] black man". Feeling "uneasy" among "so many white people around", the mother immediately leaves the place by pulling her child along, although Galahad asks his name with "the old English accent" by pretentiously saying "what a sweet child" (76). On another occasion, when Galahad takes his first white date to his old basement room, he opens the door to "a whiff of stale food and old clothes and dampness" and "dirt come out the door" (81). This dichotomy of substance and appearance, the contrast between Galahad's expensive new clothes and filthy room, is, indeed, a reflection of the double consciousness of Galahad, to use the term of Du Bois (2004), and of the 'hypocritical' life circumstances in London where upper class affluence exists side by side with extreme urban poverty. Aligning himself with the imaginary values of the hegemonic discourse of the metropolis, Galahad seeks refuge in a class-and-race-ridden society and compensates for the sense of meaninglessness and powerlessness in order to exert his basic recreational functions through illusory fulfilments. From a more general perspective, social aspiration, "the fetishisation of money and goods" and "the adoption of a relentless and ruthless materialism" standing for the process of commodification/reification, depersonalize and victimize "the boys" and entrap them within the physical and metal confinements of the dominant metropolitan culture as money becomes the dominant measure of "value and word, and even of friendship" and

[81] Big City similarly brags about knowing everywhere from Pentonvilla to Musket Hill in London and living in the big cities of the world: "None of this smalltime village life for me. Is New York and London and Paris, that is big life. You think I going to stay in Trinidad when the war over? This small place? No, not this old man" (83).

their social status and power are all determined by the values of the 'commodities' they own (Msiska 2009, 18).

The Lonely Londoners, excluding the expression of female experience, debasing women, both black and white, and aggrandizing modes of masculinity, portrays women characters as either a source of humour or as sexual objects. Tanty Bessy, for instance, is portrayed as an aggressive, confident, subversive and comic 'black' female figure who exerts herself not to lose her Caribbean identity in the colonial centre and she imposes her own Caribbean lifestyle on the metropolis. Having a "big mouth" and becoming a "familiar figure", she convinces the local shopkeeper to have a credit system, tells the baker to put her bread in a bag, and persuades the greengrocer to give her the best products rather than the rotten ones, which "initiates a process of multiculturalism" and suggests that "the boys" would not have difficulties if they did not venerate everything in London uncritically (Msiska 2009, 25). On the other hand, the characterization of the white female figures in the novel reproduces dominant masculine and racial discourses as in novels of other male authors of the 1950s, particularly those associated with the 'Angry Young Men' movement (Bentley 2003, 43). Similar to *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, in order to get over the sense of despair, anger, fragmentation, alienation, degradation, humiliation and inferiority, "the boys" restore their manhood through the sexual conquest of the white women, referred to as "bird", "sport", "thing", "craft", "number", "piece of skin", "white pussy"[82], and so gain mastery over the bodies of the white women, a further external escape method in the novel. "When my restless hands caress those white breasts,

[82] In *Moses Ascending*, male characters are usually after "white pussy" or "black pussy" whereas female characters are referred to as "cunts", "frowsy English girls" or "black bitch". Moses has even a sexual record and brags about how many "white women" he "fucked": "I have fucked more than a hundred white women, give or take a few … I am proud of my average … Blonde, blue-eyed Scandinavian, fair English rose, vivacious Latin – all have come, see and I conquered" (25).

they grasp white civilization and dignity and make them mine" (Fanon 1986, 63). To exemplify, Cap, a Nigerian from a rich family, is sent to London to study law. After his father stops sending money to him, he devotes himself to the seduction of white women and economically exploits them in order to support his expensive life style without having to work. Objectifying women as a source of "fresh" flesh and seeking "validation through European women", who are actually the embodiments of the 'superior' European culture, Cap, in this way, "achieves a symbolic victory over colonial racial subordination by making his girl friends dependent on him" (Dawson 2007, 38). Through his momentary sexual desire, lacking spiritual connection and genuine intimacy, Cap 'performs' his authentic manhood and implicitly struggles to actualize himself on an unconscious level, which is actually a false-consciousness: "It give him a big kick to know that one of the boys could take white girls to them places to listen to classics and see artistic ballet" (43). However, Cap essentially conforms to the stereotypical representation of 'black' men in which 'black' men are attributed sexual power and potency and therefore reduced to the position of sex objects, and this internalization of the 'self' as the 'other' leaves 'black' men in a perpetual combat with their own images that turn them into phallic figures as in the scene in which one "fellar" of Moses meets a white girl who is only interested in "one thing" and she calls him "the Jamaican black bastard" (101) as a compliment in the heat of emotion (Fanon 1986; Dawson 2007).

CHAPTER V: DORIS LESSING

Doris Lessing was born in Persia, now Iran, in 1919. When Lessing was six years old, her family, lured by the hope of becoming affluent through farming, moved to Rhodesia, a British colony at that time, now Zimbabwe. Despite dropping out of school at the age of thirteen, she made herself into a successful self-educated intellectual and writer and she was awarded the Somerset Maugham Award in 1954 for *Five: Short Novels*, the James Tait Black Prize in 1995 for *Under My Skin*, the David Cohen Memorial Prize for British Literature in 2001, the S. T. Dupont Golden PEN in 2002, and finally the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2007. Described as "that epicist of the female experience, who with scepticism, fire and visionary power has subjected a divided civilization to scrutiny"[83] by the Swedish Academy, Lessing, in her literary works, reflected extensively on her personal experiences as a child in Rhodesia: "Doris Lessing's life is the source of her fiction … Lessing speaks directly of that life, of her own indoctrination into racist values, her views of the third world liberation struggles, of the class-bound life of her own London neighbourhood" (Pratt and Dembo 1974, 3). In her prolific forty-year career, she published nineteen full-length novels, sixty-five short stories, five plays and three autobiographical narratives experimenting with a range of genres and narrative techniques; she also lived her life as an activist, involving herself in understanding of and resistance to colonial oppression, class conflict, global catastrophe, poverty and the traumatization and mental breakdown of twentieth-century women.

Published in 1962, read in many translations all over the world, and considered as one of the major works of twentieth-century literature, Lessing's magnum opus, *The*

---

[83] See http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2007/press.html

Golden Notebook is perhaps the most well-known novel of her works. The novel, depicting the life of Anna Wulf, the writer of *The Frontiers of War*, a "free woman", a Communist and a single mother in her thirties who suffers from political disillusionment and "writer's block" and struggles to find a way to attain wholeness, order and a coherent vision in a chaotic, fragmented and individualized social order, explores the socio-political, cultural, economic and historical circumstances of the mid-twentieth century. It focuses particularly, in its thematic emphasis, on the rise of anti-Stalinism, nihilism, gender issues, psychoanalysis, madness, colonialism and racism. In order to capture the immediacy of mental breakdown and fragmented consciousness in British society and to express it within a new narrative framework, Lessing, in the novel, uses a form-breaking and experimental narrative organization in which each "Free Woman" section, written in the third person and chronologically fictionalizing the lives of Anna Wulf and her friend Molly Jacobs in London, is followed by excerpts from the black, red, yellow and blue notebooks, written in the first person and covering the years 1950 and 1957, but now offered with a scrambled chronological order: the black notebook, recounting Anna's interior monologues about her first novel, *Frontiers of War*, parodied as *Forbidden Love*, and her memories of Southern Africa; the red book, concerning Anna's involvement with political issues, especially with the British Communist Party, and her satire of her own political stance and the party line; the yellow notebook, narrating Anna's unpublished novel, *The Shadow of the Third*, focusing on Ella and her friend Julia; and the blue notebook, functioning as a record of Anna's personal life and relations with her daughter, Janet, and friends. As Anna explains to Mother Sugar, the therapist, in the novel: "I keep four notebooks, a black notebook, which is to do with Anna Wulf the writer; a red notebook, concerned with politics; a yellow notebook, in which I make stories out of my experience; and a blue notebook which tries to be a diary" (418). This pattern of a "Free

Women" section followed by the notebooks is neatly repeated four times in the novel. "The Golden Notebook" section, in which Anna puts an end to the compartmentalization of the notebooks, attains integrity and wholeness and starts writing a new novel by getting rid of the "writer's block", comes as the penultimate section of Lessing's novel which ends with a final "Free Women" section[84] (Lightfoot 1975, 279). In Lessing's words:

> [Anna] keeps four [notebooks] … not one because, as she recognizes, she has to separate things off from each other, out of fear of chaos, of formlessness – of breakdown … In the inner Golden Notebook, things have come together, the divisions have broken down, there is formlessness with the end of fragmentation – the triumph of the second theme, which is that of unity. (Preface to *The Golden Notebook*, 7)

This puzzling arrangement of the novel's parts, through which Lessing renders disparate and contradictory moods, thoughts, orientations and motives, reveals the divisions in the personality of Anna; the dialectical synthesis of disintegration and unity within the golden-coloured notebook at the end of the novel symbolizes the urge to impose an order on chaos, which creates a form-content split. The intricate and linguistically fragmented and disconnected structure of the novel is, for that reason, at odds with Anna's awareness of this formlessness and desire for a unified and coherent whole: "She could feel herself, under this shape of order, as a chaos of discomfort and anxiety" (343). This state of mind, allowing Anna to appreciate chaos, destruction, power, art, altruism and order at the same time, is actually a sort of postmodern consciousness: "[It] is a jumble of contradictory moods – a wrenching nostalgia for the comfort of past forms, a paralysing fear of the

[84] In *Of Grammatology*, J. Derrida focuses on the word "la brisure" and proposes that it means not only the "broken, cracked part. Cf. breach, crack, fracture, fault, split, fragment" but also the "hinged articulation of two parts of wood- or metal-work". This term, therefore, signifies both "difference" and "articulation", which linguistically reveals that language is articulated through the process of producing meaning by making use of different sound (1976, 65-66). In this regard, P. Schweickart (1985, 268) puts forward the idea that the structure of *The Golden Notebook* is similar to Derrida's concept of 'the hinge/ la brisure' in the sense that it is "cracked, broken in pieces, and, at the same time, hinged, held together by folding-joints" with a "relative autonomy".

formlessness of the present, a despairing sense of emptiness and futility, a positive will to conform chaos" (Draine 1980, 47-8).

Described as an attempt "to break a form; to break certain forms of consciousness and go beyond them" by Lessing, *The Golden Notebook*, since it was published in 1961, has continued to attract critical attention; it has never been out of print. Even recently, in the *Guardian*, Margaret Drabble described the novel as a work "of shocking power and blistering honesty [with] an overwhelming impact" (2012), while Rachel Cusk proclaimed that *The Golden Notebook* is "a radical work, whose character nonetheless derive[d] from and [was] encompassed by literary tradition" and that its radicalism lays "not in the author's intention to break with or rebel against past forms, but to take breakage itself – or "breakdown", her preferred word – as her subject" (2012). Anita Brookner similarly considered the novel to be "an attempt to give an accurate picture of mid-20th-century England, much as *Le Rouge et le Noir* and *Anna Karenina* had set out to do for the France and the Russia of their time" (1982, 19). *The Golden Notebook*, hailed as a "very highly structured book, carefully planned" novel by Lessing, is also praised for its structural play, technical inventiveness and narrative experimentation. To exemplify, Jean McCrindle, in "Reading *The Golden Notebook* in 1962" (1982), avers that the novel is "the most courageous book [she had] ever read – both in structure – keeping the different parts separate and connected in order to express and avoid chaos – and in its honesty of content" (1982, 44), whereas Anne M. Mulkeen examines the "grid-like structure" of the novel, written as "an intricately-patterned spatial arrangement", and alleges that this interrelationship functions to map out the world of the heroine as "the crisscrossing of a multiplicity of viewpoints with a multiplicity of events and issues, near and far, through a series of stages in time" (1972, 262). Some critics, on the other hand, point out that this structural complexity and narrative anarchy result in superficiality and discrepancies in the

novel. For John L. Carey (1973), that Tommy is twenty years old in 1957, in the first "Free Woman" section, while he is seventeen in a notebook written in 1950, is an example of this contradiction caused by Lessing's "carelessness" (439). Walter Allen (1964, 277), likewise, criticizes the novel by suggesting that it fails "as a work of art" since its structure is "clumsy, complicated rather than complex". Patrocinio P. Schweickart (1985) also argues that the form of the novel is actually peculiar, obtrusive and extraneous and has a paradoxical function: "The reader is struck by it; she is alerted to its significance. But soon, she is off the text, that is, to the novel that is *readable* in spite of the odd arrangement of the text" (265).

Despite quitting the Communist Party in 1956, Lessing served on the editorial board of the *New Reasoner* and took an active role within the *New Left*. The *New Left*, the founding figures of which included Raymond Williams, E. P. Thomson, Perry Anderson and Stuart Hall, focused on Marxist interpretations of media, communications and literature, rejected the dominant orthodoxy in the Labour Party and the legacy of Stalinism in the Communist Party, and put forward the view that engaging with culture could enable a greater understanding of society and its culture and create political change (Hoggart and Williams 1960, 29). Written during the formation of the *New Left*, The *Golden Notebook* deals with similar issues that were the focus of the *New Left*, particularly the Stalinist dogma in the Communist Party and the role of culture in terms of progressive and radical transformation. Lessing was also heavily influenced by theories regarding literary forms, Marxist aesthetics, and modes of experimentation with fictional forms. In order to critically explore her changing attitude towards form and fiction and to articulate the multiple styles of writing and the 'formlessness' and 'anarchy' within the narrative construction of *The Golden Notebook*, it is necessary to briefly give some account of these literary debates.

The relationship between realism – relying on conventions such as the assumption of linguistic referentiality, a supposedly omniscient viewpoint, chronological and linear plot structures and non-reflexive subject matter – and modernism, associated with more fragmented structures, fluid and unorganized impressions, stream of consciousness - became a central focus once more, particularly within Marxist aesthetics, during the 1950s (Whittaker 1998, 62). In "Realism in the Balance", Marxist critic Georg Lukács, for example, focuses on the history of modern literature and proposes that the modalities of form and style in modern fiction function as an ideological mystification since modern subjectivity is divorced from socio-historical totality, conveys reality in a distorted way and represents fragmentation, solitary, superficiality and individualism: "[Modernist writers] remain frozen in their own immediacy; they fail to pierce the surface to discover the underlying essence, i.e., the real factors that relate their experiences to the hidden social forces that produce them" (1977, 33). Realism, on the other hand, has the power to render a more objective and critical portrayal of society and to unmask the hidden social, economic and political forces that control and shape human consciousness:

> Every major realist fashions the material given in his own experience, and in so doing makes use of techniques of abstraction among others. But his goal is to penetrate the laws governing objective reality and to uncover the deeper, hidden, mediated, not immediately perceptible network of relationships that go to make up society. (Lukács 1977, 38)

Though later referred to as "ideologically bound to the moment of the nineteenth century" by Terry Eagleton (1976, 36), his former mentor Raymond Williams was a highly influential British figure of the left in literary and cultural criticism in the 1950s. It was Williams who first took up and formulated for himself this heretofore largely Continental debate on the political ramifications of the formal modes of modernism and realism. In *The Long Revolution*, William celebrates literary realism, creating and judging "the

quality of a whole way of life in terms of the qualities of persons" (304), and points out that realism, since the eighteenth century, has unravelled the unpleasant and the sordid despite the misconceptions associating it with "the rising middle class, the bourgeoisie":

> Realism … appeared as in part a revolt against the ordinary bourgeois view of the world; the realists were making a further selection of ordinary material which the majority of bourgeois artists preferred to ignore … 'realism', as a watchword, passed over to the progressive and revolutionary movements. (1963, 301)

In a similar way, too, Doris Lessing, in some way echoing Williams's position in her collections of essays, *A Small Personal Voice*, had also defined realism as "art which springs … vigorously and naturally from a strongly-held … view of life" and held the view at this time that the realist novel is "the highest form of prose writing; higher than and out of reach of any comparison with expressionism, impressionism, symbolism, naturalism, or any other ism" (1994, 8).

Perhaps not surprisingly, the aesthetic preference of Lessing in her 1950s fiction, including *The Grass is Singing* (1950), *Martha Quest* (1952), *A Proper Marriage* (1954), *A Ripple from the Storm* (1958), is predominantly realism; however *The Golden Notebook*, despite having realist elements in the "Free Woman" section, written as a " summary and condensation of all that mass of material" and a "conventional short novel" (*Preface* 7), demonstrates Lessing's departure from realism as well as deliberately flagging up the limitations and inadequacy of realist fiction[85]: "I keep trying to write the truth and realising that it's not true" (247). In the black notebook, Anna, for instance, reviews her successful novel, *Frontiers of War* and questions whether the perceived reality can be transposed into an aesthetic form truthfully. She decides to rewrite it since she thinks that

[85] Contrary to this argument, Elayne A. Rapping contends that *The Golden Notebook* is "primarily committed to traditional fiction" (32) whereas Elizabeth Wilson argues that the novel can be located within "the 'great realist novel' tradition" since it tries to "retain at least that aspect of the nineteenth-century tradition which used the novel as a vehicle for moral and philosophical dilemmas" (61).

there is no way of not being intensely subjective and her novel is, for that reason, not successful at concretely revealing current socio-political and emotional realities: "[T]he emotion it came out of was something frightening, the unhealthy, feverish, illicit excitement of wartime, a lying nostalgia, a longing for licence, for freedom, for the jungle, for formlessness … I can't read that novel now without feeling ashamed" (77). Lessing also presents a single episode – in which a woman is rejected by a man after a long relationship – in different ways in order to reflect external reality through a variety of lenses, styles and perspectives, revealing different aspects of Anna such as her past experiences in Africa, her political activism in Britain, her writer's block and her seemingly chaotic personality and hallucinatory experiences; but she writes also to explore the limits of realism in dealing with the fragmentariness and multifariousness of contemporary experience. To exemplify, in "Free Woman", the reader is exposed to the fact that Anna has not really recovered from her breakup with Michael even after three years. In the blue notebook, Anna writes about how Michael leaves her in 1954 and states: "I realised that Michael had finally decided to break it off. I must pull myself together" (326). In the yellow notebook, Anna rewrites this event through the fictional characters, Ella, Lessing's alter ego, and Paul. As Ruth Whittaker (1988, 64-5) comments:

> [This] makes us realise the inadequacy of realism to cope with all this complexity without somehow fictionalizing it, making it smooth and malleable. Through Anna's attempts to organise such disparate material into her fiction …we are shown the steps involved in such a process: selection, omission, shaping and falsifying.

Drawing readers' attention to the limitations of the traditional narrative conventions of fiction in their capacity to delineate truthfully human experiences and emotions, *The Golden Notebook*, in this regard, analyses the relationship between reality and the novel. The complexity of experience and the immense challenge therefore to any attempt to offer

a precise representation in words thereof leads Anna to lose her faith in the power of language and to attempt to construct a new novel form because words are no longer reliable and secure and "the gap between what [words] are supposed to mean" and "what in fact they say" seems to be "unbridgeable" (272): "Words. Words. I play with words, hoping that some combination … will say what I want … [T]he real experience can't be described. I think … that a row of asterisks like an old-fashioned novel might be better. Or a symbol of some kind, a circle perhaps, or a square" (549). The notebooks, made up of disconnected and fragmented episodes, differing in form, style and content and based on anecdotes, newspaper extracts, letters, short stories, parody and pastiche, book reviews and dreams, fundamentally manifest the disillusionment of Lessing/Anna with a single literary form, in particular with realism, in order to reveal the truth of 'living now'. As Nick Bentley in "Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook*: An Experiment in Critical Fiction" comments:

> What Lessing attempts … is to experiment with available literary forms in an attempt to discover a new form that will record reality as she perceives it subjectively, but will at the same time be able to reflect the deeper structures of living that affect people socially, politically and economically, allowing her to develop a new kind of committed literature. To reach this new form involves Anna testing out, criticizing and ultimately rejecting various literary and aesthetic styles. (2009, 50)

The structural nature of *The Golden Notebook* also resonates with Jean-Paul Sartre's idea of the 'anti-novel'. In an introduction to Nathalie Sarraute's *Portrait d'un inconnu* (1948), Sartre, the French philosopher and critic, coined the term 'anti-novel' which is now usually associated with the French *nouveau roman* of the 1950s. An 'anti-novel' refers to an experimental literary work which does not employ the familiar conventions of the traditional novel, but instead creates new forms and patterns in order to reflect cultural and

historical transformations and to reveal the fragmented and distorted experiences of its characters through a disordered narrative framework (Hemer 2012, 26; Raskin 2013, 76).

It is difficult to precisely categorize *The Golden Notebook* in a canon of modernist or postmodernist literature since the novel subverts existing forms with its carefully woven structure, fractured aesthetics and stylistic multiplicity. Suffering from writer's block and seeking unity in a chaotic world, Anna has always believed that literature has the power to produce coherence, meaning and wholeness, which basically symbolizes modernism's aesthetic reverence for order: "I am incapable of writing the only kind of novel which interests me: a book powered with an intellectual or moral passion strong enough to create order, to create a new way of looking at life" (76). However, in the 'Golden Notebook' section, it is revealed that the first sentence of the 'Free Women', which had been believed to be the 'real' frame of the story, was indeed proposed to Anna by Saul Green and that it will function as the opening line of the new literary work of Anna. Standing for the fact that the quest for totality cannot be successful and the fragmented nature of subject and stable meaning should be accepted in order to deal with chaos in a post-war era, the novel rejects the tendency to "cage the truth" (570) and therefore debunks the modernist ideal expressed at the beginning of the novel by Anna (Krouse 2015, 117). The imposition of these two contradictory perspectives, in fact, "resort[s] to a desperate shifting from one narrative mode to another to avoid looking too naïve or too positivistic or too committed to the sheer of joy of conventional storytelling" (Danziger 1996, 4) and foregrounds the novel as a material artefact, which leads to the fact that *The Golden Notebook* is a metafictional commentary on the nature and function of fiction. In other words, Lessing undermines her own authority and omniscience, questions the relationship between fiction and reality and reveals the artificiality and fictionality of

the novel-writing process through a self-conscious and self-reflexive form in the novel[86]. As Patricia Waugh points out, the novel is "a metafictional text which draws on a whole plethora of parodistic effects, both stylistic and structural" and exposes the gap "between form and content" (1984, 74). In this respect, *The Golden Notebook*, challenging the realist and modernist techniques and using fragmented narrative framework through a metafictional pastiche of multiple forms and styles, also has the characteristics of a postmodern literary work[87].

1. The Role of the Left-Wing Writer in a Mid-Fifties Communist Milieu

During the Stalin era, the state maintained an extensive and strict programme of censorship by means of several stages of supervision. The functions of the General Directorate for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press (Glavlit), which was established as an official censorship organ in order to secure state secret protection in 1922, were extended and tightened. In 1932, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, claiming that the unions within literary circles "might change from being an instrument for the maximum mobilization of Soviet writers … to being an instrument for cultivating elitist withdrawal and loss of contact with the political tasks of contemporaneity" (qtd. in Wallach 1991, 75), dissolved all the unions and founded the Union of Soviet Writers that

[86] Dennis Porter (1974, 57) points out that "*The Golden Notebook* is self-consciously challenging the realist techniques in which it seemed initially to put its trust", whereas Katherine Fishburn (1988, 187) argues that Lessing has never truly been a realist writer, instead she has always been "a metafictionist, a writer of self-conscious fiction".

[87] In "Beginning to Theorize Postmodernism" (1987), Linda Hutcheon proposes that postmodern authors deal with the concept of fragmentation and states that "narrator in fiction become either disconcertingly multiple and hard to locate or resolutely provisional and limited" and that "postmodern provisionality and heterogeneity contaminate any neat attempts at unifying coherence—formal or thematic" (17). Considering this argument, Lessing's *The Golden Notebook* thematically contains postmodern elements as well.

aimed to achieve party and state control in literature and defined socialist realism[88] as the true art form. All materials to be published were first to be submitted to the Writer's Union, then to the state-appointed commissar and finally to the Central Committee of the Communist Party in order to control whether they were thematically and formally consistent with the literary line laid down by the party (Berlin 2000). Focusing on censorship in the Soviet Union in the 1930s and giving examples from a number of different literary translations, Samantha Sherry (2012, 164-8) points out that every text in the Stalin era was read closely and any politically ambiguous passage that contradicted the Stalinist dogma or depicted it in a negative way was removed from a work. In Joseph Freeman's *An American Testament*[89], for example, the following section was removed:

> At this time Baldwin was opposed 'in principle' to the dictatorship of the proletariat. For him it was 'no better than' the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The classless society, after the state had 'withered away' was very fine. But the transition period with its 'force and violence', its absence of civil rights, its punishment of people who had committed no 'overt act', was, so far as he was concerned, no better in Soviet Russia than in capitalist America. (328)

In another instance, the following sarcastic extract, regarding the story of two German businessmen, one of whom makes a trip to the Soviet Union, "the proletarian paradise" (388), and promises his friend to send a letter and explain his experiences, was removed from Upton Sinclair's *Dragon's Teeth*[90] because of its mocking attitude towards the Stalinist propaganda:

> "But", objected the friend, "you won't dare to write the truth if it's

[88] First defined in the All-Union Congress of Soviet writers in 1934 as "the basic method of Soviet literature and literary criticism" and focusing on "the truthful [and] historically concrete representation of reality in its revolutionary development … with the task of ideological transformation and education of workers in the spirit of socialism", the doctrine of socialist realism is a style of realist art which promoted the glorified portrayal of communist values, the bravery of communist heroes and the emancipation of the proletariat.

[89] Freeman, Joseph. *An American Testament*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1936.

[90] Upton, Sinclair. *Dragon's Teeth*. New York: Viking Press, 1942.

> unfavourable." The other replied, "We'll fix it this way. I'll write you everything is fine, and if I write it in black ink it's true, and if in red ink the opposite is true." So he went, and in due course his friend received a letter in black ink, detailing the wonders of the proletarian paradise. "Everybody is happy, everybody is free, the markets are full of food, the shops well stocked with goods — in fact there is only one thing I cannot find, and that is red ink." (388)

In this historical context of the mid-century, *The Golden Notebook* questions the role of the writer in the mid-fifties communist milieu and celebrates subjectivity against reductionist commitment by giving a powerful anti-Stalinist message. In the novel, as the Communist Party is further distorted by the Stalinist atrocities, Anna becomes disillusioned with its practices and questions the pressure on writers[91] in relation to the developments in Soviet Russia that have contributed to her writer's block: "I am back inside a nightmare which it seems I've been locked in for years … it cancels all creative emotion" (308). Anna's personal experiences in the Party, reminding the readers of the fossilized hierarchal structure of the Stalin era[92], unfolds as a strained and skewed inter-relationship of political commitment, artistic integrity and a preoccupation with the revelation of truth. In an episode in the Blue Notebook, Anna meets Jack, "a kind of administrator" (306) in the publishing house of the Party, and John Butte, an elderly man who has been set over Jack by the Party in order to report on two books. Although Anna

[91] In an interview, Lessing, revealing the approach of 'socialists' to writing and literature, remarks that 'socialist' movements were generally sceptical of writers and that anti-intellectualism was "rife" in Stalin's Russia: "Western communists … were hostile to intellectuals. They thought writing was inferior to political organizing, that writers should feel ashamed and apologize for writing books. They assumed that all bourgeois writers wrote trash. Active socialists who wanted to write had to make a choice, they had to decide whether they would organize the working class or write books … I find it difficult to write well about politics. I feel that the writer is obligated to dramatize the political conflicts of his time in his fiction. There is an awful lot of bad socialist literature which presents contemporary history mechanically" (1994, 74).

[92] In her autobiography, Lessing writes about her invitation to the Soviet Union. In order to participate in the Authors World Peace Appeal, Lessing goes to Russia, and her experiences there exemplify the pressure of Stalinism on every single individual and writer: "They attacked with their creed: literature must further the progress of communism, the Communist Party's right to decide what should be written and published, the Party's responsibility for the glorious future of all humankind … Stalin's name could not be used without a string of honorifics – The Great, the Glorious, and so on … Stalin had spoken for five hours and the applause lasted for half an hour, we were incredulous" (1998, 63-4).

knows that the final decisions about what will be published have already been made in the Party HQ and that the *Daily Worker* will praise it as "an honest novel of Party life" (309), they discuss whether the book, *For Peace and Happiness*, written by a young worker, should be published at all by the Party. Anna points out that the style of the book is very bad and "lifeless", that the book does not touch upon reality because it describes all the cities of Britain as if they are all locked in deep poverty, unemployment and brutality and gives the impression that all the workers of Britain are communist and recognize the Communist Party as their leader. She observes how the content is "a very accurate recreation of the self-deceptive myths of the Communist Party" (309). Feeling challenged by Anna, Comrade Butte remarks that the book is a good one – and will be published – by lifting his fist and suddenly crashing it on Jack's desk: "Publish and be damned" (310). This incident, after which Anna decides to leave the Party, actually symbolizes the crystallization of the intellectual rottenness of the 'communist' bureaucracy, which defends the publication of "a lousy lying book by a Communist firm" (310), and explicates how the authoritarian tendencies within the Party might either "absorb" "fresh young revolutionaries" or turn them into a group of "hardened men" with "dead" and "dry" thoughts (309).

In the Party, it is explicitly dictated that art must be communal, realist and "healthy" and that it must defend "the purity of working-class values" (309), by suggesting positive and optimistic solutions for the problems of society: "The pressure on writers – and artists – to do something other than write, paint, make music, because those are nothing but bourgeois indulgences, continued strong, and continues now, though the ideologies are different, and will continue because it has roots in envy" (Lessing 1998, 23). For example, Anna thinks that she would be labelled as a "successful bourgeois writer" (309) since her novel, *Frontiers of War*, described as an example of "the capitalist publishing racket"

(309), fictionalizes her own personal experiences and does not follow the Party line, the "joyful communal unselfish art" (312). In a similar way, communist reviewers criticise the book for being "negative" and indifferent to the struggle of freedom in Africa and they argue that the book should have employed an African working-class heroine: "[T]his author must learn from our literature of health and progress, that no one is benefitted by despair" (393). The idea that fiction must reverently be related to the "new art" (312) of the century, the central philosophy of the "desperate, crazed spirit of struggle … [of] Stalinism" (306), exerts so much pressure on Anna that she even starts to have a conversation with her imaginary visitor about writing political and historical circumstances in solidarity with those comrades fighting for socialism: "It could be a Chinese peasant. Or one of Castro's guerrilla fighters. Or an Algerian fighting in the F. L. N. Or Mr. Mathiong. They stand here in the room and they say, why aren't you doing something about us, instead of wasting your time scribbling" (554). For Anna, this sort of committed literature, referred to as "the oppression of decent writers by Soviet ideology" (Lessing 1998, 61), destroys intellectual seriousness and individual conscience and results in "mass of dead literature" (312) which is "sapless" (307), banal (315), "flat" and "tame" (311). To illustrate, in one of the Party Magazines, it is declared that a company, Boles and Hartley, will publish novels as well as sociology and history books, and the Party is flooded with manuscripts all at once. As a part of her "welfare work" (315) in the Party, Anna, thinking that "every member of the Party must be a part-time novelist" (315), reads the letters and emphasizes that most of the novels are intolerably dull, "pretty bad" and "ordinarily incompetent" (315) since they try to stick to the Stalinist demand for socialist realism. In one of the letters, a Party member even complains that his wife agrees with the "pundits" of King Street, the headquarters of the British Communist Party, that a comrade is "better occupied distributing leaflets than wasting time scribbling" (316), which

basically unveils the position of the Party towards writing fiction: "When I began writing there was pressure on writers not to be 'subjective' … 'Bothering about your stupid concerns when Rome is burning' is how it tends to get itself expressed, on the level of ordinary life" (*Preface* 12). Rejecting this narrow Stalinist view of art, Anna, on the other hand, indicates that art without deep and intense emotion is not genuine: "[T]he flashes of genuine art all out of deep, suddenly stark, undisguisable private emotion" (311).

2. Left-Wing Activism in *The Golden Notebook*

Revealing the widening gap between theory and practice in left-wing politics, *The Golden Notebook* functions as a critique of the lack of synchronization between the 'revolutionary' intellectuals and the masses and condemns the superficiality of socialist reductionism as well as the dogmatization of Marxism. In order to articulate how the steady growth of totalitarianism, centralization and hypocrisy under the ideological hegemony of the Stalinist dogma in the 1950s changed and distorted the 'revolutionary' practices of socialist activists, it is first necessary to explore the stereotypical representation of the 'revolutionary' characters. In the first Black notebook, Anna provides a detailed account of her experiences in Rhodesia and writes about a group of 'communist activists' split into two after a "terrible" fight triggered by "something … unimportant" (81) in the Party. Playing the role of a communist intellectual leader at the centre of the group and coming from an upper-class family, Willi Rodde is "a master of dialectic", subtle and intelligent as well as being "stupidly dogmatic" and "heavy minded". Willi is also for "order", "correctness" and the "conservation" of what exists, and has no sympathy for the "emotionally weak" or "deprived" or "for the misfits", which, in a way, suggests the influence of the iron fist of Stalin upon ordinary socialists. Despite mastering the official socialist jargon and labelling himself as communist, Willi's practical

attitudes in everyday life contradict his ideals and enthusiasm for an egalitarian society, which basically debunks the Marxist principle of the unity of theory and practice. In one episode, Willi and Paul – a young "snobbish" (111) socialist with "an upper-class arrogance" (87) – treat a waiter at the Mashopi hotel "as a servant" by perpetually ordering him around and making unreasonable demands (97). When Ted, who always behaves as if he lives in a "full-blown communist society" (90), starts to talk intimately to the man "as a human being" (98), Paul and Willi makes fun of Ted: "Do you imagine, Ted, that if you are kind enough to servants you are going to advance the cause of socialism?" (98). In another instance, like a capitalist rather than a socialist, Willi, proud of having a good "business sense" (94), instructs Mrs James how to run the hotel and what to invest in all over the city, and Mrs James, called "a silly goose" (94) by Willi, becomes a rich woman by the time Willi leaves the hotel. Richard Portmain, the ex-husband of Molly and one of the financial powers in the country, also exemplifies the way in which a 'revolutionary' activist, unable to internalize true socialist values, might turn into a ruthless, "cold" and "heartless" (92) capitalist. Despite being an active part of the communist movement in his youth, as a consequence of which his family cuts off his allowance, Richard decides to inherit a position in his family company, and his sudden "revulsion" (36) against left-wing politics results in a radical change in his life style. He buys a cottage in the countryside, plays golf and tennis only for business reasons, organizes "posh dinner parties" (46) and tries to impress girls with his new Jaguar, "high life" (60) and a "bloody great mansion with two maids and three cars at Richmond" (60). Meanwhile, Marion, the "unhappy" (45) and "dreary" (60) wife of Richard, brings up three children and assumes the role of entertaining the business friends of her 'husband' although Richard is "awfully mean" to her and constantly makes her "feel stupid" (44).

In *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884), a historical

materialist analysis of the institution of family and one of the most significant analyses of family economics from a Marxist perspective, Engels provides a theory about the origin of the family by focussing on the norms of female sexual morality, pointing out that the institution of the family has moved through a number of different transformations throughout its history and that the bourgeois family model is simply the latest and therefore most likely transitory family structure. As an outcome of the development of capitalism and private property, a patriarchal structure leading to the subordination of women within the constraints of traditional gender roles has been created and institutionalized within the nuclear family. Marxist ideology, in this context, questions this bourgeois family structure as part of its demand for gender equality and fight against sexism, male supremacy, discrimination, violence and the oppression and subjugation of women as a part of its claim that individuals are the products of material and historical conditions, that these conditions are expressed through capitalist and patriarchal relations in society and that only a socialist revolution can eradicate gender oppression and create gender equality. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia similarly struggled to recreate a society which was based on the principles of equality and aimed to liberate women from their domestic roles and integrate them into the public sphere (Goldman 2002). Considering this argument, Richard's misogynistic practices and moral hypocrisy such as stigmatizing Molly as "immoral, sloppy and bohemian" (36), because of her lifestyle; neglecting his wife, Marion; and treating her "like a housewife or a hostess, but never as a human being" (41) are also fundamentally in contradiction with socialist values.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, as a communist, Anna, asserting that she fights against the colour bar and struggles for a progressive social order, exhibits contradictory behaviours. On one occasion, she thinks that she is literally and socially "more sophisticated than the Colonial girls of course", despite admiring their "colonial quality" and "good-humour"

(82). In another episode, she reveals her strong proprietary emotions: “Mine. Property. Possession … my property” (356). She dislikes one of her tenants, Jemmie from Ceylon, but cannot “bring herself to give the notice because he [is] coloured” (356), whereas she does not like her new tenants much either, partly because they are homosexuals. Anna’s personality is actually fragmented across her competing emotional needs, her evidently chaotic inner self and the insights of her intellect, which is itself also unveiled at times as in voluntary submission to the prevailing concepts of masculinity and patriarchy. As a “free woman”, Anna complains about the lack of “real men” (356), suffers from “the housewife’s disease” (298), and cannot free herself from domestic routine, particularly because of her daughter, Janet, all of which consequently lead to a feeling of some sort of inescapable obstruction preventing her from enjoying her daily life. (Libby 1974, 110). As “Michael’s mistress” (301), she sensuously enjoys buying food, cooking for Michael, sweeping the room, making the bed, changing the sheet and even rolling her tampons into her handbag and concealing them under a handkerchief:

> I imagine the meat in its coat of crumbs and egg; the mushrooms, simmering in sour cream and onions, the clear strong, amber-coloured soup. Imagining it I create the meal, the movements I will use, checking ingredients, heat, textures. I take the provisions up and put them on the table; then I remember the veal must be beaten and I must do it now, because later it will wake Janet. (303)

Likewise, Ella, the literary creation of Anna, teaches herself not to look at men even casually, but changes her whole personality and feels “like a protected indoors woman from a Latin country” (277) with Paul who, in his unconscious fantasy, builds up a picture of an “invisible … and a serene, calm, unjealous, unenvious, undemanding woman, full of resources of happiness inside herself, self-sufficient, yet always ready to give happiness when it is asked for” (193). This dependency complex of Ella and Anna, feeling inferior and incomplete and accepting men as ‘providers’ in the “damned mother-ridden” (37)

society, is illustrative of the way in which women cannot achieve a decolonization of their minds and thought processes without genuinely rejecting the real nature of capitalism in all its subtlety; they cannot secure their liberation from the oppressive and unjust instruments of patriarchal society without challenging the hegemony of dominant ideologies at the intersection of highly complex and often seemingly contradictory systems of oppression. As in the case of Anna and Ella, reducing the concepts of freedom and emancipation simply to that of maintaining sexual and emotional relationships with multiple men, on the contrary, brings about superficial solutions to the problems that women experience and further creates alienated and mechanized individuals: "[S]he saw him as all flesh, a body of warm, abundant, exuberant flesh … in bed, it was a delightful shock of warm tense flesh" (290).

Some of the socialist characters, claiming that they defend the rights of the working class, behave arrogantly and keep themselves aloof from 'ordinary people' – another ironic example of the gap between theory and practice in the current left-wing politics laid before the reader by Lessing. Canvassing in a working-class area, "a dozen or so housewives" (159) from the Communist Party, for instance, have a discussion about the right way to dress when out canvassing, and some of them fear others turn up 'too posh' at front doors in "a very ugly area of uniform, small, poor houses": "I don't think it's right to dress differently than usual … it's a kind of cheating" (159). In another episode, Molly, with a patronizing and haughty attitude, compares her son with that of the milkman, "one of those bloody working-class Tories" (31), and becomes unhappy because her son, Tommy, "just sitting" on his bed all the time, is not better and cannot even see his way forward in life even though he has been given "all these advantages and all that education" (31). Prioritizing Tommy over others, at this point, also symbolizes one of the functions of the institution of family in terms of legitimizing the cults of capitalism such as

individualism, egocentrism, private property and the culture of competition.

3. The Critique of Socialism or Stalinism?

As discussed in the first chapter, there is some tendency for reactionary critics to associate characteristics such as totalitarianism, despotism, dictatorship and repression of civil liberties with socialism. However, many of these arguments against the socialist worldview derive fundamentally from responses to the atrocities of Stalinism: The Stalinist regime in the USSR was characterized by a one-party system, forced labour, iron fist policies, violent suppression of millions of people, imposed restrictions on any kind of freedom of speech, and the spreading of 'communism' through military occupation. In order to identify socialism with inherently despotic tendencies, the name of Stalin is intentionally manipulated and linked with socialism in spite of the fact that authentic socialists have always been opposed to the one-man rule of the Stalinist regime that was an exploitative system using the rhetoric of socialist values in order to legitimise its own tyrannical existence. Another concept intrinsically used to reveal the dictatorial inclinations of some so-called socialist leaders is the dictatorship of the proletariat. Referring to the self-government model of a potential socialist regime of the working class in which local councillors, largely consisting of persons from a working-class background, are elected by vote; their constituents having the right to recall those elected councillors (as in the example of The Paris Commune of 1871), this 'dictatorship' has nothing to do with what Stalin or other so-called socialist 'leaders' perpetrated in the name of socialism in their own countries. It is, on the contrary, a transition period corresponding to the abolition of all classes and the creation of a classless society on behalf of 'ordinary' people.

Anna's critical attitude towards the Party in the novel, in a way, justifies the above

arguments since Anna, as a member of the Communist Party, advocates democratization and self-management in the Party, direct participation in political action and socialism from below – to use Hal Draper's concept – in contrast to Stalinism. Anna emphatically rejects the centralized and authoritarian structure of the Party, the dogmas of Stalinism[93] and being "in the service of uniformed man" (479). Becoming a communist because "the left people were the only people in the town with any kind of moral energy, the only people who took it for granted that the colour bar was monstrous" (82), Anna does not become disillusioned with socialism, but instead she harshly criticizes "a group of dead bureaucrats" (152), running the Party in a "tight, defensive, sarcastic atmosphere" (152) and accusing everyone of being an agent to communism, and the ideological hegemony and domination of the Soviet Union and Stalinism in the Party. She even struggles to start a new "really British" Communist Party as an alternative to the existing Communist Party that is "corrupted by years of work in the Stalinist atmosphere":

> I again find myself among people filled with excitement and purpose … the plan can be summarized thus: (a) the Party, shorn of its 'old hands' who are incapable of thinking straight after so many years … should make a statement repudiating its past … (b) to break all ties with foreign Communist Parties, in the expectation that other Communist Parties will also be rejuvenating themselves and breaking with the past. (c) To call together the thousands … of people who have been communist and who left the Party in disgust, inviting them to join the revitalized party. (394)

Stating that there are certain types of 'socialists' who are "political out of a kind of religious reason" and act as if they are "God-seekers", Lessing implicitly denounces the religionization of socialism on a number of different occasions in the novel. To exemplify, most of the Party members in the novel are presented as "deadly" (394) loyal to Moscow,

[93] In an interview, Lessing points out that repression has always been a part of the history of Stalinism: "In the Soviet Union opposition is regularly destroyed. Also, in our time, radicals have been destroyed by their own side. Stalinism destroyed the lives of thousands of people. Every time we have a war, liberties go to hell. In the meantime, we go on battling. I'm concerned with the preservation of liberties. I realize that to you that sounds like an old-fashioned liberal bleat, but I've seen liberties destroyed and left-wing people suppressed too often" (1994, 77-8).

carefully educate their children in the Party line and attempt to legitimise the "old" (422) arguments of the communist bureaucracy[94]: "[W]hile most of the criticisms of the Soviet Union are true … of course there is no Party member I could say this to" (156). In an episode, Comrade Harry, one of the top academics in the Party, goes to Russia to find out what has happened to the Jews[95] "in the black years" of Stalinism (421). When he comes back with "terrible information" (422), The Party does not want to publicize it in pursuance of the solidarity myth of the Soviet Union, which is, for Harry[96], one of the reasons why the Communist Parties of the West have collapsed since they are not capable of telling the truth about anything, have the habit of telling lies to the world and cannot "distinguish the truth even to themselves" (423). In another instance, Ted, a strictly committed and faithful comrade, is chosen to go on the teacher's delegation to the Soviet Union, the "first Worker' country" (273). Feeling proud, excited and honoured, Comrade Ted is taken to the towers of the Kremlin in the middle of the night, goes up a "magnificent marble staircase with works of art on every side" and then into "a small side corridor that [is] plain and simple", stops outside "an ordinary door, a door like others" and meets "Comrade" Stalin sitting behind "an ordinary desk" (274). Welcoming Ted with

---

[94] In *Walking In The Shade: Volume Two of My Autobiography, 1949-1962*, Lessing similarly criticizes the commitment of educated and intellectual Party members to Stalinism: [I]t was the most sensitive, compassionate, socially concerned people who became communist. (Among these were a very different kind of people, the power-lovers). These decent, kind people supported the worst, the most brutal tyranny of our time … Hitler's Germany … was an infant in terror compared to Stalin's regime … the leadership of the Soviet Union had become corrupt … Stalin is a monster … I have come to think that there is something in … communism that breeds lies, makes people lie and twist facts … Stalin, the great deceiver, was … responsible." (1998, 52-9).

[95] Lessing refers to the Stalinist era as "the Black Years" because of injustices, tortures and murders: "While writing this, I read that the mass graves recently discovered and acknowledged were because Stalin, continually imprisoning hundreds of his people, was told the prisons were overcrowded, did not feel inclined to waste money on building more, and solved the problem by having the prisoners shot and then beginning again" (1998, 62).

[96] Harry divides the truth inside the Party into two: "[O]ne, a mild truth, for the public meeting of forty, and another, a harsher truth, for a closed group" (423). He also speaks of the tortures, "the beatings-up" and how the Jews are locked in cages, designed in the Middle Ages, and tortured with the instruments taken from museums (422).

an “honest kindly face” and “twinkling eyes” in a kind way, Stalin, “a great man” (275), expresses his regret for disturbing Ted so late and would like to take advice about the policy of the Soviet Union in Europe like a “real Communist Leader”. According to Comrade Ted, such different experiences regarding the Soviet Union are actually related to the narratives in the capitalist press since the members of the Communist Party are all infected by “this poison” (274). Thinking that Stalin is “mad” and “a murderer”, Anna similarly remembers that “this is a time when it is impossible to know the truth about anything” (273).

In the “frozen” (33), “grey” and “faceless” (168) streets of London, ruled by “fear” and “ignorance” (168), the characters in *The Golden Notebook*, feeling “locked up” (33), “empty” (41), “remote” (187), “alone” (62), “isolated” (156), “lonely” (401) and like a “stranger” (188) to others, run through alienation and suffer from “the emptiness of emotion” (439): “Crowds of people. The man selling newspapers has no face. No nose, rather, his mouth is a rabbit-toothed hole, and his eyes are sunk in scar tissue” (260). In order to put an end to the “split, divided, unsatisfactory way [they] all live” (157), to compensate for this sense of “meaninglessness” (439) and unpleasantness and find “a purpose in life” (161), therefore, many of the key characters in the novel have aligned themselves with the Communist Party and made it the centre of their lives, so it is the Party itself that functions as the major outward escape mechanism through which they seek to nullify the negative impacts on their lives of such alienated existence and assert, albeit through modes of illusionary self-actualization, their basic recreational functions: “The Communist Party is largely composed of people who aren’t really political at all, but who have a powerful sense of service … there are those who are lonely, and the Party is their family” (162). In this context, the novel suggests that the reason why the members of the Party perceive any attack on the collective ideology as absolute loss and cannot,

therefore, tolerate any sort of criticism against the Party or the Soviet Union, is essentially linked with the problematic relationship between the individual psyche and the collective dream. In other words, the fantasy of being acknowledged by a senior politician in the Party and of being recognized by Stalin inhibits the process of liberation, overwhelms the "individuated personality" and causes individual consciousness to be swallowed up by "the clutches of the collective consciousness" (Cederstrom 1990, 123).

Also called the Third International, the Communist International (1919-1943), abbreviated as the Comintern, was an association of national communist parties that advocated world communism by fighting against the international bourgeoisie with all available means in order to create an international Soviet Republic as a transition stage for a classless and stateless world. Gregory Zinoviev was the first elected chairman of the Comintern; however, Zinoviev, after having served for seven years, was replaced by Nickolai Bukharin because of his support for the ideas of Leon Trotsky. In 1928, Bukharin was dismissed, and Stalin, the general secretary of The Communist Party at that time, became the head of the Comintern. In order to be a part of the Comintern, the Communist Parties had to accept a number of obligations such as conducting true and collective communist propaganda through extensive dedication and consultation under the leadership of the Communist International, rejecting centrist opinions and removing reformists and traitors from the Parties:

> Communist parties … must do their utmost through major campaigns to completely overcome the influence of the social-traitor leaders over the working class and to bring the majority of the working masses under communist leadership. To unmask the social-traitor leaders, the Communist Party [must demand] … before the proletariat an answer as to whether these leaders--with their supposedly powerful organizations-were prepared to take up the struggle together with the Communist Party against the obvious impoverishment of the proletariat. (12 July 1921)

In *The Golden Notebook*, Lessing implicitly mocks the obsession of the Third

International with treachery and betrayal by revealing the paranoia in the Communist Party in the 1950s over potential traitors to communism or those who might really be capitalist spies. She explores how this paranoia was rationalized by means of reasonable explanations and arguments among the Party members, as a consequence of which the genuine communist intellectuals[97] had to leave the Party – as Anna does in the novel – and the Party was subsequently occupied by those full of "that awful dilettantish spite" (156): "[T]he fact is that literally millions of perfectly sound human beings have left the Party (if they weren't murdered first) and they left it because they were leaving behind murder, murder, cynicism, horror, betrayal" (269). Jack Briggs, once apolitical journalist on *The Times* before the outbreak of the war, is, for example, influenced by the communists he meets, and he moves steadily to the left. Refusing several highly-paid jobs in conservative newspapers, he works instead for a left-wing journal in return for a low salary. When he wants to write an article about the circumstances in China, he is put in such a bad position that he has to resign and is unable to find another job since his name somehow comes up in the Hungarian Trial as a British agent conspiring to overthrow the communist system. Despite being regarded as a committed communist journalist, "the rumours and spiteful gossip" (154) about Briggs continue to flourish in Party circles, and he is left in total isolation and treated with suspicion even by his friends. In a meeting of the writers' group, Anna and John would like to discuss this issue with Bill; however, Bill, stating that he will "make enquiries", remarks that anyone, including Anna, "could be an agent" (154). In another episode, Michael, in search of his old friends, visits East Berlin, a "terrifying place" with a "bleak, grey, ruinous" atmosphere with "lack of freedom like an invisible poison" (157), with Anna. His 'friends' in East Berlin greet him with "hostility", "fear"

[97] In her autobiography, Lessing explains how surprised Sam Aaronivitch, the cultural commissar of the Party in King Street, Covent Garden, was upon seeing a passionate "intellectual" who wanted to join the Party since most of those intellectuals were leaving the Party at that time (1998, 56).

and "hate" because Michael has been friendly with the hanged men in Prague, which means Michael too must be a "traitor" (157).

4. Reading Apartheid in *The Golden Notebook* and *The Grass is Singing*

After the colonization of Rhodesia, the white settlers, reinforcing and perpetuating the colonial fantasies of racial superiority, exploited the natural resources, secured a cheap black labour force and cruelly maintained their domination by means of racial segregation under apartheid, a system of institutionalized racism giving power to the white minority over the black majority and manifesting itself on political, economic, cultural and interpersonal levels (Saunders 1988). Living in Rhodesia for nearly twenty-five years, Lessing observed the social injustices in her childhood and became aware of the economic disparities between the white settlers and the black Africans, which subsequently led her to sympathize with the black Rhodesian, to struggle against the subordination of the black population and to condemn the hypocrisy and oppression of the British Empire in her literary works. In *A Small Personal Voice*, a collection of Lessing's essays, reminiscences, reviews and interviews over a period of seventeen years, Lessing similarly argues that "dark-skinned people" were treated as slaves under apartheid; it was even against the law for the natives to live on the lands of the whites, a preventive measure to protect them against being shouted at, abused and beaten up. She adds:

> We are responsible for one of the ugliest social systems in the world, where seven million Africans live in conditions of extreme poverty, ridden by disease, malnutrition, illiteracy … They are ruled by 300,000 whites, whose standards of living are higher than those of all but a tiny minority of the British people, and who are prepared to do anything to maintain their privileges. (1994, 235)

The black notebook in *the Golden Notebook* presents Anna's nostalgic account of her experiences in Southern Rhodesia through a number of 'entries' that function as a

progressive critique of racism and colonial discourse by implicitly revealing the process of the degradation of the colonial subject to the point of nonexistence, of the 'rationalization' of the narcissistic anxiety of white cultural supremacy and of the codification of the hierarchical syntax of Western colonialism through the confrontation between the whites and the local Southern Rhodesians. In one instance, Paul, a communist, parodies the colonial clichés by suggesting that Mrs. Boothby, the white owner of the hotel who is proud of employing black workers and of treating them "fair" and "firm", should not let her black workers "take advantage of her" by ironically emphasizing that "there's centuries of evolution between them and us" and that "they're nothing but baboons really" (107). In another episode, Paul greets the cook, the native working in the Mashopi hotel, and starts to have a conversation with him about his family "on equal terms" (122). Mrs. Boothby, "watchful, puzzled, slightly distrustful" and confused since the cook is treated as a "human being" (122) among many "favoured" white guests, listens to them for a few minutes and cuts it short by speaking in a tone noting the feudal rules within the apartheid system – an intervention bearing out Homi Bhabha's concept of mimicry in which he makes the point that the discursive construction of mimicry is ambivalent as colonial discourse, in order to maintain its mission of 'civilization', aims to reinforce the split between the 'superior' and the 'inferior' although it has "the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other" and basically demands that the colonized appear like or a simulacrum of the colonizer (Bhabha 1991, 86). For Paul, the natural dignity of the cook, an "unusually good-looking", "strong" and "well-set" middle-aged man with "a lively face and eyes" compared to the other Africans who are "poor specimens physically from ill-feeding and disease" (123), carries him into the manner of a white person, which, in a way, is reminiscent of Aphra Behn's Oroonoko who is also portrayed as a noble, exceptional, well-educated and beautiful native in terms of European physiognomy: "His

nose was rising and Roman, instead of African and flat. His mouth, the finest shap'd that could be seen ... The whole proportion and air of his face was so noble, and exactly formed, that, bating his colour, there cou'd be nothing in nature more beautiful, agreeable, and handsome" (*Oronooko* 8).

In "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature" (1985), Abdul R. JonMohamed focuses on two phases of colonialism. The first is called "the dominant" phase in which European colonizers exercise "direct and continuous … control and military coercion" and "the indigenous peoples are subjugated by colonialist material practices" whereas, in the second stage, the "hegemonic phase", the natives "accept a version of the colonizers' entire system of values, attitudes, morality, institutions, and more important, modes of production" and the internalization of "Western cultures" begins (62). *The Grass is Singing* (1950), the first novel of Lessing, published shortly after the official declaration of apartheid, in this context, takes place in the "dominant phase" of colonialism and fictionalizes the racial inequality and the victimization of the natives by portraying the ruthlessness of colonialism and the colour bar in South Africa and focusing on the racial politics dichotomized between the white settlers and the natives: "When my first novel, *The Grass Is Singing*, came out, there were few novels about Africa. That book … [was] described by reviewers as about the colour problem" (Lessing 1965). In the novel, Lessing explores the day-to-day experiences of the whites and the blacks in South Africa and explicitly reveals the demeaning and brutal life under apartheid. To exemplify, in an episode, Dick Turner, a farmer struggling to make a living off a farm in South Africa, decides to open a kaffir store, but Mary Turner, his wife, unable to imagine the natives as human beings who also need to eat and sleep, is resistant to running the shop because she abhors what is described in terms of disgust as the "exposed fleshiness" (94) of the kaffirs, the "evil-

smelling creatures" (96), and "their soft brown bodies" (94), "soft bashful faces" (94) and babies hanging on to them like "leeches" and "monkeys" (95). In another scene, Dick becomes ill, and Mary realizes that the farm has been neglected by the native workers as Dick has been failing to supervise them for some time. On the farm, she is shocked and again repulsed by the "laziness" and "negligence" (113) of the natives, and she tries to control them so as not to show any signs of "weakness" before them (116). Constantly insulting and whipping[98] the natives by mimicking this masculine role, Mary does not even allow the workers to speak to her in English or to have a break from work for more than a minute, which gives her a feeling of "uncontrollable triumph" (126), of "victory" (115) and of being boss over perhaps eighty black workers that repulsively "stink" like "hot, sour animal" (115). Aligning herself with the imaginary values of colonial discourse, taking on the role of master and assuming the ideology of white supremacy, Mary actually compensates for the sense of meaningless and powerlessness, "asserts her authority" (160) and actualizes her basic intrinsic qualities through illusionary fulfilments.

In the novel, Mary's husband proves himself to be unsuccessful and unreliable as a farmer[99], and this brings about massive and fundamental economic problems in their daily life: "The curtains were torn; a windowpane had been broken and patched with paper; another had cracked and not been mended at all; the room was indescribably broken down

[98] In *A Small Personal Voice*, Lessing writes about a new legal procedure under apartheid that prohibits the white settlers from beating the native workers: "[T]he correct procedure is, if an employee offends, to take him to the nearest police station where he will be given the option of being beaten by the African constable or fined, probably 10s (Nearly a month's wage). The offender very often choses to be beaten. It is much cheaper" (229). This law actually led the white settlers to accuse the government of being "kaffir-lovers" (229) since they believed that the only language that the blacks understood was the whip (1994, 230-31).

[99] In an interview, Lessing talks about her childhood experiences on a farm in Southern Rhodesia, which essentially bears similarities to the events in *The Grass is Singing*: "My father, by white terms, was poor … but he had 3,000 acres of land … this was land off which Africans had been thrown … after the Second World War … they opened up an area to white occupation … and the whites coming back from the war got it … the white farmer is given a whopping big loan from the land bank … my father employed, depending on the season, anywhere between forty to sixty Africans, and an adult male was paid 12/6, which is what, $1.50?" (in *A Small Personal Voice* 1994, 83).

and faded … everywhere were little bits of stuff from the store, roughly-hemmed, draping the back of a chair" (176). Mary, who does not participate in local social activities or establish any sort of friendship even with her nearest white neighbours since she is ashamed of the "bleak poverty" (61) and dire conditions they are in, consequently runs through an existential trajectory beginning with the loss of self-esteem and social approval, frustration, mental deterioration and eventually complete breakdown and paranoid alienation. The tyrannical, scornful and patronizing attitude of Mary toward the natives, in this context, also functions as an ideological façade and outward escape mechanism that mask the contradictions resulting from her class position in a class-ridden white society and offer her illusionary comfort, identity and validation.

Stating that "colour feeling is basically money-feeling … in spite of all the rationales of racialism … the white man would strike if they were paid the same, while they still worked together", Lessing makes the point that economic divisions between the whites and the blacks in Southern Rhodesia perpetuate the racial conflicts since financial success and capital accumulation basically create the myth of white superiority. In *The Grass Is Singing*, Dick's failures in farming, for example, implicitly threaten the discourse of racial superiority according to which "black men are poor because they lack the ability and willingness to work which have made the white man rich" (King 1989, 18): "She ended with a short homily on the dignity of work, which is a doctrine bred into the bones of every white South African. They would never be any good … until they learned to work without supervision … thinking about the money they would be paid" (*The Grass Is Singing*, 114). Exploiting the land and the natives ruthlessly and getting richer and richer through many different investments, Charlie Slatter, for that reason, gives advice to Dick who lives in primitive conditions due to economic problems. Slatter, in order to ideologically preserve the colonial myth of white supremacy, however, decides to take

over the farm of Dick at the end of the novel, which symbolizes the growing capitalization of farming in which small farmers are swallowed up: "Why, some natives (though not many, thank heavens) had houses as good; and it would give them a bad impression to see white people living in such a way" (*The Grass Is Singing*).

In an interview, Lessing remarks that she was attracted to communist politics because of the fact that communists, consisting of enormously "idealistic" and "intellectual" people at that time, were the only group fighting against racism and an occidental superiority complex in their lives: "The Communist Party had an enormous effect on politics because it ignored the colour bar … white and black people worked together on the basis of equality" (1994, 79). In *The Golden Notebook*, Lessing, in this regard, deals with the racial conflict between the "rootless money-driving white settlers" and the "dispossessed Africans" (74) and reveals her sympathy towards communism through the simple, utopian, admirable and fresh ideals of the communist characters to combat racialism and apartheid in South Africa, despite the gap between theory and practice: "[A]s far as it's possible in this hell-hole I try to be a socialist and fight the colour bar" (129). In an episode, Ted, Willi and Paul start a "whimsical" fantasy about what would happen in a white-settled colony if the Africans revolted, and they come to the conclusion that there would be two possible consequences in such a case. The first would be the defeat of the black regiments which would lead "nice clean-minded highly educated boys" to maintain law and order again whereas the second would be the victory of the black armies which would strengthen progressive national feelings and develop industry (100-1). They think that supporting nationalist states would reproduce all the capitalist "unegalitarian" ethics they hate, which, in fact, reminds the reader of the discussions of a socialist intelligentsia during the process of decolonization that put forward the view that national revolution must be socialist (The other prevailing argument was that the

revolution in the colonies must not be a communist one in the first stage since the colonies could gradually achieve a communist revolution in the hands of a communist vanguard only by going ahead through the successive periods of revolutionary experience). On another occasion, Paul and Willi have a discussion about the duties of socialists in a colour-dominated society and point out that socialist struggle must be pioneered by progressive whites and blacks, that black and white trade unions are "destined" to be the vanguards and that the basic problem is about the fact that black trade unions are not even class-conscious while white trade unions are "hostile" to the African question since they do not want to lose the privilege of the appeal of being a part of the ruling nation (99). This argument is basically the critique of the psychological aspects of the imaginary dividing line between two groups having identical class interests and of the fragmentation within the working class that fails to transcend the colour line and, for that reason, fuels racial antagonism and exploitation.

CHAPTER VI: JAMES KELMAN

The Scottish renaissance, also referred to as the Scottish literary renaissance, was mainly a literary movement which displayed a profound interest in modern technology, philosophy and Scottish cultural and folkloric elements. Fusing Scottish folk literature tradition with European aesthetics and forms in order to create national consciousness, reinvent a national identity and promote Scotland's native languages, the renaissance celebrated the cultural rebirth, regeneration and reawakening of Scotland. The inter-war years, despite poverty and hardship, can be considered to be the starting point of the Scottish literary renaissance since Scottish writers and poets, viewing Scotland as a culturally, historically and politically appropriated and Anglicised homeland, rejected any sort of cultural imperialism and struggled to establish a recognizable Scottish identity in relation to nationalist and patriotic aspirations fuelled by the war (Henderson 2012)[100].

C. M. Grieve, a Scottish poet, journalist, essayist and political figure, known by his pen name Hugh MacDiarmid, published a series of three short anthologies entitled *Northern Numbers: Being Representative Selections from Certain Living Scottish Poets* between 1920 and 1922 and edited his own periodicals and magazines like *The Scottish Chapbook* and *The Scottish Nation*, which, to a certain extent, established him as one of the central figures of the Scottish literary revival. One of the members of the National Party of Scotland and the Communist Party of Great Britain, MacDiarmid developed a literary version of the Scots language and wrote his literary works in synthetic Scots or Lallans, referring to the Scots language as a whole, and Scottish authors such as Lewis Grassic Gibbon, Edwin Muir, Neil Gunn, William Soutar, Sydney Goodsir Smith, Fionn

[100] Henderson, Jason. "MacDiarmid, Muir, McLean & the Renaissance." 2012. See https://scrieve.wordpress.com/macdairmid-muir-mclean-the-renaissance/

MacColla and Norman MacCaig employed this 'literary manifesto' by combining traditional ballad culture with their own language and adopting modernist literary elements and techniques in their literary works (Gifford 2012). The determined use of the linguistic subversions of standard English and a wide range of idioms and expressions from different regions of Scotland undermined the perception that Scots was inferior to English as a language and revealed the fact that Scottish vernacular could also be employed as a universal literary tool, which arguably led to a progressive linguistic revolution in Scottish literature. In this context, Scottish literature in the late 1970s and early 1980s witnessed a new phase of revival, and writers such as Alasdair Gray, James Kelman and Irvine Welsh, using working-class urban realism, creative linguistic strategies and narrative experiments within the specific national context of Scotland, sought to portray the existential crisis, isolation and powerlessness of Scottish society in the post-industrial era. Beyond this, however, these writers sought to explore Scotland's complex linguistic inheritance through stylistic innovations and to use their fiction to resurrect a national and political identity by finding ways to encourage the possibility of cultural autonomy and resist normative modes of assimilation by the cultural forces and capital of the colonial centre. This chapter will, therefore, investigate Kelman's engagement with Glaswegian vernacular as well as his rejection and deconstruction of the cultural values and linguistic hegemony of Britain. It will also proceed to a discussion of the ways in which Kelman, one of the representatives of a "new – perhaps even more 'real' – Scottish Renaissance" (1), to use the term of Gavin Wallace in the introduction to *The Scottish Novel Since the Seventies* (1993), represented and mediated the disintegrating, alienating and destructive effects of post-industrial capitalism upon the Scottish working-class characters in *How Late It Was, How Late* (1994) and *A Disaffection* (1989).

***

Telling the story of Sammy Samuel, a 38-year-old working-class Glaswegian from the Scottish working class who loses his ability to see after being beaten by the police, *How Late It Was, How Late* attracted widespread international attention after winning the 1994 Booker Prize, one of the most prestigious literary awards in Britain, amid huge controversy. Kelman's heavy use of profanity and Glaswegian vernacular and his deployment of the modes of free indirect discourse and other kinds of stylistic experimentation were harshly attacked by the British literary establishment. Rabbi Julia Neuberger, one of the Booker judges, described the decision as "a disgrace" and stated that she was especially unhappy since Kelman was unreadably bad and "deeply inaccessible for a lot of people"[101]; Simon Jenkins, a conservative columnist in *The Times*, referred to the award as "literary vandalism" and accused Kelman of being a "Glaswegian Alcoholic With Remarkably Few Borrowings" (1994, 20). In a similar way, Max Davidson described the novel as "the ravings of a Glaswegian drunk" (1994, 9) whereas *The Times* expressed the view that the novel was a "rambling monologue of Glaswegian low life, narrated by the sort of lumpen-proletarian Scottish drunk one might cross Sauchiehall Street to avoid" (qtd. in Kövesi 2007, 157). Contrary to these views, there were also many scholars who defended the novel and its use of phonetic spellings, repetitions, regional patois and linguistic and punctual 'inconsistencies'. Ian Bell, for example, made the point that the "blindness of so many commentators to the book's deep humanity" reflected "a terrible indictment of their limitations in sympathy and understanding" (qtd. in Kövesi 2007, 157), while David Buckley appreciated "the fierce

[101] Quoted in Robert Winder's article in the *Independent* published on 12 October 1994. See http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/highly-literary-and-deeply-vulgar-if-james-kelmans-booker-novel-is-rude-it-is-in-good-company-argues-1442639.html

rhythms of Glasgow vernacular" (1994, 19) and Susan Taylor Chehak noted that Kelman's work employed "the ordinary language of modern Scottish thugs, complete with just about every slang word that you've ever heard" (2000, 234).

Language has an ideological dimension and symbolic power; words/signs within a language actually function as the most powerful medium to express cultural, national, ethnical and political identities and reveal certain objectives and the discursive construction of a hegemonic structure: "Speech is no mere verbalisation of conflicts and systems of domination but … is the very object of man's conflict" (Foucault 1972, 217). In this regard, Kelman's 'controversial' language in the novel, as might be deduced from the comments following on the Booker prize award, can be analysed from two different perspectives. First is the fact that Kelman rejects and deconstructs the cultural values and linguistic hegemony of the imperial centre and, therefore, offers a shelter against cultural assimilation; the second might be related more specifically to the writer's engagement with Glaswegian vernacular, as with other writers in this study, articulated through the dichotomy of 'them', the language of law and bureaucracy, and 'us', the speech patterns of the working class.

English has been the dominant language[102] in Scotland since it was adopted as the language of the court by King Malcolm III and his wife, Margaret, in the eleventh century. Despite helping the British Empire transform English into a world language by means of colonialism, militarisation and oppression, Scotland itself has ironically been more a victim of the Empire, sharing the traumatic experiences of the colonized, and the Scots language and Scottish dialect have gradually come to be associated in the popular

[102] It can also be pointed out that the Scots language was further weakened by the Union of the Crowns in 1603, the introduction of the King James Bible, an English translation of the Christian Bible for the Church of England between 1604 and 1611, and the Union of the Parliaments, The Acts of Union, in 1707 (Craig 1989, 5).

imagination with backwardness, or perceived as debased and inferior: "[T]he adverse judgement of Bad Scots have been so institutionalized … [Scots speakers] think … that their speech-habits are … "bad" or "wrong" or "incorrect". Well, they have been told so often enough by their mothers and teachers" (Aitken 1982, 42). In this context, the choice of language has always been problematic for Scottish writers. Some authors have used Scottish vernacular in their works in order to resist the loss of identity and British cultural imperialism and to create Scottish language awareness, while many others have reconsidered their cultures by interiorizing the superiority myths of the colonial mindset and redefining their identities by embracing English. To give an example, Ian Rankin, a Scottish crime novelist and a big fan of Kelman, is impressed by Kelman's use of Scottish vernacular, and recounts how one day he shows Kelman's stories to his father. However, Rankin's father claims to be unable to read it, saying that it is not English, although he is from the same "working-class linguistic community" as Kelman; after this exchange, Rankin himself decides to pursue an alternative literary style by not writing phonetically and preferring to use a 'safe' language which might be easily understood and appreciated by middle-class metropolitans (qtd. in Wroe 28 May 2005). Unlike Rankin's formal literary language, Kelman's authentic and revolutionary semiotics, challenging the verbal elitism of 'them' and contributing to the language-consciousness of Scots, creates a variety of possibilities for writers within the front of resistance, standing for the fact that Standard English, "the language of books", is not able to convey the experiences of many people in the British Isles:

> Language is the culture – if you lose your language you've lost your culture, so if you've lost the way your family talk, the way your friends talk, then you've lost your culture … that's what happens with all these stupid fucking books by bad average writers because they've lost their culture … not only that, what they're saying is it's inferior, because they make anybody who comes from that culture speak in a hybrid language, whereas they speak standard English. And their

> language is the superior one. So what they're doing, in effect, is castrating their parents, and their whole culture. (Kelman 1985)[103]

Bill Ashcroft and his co-editors in *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) analyse the intentional manipulation of different linguistic forms and investigate linguistic strategies such as abrogation and appropriation through which postcolonial writers experiment with and manipulate the language of the colonial centre. Appropriation basically refers to the "reconstitution of the language of the center, the process of capturing and remoulding the language to new usages" and abrogation signifies the "denial of the privilege of 'English'" and "rejection of the metropolitan power over the means of communication" (1989, 38). Extrapolating from this argument, Kelman's *How Late It Was, How Late* can be categorized as a postcolonial literary work in terms of its use of English since abrogation and appropriation are both simultaneously present in the novel. Kelman's mixing Standard English with the Scottish dialect, making the novel more inventive and revolutionary, explicitly reveals the insufficiency of Standard English in terms of representing the diverse experiences of the Scottish working class and functions to establish a specific subcultural identity as an effective form of subversive resistance to the colonial language of the Establishment, which is indeed emblematic of the process of abrogation. The incorporation of the direct speech patterns of the Glaswegian vernacular such as "gony" for 'going to', "sodjers" for 'soldier', "naybody" for 'nobody', "aye" for 'yes', "wean" for 'child', "the morrow" for 'tomorrow', "mind" for 'remember' and the manipulation of the syntactical and grammatical rules of 'them' language, on the other hand, reflect the process of appropriation (Bonke 1999, 70). The deployment of such strategic deviations

[103] From the interview of Duncan McLean published in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1985.

from Standard English[104] basically confers an oral quality on the text and serves to reinforce the rejection of the cultural assumptions and power relations of the colonized and the colonizer by creating a cultural distance between 'the centre' and 'the periphery' and constructing a counter discourse against the dominant culture:

> There is a literary tradition to which I hope my own work belongs, I see it as part of a much wider process – or movement – towards decolonisation and self-determination: it is a tradition that assumes two things: 1) the validity of indigenous culture; and 2) the right to defend in the face of attack. It is a tradition premised on a rejection of the cultural values of imperial or colonial authority, offering a defence against cultural assimilation, in particular an imposed assimilation. (Kelman 1994, 2)

In *How Late It Was, How Late*, therefore, Kelman stylistically challenges the foundations of canonical British literature, which prioritizes Standard English and excludes linguistically faithful representations of working-class identities; instead, he fictionalizes a story deriving from his own particular background and socio-cultural experience that is committed to remaining a part of his own community and sustaining its linguistic practices and registers. The use of nonstandardised language in the novel indeed reveals the implicit clash between standard and vernacular language and functions as an arbitrary sign and exterior marker of a collective identity in order to emphasize existing social conflicts in his own culture and to identify the class positions of the characters through the dichotomy of '*them*', "posh-foreign" and "high class" (191) businessmen, the "upper class" (19) and "greedy … dirty bastards" (35) and "arsehole[s] in a sharp suit walking up and down" (15) and talking "with the right voice"(4) in a "smart tailored suit" with "scarlet lips [and] smile" (2), and "sodjers" (3), "the fucking uniforms" (307), the

[104] Kelman's use of Glaswegian vernacular in the novel also corresponds to the concept of heteroglossia. Identifying two linguistic forces in the literary works, 'centripetal' and 'centrifugal', Bakhtin suggests that dominant cultures exert centripetal pressures in order to homogenise language within a unified system, while a centripetal force resists the process of standardization through grammatical and syntactical deviations and subversions. This actually reveals the fact that Kelman's rebellious language is a medium for the evolution of a local variety of 'e'nglish and functions as a centripetal force against the superiority assumptions of the imperialist/metropolitan centre (Bakhtin 1981, 272-73; Bentley 2007; Lashley 1984).

"fucking bastards" (3), and "the screw[s]" (9), and '*us*', the "bottom line man" (2) and the "fucking pest" (5) without "any fucking choices" (35). For example, in one episode, Sammy is questioned by the police, the officials of state bureaucracy, and told not to "use the word 'cunts' again" (174) with an accent sounding "a bit English" (175) since it does not fit in the computer. Sammy, in another scene, meets Doctor Logan, another agent of social authority and, therefore, the state, in order to prove "the alleged dysfunction" (243) and to be registered for Dysfunctional Benefit, but he feels threatened by Logan's consistent use of Standard English, his initial silence, abrupt responses and indifferent, cold and patronizing manners. Controlling the "distribution of turns, selection and change of topics, opening and closing of interactions, and so forth" (Fairclough 1992, 152) and finding Sammy's language offensive, the doctor asserts his authority and superiority through his dialogues in Standard English with the protagonist: "You're Mister Samuels, you were taken onto this register for a probationary period some six months ago; you're here this morning to complain of sightloss in both eyes; is that correct?" (235-6). After not being able to convince the doctor of his blindness, Sammy encounters Ally, the mysterious rep offering help in return for a third percent of all eventual payment, and Ally, trying to talk Sammy's vernacular language, warns Sammy not to lose his temper and advises him to discipline the words he uses and to change the way he speaks: "Look eh pardon me; just one thing, ye're gony have to watch yer language; sorry; but every second word's fuck. If ye listen to me ye'll see I try to keep an eye on the auld words" (287-8). Ally, despite adopting the language of 'them' and possessing a hybrid position between the state mechanism and its victims, ironically makes use of the discursive rhetoric of 'them' and 'us' in order to reinforce and legitimate his own arguments: "You know the score Sammy, ye go up to court ye dont start acting the clown, ye have to play the game. It's them that make the rules … They dont even like being in the same room as us" (259). However,

Sammy does not conform to the use of a more acceptable speech pattern and, for that reason, he rejects being categorized by his 'e'nglish, which explicitly challenges the homogeneity of 'them' and suggests that language is actually a battleground over the power relations between Sammy's working-class vernacular and the Standard English of the institutional representatives of the status quo.

In *A Disaffection*, the third novel of Kelman, written in vernacular Scots in a stream of consciousness voice, Kelman, in a similar way, portrays the existing social conflicts in Scottish culture through the perspective of Patrick Doyle, a 29-year-old working-class-born secondary-school teacher, and reveals Doyle's rebelliousness toward the inherent power relationships in the world of 'them' – the "fucking imperialist bastards" (117), "selfish and greedy aristocratic capitalist mankindhating landowners" (301), "multibillionaire capitalist bastards" (113) and "upper-class english squire" (295) who steal "our fish" (110) and "Scotland's oil" (110), always eat in the "high-class" (112) and "posh" (110) kitchens of "English … establishments" (112) and "let you say and do what you wanted to do … so long as it didnt threaten what they possessed" (53). Doyle's hostility towards the agents of 'them' manifests itself in his relationship with the headmaster of the school, "Old Milne", and the metaphors of mental rebellion are visible in Doyle's free-floating interior monologues. In the novel, "Old Milne" is presented as the embodiment and representative of the status quo and referred to as an "Edwardian aristocrat" (30), a "fucking bastard" (104), a "capital A R S E arse" (168), an "absolute fucking piece of tollie" (104), a "congregationalist" (104) and a "right-wing fucking shite" (151). On one occasion, Doyle, for example, fantasizes about attacking 'Old Milne" with a Doberman Pinscher and a big double-barrelled shotgun, which actually reinforces his theoretical political resistance to 'them' and functions as an inward escape mechanism from the perceived entrapment in his job: "Ye see ya auld fucking conniving bastard ye

I'm resigning my commission and then after my dog's fucking bit ye I'm gonni fucking shoot ye! Okay?" (167). In the classroom, Doyle also makes use of profanity and Scottish vernacular as an effective form of subversive resistance to the language of the Establishment through the manipulation of the syntactical and grammatical rules of English: "I mean ye shouldni even be here … I am no kidding ye weans I'm really fucking, not to be trusted" (186). In an episode, Doyle tells the students to "open [their] fucking jotters and get scribbling" (23) and repeats that "the present government, in suppressing the poor, is supressing [their] parents" (24) and even suggests they should go and blow up the DHSS office (186). Doyle's inclination to destroy everything symbolizing 'them' fundamentally springs from his state of powerlessness vis-à-vis those holding "the position of power" (280) and functions to reminds the reader of the Luddites, a group of English textile workers in the nineteenth century who destroyed machinery as a form of protest against industrialisation.

Kelman's personal resistance to the rules and language of 'them', however, has not been very different from that of Sammy and Doyle. To exemplify, when Kelman was nominated as a Booker finalist for the first time in 1989, he did not participate in the awards' dinner by stating that he had "better things to do than swan around with the literati" (qtd. in Wynne-Jones 1997), whereas he showed up in a casual suit and with an open-necked shirt and gave an acceptance speech about English cultural imperialism upon winning the Booker prize in 1994 (Pitchford: 2000: 701): "My culture and my language have the right to exist, and no one has the authority to dismiss that … A fine line can exist between elitism and racism. On matters concerning language and culture, the distance can sometimes cease to exist together" (from Kelman's speech qtd. in Wood 2014). In another instance, one of Kelman's short stories was accepted by a magazine at York University in 1972, but the editor refused to allow its publication because of its heavy use of profanity;

in the mid-1970s, another publisher urged Kelman to write in more accessible language since Kelman's Glaswegian dialect did not sell in America (Lyall 1994). Kelman was also harshly criticized by many Scottish critics and even accused of "letting the nation down" through a debased and "unfortunate portrayal of Scotland" (qtd. in Pitchford 2000). However, Kelman – despite all such sectarian pressures and 'sanctions' – literarily revolted against the perception of nonstandard English as a deviation and corruption and refused to 'censor' his language, just as Sammy refuses in *How Late It Was, How Late*:

> I mean, how could I write stories about the characters that I have created in the Queen's English? How can that be done? It means I couldn't write stories about these characters. I'd have to write stories about some other characters. And usually that's what happens in Scottish literature … I would never consider asking Ian McEwan why his characters address one another in crisp, grammatically flawless English or attempt to interrogate Martin Amis as to why so many of his anti-heroes are ultra-literate Oxford alumni.[105]

Kelman, rejecting the pressure to adapt to the language of the ruling class and to fulfil the metropolitan norms and desires of a middle-class audience for an easily 'understandable' and 'consumable' literary work, writes about the 'real' stories of 'ordinary' people and reflects their everyday lives in a more realistic style, without using dramatic moments and a conventional plot structure: "Ninety per cent of the literature in Great Britain concerns people who never have to worry about money at all. We always seem to be watching or reading about emotional crises among folk who live in a world of great fortune in matters of money and luck" (Kelman 2008[106]). Kelman's fiction draws on modernist, realist and regional elements and makes stylistic and lexical innovations that challenge monological narrative, dissolve linguistic hierarchies and condemn the British class system (McGlynn 2002, 53), so his writing functions as a vehicle for deconstructive

[105] Quoted in James Maxwell's article in the *Glasgow Guardian* published on 30 November 2009. See https://glasgowguardian.co.uk/2009/11/30/a-disaffection-james-kelman-versus-the-world/

[106] From the interview of Theo Tai published in the *Guardian* in 2008.

resistance to the literary Establishment and undermines the usual hegemonic forms of committed art. Contrary to the presentation of skilled and politically active working-class characters in traditional narratives, Kelman's *How Late It Was, How Late*, in this sense, concerns a marginalized, daft, atomized, alienated and inward looking character, Sammy, who does not struggle for a potential salvation or a political and economic transformation, a revolution, and Kelman focuses instead on the exploration of Sammy's perceived entrapment and existential crisis against 'them'. As Kövesi comments (2007, 21):

> Kelman does not present us with a generalised working-class world or society: he presents us with working-class individuals to interpret … Kelman's fiction does not present political or social problems which are digested, processed and solved by the agenda of the narrator, or by the devices, resolutions or social conscience of the narrative. Instead the … novels present individuals to watch and to listen to, the spaces around them to be filled in by the coaxed, teased, frustrated, participation of the reader.

Kelman's working-class realism, in fact, transcends the modes of previous working-class fiction since Kelman liberates the narrative voice from the constraints of standard English, interweaves spoken and written forms of speech and refuses to use inverted commas as speech markers. In so doing, he levels the distinction between the medium of narration and the medium of dialogue and creates a neutral narrative technique and linguistic unity (Craig 1993, 103). He also negates the homogenizing representational logic and codes of bourgeois cultural hegemony and rejects the stratification within the narrative form and a hierarchy of discourse dominated by a superior standard language (Kelly 2013, 78).

In the novel, distinguishing the voice of the narrator from that of the protagonist is not often possible because Kelman, one of the representatives of a new era in the Scottish Renaissance, employs free indirect discourse, distances himself from the process of narration, rejects linguistic superiority and uses the same colloquial language as his protagonist in terms of syntax, speech idioms and vocabulary: "The hand on his shoulder

my fuck it would have been nice, it would have been nice, know what I'm saying, dirty bastards, Sammy would have fucking loved it; get yer fucking hand off my fucking shoulder ya bastard ye just dont fucking touch me" (35-6). Unlike many other traditional working-class writers who retain standard English as a neutralised narrative technique through interpretative narrative guidance and, therefore, become alienated from their own characters by excluding, marginalizing and otherizing their socio-economic realities, cultures and values[107], Kelman does not render the represented speech of his protagonist in quotation marks and thereby helps his readers get into Sammy's mind by 'merging' his own voice with Sammy's interior monologues and senses of smell, touch, taste and hearing. In *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, Alan Sillitoe, for example, uses standard English, direct speeches and a normative narrative voice while quotation marks are employed for characters' speeches: "'Arthur' his father called, in a deadly menacing Monday-morning voice that made your guts rattle, sounding as if it came from the grave, 'when are yer goin' ter get up? Yer'll be late fer wok'. He closed the stairfoot door quietly so as not to waken the mother and two other sons still at home" (24). In *The Lonely Londoners*, Sam Selvon, on the other hand, develops "nonstandard Creole into the language of the third-person narrative" (Mair 145-46), constructs a distinctive modified Trinidadian vernacular by mixing standard English and the Trinidadian dialect and, as Kelman similarly does in *How Late, It Was How Late*, uses it in order to inform a wide range of readers about the authenticity of the Caribbean culture and life and present the diverse experiences of immigrants in Britain.

[107] In a talk delivered to the students of art at Glasgow School of Art in November 1996, Kelman stated that he was aware of "the distinction between dialogue and narrative as a summation of a political system" and that he felt "uncomfortable with 'working-class' authors" who allowed "the voice of higher authority to control narrative"

In *How Late It Was, How Late*, Kelman explicitly reveals the victimization process of Sammy and explores the melancholic symptoms of his failure, crisis, dispossession and estrangement in the de-industrialized world of the post-Thatcher era. As an isolated, 'rootless', unemployed and blind individual confined to the margins within the stifling material conditions of urban life, Sammy runs through a state of loss, discontent and frustration, which subsequently results in alienation in the form of meaninglessness and powerlessness: "The account of Sammy's life … accords with much thinking about the barrenness of the present, its voided, ahistorical directionlessness; the ongoing, unmappable quandary of an endless present that we have all fallen into and out of which there is no escape" (Kelly 2013, 178). Sammy's confrontation with the bureaucracy of the modern day and treatment by the police officers and other authorities basically prevents him from feeling self-assured, fulfilling the needs related to his human nature, asserting himself through his own identity and becoming integrated into the mainstream society and, in return, this leads to a life within the boundaries of social isolation: "[I]t was lonely, just fucking lonely lonely lonely fucking lonely, lonely; that was his life, lonely" (66). In one episode, the police officers, for instance, do not "give a fuck" about Sammy's 'screaming' for help and make fun of him, although he desperately tells them that he suffers from a loss of sight and wants to report it: "Drunk and incapable, said another yin, he cannay admit it like a man, but says he's lost his fucking eyesight somewhere. Anybody find an eyesight! There's a guy here looking for an eyesight" (14). In another episode, Sammy decides to stop "some cunt" (43) and awkwardly asks for help in order to get him off the road after being released, but no one will speak to him. The fact that Sammy looks for "somebody he could trust" throughout the novel is actually descriptive of the alienation of men to man, the fourth and last stage of Marx's theory of alienation, in which individuals view each other as objects in accordance with their own profits and

material gains, and of social isolation realized and expressed in daily relations that are depersonalized, commodified and based on personal interests: “There was naybody … He had to make it to the flats on his own. That was okay. It was best. There was nay way ye could rely on cunts getting ye out of trouble … They aye find ways to fuck ye. It doesnay matter who ye are” (267). After arriving at the DSS Central Medical, Sammy wants to be registered for Dysfunctional Benefit and ironically tries to exert himself to persuade the officials that he is blind. Failing to prove his visual malfunction within the information overload controlled externally and unable to predict the results of his own actions, behaviours and what or whom to trust, he eventually feels worthless and meaningless: “He was a blind bastard. Righ then. That stage ye just go, Fuck it, cause what else is there? nothing, there’s fuck all” (351). Considering the fact that in post-industrial societies there are many external agencies that directly and indirectly shape and control the lives of individuals instead of allowing them to regulate their own time and daily activities, Sammy’s sense of powerlessness is also chiefly caused by the dehumanizing characteristics of bureaucracy and bureaucratic ritualism: because he feels no confidence and is not able to steer or even participate in decision-making processes since the link between aimed-action and perceived-outcome is obscured. Consequently, Sammy becomes apathetic and convinced of his own powerlessness, and he experiences alienation in the presence of complex bureaucratic procedures and inaccurate information (Seeman 1966).

Since Sammy cannot actualize the basic recreational functions and instinctual impulses in his human nature, in order to compensate his sense of nothingness, he seeks refuge from the world of ‘them’, in which it is always “fucking them”, the “bastards, always at their convenience, every single last bit of time … like greedy weans trashing about looking for the tit” (35), and tries to escape from the perceived unpleasantness of his

life. The desire to smoke, listening to music and daydreaming about starting a new life in England are the basic escape mechanisms through which Sammy nullifies the negative impacts of his entrapment and exerts, albeit through illusory fulfilment, his existential being. To exemplify, whenever Sammy is confronted with "a fucking problem" (40), he gasps for a smoke, a "good man" (38), since it helps him come in and out of thoughts: "[Y]e're blind, the patacake games it was fair enough man ye're no gony run down the road, ye just have to take it easy and no fucking … okay. A smoke right enough would be good" (54). In a similar way, Sammy always has a song in his head, consoles himself with the lyrics of a wide range of blues and folk music singers and songwriters like Willie Nelson, Waylon Jennings, Kris Kristofferson, Bob Dylan and Patsy Cline, and transcends his "imprisoned circumstances" through "the abstraction of imagined music" (Kövesi 2007, 136):

> He got down on his knees to feel the floor, cold but firm, cold but firm. The palms of his hands flat on it; he had this sensation of being somewhere else in the world and a music started on his head, a real real music, it was hypnotic, these instruments beating out the tumatumatumti tumatumatumti tum, tum; tum, ti tum; tum, tum; tum, ti tum, tumatumatumti tumatumatumti byong; byong byong byong byong byong; byong, byong byong, byong, byong byong. He was down now and rolled onto his back, lying there smiling … shooting pains. (*How Late* 12)

Finding peace and tranquillity in nature away from the mechanizing and deadening life conditions of Glasgow is another outward escape mechanism presented in the novel. Thinking that there is "nothing" in Glasgow for him and that he should get rid of "all that can-ye-help-me-crap fucking bullshit" (276), Sammy decides to get a job and get "fixed up" (381) and start a new life in a "quaint auld sleepy" (277) place with "a big long stretch of seashore" (277) in "fucking England" (315), where he can take off his shoes, "relax" and find a "four-legged friend" (277), rather than London where all the Glasgow accents disappear and everybody gets "anonymous" (276). Sammy's desire to be closer to nature,

"man's inorganic body" (Marx 1844: 31), actually offers him a refuge through which he can potentially achieve his dreams, feel "safe" and forget the conflicts and problems in his life (277).

In the second half of the twentieth century, many traditional occupations disappeared, practical knowledge was replaced with theoretical knowledge and new occupational groups, including white-collar employees and mental labourers such as technicians, supervisors, managers, academics and so on, emerged in relation to the transition from industrial production to information technology and serviced-based economy, which consequently resulted in "post-industrial or postmodern capitalism" (Eagleton 2011, 171). Despite this structural transformation of capitalism, the destructiveness of post-industrialism based on the polarization between the oppressors and the oppressed has not changed and the exploitation of human labour has increasingly continued to increase. The physical, psychological and alienating effects of factory work upon wage-earners in capitalism has perpetuated itself in the working experiences of all non-productive labourers, the so-called new middle-class, in the banking, insurance, education, advertising, science and technology sectors of the neo-capitalist era. In this context, *A Disaffection* also fictionalizes the effects of the socio-political, intellectual and sociological conjunctures of Britain in the 1980s upon the newly emerging middle class and reveals the reduction of Patrick Doyle to a passively instrumental role within the mechanisms of post-industrial capitalism.

In the novel, Doyle cannot actualize his purposive needs for productive activity as a teacher, a cognitive worker, and cannot develop his talents and capacities in a free, spontaneous, conscious, creative and organic way, and this gradually results in his state of alienation in relation to his students, to his working conditions, to his human nature and to

others around him. Although Doyle earns "the average weekly wage of a full-blooded member of the professional classes" (18), has "no financial worries of any kind whatsoever" (167) and enjoys a relatively luxurious life compared to "more than half of Scotland" (255) who do not have a job, he, unable to gain control over himself and to express his intrinsic qualities and potentialities in his human species through his job, cannot actualize himself, and his relationship to his students, symbolically the products of his work, as an alien object subsequently dominates and fragments him. In one episode, for example, the students happily tell Doyle that his shoelaces are undone, but Doyle grumpily thinks that the prank is "so fucking horrendous" (28) and does not even bother checking his shoelaces. Despite the fact that Doyle is "listened to" (7) and "paid the utmost attention" (7) by his students, he also becomes radically estranged from his own work since he does not have any control over the form of his intellectual 'labour' and the contexts of production conditions and so cannot operate his creative abilities and his human powers through a set of direct, measurable and solid continuities:

> Theoretical webs, dirty webs, fusty webs; old and shrivelling away into nothingness, a fine dust. Who needs that kind of stuff. Far far better getting out into the open air and doing it, actually doing it, something solid and concrete and unconceptualisable. And now there existed a great temptation: to stop being a teacher. To stop being a teacher. To concentrate solely upon things of genuine value, things of genuine authenticity, of a genuine physicality. (10)

In *The Labour of Dionysus: A Critique of the State-Form* (1994), Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri point out that we live in a postmodern age and that postmodern capitalism no longer needs "mediatory mechanisms of legitimization and discipline" but instead indirectly exerts its hegemony and power through decentralized "networks of control" (1994, 259). Gilles Deleuze too, in "Postscript on the Societies of Control" (2011), focuses on the smooth replacement of the disciplinary apparatuses of modernism like prisons or factories by abstract institutional forms that discipline and control every level of society in

a simultaneous way. In a similar way, Pierre Bourdieu in *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1984) introduces the concept of symbolic power which stands for the tacit modes of disciplinary practices used against another within a hierarchical structure through institutions, especially those of education. Considering these arguments, Doyle's awareness of his own powerlessness within the cycles of post-industrial power relations, the symbolic power of 'them', and exclusion from the decision making mechanisms, lead to his disaffection, disillusion and detachment. Doyle, feeling that his mind is never "in control" (295), that he is "a fucking no-user" (199) and that he is "the tool of a dictatorship government" (67) and under the constant surveillance of the State intelligence services, becomes "sickened" (1) and disempowered because, selling his unproductive labour to 'them' as a representative of "a corrupt and repressive society" (303) that operates "efficiently" (303), he recognises his implicit complicity in materializing the dominant ideology and perpetuating and prolonging the machinery of the Establishment:

> Now, all of yous, all you wee first-yearers, cause that's what you are, wee-first-yearers. You are here being fenced by us the teachers at the behest of the government in explicit simulation of your parents viz. the suppressed poor. Repeat after me: We are being fenced in by the teachers … at the behest of a dictatorship government … in explicit simulation of our fucking parents the silly bastards. (25)

Thinking about how he "sold his rights for a when of pennies" (303) and "became a member of the polis" (139) also increases Doyle's state of perceived 'impotence' and alienation as it reminds him of his entrapment in the vicious cycle of the reproduction of the relations of production through the State Apparatuses, of his 'official' mission of getting the weans' heads swollen with all that "rightwing keech" (149) in order to sit back with "big wagepackets" (149) and, therefore, of his responsibility for "the present polity" (149).

In his *Prison Notebooks* (1999), covering a wide range of topics such as Italian history and nationalism, the French revolution, Fordism, Fascism, civil society and high and popular culture, Antonio Gramsci argues that the capitalist state is made up of two overlapping "superstructural levels", political society, the stage of political and legal institutions operating through 'coercive power', and civil society, the institution of family, education system and trade unions ruling through 'consent', and he remarks that the dominant group, the ruling class, exercises "direct domination" and enforces discipline either actively or passively through the instrumental character of political and civil society (145). At this point, Doyle, as an intellectual with a Master's degree, "the dominant group's [deputy] exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government" (Gramsci 1999: 145), complies with the disciplinary mechanisms and ubiquitous control of the institutional representation of the Establishment exerted through civil society – unlike Sammy in *How Late It Was, How Late*, who challenges the hegemonic 'truths' of 'them' cast through the abstract, faceless and repressive bureaucratic apparatuses of 'political society' (Alcala 2016, 103).

In one episode, Doyle notices the nightlight beaming from the topmost windows of a national bank and impulsively wants to smash the windows of all banks, insurance offices and anything connected with "the financial institutions of the Greatbritish rulers" (335) with a brick. In another episode, Doyle has a conversation with his brother's wife, Nicola, and makes the point that having a job should not mean that you have to stick to it, that the system prevents people from taking matters into their hands and that a revolutionary social change can only be achieved when people start making their own decisions (319). In spite of theoretically being aware of the 'formula' of dismantling the exertion of control and systematic exploitation of the prevailing mode of production, neo-capitalism, and expressing his desire to build a new society, "a straight bourgeois intellectual wank"

(306), Doyle is practically unable to stand up to the State of late capitalism, which leads to his fragmentation and loss of self-respect: "None of us wanted to be a teacher in the first bloody place but here we are all here, bloody teaching, it's bloody terrible so it is. I'm really bloody browned off with it all, I'm no kidding ye" (14). Even accepting to be transferred to another school by the absolute power of 'them' justifies the argument that Doyle has to conform to the form of labour imposed by the institutionalized apparatuses of the State rather than actively resisting the decision. His revolt against the agents of 'them' becomes 'impotent' and fades away, exemplifying the dilemma and pacifism of the newly emerging middle class in the second half of the twentieth century.

From a Marxist perspective, the subjective feelings, level of income, lifestyle or patterns of consumption of an individual do not locate her class position (Callinicos 1987, 4-6); instead what determines the class position of an individual is her objective place within the social relations of production and whether she owns the means of production or not: "[The concept of class in Marxism] … is a question of where you stand within a particular mode of production – whether as slave, self-employed, peasant, agricultural tenant, owner of capital, financier, seller of one's labour power, petty proprietor and so on" (Eagleton 2011, 160-61). In this respect, in order to re-conceptualize the concept of class, new strategies, aiming to extend and reform the Marxist class model by taking the economic and social circumstances of contemporary society into account, needed to be developed. The Professional and Managerial Class theory, one of the alternative theories conceptualizing the class structure of advanced capitalism, for example, puts forwards the idea that capitalist developments in the 1950s have created a new middle class that includes mental workers such as scientists, engineers, teachers and lower and middle level administrators and that these wage earners can be categorized as a part of the PMC since they reproduce capitalist culture and capitalist class relations and do not own the means of

production (Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich 1976, 7). Considering this argument, Doyle evidently belongs to the Professional Managerial Class with "a good sort of middle-class job" (303) and "a good sort of middle-classish wage" (303), and this gives him the freedom of doing whatever he wants, of driving motor cars and journeying by taxis (327), of walking along to the licenced grocer and of buying a bottle of whisky and the most expensive lager in the shop (303). However, Doyle, being closely engaged with a working-class community, does not identify himself as a "middle-class wanker" (285) and, therefore, one of 'them' although he swears at those "bastards" (73), scoffing at the work teachers perform in return for their time off, and he tries to justify the fact that teachers teach all day and indeed deserve what they earn, which subsequently leads to the state of inbetweenness:

> I've hated being a teacher. No kidding ye. It fucking stinks. It stinks. A genuine stench, of corruption, everywhere, rotten decomposing flesh being nibbled by a few fat vultures, everywhere you look a genuine stench … it's rotten, from the outside in and the inside fucking out. Every last fucking thing about it, it stinks. And what goes on in the classroom, it's a load of dross. This is how I'm fucking chucking it. (280)

This ambivalent position of Doyle, alternating between his new middle-class position and the working-class environment in which he grew up, in other words, between the centre and the periphery, manifested in his use of English, also results in discontentment and estrangement. As a teacher having a master's degree with honours, Doyle, discrediting the institutionalised discursive practices of 'them' in the classroom and employing Glaswegian working-class vernacular with his family members, makes use of sophisticated English and perfect linguistic forms and structures with his colleagues just as Ally, the rep, does in *How Late It Was How Late*: "I'm being honest, putting in for a transfer and then going away and managing to forget about it: I can imagine myself doing that. It's the kind of mischief I get up to. There are all sorts of flagellation. Mind these

paintings by Goya I was telling yous to take a look at?" (198). However, Doyle's interior monologues, intellectual ruminations and existential questionings consist of profanity and argot, which actually reveals his hybrid position and deconstructs the argument that complex ideas and deep thoughts can only be expressed within the territory of educated and sophisticated speeches (McGlynn 2002, 76): "When I am dead I shall be thingwi and there shall be no more problems insofaras the world ceases to exist when I shut the fucking eyelids. Okay! I'm going to fucking wipe yous out ya bastards" (221).

Doyle, becoming alienated from his students, the products of his work, from teaching, the working process, and from his own human nature, cuts off his relationship with the outer world and even stops buying newspapers and taking any interest in the news or what goes on: "I dont matter and you dont matter … None of us matters at all. Fucking ignorance and warped brains" (305-6). Despite feeling "alone" (5), getting "awful lonely" (147), craving for affection and love (21), not feeling genuinely "happy" (199) for years and coming home to "coldness" (5) and "a permanent of dearth of … the warmth" brought into being through "presence … a fucking person" (5), Doyle does not want to meet his colleagues or reply to the letters of his old pals or re-establish contact with them, and he avoids talking to his father and constantly thinks about going home, drawing curtains and setting himself down when he meets his brother: "Not having anything to talk about. What was there to talk about? Nothing. Fuck all" (118). In order to compensate for his state of "un-of-this-world-ness", to nullify the process of alienation, he runs through (58), to find "freshness" (74) and to attain "freedom" (42), "liberation" (42) and a "good-to-be-alive-ness" (58), when he feels a bit low and "alone" (248) Doyle plays his bright silver, red and black shiny pipes, likened to a "surrogate child" (4), a "pet" (4) and a "wife" (4). Raising them to his lips, closing his eyelids tightly and blowing a very long and deep sound, which is indeed "medicinal" (82) and "psychotherapeutic" (82), this activity also functions as an

outward escape mechanism. Playing the pipes, a pleasurable activity, helps Doyle relax, take his mind off his daily problems, find "peace" (225) and forget that he is "ordinary" (293) and "nothing" (191): "[W]henever I get down in the dumps I just sit back and play these pipes and I get cheered up. I dont always get the tunes right but sometimes I do and it sounds great" (299).

Marx's theory of alienation is founded upon the idea that existing social conditions prevent human beings from leading a meaningful life, corresponding to the satisfaction of the intrinsic qualities in human nature. Instead, human beings are doomed to experience estrangement within the dehumanized circumstances of the money-oriented world, yet they might overcome alienation when an atmosphere in which individuals can actualize their own selves can be created and sustained. Focusing on two concepts, 'natural man', the characteristics shared by every human being, and 'species man', the powers and needs setting human beings apart from the rest of all living creatures, Marx argues that an individual tends to create items in a free, spontaneous and conscious way: the purposive need for productive activity, in order to satisfy his/her instinctual human essence, is the means to manifest and confirm his/her essential powers and to actualize himself/herself through the objects he/she produces without being subordinated to someone else (Marx 1844). In this context, the fact that Doyle, as a teacher being forced to live his life "in a certain way" (301) under the ideological hegemony of the State and not being able to have the control of his working process, teaching, discovers a pair of old pipes, paints them different colours, plays them and feels "happy" (300), suggests that Doyle, like a traditional craftsman, becomes aware of his potentials, finds an opportunity to see the real organic whole and the surrounding conditions and their effects and so is able to realise the objective form of his own work and actualize himself. The pipes, albeit through an illusionary mode of actualization, offer Doyle an opportunity for self-expression, self-

development, self-fulfilment and self-consciousness within the vicious, mechanized and monotonous circle of postmodern power relations; they come to soothe his "troubled soul" (82).

The constant state of the desire for sitting on his tod and sipping his draught beer on his own "quietly and peacefully" (250) is, on the other hand, represented in the novel as an inward escape mechanism since it takes Doyle's mind away from his daily "worries" (250) and downgrades the seriousness of his inability to control his own life. Doyle, despite considering television as "the land of fantasy" (296) and believing that television is a device "for people being watched instead of people watching" (296), also ponders getting a "fucking telly" (80), staring straight at it when he is "lonely" (80) and finding "comfort" (80) and serenity, and this inward escape mechanism basically enables him to transport himself away from the traumatic and painful challenges in his life and to suppress and avoid the dynamics based on his external reality through an introspective internal journey.

Doyle, "the mental bastard … on the road" (68) who is unable to decide what to do at weekends, drives randomly, heading south to the English border and then returning back home in Glasgow, and talks to himself inside the car. In one episode, he thinks of buying a new car with a stereo hi-fi radio and cassette, listening to music or talks or taped radio drama, tapping his fingers and relaxing. In another episode, he fantasizes about motoring south, down to the Bay of Biscay, driving across to Morocco, heading straight left along the northern coast of Africa and bypassing "the whole of fucking Europe" (166). Doyle's free-floating internal thoughts while driving, akin to "smoking dope, the pipe of peace" (66), momentarily give him a chance to think, help him forget his disaffection, ineffectuality and conflicts in his life and, therefore, serve as a means of another inward

escape “from the head” (91), which reminds the readers of Arthur’s lathe, through which Arthur daydreams about “pleasant events” (SNSM 39) and steps into “a cosy world of pubs and noisy tarts” (SNSM 39), in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*. This also exemplifies the fact that, despite the structural transformation of capitalism in the post-war period, the destructiveness of the money-oriented world has not changed at all: the alienating impacts of factory work in the modern period perpetuated itself in the working experiences of non-productive workers in postmodern capitalism.

CONCLUSION

Subsequent to the prodigious expansion of modern capitalism into what has been termed postmodern/late capitalism in the second half of the twentieth century (Eagleton 2011; Hardt and Negri 1994; Jameson 1984; Mandel 1975; Wright 2011), *one-dimensional* class-centred left-wing theories based on the dichotomy of the exploiter and the exploited have undergone widespread and diverse critique from the perspective of a range of alternative political ideologies as well as from ethical, cultural, social and historical perspectives. These more recent perspectives have gradually become aligned or allowed to intersect with the predominantly class analysis of traditional Marxism since this more traditional politics of class has been challenged by a postmodern concept of difference and identity that purports to articulate those contemporary forms of oppression whose dominant is perceived to be gender, sexuality, colour and/or nationality. It has been put forward that *one-dimensional* class politics, for example, is unable any longer to rationalize or provide an account of current circumstances that appear more related to the concept of the pluralization of national identity as capitalism has taken on a more multi-cultural orientation as a consequence of the immigration of many 'black' and Asian communities to the colonial/global centres after the process of 'decolonization' in the 1950s (Gilroy 2002).

Identity-based social theories, significantly problematizing symbols and identities rather than material conditions, relations of production and distribution of resources, therefore call for a radical revision of the class-centred approach, described as reductive, anachronistic and culturally-blind (Solomos 1995), and of the relationship between identity and class; they aim instead to 'fight' for a free and democratic society by rejecting the ontological centrality of the working class, laying greater emphasis on the pluralistic

character of contemporary social movements and their potential functions in terms of radicalizing and mobilizing masses through new antagonisms, different social conflicts, and new forms of subordination taking place after the Second World War (Laclau and Mouffe 2014). So "the boys", working in the worst jobs, feeling neglected, exploited, oppressed, marginalized and otherized and ideologically positioning themselves towards challenging injustice and dehumanization through the them-us contradiction, in *The Lonely Londoners* and *Moses Ascending*, seem to suggest that a political struggle articulated through identity concepts can potentially be more influential in challenging dominant structures, theoretically radicalizing peripheral groups towards rebellion and resistance and anchoring the dynamism of 'blacks' in 'leftism' - which indeed can serve to reinforce arguments around the politics of identity on the Left.

In *Black Skin, White Masks* (1986), Frantz Fanon points out that the colonized depend on the colonizer for recognition, self-worth and self-affirmation and that the process of decolonization can only be initiated by struggling against the imposition of the codes of colonial identities. Taking this discussion further and investigating the operation of power relations within the system, Michel Foucault, in "The Subject and Power" (1982), indicates that power relations categorize individuals, attach them to a certain identity determined by law or status or linguistic and cultural differences in a constraining way and impose "a law of truth" (781) on them in order to make them 'recognizable'; it is this process which subsequently leads to their subjugation. In *The Psychic Life of Power* (1997), Judith Butler, constructing her arguments on a Foucauldian critique of normativity and the production of power, similarly argues for a refusal of the subject to identify the other and to think of the self as identifiable since actual relations between the subject and the other do not rest on mutual acknowledgement. For Butler, agency does not need the approval of the subject in order to be identifiable. Interpellation, the social operation of

power, creates identities, pernicious and inaccurate representations of the self, where subjects accept, internalize and perform the narratives of the dominant power structures through such discursively constructed identity codes and consequently run through the process of subjection in return for recognition: "[T]he possibility of continuing as a recognizable social being requires the formation and maintenance of the subject in subordination … the desire to persist in one's own being requires submitting to a world of others that is fundamentally not one's own" (1997, 27-8). To accept simply the necessity of pragmatically identifying the self in relation to essentialist constructions ascribed by the 'oppressor', despite the potential for their subversion and political mobilization, is to inhabit a false consciousness that is complicit with justifying the hegemonic, homogenous and reductionist politics of power relations.

What seems to follow from this is that simply deploying identity concepts in order to advance political claims paradoxically commodifies subjective identities, homogenises the subordinated, presenting diverse subjectivities as a unified group within the terms of the discourses of postmodern capitalism and their niche structures of address. The sources of oppression are thereby located within the framework of nationality or ethnicity or race or gender and sexuality: a move which singularly fails to give an adequate let alone radical materialist critique of exploitation, poverty and subordination within the larger context of global economics: "'Immediate' struggles … do not look for the 'chief enemy' but for the immediate enemy. Nor do they expect to find a solution to their problem at a future date" (Foucault 1982, 780). Furthermore, *one-dimensional* identity politics, unable to suggest a permanent solution to the shared experience of injustice of the members of the oppressed, excluded and subordinated groups, or structurally to challenge the mode of production, explicitly takes over the totality of individuals, subordinates them to the social and economic circumstances in accordance with the needs of capital, restores the hegemony of

capitalism and materializes the dominant ideology: "Group identity supplants class interest as the chief medium of political mobilization. Cultural domination supplants exploitation as the fundamental injustice. And cultural recognition displaces socio-economic redistribution as the remedy for injustice and the goal of political struggle" (Fraser 2004, 205).

One-dimensional identity politics cannot either suggest a materialist explanation or a solution to the fact that the individualistic values of the money-oriented world, insidiously transforming and colonizing human consciousness, create its own victimizers/perpetrator out of the victimized as in the examples of Moses, distancing himself from his other "fellars" and taking on the role of a master after becoming a landlord, in *Moses Ascending*; or of Mary Turner, describing the native women as "evil-smelling creatures" (96), and mimicking a masculine role by whipping and insulting the native workers, in *The Grass Is Singing*; or of Sammy, losing his sight after being beaten by the Scottish police and being further victimized by the Scottish authorities and bureaucracy, in *How Late It Was, How Late*.

One-dimensional identity politics also ignores the fact that the destructiveness of the money-oriented world based on the polarization of the exploiter and the exploited has not fundamentally changed since the 1950s, despite the structural evolution of capitalism; that the exploitation of human labour has increasingly continued, and that the physical, psychological and alienating effects of factory work upon wage-earners in modern capitalism has perpetuated itself in the working experiences of all non-productive workers in the banking, insurance, education, advertising, science and technology sectors in postmodern capitalism. Doyle in *A Disaffection*, Arthur in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, and the central characters in *The Golden Notebook*, demonstrate how individuals

within capitalist societies – whether in the modern or postmodern period – run through a state of discontent, frustration, un-belonging and alienation in the form of meaninglessness, powerlessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and social isolation (Seeman 1975) in a similar pattern; exposed too are the ways in which such characters seek to nullify the negative impact of the money-oriented world on their lives and assert, albeit through modes of illusionary self-actualization, their existential being and intrinsic values through similar outward and inward escape mechanisms, since their human nature has been confiscated or destroyed, their consciousnesses reshaped so they are transformed into thing-like beings. This is a process that is not adequately clarified by postmodern theory, analysis of identity political formations, or the classic modes of political liberal analysis.

This case is not so very different in more recent fiction. In *Money: A Suicidal Note* (1984), for example, Martin Amis depicts individualism and the realities of a fetishized consumer culture and explicitly lays out how social relationships are increasingly defined by personal interests; here too, commodified and depersonalized relations result in mechanization, hopelessness, dehumanization and fragmentation. Tim Lott, in *Rumours of a Hurricane* (2002), portrays Charlie Buck's struggle for social mobility as a working-class man in the Thatcher era, which leads to his abjection, deprivation and 'invisibility' as a homeless and drunk person and, subsequently, to his final suicide. However, the process of cultural/social alienation that Chanu Ahmed in Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* (2003), Karim in *The Buddha of Suburbia* (1990), Ahmed Kamal in John Lanchester's *Capital* and Samad Iqbal in Zadie Smith's *White Teeth* (2002) run through in the colonial centres, reveals the fact that alienation cannot simply be conceptualized within the boundaries of a *one-dimensional* class-centred analysis. These novels, like those examined in this thesis, therefore reveal how the critique of *one-dimensional* identity politics should

not necessarily mean the exclusion of questions around cultural and social specificity: questions of gender inequality, or homophobia, or xenophobia, might be reframed and situated within an economic framework that foregrounds questions of class and they can therefore be more properly and effectively relocated within the framework of the totality of the social relations of production.

Nonetheless, this study suggests that a *one-dimensional* identity politics that eschews questions of economics and class relations and is solely concerned with recognition, tolerance and respect, oblivious to material conditions and class issues, and only seeking for opportunities to create an autonomous cultural space in which to perform identity or locally to gain control over the processes shaping immediate day-to-day experience (by strengthening 'solidarity' through dynamic and distinct cultural, racial and tribal ties), will most likely lead to an absolutization of differences that is unable to propose an anti-establishment, egalitarian and emancipatory framework to critique, resist and overthrow oppression and injustice. *One-dimensional* identity politics might be seen to transmit the kind of false consciousness that was created by conventional nationalist ideologies during the rise and consolidation of the European nation-states and thereafter. This brings forth, therefore, the very same illusion of a collective unity against a common enemy in another imagined community, to use the term of Benedict Anderson (2006). As this thesis has argued through the analysis of key fictions of the period, the cultural and political codes of this kind of 'resistance' remain ultimately locked within the framework of the isolated, self-centred and individualistic sphere of the capitalist or system of money, as in the case of Arthur in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* and Smith in "The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner". A politics of postmodern difference may carry the potential for temporarily mobilizing and radicalizing certain identity groups against the system in relation to the changing paradigmatic forms of political conflict. However, this

thesis has tried to show how identity formations based exclusively on race, ethnicity, religion, gender and other affiliations ultimately deepen different forms of antagonism within the working class and pitch different groups against each other for the sake of capital accumulation. This thesis has tried to examine, through close reading of a range of fictions where class is presented in relation to race, gender, ethnicity and nationality, how contemporary left-wing politics might take the concept of identity into account in a more radically intersectional manner in order precisely to locate the deep sources of inequality and oppression within postmodern capitalism and to prevent the displacement of class politics by identity politics in the comfort zone of postmodern capitalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitken, A.J. "Bad Scots: Some Superstitions about Scots Speech." *Scottish Language* 1 (1982): 30-44.

Alcala, Roberto del Valle. *British Working-Class Fiction: Narratives of Refusal and the Struggle Against Work*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

Allen, Walter. "In the World of the Bottom Dogs." *New York Times Book Review*, March 25, 1962.

---. *The Modern Novel in Britain and the Unites States*. New York: Dutton, 1964.

Althusser, Louis. *For Marx*. Translated by Ben Brewster. London: The Penguin Press, 1969.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.

Aronson, Ronald. *After Marxism*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1995.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Atherton, Stanley S. *Alan Sillitoe: A Critical Assessment*. London: W. H. Allen, 1979.

Avineri, S. *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogic Imagination*, Edited. by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Barker, Adele Marie, and Bruce Grant, eds. *The Russia Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Baudelot, Christian, Roger Establet, and Jacques Malemort. *La Petite Bourgeoisie en France*. Paris: Maspero, 1974.

Becker, James F. "Class Structure and Conflict in the Managerial Phase: I." *Science and Society* 37, no. 3, (1973): 259-277.

---. "Class Structure and Conflict in the Managerial Phase: II." *Science and Society* 37, no. 4 (1973/74): 437-454.

Bell, Kathleen. "Arthur Seaton and the Machine: A New Reading of Alan Sillitoe's *Saturday Night and Sunday Moring*." In *British Industrial Fictions*, edited by H. Guastav Klaus and Stephen Knights, 148-162. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000.

Bensaid, Daniel. "Marxisms, Theory, Yesterday and Today." *International Viewpoint*. Last Modified October 4, 2010, http://www.internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article1929.

Bentley, Nick. "Black London: The Politics of Representation in Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*." *Wasafiri* 18, no. 39 (2003): 41-45.

---. "Form and Language in Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*." *ARIEL* 36, no. 3-4 (2005): 67-84.

---. "Doris Lessing's The Golden Notebook: An Experiment in Critical Fiction." In *Doris Lessing: Border Crossings*, edited by Alice Ridout and Susan Watkins, 44-60. New York: Continuum, 2009.

---. *Radical Fictions: The English Novel in the 1950s*. Germany: Peter Lang, 2007.

Berberoglu, Berch. "The Centrality of Class in Contemporary Capitalist Society." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 33, no. 1 (2007): 49-67.

Berlin, Isaiah. "The Arts in Russia under Stalin." *The New York Review of Books*, October 19, 2000.

Bhabba, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Billington, Michael. "Alan Sillitoe, Angry Young Writer of the 1950s, Dies at 82." *The Guardian*, April 25, 2010.

Bogardus, John. "Sartre's Contribution to Marx's Concept of Alienation." Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, 1969.

Bonke, Dietmar. *Kelman Writes Back*. Berlin: Galda & Wilch Verlag, 1999.

Booker, M. Keith. *The Modern British Novel of the Left*. London: Greenwood, 1998.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Bradbury, Malcolm. "Beating the World to the Punch." *New York Times Book Review*, August 16, 1959.

Braverman, H. *Labour and Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.

Brewer, Anthony. *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Brookner, Anita. "Women against Men." *London Review of Books* 4, no. 16 (1982): 19-20.

Brown, J. Dillon. *Migrant Modernism: Postwar London and the West Indian Novel*. Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2013.

Buckley, David. “Review.” *Observer*, April 3, 1994.

Butler, Judith. *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Caerdi, G. “On the Economic Identification of the New Middle Class.” *Economy and Society* 4, no.1 (1975): 1-86.

Callinicos, Alex. *Is There a Future for Marxism?*. London: Macmillan Press, 1982.

---. *Race and Class*. London: Bookmarks, 1993.

---. “Wither Anglo-Saxon Marxism?.” In *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism*, edited by Jacques Bidet and Stathis Kouvelakis, 79-95. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2009.

---, and Chris Harman. *The Changing Working Class*. London: Bookmarks, 1987.

Carey, John L. “Art and Reality in *The Golden Notebook.*” *Contemporary Literature* 14, no. 4 (1973): 437-546.

Castells, M. *The City and the Grassroots*. London: Edward Arnold, 1983.

Cederstrom, Lorelei. *Fine-Tuning the Feminine Psyche: Jungian Patterns in the Novels of Doris Lessing*. New York: Peter Lang, 1990.

Cereseto, Shirley, and Howard Waitzkin. “Economic Development, Political-Economic System, and the Physical Quality of Life.” *American Journal of Public Health* 76, no. (1986): 104-120.

Chakraborty, Chandrima. “Interrupting the Canon: Samuel Selvon’s Postcolonial Revision of Robinson Crusoe.” *ARIEL* 34, no. 4 (2003): 51-72.

Cheha, Susan Taylor. *Don Quixote Meets the Mob: The Craft of Fiction and the Art of Life*. Philadelphia: Xlibris, 2000.

Clarke, Austin. *A Passage Back Home: A Personal Reminiscence of Samuel Selvon*. Toronto: Exile Editions, 1988.

Collings, Marcus. "Pride and Prejudice: West Indian Men in Mid-Twentieth Century Britain." *Journal of British Studies* 40, no.3 (2001): 391-418.

Connor, Steven. *The English Novel in History 1950-1995*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Cooper, William. "Reflections on Some Aspects of the Experimental Novel." In *International Literary Review No. 2*, edited by John Calder, 29-36. London: John Calder, 1959.

Coopersmith, S. *The Antecedents of Self-Esteem*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.

Cox, O. Cromwell. *Castle, Class and Race*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959.

Craig, Cairn. Introduction to *The History of Scottish Literature*, Edited by Cairn Craig. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1989.

---. "Resisting Arrest: James Kelman." In *The Scottish Novel Since the Seventies*, edited by Gavin Wallace and Randall Stevenson. Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.

Cutler, Antony, Barry Hindess, Paul Hirst, and Athar Hussain. *Marx's Capitalism and Capitalism Today*. London: Routledge, 1977.

Dahrendorf, R. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.

Danziger, Marie A. *Text/Countertext: Postmodern Paranoia in Samuel Beckett, Doris Lessing, and Philip Roth*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1986.

Davidson, Max. "Critic's view." *The Daily Telegraph*, October 13, 1993.

Davis, Helen. *Understanding Stuart Hall*. London: SAGE, 2004.

Davison, R. B. *West Indian Migrants*. London: OUP, 1962.

Dawson, Ashley. *Mongrel Nation: Diasporic Culture and the Making of Postcolonial Britain*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2007.

Day, Gary. *Class*. Oxford: Routledge, 2001.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Translated by D. Polan. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October* 59 (1992): 3-7.

Denny, N. "The Achievement of the Long-distance Runner." *Theoria*, no. 24 (1965): 1-12.

Derrida, J. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Spivak. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1976.

Disraeli, Benjamin. *Sybil, Or the Two Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Dixon, Marlene. "The Subjugation of Women under Capitalism: The Bourgeois Morality." *Synthesis* 1 (1977): 18-30.

Doğan, Sevgi. "*Hegel and Marx on Alienation*." Master's thesis, METU, 2008.

Draine, Betsy. "Nostalgia and Irony: The Postmodern Order of *The Golden Notebook*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 26, no. 1 (1980): 31-48.

Draper, Hal. *The "Dictatorship of Proletariat" from Marx to Lenin*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987.

Dryer, Rebecca. "Immigration, Postwar London, and the Politics of Everyday Life in Sam Selvon's Fiction." *Cultural Critique* 52 (2002): 108-144.

Du Bois. W. E. B. *Black Reconstruction in America*. New York: The Free Press,1935.

Dumenil, Gerard, and Dominique Levy. "Old Theories and New Capitalism: The Actuality of a Marxist Economics." In *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism*, edited by Jacques Bidet and Stathis Kouvelakis, 95-122, Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2009.

Eagleton, Terry. *Criticism and Ideology*. London: Verso, 1976.

---. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. New York: Routledge Classics, 2002.

---. *Why Marx Was Right*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. *Nickel & Dimed*. London: Granta, 2010.

---, John Ehrenreich. "The Professional-Managerial Class." *Radical America* 11, no. 2 (1977): 7-25.

Elster, Jon, ed. *Karl Marx: A Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Engels, Friedrich. *Anti Dühring*. 1876/78. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Engels_Anti_Duhring.pdf.

---. *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*. Translated by Paul Taylor. Moscow: Progress Publisher, 1946.

Essed, P., and D. Golderg. *Race Critical Theories*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Etzioni, A. *The Active Society*. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Evans, J., and Stuart Hall. *Visual Culture: A Reader*. London: Sade, 1999.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambrdige: Polity Press, 1992.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Mask*. London: Pluto Press, 1986.

Feuerbach, Ludwig. *The Essence of Christianity*. Translated by Marian Evans. London: Trubner & CO, 1881.

Fischer, Ernst. *How to Read Karl Marx*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1996.

Fishburn, Katherine. "Wor(l)ds within Words: Doris Lessing as Meta-Fictionist and Meta-Physician." *Studies in the Novel* 20, no. 2 (1988): 186-205.

Forbes, Curdella. *From Nation to Diaspora: Samuel Selvon, George Lamming and the Cultural Performance of Gender*. Kingston: The University of the West Indies Press, 2005.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language*. Translated by A M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

---. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4 (1982): 777-795.

Fraser, Nancy. "Recognition or Redistribution?". In *Contemporary Political Theory: A Reader***,** edited by Colin Farrelly, 205-220. London: SAGE, 2004.

Fromm, Erich. *Marx's Concept of Man*. New York: Frederick Unbar Publishing Company, 1961.

Geyer, F., ed. *Alienation, Ethnicity, and Postmodernism*. Lomdon: Greenwood, 1996.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1973.

Giddin, James. "Alan Sillitoe's Jungle." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 4, no. 1 (1962): 35-48.

Gifford, Douglas. "Re-mapping Renaissance in Modern Scottish Literature." In *Scotland and the 19th-Century World*, edited by Gerard Carruthers, D. Goldie and A. Renfrew, 17-38. New York: Rodopi, 2012.

Gilroy, Paul. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. London: Routledge, 2002.

---. “Steppin’ out of Babylon – Race, Class and Autonomy.” In Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back*, Hutchinson, London, 1982.

Gindin, James. *Postwar British Fiction: New Accents and Attitudes*. Westport: Greenwood, 1976.

Gmelch, George. *Double Passage: The Lives of Caribbean Migrants Abroad and Back Home*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1992.

Goldman, Wendy Z. *Women at the Gates: Gender and Industry in Stalin’s Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Green, Peter. “Book Review.” *Daily Telegraph and Morning Post*, October 17, 1958.

Habila, Helon. “Out of the Shadows.” *The Guardian*, March 17, 2007, http://www.theguardian.com/books/2007/mar/17/society1.

Hall, Stuart. “Pluralism, Race and Class in Caribbean Society.” In *Race and Class in Post-Colonial Study*. Paris: UNESCO, 1978a.

---. “Race and Poverty”. In *The Inner Cities*, edited by T. Blair. London: Central London Polytechnic Papers on the Environment, 1978b.

---, C. Crichter, T. Jefferson, J. Clarke, and B. Roberts. *Policing the Crisis*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1978.

Hanson, Gillian Mary Hanson. *Understanding Alan Sillitoe*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.

Hardimon, Michael O. *Hegel’s Social Philosophy: The Project of Reconciliation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.

---. *Labour of Dionysus: A Critique of the State-Form*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

---. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Books, 2004.

Hegel, G.W. F. *Philosophy of Mind*. Translated by William Wallace. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2008.

---. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, Edited by Allen Wood. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1991.

---. *The Phenomenology of Mind*. Translated by J. B. Baillie. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910.

Hemer, Oscar. *Fiction and Truth in Transition: Writing the Present Past in South Africa and Argentina*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2012.

Hennessy, R. "*Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Hesse, Barnor. "Black to Front and Black Again: Racialization through Contested Times and Spaces." In *Place and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Michael Keith and Steve Pile, 162-181. London: Routledge, 1993.

Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. New York: Macmillan, 1992.

Hickman, Mary, Helen Crowley, and Nick Mail. *Immigration and Social Cohesion in the UK: The Rhythms and Realities of Everyday Life*. London: London Metropolitan University, 2008.

Hill, Judah. *The United States in the 1970s*. California: Emeryville, 1975.

Hoare, Quentin, and Geoffrey N. Smith, eds. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Elec Book, 1999.

Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life*. London: Penguin Modern Classics, 2009.

---, and Raymond Williams. "Working-Class Attitudes." *New Left Review* 1, no. 1 (1960): 26-30.

Hitchcock, Peter. *Working Class Fiction in Theory and Practice: A Reading of Alan Sillitoe*. London: UMI Research, 1989.

Hutcheon, Linda. "Beginning to Theorize Postmodernism." *Textual Criticism* 1, no. 1 (1987): 10-31.

Hutchings, William. "Proleterian Byronism: Alan Sillitoe and the Romantic Tradition." In *English Romanticism and Modern Fiction*, edited by Allan Chavkin, 83-112. New York: AMS Press, 1993.

---. "The Work of Play: Anger and the Expropriated Athletes of Alan Sillitoe and David Storey." *Modern Fiction Studies* 33, no. 1 (1987): 35-47.

Ingrams, Elizabeth. "*The Lonely Londoners*." *Wasafiri* 16, no. 33 (2001): 33-36.

James, Louis. "Writing the Ballad: The Short Fiction of Samuel Selvon and Earl Lovelave." In *Telling Stories, Postcolonial Short Fiction in English*, edited by Jacqualine Bardolph, 103-109. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." *New Left Review*, no. 146 (1984): 53-92.

---. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1981.

JanMohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (1985): 59-87.

Jean D'Costa. "The West Indian Novelist and Language: A Search for a Literary Medium." In *Studies in Caribbean Language*, edited by Lawrence Carrington et al., 252-265. Port of Spain: Society for Caribbean Linguistics, 1983.

Jenkins, Simon. "An Expletive of a Winner." *The Times*, October 15, 1994.

Jessor, R., T. Graves, R. C. Hanson, and S. L. Jessor. *Society, Personality and Deviant Behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Jones, Kile. "A Critique of Ludwig Feuerbach's Philosophy of Religion." 2006. http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:rHw88oEAbHkJ:semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TZlOGY1N/Ludwig%2520Feuerbach.doc+&cd=1&hl=tr&ct=clnk&gl=uk&client=firefox-a.

Josephson, Eric, and Josephson, Mary, eds. *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1962.

Juan, E. San. "Marxism and the Race/Class Problematic." 2003. http://clogic.eserver.org/2003/sanjuan.html.

Kalekin-Fishman, Devorah. *Designs for Alienation: Exploring Diverse Realities*. Finland: University of Jyvaskyla, 1998.

---. "Tracing the Growth of Alienation: Enculturation, Socialization, and Schooling in a Democracy." In *Alienation, Ethnicity, and Postmodernism*, edited by Geyer, Felix, 107-120. London: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Kalliney, Peter. J. "Cities of Affluence: Masculinity, Class, and the Young Angry Young Men." *Modern Fiction Studies* 47, no. 1 (2001): 92-117.

Kaufman, A. S. "On Alienation." *Inquiry* 8 (1965): 141-165.

Kay, Hubert. "Karl Marx." *LIFE Magazine*, October 18, 1948.

Kelly, Aaron. *James Kelman: Politics and Aesthetics*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2013.

Kelman, James. *A Disaffection*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1989.

---. "Elitist Slurs Are Racism by Another Name." *Scotland on Sunday: Spectrum Supplement*, October 16, 1994.

---. *How Late It Was, How Late*. London: Vintage Books, 1995.

Khan, Naseem. "The Rise of *The Lonely Londoners*." *The Independent*, November 12, 1993, http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/the-rise-of-the-lonely-londoners-when-the-writer-sam-selvon-arrived-in-england-in-1950-he-came-in-on-1503747.html.

Khan, Nasir. *Developments of the Concept and Theory of Alienation in Marx's Writings*. 1995. www.geocities.com/peaceandhumanrightswebsite/alienbook.pdf.

Kolakowski, L. *Main Currents of Marxism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Kövesi, Simon. *James Kelman*. Machester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Krouse, Tanya. "Between Modernism and Postmodernism: Positioning The Golden Notebook in the Twentieth-Century Canon." In D*oris Lessing's The Golden Notebook After Fifty*, edited by Alice Ridout, Roberta Rubenstein, and Sandra Singer, 115-135. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy Toward a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso Books, 2014.

Ladner, Gerhart B. "Homo Viator: Medieval Ideas on Alienation and Order." *Speculum* 42, no. 2 (1967): 233-259.

Lamming, George. *The Pleasures of Exile*. London: Michael Joseph, 1960.

Lashley, Cliff. "Towards a Critical Framework for Jamaican Literature: A Reading of the Fiction of Victor Stafford Reid and Other Jamaican Writers." Ph.D. thesis, University of the West Indies, 1984.

Lawrence, D. H. *Sons and Lovers*. Istanbul: White Face Publishing, 2010.

Lefranc, M. "Alan Sillitoe: An Interview." *Etudes Anglaises*, 1973.

Lenin. V. I. *Lenin Collected Works, Vol 6*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1964.

---. *Lenin Collected Works, Vol 29*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.

---. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Sydney: Resistance Books, 1999.

---. *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*. 1920. http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/pdf/Lenin_Left_wing_Communism.pdf.

Lessing, Doris. *African Stories*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.

---. *A Small Personal Voice: Essays, Reviews, Interviews*. Edited by Paul Schlueter. London: Flamingo, 1994.

---. *The Golden Notebook*. London: Fourth Estate, 2014.

---. *The Grass Is Singing*. London: Fourth Estate, 2013.

---. *Walking In The Shade: Volume Two of My Autobiography, 1949-1962*. London: Flamingo, 1998.

Lewis, Daniel. ""Say It, Don't Do It": Male Speech and Male Action in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 20, no. 2 (2012): 91-107.

Libby, Marion V. "Sex and the New Woman in *The Golden* Notebook." *The Iowa Review* 5, no. 4 (1974): 106-120.

Lichtheim, G. "Alienation." In *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, edited by D. Sills, 264-268. New York: Macmillan & Free Press, 1968.

Lightfoot, Marjorie J. "Breakthrough in *The Golden Notebook*." *Studies in the Novel* 7, no. 7 (1975): 277-284.

Lockwood, Bernard. "Four Contemporary British Working-class Novelists: A Thematic and Critical Approach to the Fiction of Raymond Williams, John Brian, David Storey and Alan Sillitoe." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1966.

Lodge, David. *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy and the Typology of Modern Literature*. London: Edwards Arnold, 1979.

Loren, Charles. *Classes in the United States*. California: Cardinal Publishers, 1977.

Löwith, Karl. "Man's Self-Alienation in the Early Writings of Marx." *Social Research* 21, no. 2 (1954): 204-230.

Lukács, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1971.

---. "Realism in the Balance". In *Aesthetics and Politics*, edited by Ronald Taylor, 28-57. London: Verso, 1977.

Lyall, Sarah. “In Furor Over Prize, Novelist Speaks Up for His Language.” *The New York Times*, November 29, 1994.

Macleod, Lewis. “Various pub gave signs of life”: Of Drink and time in Alan Sillitoe’s Saturday *Night and Sunday Morning*.” *The Yearbook of English Studies* 42, no. 1 (2012): 113-131.

Mair, Christian. “Contrasting Attitudes towards the Use of Creole in Fiction: A Comparison of Two Early Novels by V. S. Naipaul and Sam Selvon.” In *Crisis and Creativity in the New Literatures in English*, edited by Geoffrey V. Davis, and Hena Maes-Jelinek, 133-149. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1990.

Mandel, Ernest. *Introduction to Capital: Volume 2*. London: Penguin, 1969.

---. *Late Capitalism*. London: NLB, 1975.

---, and G. Novack. *The Marxist Theory of Alienation*. New York: Pathfinder, 1970.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Negation Essays in Critical Theory*. London: Penguin Press, 1968.

---. *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and The Rise of Social Theory*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.,1955.

Marx, Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. 1859. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_Contribution_to_the_Critique_of_Political_Economy.pdf.

---. *Capital, Vol. I.* 1867. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-I.pdf.

---. *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*. Translated by Joseph O’Malley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.

---. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1884*. 1844. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Economic-Philosophic-Manuscripts-1844.pdf.

---, and Friedrich Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. 1848. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf.

---. *The Civil War in France*. 1871. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_The_Civil_War_in_France.pdf.

---. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. 1852. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/18th-Brumaire.pdf.

---. *The German Ideology*. 1845-6. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_The_German_Ideology.pdf.

---. *The North American Civil War*. 1861. https://marxists.anu.edu.au/archive/marx/works/1861/10/25.htm.

---. "Theses on Feuerbach". In *The Marx Reader*, edited by Christopher Pierson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997.

---. *Theories of Surplus Value*. 1863. http://digamo.free.fr/tpv.pdf.

Mayne, Richard. "Book Review." *Sunday Times*, October 12, 1958.

McCindle, Jean. "Reading *The Golden Notebook* in 1962." In *Notebooks/Memoirs/Archives: Reading and Rereading Doris Lessing*, edited by Jenny Taylor, 43-56. Boston: Routledge, 1982.

McGlynn, Mary. "'Middle-Class Wankers' and Working-Class Texts: The Critics and James Kelman." *Contemporary Literature* 43, no. 1 (2002): 50-84.

Melucci, Alberto. "The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach." *Social Science Information* 19, no. 2 (1980): 199-226.

Memmi, Albert. *Racism*. Translated by Steve Martinot. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Mercer, Kobane. *Welcome to the Jungle*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Meszaros, Istvan. *Marx's Theory of Alienation*. London: Merlin Press Ltd., 1970.

Miles, R. "Marxism versus the Sociology of 'Race Relations.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 7, no. 2 (1984): 217-221.

Mill, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Minogue, S., and A. Palmer. "Helter Skelter, Topsy-turvy and 'Loonycolour': Carnivalesque Realism in *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*." *English: The Journal of the English Association* 51, no. 200 (2002): 127-143.

Msiska, M. H. "Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners* and the Structure of Black Metropolitan Life." *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal* 2, no.1 (2009): 5-27.

Mulkeen, Anne M. "Twentieth-Century Realism: The "Grid" Structure of *The Golden Notebook*." *Studies in the Novel* 4, no. 2 (1972): 262-274.

Murchland, Bernard. "Some Comments on Alienation." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 29, no. 3 (1969): 432-438.

Naess, Arne. "Self-Realisation: Ecological Approach to Being in the World." In *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by G. Sessions, 225-239. Boston: Shambhala, 1995.

Nardella, Anna Ryan. "The Existential Dilemmas of Alan Sillitoe's Working-Class Heroes." *Studies in The Novel* 5, no. 4 (1973): 469-482.

Nasta, Susheila, ed. *Critical Perspective on Sam Selvon*. Colorado: Three Continents Press, 1988.

---. *Home Truths: Fictions of the South Asian Diaspora in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Nazareth, Peter. "Interview with Sam Selvon." *World Literature Written in English* 18, no. 2 (1979): 420: 437.

Neal, Arthur G., and Collas, Sara F. *Intimacy and Alienation: Forms of Estrangement in Female/Male Relationships*. New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, "The Language of African Literature." In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, 285-290. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Nicolaus, Martin. "Proletariat and Middle class in Marx: Hegelian Choreography and the Capitalist Dialectic." *Studies on the Left* 7 (1967): 22-49.

Okawa, Rachelle. "Humour in Exile: The Subversive Effect of Laughter in Sam Selvon's The Lonely Londoners and Gisele Pineau's L'Exil Selon Julia." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 49, no. 1 (2013): 17-27.

Ollman, Bertell. *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*. Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

---. *What is Marxism? A Bird's-eye-view*. New York: Red Hot Publications, 1982.

Orwell, George. *Coming Up for Air*. New York: Penguin Books, 1939.

Ossowska, Maria. *Bourgeois Morality*. Translated by G. L. Campbell. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 2004.

Perrott, Roy. "Miss Murdoch rings the Bell." *Manchester Guardian*, November 4, 1958.

Perry, Mark. J. "Why Socialism Failed." *Foundation for Economic Education*, last modified June 1,1995, http://fee.org/freeman/detail/why-socialism-failed.

Petrovic, Gajo. "Reification." 1965. https://www.marxists.org/archive/petrovic/1965/reification.htm.

Phillips, Caryl. "Following On: The Legacy of Lamming and Selvon." *Wasafiri*, no: 29 (1999): 34-46.

Pichler, Susanne. "Alien-Nation and Belonging: Ethnic Identities in Selected Black British Novels." *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 29, no. 1 (2004): 43-63.

Pitchford, Nicola. "How Late It Was for England: James Kelman's Scottish Booker Prize." *Contemporary Literature* 41, no. 4 (2000): 693-725.

Porter, Dennis. "Realism and Failure in The Golden Notebook." *Modern Language Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1974): 56-65.

Poulantzas, Nicos. *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*. London: NLB, 1975.

Pratt, Anita, and L.S. Dembo. *Doris Lessing*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1974.

Procter, James, ed. *Writing black Britain 1948-1998: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Ramchand, Kenneth. Introduction to *The Lonely Londoners*. New York: Longman, 1985.

---. "The West Indian Novel and its Background – Thirty Years Later." *ARIEL* 31, no. 1 (2000): 351-373.

Rapping, Elayne Antler. "Unfree Women: Feminism in Doris Lessing's Novels." *Women's Studies* 3, no. 1 (1975): 29-45.

Raskin, Jonah. "*The Golden Notebook*: Doris Lessing's Rendezvous with the Zeitgeist." *Dissent* 60, no. 1 (2013): 74-79.

Richardson, Maurice. "New Novels." *New Statesman*, October 18, 1958.

Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. North Carolina: University Press of North Carolina Press, 1983.

Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, 1973.

Rothfork, John. "Race and Community in Sam Selvon's Fiction." *Caribbean Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (1991): 9-22.

Rubin, I. I. *Essays on Marx's Theory of Value*. Detroit: Black and Red, 1972.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981- 1991*. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

Salman, Malek M. "Post-war British Working-class Fiction with Special References to the Novels of John Braine, Alan Sillitoe, Stan Barston, David Storey and Barry Hines", Ph.D. Thesis, The University of Leeds, 1990.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

Salick, Roydon. *The Novels of Samuel Selvon: A Critical Study*. London: Greenwood Press, 2001.

Santilli, Paul. "Marx on Species-Being and Social Essence." *Studies in East European Thought* 13, no. 1-2 (1973): 76-88.

Saunders, Christopher C. T*he Making of the South African Past: Major Historians on Race and Class*. Cape Town: David Philip, 1988.

Saville, John. *1848: The British State and the Chartist Movement*. Cambrdige: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Sayers, Sean. "The Importance of Hegel for Marx: Reply to Zarembka." *Historical Materialism* 8, no. 1 (2001): 367-372.

Schaff, Adam. *Alienation as a Social Phenomenon*. New York: Oxford Pergamon Press Ltd., 1980.

Schacht, Richard. *Alienation*. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1970.

Schilling, S. Paul. *God in the Age of Atheism*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Schweickart, Patrocinio P. "Reading a Wordless Statement: The Structure of Doris Lessing's *The Golden Notebook*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 21, no. 2 (1985): 263-279.

Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation Studies." *Annual Review of Sociology* 1 (1975) 91-123.

---. "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (1966): 353-367.

---. "On the meaning of alienation." *American Sociological Review* 24, no. 6 (1959): 783-791.

Selvon, Sam. “Finding West Indian Identity in London.” In *Tiger’s Triumph: Celebrating Sam Selvon*, edited by Susheila Nasta and Anna Rutherford, 58-62. London: Dangaroo, 1995.

---. *Moses Ascending*. London: Penguin Books, 2008.

---. *Moses Migrating*. Washington DC: Three Continents Press, 2008

---. *The Lonely Londoners*. London: Penguin Books, 2006.

Sennett, Richard. *The Culture of the New Capitalism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Sewell, Rob, and Alan Woods. “What is Marxism.” March 15, 2000. http://www.marxist.com/what-is-marxism-economics-materialism.htm

Shapiro, David. *Social Realism: Art as a Weapon (Critical Studies in American Art)*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co, 1973.

Sharpe, Mike E. *America in Decline*. London: Routledge, 2012.

Sherry, Samantha. “Censorship in Translation in the Soviet Union in the Stalin and Khrushchev Eras.” Ph.D. thesis, The University of Edinburg, 2012.

Sillitoe, Alan. *Key to the Door*. London: W. H. Allen, 1961.

---. *Mountains and Caverns*. London: W. H. Allen, 1975.

---. “Poor People.” *Anarchy* 4, no. 4 (1964): 124-128.

---. *Raw Material*. London: W. H. Allen, 1978.

---. *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*. London: Harper Perennial, 1958.

---. “The Loneliness of the Long-Distance Runner.” London: W.H. Allen, 1959.

Sivanandan, A. *A Different Hunger*. London: Pluto Press, 1982.

---. “The Liberation of the Black Intellectual.” *Race and Class* 18, no. 4 (1977): 329-343.

Solomos, John, and Les Back. “Marxism, Racism and Ethnicity.” *American Behavioural Scientist* 38, no. 3 (1995): 407-420.

Soviet Union Information Bureau. *The Soviet Union: Facts, Descriptions, Statistics*. 1929. https://www.marxists.org/history/ussr/government/1928/sufds/

Ste. Croix. G. E. M. De. *Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. London: Duckworth, 1981.

Steven Jonas. “If Stalin Equals “Communism, Bad,” Why Doesn’t’ “Hitler Equals Capitalism, Bad?.” June 3, 2014. http://www.cjournal.info/2014/06/03/if-stalin-equals-communism-bad-why-doesnt-hitler-equals-capitalism-bad/

Tabak, Mehmet. “Marx’s Theory of Proletarian Dictatorship Revisited.” *Science and Society* 64, no. 3 (2000): 333-356.

Taylor, Christopher. “Realism and the Language of Realism in the Works of Alan Sillitoe.” In *Four Fits of Anger: Essays on Angry Young Men*, edited by Mark Brady. Zeta Universita: Campanotto, 1986.

Taylor, D. J. *After the War: The Novel and English Society since 1945*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.

Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980.

Touraine, Alain. *Production de la Société*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1973.

Trotsky, Leon. *Literature and Revolution*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960.

---. “Stalinism and Bolshevism.” *Socialist Appeal* 1, no. 7 (1937): 4-5.

Vaverka, Ronal Dee. *Commitment as Art: A Marxist Critique of a Selection of Alan Sillitoe’s Political Fiction*. Uppsala: Ubsaliensis s. Academiae, 1978.

Virdee, S. *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Wain, John. “Possible Worlds.” *Observer*, October 12, 1958.

Wallach, Amei. “Censorship in the Soviet Bloc.” *Art Journal* 50, no.3 (1991): 75-83.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. “The Ideological Tension of Capitalism: Universalism versus Racism and Sexism.” In *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, edited by Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, 29-36. London: Verso, 1991.

Warner, W. L. *Social Class in America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Waugh, Patricia. *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1984.

---. “The Historical Context of Post-War British Literature.” In *The Post-war British Literature Handbook*, edited by Katharine Cockin and Jago Morrison, 35-57. London: Continuum, 2010.

Weber, Max. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge, 2009.

West, Anthony. “*On the Inside Looking In*.” *New Yorker*, September 5, 1959.

Whittaker, Ruth. *Doris Lessing*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

---. *The Long Revolution*. London: Pelican Books, 1963.

---, and M. Orrom. *Preface to Film*. London: London Drama Limited, 1954.

Wilson, Elizabeth. “Yesterday’s Heroines: On Rereading Lessing and de Beauvoir.” In *Notebooks/Memoirs/Archives: Reading and Rereading Doris Lessing*, edited by Jenny Taylor, 57-74. Boston: Routledge, 1982.

Wood, Allen W. *Karl Marx*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Wood, James. “Away Thinking About Things.” *The New Yorker*, August 25, 2014.

Wright, Erik Olin, ed. *Approaches to Class Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

---. “Class Boundaries in Advanced Capitalist Societies.” *New Left Review* 1, no. 98 (1976): 3-41.

---. “Foundations of a Neo-Marxist Class Analysis.” In *Approaches to Class Analysis*, edited by Erik Olin Wright, 4-31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

---. “Intellectuals and the Class Structure of Capitalist Society.” In *Between Labour and Capital*, edited by Pat Walker, 197-213. Boston: South End Press, 1979.

---. “Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality.” *American Sociological Review* 42, no. 1 (1977): 32-55.

---. “Varieties of Marxist Conceptions of Class Structure.” *Politics and Society* 9, no.3 (1980): 323-370.

---. “Working-Class Power, Capitalist-Class Interests, and Class Compromise.” *American Journal of Sociology* 105, no. 4 (2000): 957-1002.

Wroe, Nicholas. “Booby Dazzler.” *The Guardian*, May 28, 2015.

Wyndham, Francis. “The New Indian Writers.” *Harper’s Bazaar*, May, 1958.

Wynne-jones, Ros. “Time to Publish.” *Independent On Sunday*, September, 14 1997.