ATILIM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE PH.D. PROGRAM

A STUDY OF SUBVERSION AS REPRESENTED IN THE NOVELS OF VICTORIAN AND THATCHERITE ENGLAND:

NORTH AND SOUTH, HARD TIMES, WATERLAND, THE RADIANT WAY

PhD. Dissertation

Ebru Çeker Gündoğdu

Ankara – 2019

ATILIM UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ENGLISH CULTURE AND LITERATURE PH.D. PROGRAM

A STUDY OF SUBVERSION AS REPRESENTED IN THE NOVELS OF VICTORIAN AND THATCHERITE ENGLAND:

NORTH AND SOUTH, HARD TIMES, WATERLAND, THE RADIANT WAY

PhD. Dissertation

Ebru Çeker Gündoğdu

Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Gülsen Canlı

Ankara – 2019

ACCEPTION AND APPROVAL

This is to certify that this dissertation titled "A Study of Subversion as Represented in the Novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England: *North and South*, *Hard Times*, *Waterland*, *The Radiant Way*" and prepared by Ebru Çeker Gündoğdu meets with the committee's approval unanimously as Ph.D. Dissertation in the field of English Language and Literature following the successful defense of the dissertation conducted on 31.01.2019.

Signature of the Director

Prof. Dr. Dilaver TENGİLİMOĞLU

Signature of the Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Gülsen CANLI

Signature of the Member

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen ARAS

Signature of the Member

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN

Signature of the Member

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aslı Özlem TARAKÇIOĞLU

Signature of the Member

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nesrin TEKİN

ETHICS DECLARATION

I hereby declare that;

- I prepared this thesis in accordance with Atılım University Graduate School of Social Sciences Thesis Writing Directive,

- I prepared this thesis within the framework of academic and ethical rules,

- I presented all information, documents, evaluations and findings in accordance with ethical and moral principles,

- I cited all sources to which I made reference in my thesis,

- The work of art in this thesis is original,

I hereby acknowledge all possible loss of rights in case of a contrary circumstance. (in case of any circumstance contradicting my declaration)

31 / 01 / 2019

Ebru Çeker Gündoğdu

ÖZ

ÇEKER GÜNDOĞDU, Ebru. Victorya ve Thatcher Dönemi İngiltere'si Romanlarında Temsil Edilen Bir Alt Üst Etme Çalışması: *North and South*, *Hard Times*, *Waterland*, *The Radiant Way*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara, 2019.

Bu tez, Kültürel Materyalizm ışığında, seçilen Victoria ve Thatcher dönemi İngiltere'si romanlarının muhalif bir okumasını sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu iki dönemin genel özelliklerini ortaya koyan dört roman seçilmiştir. Elizabeth Gaskell'ın *North and South* ve Charles Dickens'ın *Hard Times* seçilen Viktorya dönemi romanları, *The Radiant Way* ve *Waterland* Thatcher dönemi İngiltere'si romanlarıdır. Çalışmanın odağı, bu romanlardaki sınıf, aile ve eğitim kurumları ile ilgili karşıt unsurlar olmuştur. Bu kadar uzak dönemlerin karşılaştırılmasıyla, çalışma İngiliz toplumundaki güç ilişkilerinin iki dönem arasında nasıl değiştiğini ortaya çıkarmayı ve zaman zaman muhaliflerin hakim ideolojiyi nasıl şekillendirdiği yada yıktığını açıklamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın iddiası, bu romanların yalnızca hakim ideolojileri değil, aynı zamanda onların muhaliflerini de barındırmakta olduğudur ve bu romanların daha derinlemesine anlaşılması için romanlarda mevcut manipülasyonların farkında olunması gerektiğidir. Çalışma ayrıca, ideolojilerin toplumda nasıl işlediğini ve insanların bu farklı çağlardaki algılarını nasıl şekillendirdiklerini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kültürel Materyalizm, hegemonya, muhalefet, alt üst etme, söylem

ABSTRACT

ÇEKER GÜNDOĞDU, Ebru. A Study of Subversion as Represented in the Novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England: *North and South*, *Hard Times*, *Waterland*, *The Radiant Way*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Ankara, 2019.

This dissertation aims to provide a dissident reading of the selected novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England in the light of Cultural Materialism. Four novels which reveal the general characteristics of these two epochs have been chosen. *North and South* by Elizabeth Gaskell and *Hard Times* by Charles Dickens are the selected Victorian novels and *The Radiant Way* and *Waterland* are the novels of Thatcherite England. The focus of the study has been on the subversive elements in these novels concerning the institutions of class, family and education. Through the comparison of such distant periods, the study aims to reveal how the power relations in English society changed in-between two periods and to lay bare how dissidence managed, at times, to appropriate or to subvert the hegemonic ideologies of those times. The claim of this study is that these novels embody not only hegemonic ideologies but also subversions of them, and in order to make a deeper comprehension of the novels, one needs to be aware of the manipulations present in the novels. The study also provides a means to realize how ideologies functioned in society and how they shaped people's perceptions in these different epochs.

Keywords: Cultural Materialism, hegemony, dissidence, subversion, discourse

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Professor Doctor Gülsen CANLI, who who has supported me throughout my studies with her enthusiasm, never-ending support, patience and kindness, as well as her academic experience, which has been invaluable to me. It has been an honour for me to be her Ph.D. student. This dissertation is the result of her detailed reading of my drafts, constructive feedback, confidence in my research and careful editing.

I am also grateful to the distinguished members of my dissertation committee Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azade Lerzan GÜLTEKİN and Asst. Prof. Dr. Gökşen ARAS for their thought-provoking questions, insightful comments and advice during our committee meetings.

Last but not the least; I also would like to express my deepest thanks to my mother, father, and sisters for their incessant support and belief in me. Thank you for always being there for me, making me feel loved and appreciated, and supporting me in every possible way

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Literature is an embodiment of narrative patterns, ideological mechanisms of the episteme, aesthetic concerns and epistemological speculations. It is produced in a field of both reflection and reinforcement. Therefore, it is indeed a battlefield of ideologies. Moreover, the ideologies embodied in the literary texts are not stable because they may be interpreted conversely in different times. Bearing in mind that literature is such an active and interactive force, it is necessary to consider all these conditions while trying to comprehend a literary text. Focusing only on the text or only on the historical circumstances does not provide a thorough understanding because literature and history are in a reciprocal relationship as a result of which each of them shapes and reshapes the other constantly. Deriving from Raymond Williams' cultural studies, cultural materialism bases its theory on this interaction and puts forward a comprehensive theory to analyse literary texts deeply. It especially emphasizes the political agenda imbued in literary texts.

This dissertation mainly aims to compare and contrast the novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England from a cultural materialist perspective in terms of the subversion represented in them and draw some conclusions about how subversiveness operated in such distant epochs. The novels of these two periods have not been compared in terms of subversion yet. Therefore, the study will be novel and will offer a new understanding of these texts and epochs. Although there is almost a century between these epochs, this time gap is instrumental in the study of subversiveness as it provides enough time to observe the changing social circumstances and the status of hegemonic and subversive ideologies. Considering the fact that these two distinct periods harboured powerful hegemonic ideologies, and yet, they also encapsulated weak, conflicting voices, it is reasonable to adopt cultural materialism which provides an efficacious theoretical framework to deal with the novels of these epochs. Brannigan explains the efficiency of reading a text from a cultural materialist point of view in order to lay bare the encrypted ideologies as follows:

> Cultural materialism … is primarily useful as a series of ways of analysing the material existence of ideology, concentrated in the study of literary texts. For cultural materialist critics, ideology works in language and our deployment of language, but more than this, ideology exists in a material form through institutions like the church,

the school, the theatre, the university and the museum. What cultural materialists are keen to show is that culture is a field of much ideological contest and contradiction, and that no cultural artefact or practice is outside this political sphere. Furthermore, literary texts do not exist in a fixed moment of production for cultural materialists. (12)

The last sentence of the above quotation, reveals another important point about cultural materialist theory. It refers to the cultural materialists' belief in the reproduction of meaning in literary texts throughout time. They maintain that literary texts do not or cannot have stable meanings because once they are written, they are no longer under the control of the author or the dominant ideology and the reader may interpret them as he/she wishes (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 48). Furthermore, Alan Sinfield, the founder of cultural materialism as a literary theory, maintains that "meaning is produced culturally, and … humanities intellectuals contribute to the contest to make some stories, some representations, more plausible than others" (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 26). As Sinfield makes it clear in his claim, meanings deduced from texts vary from culture to culture and from episteme to episteme. Hence, comparing the novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England will illustrate how Victorian period was interpreted in the 1980s during which Thatcher was the Prime Minister of Britain and in which ways subversion manifested itself in between these periods.

There are mainly three reasons why specifically these epochs have been chosen to be compared in this study. Firstly, hegemonic ideologies were extremely prevalent and pervasive during both epochs, yet there were also severe oppositions which will be specified further in the study. Therefore, there is a great deal of material concerning subversion that can be explored. Secondly, there is enough time gap to see the formations that took place in society and in literary texts. Finally, and most importantly, the latter period made a deceptive attempt to return to Victorian values and this claim of reiteration of the past precipitates a comparison of the two periods. In the 1980s' England, a Neo-Victorian tradition became popular and this trend was not only supported but was also strategically exploited by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Kate Mitchell, in the introduction to her book *History and Cultural Memory in Neo-Victorian Fiction: Victorian Afterimages*, points out this idealization of Victorian period and the stunning transformation that took place in the public reception

of it during the twentieth century. She refers to Ezra Pound's coinage of the term 'Victoriana' as a derogatory term for the Victorian Period and draws attention to the substantial contrast about the reception of the Victorian period between the first and the second half of the twentieth century. She maintains that Victorianism was a captivating subject for people especially in the last decades of the twentieth century: "a fascination with the period invaded film, television … advertising … about the Victorian period. Far from an unpleasant odour detected and quickly left behind, the literature and culture of Victorian period have been courted, sought and summoned across many facets of contemporary culture for more than three decades" (1).

The invocation of the Victorian era did not appear with Thatcher, as the above paragraph explains, Thatcher made use of this nostalgia well in her discourse and contributed to the discussions about how far Thatcher managed to re-establish the Victorian values, traditions and systems. Although Thatcher frequently referred to the Victorian era, it was not always in order to praise the old era. She formed her discourse through the Victorian patterns by either appraising or assaulting them. For instance, she extolled Victorian family values but she criticized "such Victorian establishments as the public service ethic, the Universities, the Bar, the House of Lords and the Church of England, and she deregulated the City of London" (K. Mitchell 51). Furthermore, she was quite selective in her references to Victorian times and emphasized certain things and values while ignoring some others (Samuel 19; Evans 114). These points will be discussed further in the study.

The study focuses on four novels which reveal the general characteristics of the two epochs. Two novels, *North and South* by Elizabeth Gaskell and *Hard Times* by Charles Dickens, are chosen to represent the Victorian period. The reason why these Victorian novels are preferred specifically is that both *Hard Times* and *North and South* represent the changing social order in that epoch: the transformation of an agricultural society into an industrial one. The industrial and technological developments in the nineteenth century influenced the lives of people and reshaped the society not only economically but also culturally. In England, the north of the country was the first and most influenced part from these changes mainly because of the factories mushrooming in the north.

The spreading of factories across the north of England first changed the physical appearance of the cities and towns in these parts with the heavy smoke they produced. The landscape offered by such residential areas are described in each of these novels. Inspired by the industrial city of Preston, Dickens creates the fictive Coketown (Jensen and Thorp 156). He presents the town in the novel with an emphasis on its industrial landscape: "It was a town of red brick, or of brick that would have been red if the smoke and ashes had allowed it; but as matters stood it was a town of unnatural red and black like the painted face of a savage. It was a town of machinery and tall chimneys" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 26). In the same way, Gaskell sets her novel in Milton which is a "fictive counterpart for Manchester" (Wolfreys 113). Her introduction of Milton is again based upon the familiar atmosphere of an industrial city: "long, straight, hopeless streets of regularly-built houses, all small and of brick. Here and there a great oblong many-windowed factory stood up, like a hen among her chickens, puffing out black 'unparliamentary' smoke" (Gaskell 59). In addition to the changes in physical appearances, the rising number of factories precipitated the need for more workforce which caused an increase in population. People rushed into these industrial cities (Preston was among them) in order to find work at factories (Barnard 54). As most of the population in these places dealt with factorial works, instead of domestic or agricultural labour as they used to do, their daily routines, priorities, manners and needs all changed accordingly.

Being set in the industrial north of England, both *Hard Times* and *North and South* lay bare the essential social changes in English society brought about by the above-mentioned developments. Hence, they illustrate the emergence of a new culture in the north which spread across the country towards the end of the nineteenth century. As a result, they present a great deal of material that may be studied in terms of the power of historical developments in shaping the culture of a society. The specific time and the place of the setting in both novels, an 1850s industrial English town, provide a battlefield for the subversive and hegemonic ideologies. Therefore, it is easy to observe the progress of the reciprocal relationship between them. For example, *North and South* demonstrates the delicate power balance between them by first portraying a fictive southern town in England, Helstone, where the industrial developments have not been much influential. So, the hegemonic ideologies are not powerfully challenged

by the subversive ones. Later, the scene changes: Milton demonstrates a heavily industrial town where all the established ideologies are questioned by the changing lifestyles. All these circumstances make these two Victorian novels the best choice for a cultural materialist reading.

Hard Times and *North and South* are both condition of England novels, and share many similarities as mentioned in the above paragraph. However, it is also possible to discern the influence of the different positions the writers held at those times. Dickens is a canonical Victorian writer; he was widely accepted and highly regarded in his time by people from all spheres of life. Therefore, especially in his later novels, he is careful about "not to offend middle-class sensibilities" (J. M. Brown 15). Still, this does not prevent him from criticizing the social injustices he observes; he is only more allusive in his criticisms, and so is the subversions represented in *Hard Times*. However, Gaskell as a woman writing from the periphery, is more outward in her criticisms. Her marginal position is felt in her novel, as well. In her novels, her sympathy in the description of the people from disadvantaged positions, such as the working-class people or fallen women, is remarkable, and she insistently creates strong and independent women heroines such as Margaret in *North and South*. In spite of their criticisms of social order in their novels, Dickens and Gaskell were sometimes considered to be partial in their representations. For example, Young stresses their wish to preserve the middle-class order: "Elizabeth Gaskell and Charles Dickens, develop techniques for interpreting and representing the culture of working-class poverty that imaginatively tame the lion of working-class violence and maintain order within the bourgeois vision of society" (53). Cazamian evaluates them as conservative and states: "Taken as a group, Dickens, Disraeli, Mrs. Gaskell, and Kingsley had one common ideal: an efficient, paternalistic philanthropy, in which the State, or the great traditional estates of Church and nobility, carefully supervised social ills … We never find an ideal of progress which is both economic and democratic" (293). Therefore, by studying these two Victorian novelists in terms of subversion in social institutions, the study will also refute the claims that their novels offer no progress or that they are too conservative.

There are several reasons why *The Radiant Way* and *Waterland* are chosen to represent the novels of Thatcherite England. Firstly, they are written and set in the 1980s, and they reflect not only the social, political and historical conditions but also the literary styles of these times. For example, David Malcolm states that Swift in *Waterland* illustrates three common features of the 1980s' British fiction: "His novels are very mixed in terms of genre; he is a writer obsessively fascinated with the role of historical events in his characters' lives; and much of his writing is deeply metafictional" (9). However, he also notes that contrary to the current trend of using cosmopolitan settings, Swift prefers English ones which make the novel more appropriate for this study. *The Radiant Way* also provides a good example of its times as it depicts the social atmosphere of the 1980s through various characters from different classes and is described by the critics to be a 'state of the nation' novel (Stevenson 30). Brooker affirms the novel's success of depicting the 1980s England:

> *The Radiant Way* is a significant attempt at the sub-genre of the 'condition of England' novel … The novel … might convey the diversity of national life through its own range of characters, and indeed places. While no novel can feature every aspect of collective life in detail, fiction might at least provide images metonymic of that inclusiveness. *The Radiant Way* ostentatiously commences with such a strategy, in showing us Liz Headeland's New Year's party at the start of 1980. (149).

Secondly, they complement each other with their Victorian counterparts in certain ways and share some common characteristics. *Waterland*, for example, is classified as a Neo-Victorian novel; it invokes and questions Victorian values and institutions along with the social and political circumstances of the 1980s' England. Therefore, *Waterland* provides the reader with a 1980s' outlook of Victorian times, and *The Radiant Way*'s being a state of the nation novel, like the chosen Victorian novels, provides the opportunity to interpret the characters and events under the light of the historical and social developments.

Lastly, the authors of the novels of the Thatcherite England, Margaret Drabble and Graham Swift, again enable the study to have a different gender standpoint. Although the differences or similarities between the representation of male and female authors is not in the scope of this study, novels from different genders can still contribute to the variety of the material as women may be regarded to write from a

disadvantaged position even in the 1980s and this situation is inevitably influential in the representation of subversion in their novels. As a result, all the four novels present a microcosm of their epochs and provide handy materials for the purpose of the study.

As stated before, the objective of the study is to discuss the subversions in class, family and education represented in the above-mentioned novels. The scope of subversion to be explored will be kept within the social institutions of family, education, and class. In *Faultlines*, Sinfield suggests that some institutions are much more powerful than others and that the ideologies they support are harder to question or challenge (33). This is the reason why especially these institutions are preferred in this study because they are among those powerful institutions and the stories they endorse are widely accepted and rarely challenged. Besides, all of these institutions are an important matter of concern in each selected novel. Another reason for choosing specifically these institutions is that they were the most influential instruments used in the service of hegemonic policies during both epochs.

As a result, the aim of the study is to prove that, contrary to the new historicist claims, subverting the hegemony is possible and to demonstrate the subversions in the representation of these institutions in the novels, and compare and contrast the two periods in order to reach a conclusion about the development of subversion and its influence on the hegemonic institutions. In this way, the study will reveal the connection between culture and hegemonic authorities of the period, and illustrate how individuals shape culture even if they are also affected by historical circumstances beyond their control. Hence, this study is more concerned with the individual's power to shape the circumstances rather than the influence of the authority (hegemony) on the circumstances. However, it does not deny the power of the authority, either. The claim of this study is that these texts are imbued not only with hegemonic ideologies but also with subversions of them and in order to comprehend the underlying themes in these texts, one needs to be aware of the manipulations present in them. Hence, through a study of the subversion in the texts, the objective is to provide a deeper understanding of the texts by taking into account the hegemonic manipulations present in the institutions of family, education and class during these epochs and offer

alternative perspectives to these novels. It will also provide a means to compare and contrast how subversion functioned in these different epochs.

CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Theoretical Background: Cultural Materialism

The theoretical framework of the dissertation will be constructed upon cultural materialism which was first coined by Raymond Williams, who associated culture with materialism and maintained that culture was material of arts. The main argument of the study will focus on the concept of subversion, which was first introduced by Greenblatt and was later developed by cultural materialist Jonathan Dollimore. Subversion is explained by Greenblatt in his essay "Invisible Bullets" as the paradoxical co-existence of the celebratory and degrading elements concerning the existing authority in a textual work. He warns that in order to detect and confirm this subversiveness, one needs to be distant and secure from the disastrous executions of the relentless domineering authority. Therefore, an analysis of a work in terms of the subversions it consists should be made in a distant future when that authority loses its power and effectiveness (797).

Greenblatt confirms the existence of subversion, yet he proposes a containment theory in which he claims that subversion is consciously produced by authority as part of a scheme and so it is always under the control of authority. He, thus, concludes that subversion may never challenge the authority. However, cultural materialists evaluate this containment theory conversely. In his introduction to *Political Shakespeare*, Dollimore argues that; "[r]esistance … may be there from the outset or itself produced by authority for its own purposes, once installed it can be used against authority as well as used by it" (12). Likewise, Sinfield opposes Greenblatt and does not accept the absolute victory of hegemony over subversion. He extends Greenblatt's explanations on subversion and maintains that even the existence of subversion is a challenge to authority. In *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*, Sinfield argues that authority cannot prevent the emergence of subversion because absolute authority is merely an illusion. He says that the potential of dissident arises from "conflict and contradiction that the social order inevitably produces within itself, even as it attempts to sustain itself. Despite their power, dominant ideological formations are always, in practice, under pressure, striving to substantiate their claim to superior plausibility in the face of diverse disturbances" (41). Hence, subversion has

an undeniable effect on authority. Sinfield gives many examples in which the dissident or the subversive has had influence over the dominant ideologies in one way or another in both historical events and texts.

Another important point that needs to be noted about subversion is that it arises from dissidence. For cultural materialist critics, dissidence is not a complete opposition to the dominant ideology; "[i]t is instead close in resemblance to the structures of power and is in fact produced by the internal contradictions of these structures. It does… imply a deviation from some aspect or tenet of the dominant ideology or culture" (Brannigan 111). Dissidence gives way to subversion and subversion does not take place at once and needs time to progress. Sinfield claims that dissidence may seem like a weaker claim but "it is actually stronger insofar as it posits a field necessarily open to continuing contest, in which at some conjunctures the dominant will lose ground while at others the subordinate will scarcely maintain its position (*Faultlines* 49). The seemingly powerless dissidence in hegemony may, in time, grow and subvert the hegemony. Dollimore also affirms this in his introduction to *Political Shakespeare*: "Non-dominant elements interact with the dominant forms, sometimes coexisting with, or being absorbed or even destroyed by them, but also challenging, modifying or even displacing them" (6). Moreover, dissidence may contain subversive elements; it does not have to turn into subversion in order to be considered successful because it already implements a persevering pressure on authority.

Influential Theories and Concepts on Cultural Materialism

Raymond Williams pioneered cultural studies which had always existed but had never been considered a special field beforehand. Cultural materialism derives from these previous studies of culture. These studies were also influenced by several already existing theories. Jonathan Dollimore, who defined cultural materialism and formed a thorough theory out of prior works on cultural studies, explains the origins of the theory and the influential theories that contributed to the formation of the new theory in his introduction to *Political Shakespeare* as follows:

> The term 'cultural materialism' is borrowed from its recent use by Raymond Williams; its practice grows from an eclectic body of work in Britain in the post-war period which can be broadly characterised as cultural analysis. That work includes the considerable output of

Williams himself, and more generally, the convergence of history, sociology and English in cultural studies, some of the major developments in feminism, as well as continental Marxist-structuralist and post-structuralist theory, especially that of Althusser, Macherey, Gramsci and Foucault. (2-3)

In order to explain cultural materialism and its focus, it is crucial to define several key concepts and theories. The most important basic concept connected to cultural materialism is undoubtedly 'culture'. In the 1970s, Arnold's concept of culture was widely popular although it later received severe criticisms concerning the restrictive nature of his definition. In *Culture and Anarchy*, he states that "[c]ulture is … properly described not as having its origin in curiosity, but as having its origin in the love of perfection; it is a study of perfection" (34). His elitist concept of culture restricts the term within limits of high culture: it disregards popular culture and, moreover, it confines culture to arts. In *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*, Eliot refers to Arnold's definition and states that he failed to consider the term in a wider context. He claims that "we shall look for culture, not in any individual or in any one group of individuals, but more and more widely; and we are driven in the end to find it in the pattern of the society as a whole" (21). In the 1960s, Raymond Williams made extensive studies of culture and defined it as "a particular way of life, which expresses certain meanings and values not only in art and learning but also in institutions and ordinary behaviour" (*The Long Revolution* 57). Cultural materialists' concept of culture is based on Williams' definition because he not only defines it but also signifies the ideologic power of the concept. As Williams points out, culture is not limited to art; everything in daily life is connected to culture. This wide scope of culture makes it a means of power and ideology, two important concepts in cultural studies.

Power is an important issue in cultural materialism because it views literary works or indeed culture in any form as a means of power. The relation between power and culture is based on Foucault's arguments about power, knowledge, truth and discourse. Foucault's claim is that knowledge is power. He claims that truth and knowledge are situational; they are constructed by the authorities of the time. In his article "Panopticism", he explains how power functions in society. He states that power does not belong to a person or a group of people; it is a system and people form only a part of it and it works mechanically by initially setting the norms and then

selecting out and conforming the misfits to the society. He, therefore, emphasizes the power in discourse. Moreover, he states that power is absolute and unbreakable. His views on power and discourse are inspirational for cultural materialists and have shaped their theory to a certain extent, yet they firmly reject Foucault's claim about the absoluteness of power. The parting of the ways between cultural materialists and Foucault is explained by Ryan; he asserts "[c]ultural materialism owes much to Foucault … but … its stress tends to fall on the conflicts rather than the rules, on Foucault's warrant to detect fractures in the edifice of power rather than his stronger case for regarding power as ubiquitous and irresistible" (1).

Another key concept in cultural materialism is Marxist philosopher Althusser's theory of ideology. Althusser develops the earlier Marxist understanding of ideology which regarded ideology as an imaginary construction. He argues "'ideas' or 'representations', etc. which seem to make up ideology do not have an ideal … or spiritual existence, but a material existence" (Althusser 19). Marx's focus is more on what Althusser defines as 'repressive state apparatuses' such as the government, the army, the police or the courts while he tries to explain the exploitation of the working class in society. Althusser, on the other hand, suggests that there are also apparatuses which materialize certain ideologies and they are indeed the very means which enable the continuity of this exploitation. He defines them as ideological state apparatuses each of which contains an ideology. These state apparatuses, such as family, religion or education, are the realization of an ideology; they function as a means of spreading a certain ideology and this brings ideology a material existence. The political agenda in cultural materialism derives from this kind of Marxist and Althusserian views of ideology and its function in culture.

Cultural materialists, basing their views on Althusser, believe that ideology shapes people's perceptions, and it does so with a political objective generally serving the purpose of the authority. Alan Sinfield, for example, explains how ideology works in society:

> Societies need to produce materially to continue – they need food, shelter, warmth; goods to exchange with other societies; a transport and information infrastructure to carry those processes. Also, they have to produce ideologically … They need knowledges to keep

material production going … And they need understandings, intuitive and explicit, of a system of social relationships within which the whole process can take place more or less evenly. Ideology produces, makes plausible, concepts and systems to explain who we are, who the others are, how the world works. (*Faultlines* 32)

In *Faultlines*, Sinfield also refers to Althusser's ideological state apparatuses and says that "[i]deology is produced everywhere and all the time in the social order, but some institutions – by definition, those that usually corroborate the prevailing power arrangements – are vastly more powerful than others. The stories they endorse are more difficult to challenge, even to disbelieve" (33). It is clear from Sinfield's remarks that he acknowledges the power of ideology and agrees with Althusser on the operation of ideology through some institutions. What Sinfield points out here is indeed perfectly in parallel with Althusser's notion of interpellation which means the internalization of imposed ideas or values. However, Sinfield and other cultural materialists do not share Althusser's perception of ideology as an omnipotent power which leaves no place for resistance.

Hegemony is the other key concept in the study of cultural materialism. Although the word itself had been in use long before him, the concept was developed by the Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci in his prison notes. It generally means political leadership based on the consent of the led, a consent which is secured by the diffusion and popularization of the world view of the ruling class. Gramsci sometimes uses the word interchangeably with domination but throughout his notes he makes the distinction between these two words and improves his concept of hegemony by making specific explanations about it. He clarifies how hegemony functions as follows:

> The hegemony of a directive centre over the intellectuals asserts itself by two principal routes: I. a general conception of life, a philosophy (Gioberti), which offers to its adherents an intellectual "dignity" providing a principle of differentiation from the old ideologies which dominated by coercion, and an element of struggle against them; 2. a scholastic programme, an educative principle and original pedagogy which interests that fraction of the intellectuals which is the most homogeneous and the most numerous (the teachers, from the primary teachers to the university professors), and gives them an activity of their own in the technical field (103-104).

The above-mentioned means through which hegemony consolidates itself were wisely used both during Victorian and Thatcherite periods. It would not be wrong to say that Victorian hegemony depended on a scholastic programme whereas Thatcherite hegemony was fortified more by differentiating itself from previous ideologies.

Unlike Althusser's concept of ideology, Gramscian hegemony regards the existence of challenge and subversion. Moreover, Gramsci confirms the undeniable power of the subordinate ideologies or groups. He states that the subaltern social groups do not stop exerting pressure on the ruling groups in a society unless they finally succeed in taking over control. However, he also acknowledges that their victory is extremely difficult both because they are constantly interfered by the authority and because they are not unified and consistent. He claims that even when they achieve victory, it takes quite a long time to secure it and gives the French Revolution as a historical example of such a victory stating that it was not safe up until 1830. Finally, he implies the significance of such formations in history by stating that "[e]very trace of independent initiative on the part of subaltern groups should … be of incalculable value for the integral historian" (55).

Raymond Williams, looking for "a more complex model of culture, which can account for the fact of change and cope with the movement of history", engaged with Gramsci's idea of hegemony (Ryan 3). In his article "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", Raymond Williams prefers hegemony over ideology as he thinks that the first is more comprehensive:

> [H]egemony supposes the existence of something which is truly total, which is not merely secondary or superstructural, like the weak sense of ideology, but which is lived at such a depth, which saturates the society to such an extent, and which … even constitutes the substance and limit of common sense for most people under its sway" (37).

He maintains that hegemony explains the circumstances and interactions in society better than any other concept. Gramscian hegemony not only acknowledges the existence of dominant ideologies and the class structure in society but also does not fail to recognize the dynamics in society; the possibility of dissidence or hope for change resides in it.

Deriving from the notion of hegemony, Raymond Williams forms a cultural pattern to explain the social dynamics within culture. In "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", he proposes that "hegemony is not singular; indeed, that its own internal structures are highly complex, and have continually to be renewed, recreated and defended; and by the same token that they can be continually challenged and in certain respects modified" (38). In the article, he continues his assertion by stating that in order to distinguish various formations in culture, he developed "a model which allows for this kind of variation and contradiction, its sets of alternatives and its processes of change" (38). He affirms the inevitable existence of a prominent set of values and ideas which are regarded as the dominant culture. However, he also notes that this is not a stable and consistent system; throughout time it changes and produces alternative and conflicting thoughts and practices which he calls residual and emergent cultures. In the same article, he explains that by residual, he refers to "some practices, meanings and values, which cannot be verified or cannot be expressed in terms of the dominant culture, are nevertheless lived and practiced on the basis of the residue – cultural as well as social – of some previous social formation" (40). As for the emergent culture, he refers to the newly emerging ideas, beliefs or practices. Williams' analysis of culture as dominant, residual and emergent has helped cultural materialists to develop the idea of subversiveness which forms the basis of the criticism. In *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*, Alan Sinfield affirms his contributions to the theory as follows:

> Much of the importance of Raymond Williams derives from the fact that at a time when Althusser and Foucault were being read in some quarters as establishing ideology and/or power in a necessarily unbreakable continuum, Williams argued the co-occurrence of subordinate, residual, emergent, alternative, and oppositional cultural forces alongside the dominant, in varying relations of incorporation, negotiation, and resistance. Cultural materialism seeks to discern the scope for dissident politics of class, race, gender, and sexual orientation, both within texts and in their roles in cultures. (9-10)

Main Concerns of Cultural Materialism

In the 1980s, the influences of the above-mentioned concepts and theories coupled with the troubled social and political atmosphere triggered critics' interest in cultural studies. As a result of this, in America Stephen Greenblatt developed new

historicism, and in Britain Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield laid the foundations of cultural materialism in their anthological work *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Ryan xv). Both of these literary theories share some common concerns such as their discredit in the objectivity of historical knowledge, their interest in the connection between text and history or the power relations present in the text, yet cultural materialism differentiates itself from the other in that its focus is the power of dissident or subversive elements in culture and literary texts not the omnipotence of hegemony. Moreover, cultural materialism deals not only with the past and the text but also with the present; cultural materialist critics reinterpret past works within the context of contemporary power relations.

Cultural materialism is often thought as if it were the same as new historicism. However, there are considerable differences between the two. A new historicist critic sets out to display how ideologies are produced, spread and perpetuated through cultural representations whereas a cultural materialist critic is concerned with how and what kind of resistance occurred in such representations despite the oppressive authorities (Brannigan 102). Hence, their objectives are different though they may use the same means.

Dollimore and Sinfield introduce cultural materialism in the foreword to their afore-mentioned joint work as "a combination of historical context, theoretical method, political commitment and textual analysis" (vii). In this definition, they make it clear that the text, the context and the political agenda embedded in the work need to be explored in literary analysis. The main characteristics of cultural materialism are "the focus on the possibilities of subversion, the bifocal perspective on both the past and the present, the belief that both the objects of their studies and the methods by which they study are forms of dissidence, the view that all forms of representation are engaged in political struggle" (Brannigan 109). Therefore, cultural materialists give voice to the unheard peripheral voices of the past within the context of the present by noting the reasons of their marginality in the past and also by drawing attention to their powerful stance of resistance.

In his introduction to *Political Shakespeare*, Dollimore alleges that culture is not a coherent and unified entity; it consists of different forms in different proportions

simultaneously: "[n]on-dominant elements interact with the dominant forms, sometimes coexisting with, or being absorbed or even destroyed by them, but also challenging, modifying or even displacing them" (6). By the same token, literary works as a form of cultural production cannot be coherent, as well. He dismisses any possibility of a monolithic literary work because it inevitably embodies non-dominant agents along with the dominant ones. The author incorporates these two types of agents either consciously or unconsciously. In his book *Faultlines*, Sinfield exemplifies a conscious scheme for this embeddedness. He states that Queen Elizabeth I did not want to spend much money on "what C. Wright called the cultural apparatus" (182). She, instead, made other people do it for her. However, this pressure on the artists of the time caused them to "incorporate secular and religious symbolism that ratified the prevailing power arrangements and projected them onto a supernatural dimension" (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 182). Therefore, oppression may provoke resistance. This resistance may not be discernible when the work is produced, but it may resurface at a later period. The dissidence may not even be placed by the author; it may be interpreted as such by the reader:

> A dominant discourse cannot prevent "abuse" of its resources. Even a text that aspires to contain a subordinate perspective must first bring it into visibility; even to misrepresent, one must represent. And once that has happened, there can be no guarantee that the subordinate will stay safely in its prescribed place. Readers do not have to respect closures – we do not, for instance, have to accept that the independent women characters in Shakespearean comedies find their proper destinies in the marriage deals at the ends of those plays. We can insist on our sense that the middle of such a text arouses expectations that exceed the closure. (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 48)

Cultural materialists maintain that absolutism may never be achieved and it is no more than a fantasy to establish absolutism or produce an absolutist work of art. Not even the Communist Party or the Tudors who adamantly attempted to realize this dream could contain history (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 182). Achieving a totally unified authority is impossible because "[a]ll stories comprise within themselves the ghosts of the alternative stories they are trying to exclude" (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 47). Time may change the status of these alternative stories; what is acceptable and honourable may in time be regarded as degrading or even punishable. The dissident elements may in the future be a part of the dominant culture because the dominant culture is not a

unified whole; it consists of contradictions and alternate views within itself. Hence, cultural materialists are against the presumption of the existence of a 'monolithic power'; they instead acknowledge the presence of a power structure which is "made up of different, often competing elements, and these not merely producing culture but producing it through appropriations" (Dollimore, *Political Shakespeare* 12).

The diversifications within the dominant discourse or culture derive from the structure of power because power cannot be held only by one person; it needs to be distributed in order to expand the realm of authority and to implement it efficiently. Sinfield illustrates this situation by giving examples from Shakespeare's play *Macbeth*. He states that the Thane of Cawdor, in the play, was initially part of the authority, yet he rebelled against the king (*Faultlines* 40). This rebellion changed the status of the Thane of Cawdor and he became a dissident. Moreover, his being murdered by the authority became legitimate because "[v]iolence is good … when it is in the service of the prevailing dispositions of power; when it disrupts them, it is evil" (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 95). This complexity of power structure saves literary works from being servants of certain ideologies and makes them 'a site of contest' (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 94).

The reason why interpretations of texts vary throughout time is that the conditions of plausibility change. The conditions of plausibility are largely determined by hegemonic ideology because the consciousness of a person is formed by ideology from the moment he or she is born. However, the very fact that ideologies are not stable and consistent proves that the subversive elements also play a part in shaping the conditions of plausibility. For example, "[w]hen a part of our worldview threatens disruption by manifestly failing to cohere with the rest, then we reorganize and retell its story, trying to get it into shape-back into the old shape if we are conservative-minded, or into a new shape if we are more adventurous" (Sinfield, *Faultlines* 46). At this point, we change certain parts of the old set of conditions of plausibility. Sinfield proposes that literary criticism itself is a subculture and that critics should change the conditions of plausibility in textual analysis (51). By this means, it is possible to discern different details that have never been signified before and to give voice to the marginalized groups or elements in the text.

1.2. Historical Background

As cultural materialism signifies the relationship between the text and its historical context, it is necessary to lay bare the circumstances of class, family and education in Victorian and Thatcherite England. Sinfield states this necessity in *Faultlines*: "It is a key proposition of cultural materialism that the specific historical conditions in which institutions and formations organize and are organized by textualities must be addressed" (49). A historical background information is essential in order to recognize the hegemonic and dissident elements in these epochs. It will help to evaluate the texts regarding the conditions of the time the text is written. Hence, in this part, a brief summary of the two epochs are provided with a special focus on these social institutions.

Victorian England

Victorian period is a time of transition in all aspects of life. Many scientific discoveries about both human nature and the universe took place and they revealed new information which paved the way for technological advances and industrial revolution. These discoveries and advancements had inevitable influence on people's daily lives, economics, social structure, politics and religion. Transportation and communication got easier; agricultural developments improved farming; new working positions occurred as a result of industrialization which also enabled social mobility to a certain extent and resulted in the appearance of a new class (the working class) which contributed to the improvement of social rights; religion and conventions started to be questioned. In the introduction of *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, Greenblatt refers to these developments and their effect on a Victorian's life as follows:

> By the end of the century – after the resources of steam power had been more fully exploited for fast railways and iron ships, for looms, printing presses, and farmers' combines, and after the introduction of the telegraph, intercontinental cable, photography, anaesthetics, and universal compulsory education – a late Victorian could look back with astonishment on these developments during his lifetime. (1889)

These developments were useful for mankind and improved the quality of life but they also created a tense atmosphere because of the clash between the old and the new. Charles Dickens expressed this contradiction present during the era in *A Tale of Two Cities*: "IT WAS THE BEST of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair" (3). Therefore, the century presented an environment full of diversity, conflict and doubt.

The advancements and their consequences did not spread all at once at the same speed around the country. The transition was more gradual in southern parts compared to the northern parts. The widespread industrial development in the latter accelerated this transition period while the first preserved its conventional structure for a longer period. The striking difference between the north and the south is stated as "urbanization ... created dramatically expanding cities, predominantly in northern England that were wholly alien in their physical and social make-up to these still working on the land or in provincial towns" (Plunkett 4). The overall outcome of the developments was a transformation in terms of physical environment, social structure, values, attitudes, living conditions and religion. The extent of this transformation distinguished the north from the south, at least till the end of the nineteenth century, the south stood for the decaying Victorian norms while the north represented the changing dynamics of the age. Victorian novelists tried to articulate all the consequences of these historical developments on individual lives, personal relationships and society from different perspectives.

Class

The concept of class in Britain is a complicated term to comprehend. In the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth century, class was only based on the family the person is born into. It was not money what determined one's social class. In contrast, since it was almost impossible for a commoner to earn enough money to raise his living standards and become rich or for an aristocrat to fall into poverty, it was social class that determined his amount of money. Therefore, there were only aristocrats (the landed) and the commoners (everyone else) in the eighteenth

century (S. Mitchell 18). However, economic advancement as a result of imperial expansion, agricultural developments and the Industrial Revolution, which rapidly gained pace during Victoria's reign, made it possible for the commoners to earn money and improve their life standards. This situation gave rise to new classes and enabled mobility between the classes to a certain extent; it was a "transition from an aristocratic to a class society" (J. P. Brown 72). As a result, class structure was reshaped by Victorian society gradually and social classes started to be considered under three basic classes as working, middle and upper classes.

Each social class had different duties in society and there were certain characteristics that separated each of them. In general, the working-class members did physical labour; middle-class members mostly worked in occupations which required mental labour; and upper classes (landed gentry and aristocracy) inherited their income and were only engaged in unpaid occupations. It was certainly not solely the source of income that differentiated the classes. The distinctions were discernible in all spheres of everyday life from manners, education, way of dressing and talking to values and beliefs. They even resided in different parts of towns and had a completely different life style. In spite of the gap between the living standards of these classes, the distinction between them was readily accepted by the society. Sally Mitchell states that "Victorians believed that each class had its own standards, and people were expected to conform to the rules for their class. It was wrong, people thought, to behave like someone from a class above—or below—your own" (18). Yet, this unquestioning submission did not last long with the growing middle-class power.

As a result of the advancement of technology and heavy industrialization, middle-class people had the opportunity to raise their income greatly which provided them the opportunity to reach upper-class living standards. However, the members of the working class were in extremely poor conditions and they could barely feed themselves; their children were starving while some middle-class and upper-class people were living in extravagant luxury. This situation created some kind of antagonism which came to be known as "class feeling" (J. P. Brown 71). This was mostly felt between the middle and the upper classes because their interests clashed. The 1832 Reform Act "extended voting rights to the lower middle class and placed a

great deal of political power in the hands of the middle classes, power which had hitherto been concentrated in the hands of the landed aristocracy" (J. P. Brown 92). Throughout the century, the middle classes gradually gained the control of economy and politics in England.

Both the number and the power of middle classes increased in the Victorian period. Middle classes included a great variety of people from different spheres of life and there was a considerable difference between the incomes of lower-middle and upper-middle class people. There was an uncertainty about their status. Whelan expresses their ambiguous situation as follows:

> That the middle class came into its own in Britain in the nineteenth century is well documented, but despite its continued consolidation of power and cultural dominance throughout the century, the issue of class identification—who was in, who was out and how one was to know—remained a contested issue, primarily among those who considered themselves "in." (2)

Therefore, middle-class people lived in different circumstances according to their occupations and incomes. The highly educated members of the class (known also as the old middle class) were generally at the highest social standing. Later-formed part of this upper-middle-class consists of people who became rich through industrialization. The rest of the class members were largely made up of farmers, small shop keepers, and people from occupations which required a basic education.

Although there was a considerable gap between the living standards of the middle-class people, they managed to form the standard of Victorian way of life and values; "[i]n addition to maintaining a certain kind of house, the middle class despised aristocratic idleness; the majority valued hard work, sexual morality, and individual responsibility" (S. Mitchell 20). Education and family were also quite important for them. Their dedication to such ideological institutions played an important role in both developing and maintaining their power. In terms of religion, initially most of the middle-class people were regular churchgoers. However, later in the nineteenth century, especially among the newer members of the class, religion lost its significance. Altholz draws attention to this transformation in the second half of the century: "Most importantly, those special segments of the middle class which served

as culture-bearers to their age and shapers of the next, the intellectual and professional classes, had their faith eroded in a distinctive and decisive manner" (150). As a result, the majority of the middle class came to be dissenters.

The upper classes included the aristocracy and the landed gentry. They were the smallest but the most powerful class in England because they played a decisive role in the economic, political and social issues of the country. Moreover, thanks to the tradition of primogeniture, they were the wealthiest in Europe. The members of upper classes had "either titles, wealth, land, or all three" (Steinbach 129). They possessed more than two-thirds of all the land in the country. The titled aristocracy or peerage had these titles from the highest in rank: duke, marquess, earl, viscount, and baron. The titles were inherited by the eldest son only after the father died and there was no promotion between the ranks. The peerage held significant privileges. A nobleman "was automatically a member of the House of Lords. He could not be arrested for debt. And if he were charged with a criminal offense, he would be tried by a jury of his peers —a jury made up of other noblemen, in a special court held in Westminster Hall rather than in an ordinary criminal court" (S. Mitchell 22). Unlike Europe, other family members in the peerage could not benefit from these privileges. Moreover, although the titles of baronets were inherited, they were neither totally aristocrat nor totally commoner but were something-in-between and they could not sit in the House of Lords in the Parliament. However, "Even in the middle 1860s, about one third of the men in the House of Commons were either baronets or the sons or grandsons of peers, which helped maintain the political influence of the upper class" (S. Mitchell 23-4).

What separated the landed gentry from the aristocracy was that unlike their superior, the former did not have a title; owned relatively less land and estate; and they were generally not active in politics. Moreover, the landed gentry were more influential in local affairs of the country while the aristocracy were more active in city life. The landed gentleman was generally called 'squire' but it was not an official title. He was assumed to help to maintain peace, deal with local issues, and to set up and encourage charity organisations (S. Mitchell 24). Both the aristocracy and the gentry

were socially very active and would spare lots of time for sports, parties, hunting, or festivals.

The working class was the majority of the population. They were largely unskilled and undereducated. Although heavy industrialization improved the living standards of most of the middle-class people, it also made human labour cheap. Nassaar confirms this aspect of industrialization, as well: "As England industrialized in the shadow of a laissez-faire economic system, the condition of the working class in the industrial and coal-mining areas was nothing short of appalling" (92). Working-class people had to work long hours for less money and under hard conditions. They could barely feed their family with their wages and generally other family members had to work, as well, in order to contribute to the family income. Their children could receive little education because they had to start working at a very early age. Julia Prewitt Brown states that "the most important division within the internal structure of the working class was between skilled and unskilled workers" (18). Skilled workers were in a relatively better situation than the latter. However, such works required long time apprenticeship so only those families who did not need their children's economic support could send their children for apprenticeship. This meant that unskilled workers' children were most likely to share their family's destiny and works that needed skill became like a family job passing from father to son.

Working-class people had neither much time nor enough money to spare for leisure activities like other class members. The only leisure activity for them was to spend some time drinking at pubs. For most of them, Sunday was holiday and it was the only day family members could spend some time together. Generally, they would not attend churches because most working men were dissenters. Thomas Heyck's claim about religious doubt among working-class people in a way supports this generalisation:

> If one looks to popular religious belief in the nineteenth century, then the obvious historical development was a decline in working-class church membership from the peak reached during evangelical revival of the early nineteenth century. The explanation for this decline must in large part be social. Substantial numbers of working-class people became non-believers (or "free thinkers") because they saw the

churches and their teachings as instruments of social control. (*A History of the Peoples of the British Isles* 313)

However, deriving from different living conditions in suburbs and cities, there were exceptions: "For example, country workers were far more likely to be politically conservative and members of the Church of England than city workers, who were increasingly apathetic about religion … and more radical politically" (J. P. Brown 73). Therefore, it was not only some of the scientific developments that undermined religious authority in the nineteenth century but also some of the social circumstances such as the miserable living conditions of the working-class people.

The growing number of working-class people and their frustrating working conditions contributed significantly to the formation of class consciousness and the enhancement of democracy and women's rights in the second half of the century. To defend their rights, working-class people even started a movement called "Chartism" which was influential in 1830s and 1840s but failed in 1848. However, in the second half of the century, they formed trade unions which were more effective and they put important pressure on the government and the upper classes to take the working-class people seriously. As a result, some acts were passed by the Parliament which relatively improved their situation. Nassaar points out these attempts of the government as follows:

> After 1850 … the condition of the working class began to improve as the so-called Time of Troubles was gradually replaced by a period of prosperity. A succession of Factory Acts in Parliament restricted child labor, limited working hours, and gradually improved the condition of the working class. In 1867 a second Reform Bill was passed, giving the vote to the working class. By the end of the century universal compulsory education had become a reality. (92)

Another important influence which improved class consciousness was Marxist views. Although Marx's *Das Kapital* was published in 1867, it was not until the late 1870s that his works started to be published in England. They had repercussions in the country as a result of which some organizations were established such as the Social Democratic Federation and the Fabian Society (Hughes 37). In conclusion, at the end of the nineteenth century, although the class system did not disappear, the distinction between the classes softened and the hierarchy in the society diminished.

Family

The nineteenth century witnessed a great many of developments in all spheres of life at a great speed. Clashing with the long-established views and beliefs, the expanding scientific knowledge shattered the over confident Victorians. Moreover, the advanced technology made itself felt in every aspect of daily life such as fast communication and easy transportation. Subjected to such drastic changes in everyday life, the Victorians "clung to the idea that family might provide stability and access to eternal values" (Nelson 6). Therefore, the notion of family was idealized and was regarded highly during the Victorian period. The value the Victorians attach to family was clearly reflected in all forms of art produced during that time such as in lyrics, paintings, journals and novels.

Contrasting with the above-mentioned value the Victorian society attributed to family especially to maternity, family members spent very little time together. In the working class, parents did not have enough time to spare for their children as the father had to work under hard conditions and for long hours, and the mother either worked outside or inside the house, so the children had to take care of themselves. Families who had a good income hired many servants in order their children to be looked after well and educated. Therefore, despite the idealization of family institution in Victorian times, parents and children were emotionally distant to each other in living practice.

Most families in the nineteenth century were nuclear but large. A typical Victorian family generally consisted of parents and a number of children depending on the family income. The short life expectancy made it difficult to bring the three generations together so grandparents were rarely in this circle. This situation, however, could turn the simple nuclear family pattern into a complex one due to the presence of widowers. There could be blended families consisting of half and step children or parents (Nelson 113). Still, generally "the large families of the early nineteenth century were due to the high birth rate; women born between 1781 and 1831 had an average of six children each. Later in the century, the birth rate lowered by roughly half, most of this reduction occurring in affluent families" (G. S. Frost 12). This drop in the

number of children derived from economic reasons. The practice of primogeniture among the aristocrat and the upper-class families, which meant that the oldest son inherited all the property of the family, left the second or the third son without any guarantee in order to lead a comfortable life. In that case, they either had to make a good marriage which would provide them with money or had to receive a good education which became quite expensive toward the end of the century. This situation deterred families from having large families (Nelson 73).

In the nineteenth century, marriage motivations were "romantic love and the longing for companionship and children … the desire for productive work (wives), for financial security and social status (wives, but also many husbands), for an acceptable outlet for sexual urges (husbands, but also many wives), and for a dependable housekeeper (husbands)" (Nelson11). It was mostly working-class people who married for love. The middle-class people looked for certain criteria before creating an emotional bond with the other sex. For example, a middle-class man regarded sexual inexperience in a woman very important while the woman would require the man to be able to provide her a certain standard of life. For the upper-class people, it was the family name and power that was of great importance when choosing a companion. Although people would not regard arranged marriages as acceptable, among the middle and upper class, young people were carefully brought together considering their being appropriate for each other. Therefore, people who got married were generally of the same class circle.

It was not appropriate for a man to consider marriage before he was financially secure and likewise for a woman to commit herself to a man before he declared his serious interest (S. Mitchell 159). As a result, in contrast to the general assumption of people, the average marriage age in Victorian times was quite high; for women it was twenty-five and for men it was about twenty-eight. Class was a determining factor in marriage age; "[m]embers of the working class, on average, married a bit younger; but both men and women of the middle class were often older than 30, because a man wanted to be financially established before he took on the support of a family. More than 10 percent of the population as a whole never did marry" (S. Mitchell 147). Toward the end of the century, as women started to question the nature of marriage

and the assumed role of the wife, the age of marriage grew. However, the legal age of consent to be involved in a sexual relationship for a girl was considerably low; it was twelve until 1875, and was raised to sixteen with the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885. Moreover, there was no such age limit stated clearly in law for boys which meant that their being engaged in sexual activity at a very early age was not of much concern for adults (Nelson 19).

In Victorian society, sex was considered to be something shameful, particularly for women, and people were expected to repress such desires until they got married. Even when they got married, sexual gratification was thought to be a need only for the male not for the female because the general assumption was that "women's sexual drive was, or should be, different from man's to being focused on pregnancy rather than pleasure" (Nelson 9). In spite of the tremendous effort of the Victorians to avoid sexuality, it was a pervading theme in that age "evidenced in phenomena such as the profusion of manuals dealing with sexual conduct and practice, the thriving trade in pornography, the prurient interest in anatomical wax museums with their displays of sexual freaks and sexual diseases, the numbers of prostitutes on the streets in all Victorian cities, and so on" (Guy 464). This prevalent sexual concern may be regarded as "an expression of fear – a defensive rear – guard against action waged against a proliferation of activities which had passed beyond the ability of convention alone to restrain (Guy 464). In such a moral environment, marriage provided men with an acceptable means of gratification of sexual desires.

Sexual innocence of a woman, especially from a good family, was regarded so highly that the idealized wife's "symbol of romantic perfection became the girl rather than the woman" (Nelson 19). Therefore, parents would make sure that girls and boys were kept distant or were brought together only in the company of other people. There were even chaperones who would accompany young women either at home in the presence of a man outside the family or when they went out to social events. Chaperones both provided safety and tried to find a suitor for the female appropriate for her own social circle (S. Mitchell 156). Under such strict surveillance and without any possibility of dating, females did not have much chance to get to know men. Therefore, it was common for Victorian girls to marry their cousins as they had more

freedom in their relationships within the family (S. Mitchell 159). However, the relationship between brothers and sisters was considered without a sexual component, so "siblings of opposite genders could experience an intimacy and freedom otherwise impossible between male and female; thus, Dante Gabriel Rossetti could draw his sister in the nude not despite but because of their kinship" (Nelson 12).

In the nineteenth century, there were strictly defined roles attributed by the Victorian society to all the family members. It was to such an extent that, in one of her essays, Florence Nightingale complains about the roles ascribed by the institution of family: "The family uses people, not for what they are, not for what they are intended to be, but for what it wants them for – for its own uses. It thinks of them not as what God has made them, but as the something which it has arranged that they shall be" (216). It may easily be discerned from Nightingale's statements that members had clear cut roles. Presumably, it was the wife who had the heaviest responsibility and who was supposed to hold the family together and take care of the needs of each and every family member. That is why "the Victorian era witnessed a boom in advice manuals, and particularly in advice manuals aimed at women" (Nelson 26). John Ruskin's "Of Queens' Garden", in which he delegates women duties in society, is one of the best examples of the time to illustrate how a certain Victorian ideology was embodied within a text so naturally and unconsciously. In *The Cambridge Companion to John Ruskin*, this is affirmed by stating that even a few sentences from Ruskin's afore-mentioned text are enough to reflect "the generality of Victorian patriarchal attitudes towards women (attitudes that privilege male control of society's power structures), leaving readers with the impression that these comments tell the whole story" (Weltman 162).

Coventry Patmore's poem "Angel in the House" is another and indeed a more striking example in which women were assigned with certain roles. It is a narrative poem, written in parts first in 1854 and revised throughout the years up until 1862. Patmore describes his wife Emily Patmore in the poem and idealizes her as the perfect model for Victorian women. Therefore, the poem indeed not only describes a specific woman but also enforces certain features and roles onto all Victorian women. It defines the paragons of womanhood as being passive, submissive, meek, self-sacrificing and

morally pure. It was so influential that the phrase 'angel in the house' became a popular representation for the ideal Victorian wife in the late nineteenth century, and yet it was also often severely criticized by feminist critics in the twentieth century (Strezova 132).

Although more than half of the population was made up of working-class people, it was middle-class patterns of life that was regarded as the norm in Victorian society "because it was the middle class that controlled the presses, writing and producing most of the books and periodicals that voiced and shaped public opinion" (Nelson 6). In the middle-class family pattern, wife's sphere of activity was home and husband's sphere of activity was work. So, wife and husband belonged to separate spaces. Especially during the early and mid-Victorian period, it was considered inappropriate for women to have a job because outside world was assumed to have a negative effect on maternal skills. The Victorian middle-class family pattern was as follows:

> Ideologically, the middle-class home and family represented the essence of morality, stability, and comfort. The husband had legal and economic control over his wife, children, and servants. The family depended on his income: the wife did not bring in money through labor (as in the working class) or have a private settlement (as among gentry and aristocrats). The children remained subordinate and obedient. Boys, who needed extended schooling to reproduce their parents' style of life, were under their father's authority until they had enough training and experience to make their own way in the world. Middle-class daughters were not expected to "make their own way" – with a very few exceptions, they stayed at home unless or until they married. (S. Mitchell 146)

Middle-class mothers did not provide the physical care of the children themselves. They had servants to do such works, instead they were expected to instruct the children morally and be a good example for them. Their duty towards their husbands was to submit to them and satisfy their needs. In contrast to the clearly defined maternal duties, "[p]aternal roles were not so vividly imagined … If mother and unborn baby were one flesh, the father enacted, at best, the part of concerned onlooker. Even after the baby's birth, fathers … often had little intimate contact with infant offspring" (Nelson 47). Middle-class father's major duty was to make sure that the economic needs of his family was satisfactorily provided. Therefore, he had to

work outside the house because unlike his social superiors (the upper class), he had to work in order to earn money. As for the children, sons were expected to find a good job in order to maintain or improve his living standards, and daughters were required to dress and behave nicely and "to develop accomplishments that were valued without being readily marketable, such "fancy work" or embroidery … and accompanying themselves on the piano or harp, instruments that Victorian culture regarded as well suited to female performers because one could look graceful while playing them" (Nelson 82).

Having better standards than the middle class, upper-class families had a more luxurious life. Although the father did not have to work and had more time to spare for his family, there was more distance between the upper-class family members. The wife had many people at her service for different purposes; nannies, nurses, maids, governesses, and so on. Therefore, she did not have to deal with their children either for physical care or for moral instruction; instead she only had to find the appropriate people to do such works. The husband's most important duty was to be a gentleman which meant that he should not need to work in order to earn money because "[a]t least theoretically, the money was already present, usually generated by rents received from the farmers who lived as tenants on the family land" (Nelson 28). Parents and children had their own space in the house and would only come together at certain decided hours and occasions. Children were subjected to busy educational studies; boys were generally sent to boarding schools at a certain age while girls continued their education at home with governesses. Therefore, parents had enough time for their own pleasures and social responsibilities (S. Mitchell 150).

Although the idealized Victorian family pattern was constructed upon middle-class family model, it was indeed the working-class parents who suffered most in order to provide for their family. Moreover, despite the limited time they had for themselves, it was again the working-class parents who spent more time with their children and form a closer bond both because they were physically closer as they lived in small houses and because they had to deal with the children themselves. They were in extremely poor conditions. The wife was all alone to do the "cooking, cleaning, washing and sometimes making the clothes, marketing, budgeting, and either

providing or (if she went out to work) arranging child care" (Nelson 16). The husband had to work long hours so he spent most of his time away from house. The children would sometimes have to look after themselves if the mother worked at a job. They did not have much chance to receive education especially after elementary school and they soon had to start working at an early age. Sally Mitchell draws attention to the hypocritical attitudes of Victorian society toward children and says: "Despite the difficult conditions of many children's lives, the sentimental idealization of childhood is a striking characteristic of Victorianism" (152).

Women did not have sufficient legal rights against their husbands. Such rights became a concern for people gradually in the second half of the nineteenth century. The Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 made it possible for divorced women to be able to possess estate and manage their own money. With the Married Woman's Property Act of 1882, they had the right to own property after marriage (Nelson 5-9). In the last quarter of the century, instead of political and legal concerns, feminist thinkers started to deal with "the formulation of new morality, a new code of behaviour and sexual ethics" (Cunningham 3). The established roles of women were reconsidered and put aside. This questioning gave rise to a new figure of female as the New Woman:

> Highly qualified women were emerging as a result of concessions wrung from the educational establishment and suitable work and social status had to be found for them … and the financial independence and personal fulfilment gained through work began to seem attractive alternatives to marriage. It was pointed out that women were likely to remain the weaker sex as long as they were encased in whalebone and confined their physical activity to the decorous movements of the ballroom. (Cunningham 1-2)

The emergence of the New Woman did not surely happen overnight. It was indeed signalled with the discussions of 'woman question'. However, these newly described characteristics of women did not become successful enough to emancipate women from the formerly ascribed Victorian roles.

Education

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was not a unified education system in England. Indeed, there was almost no consensus concerning what was to be

taught at schools, in which ways and by whom these schools were to be funded, or even who was to be educated there. There were few elementary schools and they were mostly funded by charitable or religious organizations. Education was generalized, and classics and philosophy were regarded higher than science or economics (Black 431).

Arguments about the place of religious instruction at schools and the overall belief in parents' right to interfere with their child's education retarded adopting compulsory education in England (S. Mitchell 169-170). In 1851, the Parliament, having grasped the significance of "a literate and numerate workforce- as well as the value of schools to keep children off the streets and promote discipline", decided to spare money for schools and to take some control over the substance of education (S. Mitchell 173). Still, during almost the two-thirds of the century, education system in England did not receive the necessary attention and it was not centralized. For example, it was not until 1870s that the government took some actions in order to make elementary schools compulsory. With the 1870 act, compulsory education was partly introduced to the country by giving rights to local school boards of adopting compulsory attendance for children of certain age. It also necessitated that elementary schools should be available in all parts of the country (S. Mitchell 175). Moreover, after the act, the public pressure for a better education system increased and the problems of nonattendance started to diminish. As a result, in 1880, more severe actions were taken such as requiring the school boards to enforce compulsory education and subjecting parents to fines for keeping their children away from education (Hindman 50). In 1893, school leaving age was accepted as eleven, it was raised to twelve six years later, and finally in 1900 to fourteen which did not change for most of the twentieth century (Black 430).

There were two powerful incentives for education during the Victorian period; utilitarian and evangelical drives. Utilitarians regarded education as a way of accumulating knowledge for social advancement and justice while evangelicals saw it as a means of moral instruction (Black 431). Therefore, education system during that time was constructed around these concerns. Universities were imposing religious tests which began to be questioned in 1850s. The increasing scientific knowledge, religious controversies, and technological advancements made it a necessity to systemize

knowledge at universities. Therefore, universities decided to act more professionally. They took some formal actions in order to accomplish this. In *Victorian Age: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*, this process is summarized as follows:

> [U]niversities … were forced to become more professional, and one important function of the far-reaching university reforms set in motion in the middle of the nineteenth century was formally to dissociate academic success from religious orthodoxy. (The Oxford University Act of 1854 and Cambridge University Act of 1856 permitted nonconformists to enter without a religious test to take a BA degree and removed the obligation for fellows to take holy orders; religious tests were abolished altogether in 1871). (Guy 201)

The codification of education system in nineteenth century England was difficult and took time not only because of the religious contradictions but also because of different types of schools which were independent of a standard curriculum. The difference between schools derived from the fact that Victorian society was class-based and this social division played an important role in the type of education children received. Heyck affirms this discrimination in education:

> "[t]he vocabulary of class dominated assumptions about both a person's place in the social structure and the proper function of social institution. Education did not escape class-consideration; thus, the Victorians generally assumed that there should be different kinds and levels of schools, with different educational objectives, for each social class" (*A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture* 195).

For example, elementary schools were a means of cheap education for working class and lower middle-class children; even few of them were free. They were named differently according to the type of organization they were funded by such as "board school, district school, parish school, village school, voluntary school, national school" (S. Mitchell 169). There were also Sunday schools which were free and aimed to give education to children and adults so that they could read the Bible. Another means of free education was ragged schools which were funded by charities. They would also provide free meals and clothes. In short, people could receive elementary education cheaply or even freely. However, the quality of education at these schools was not good enough. Sally Mitchell states that "[v]ery little was taught except reading, writing, and arithmetic. The church societies required that a clergyman come into

school regularly for religious instruction, but teachers had almost no motivation to spend time on history, geography, science, or practical subjects (173).

The government tried to give some support in order to improve the conditions in elementary education. In 1830s, it spared some money for education for the first time. This money was granted to some charitable organizations to be spent for the construction of school buildings and the training of teachers. Another government support was provided in 1862 with a system in which schools that are in need of funding "were visited by a government inspector … Children who passed the inspector's examination moved up to a higher standard – and the size of the school's grant (as well as the teacher's salary) depended on the number of children who passed" (S. Mitchell 173).

It was costlier to get a secondary education and people who were rich enough to meet the expenses would either hire governesses to educate their children at home or send them to private or public schools. Private schools were generally owned and run by a single person and gave different kinds of education depending on that person's choices. Public schools provided a better education and were more expensive than private schools because they were not run by a single person, instead they were managed by a group of people and "had a degree of oversight as well as continuity and tradition" (S. Mitchell 170). Greek, Latin and religion were at the core of traditional curriculum of these schools because being competent in Greek or Latin, and having a satisfactory level of religious knowledge were the hallmarks of a gentleman. However, towards the end of the nineteenth century, as other classes than the landed started to demand secondary education with the aim of social advancement, courses that improve practical skills also became a part of the curriculum. As a result, "[s]cience, history, English literature, and modern foreign languages were added during the 1880s as an army or modern curriculum" (S. Mitchell 179). By the end of the century, it became a necessity for the government to make secondary education more available for people of lower classes and the Parliament passed the 1902 Education Act which "required local education authorities to provide secondary schools throughout the country" (S. Mitchell 181).

As for university education, it was presumably restricted to a small group of people concerning both class and religious issues. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Oxford and Cambridge were the only universities in England. The education these universities gave was far from providing practical skills in a developing modern world and therefore only those who do not need to work after getting a degree would go to university, so university education was only appealing to the upper classes. Moreover, they were accepting only Anglicans. Although these two were worldwide prestigious universities, the handicap they faced in the nineteenth century is expressed by Vernon as follows:

> From the sixteenth century, their significance rested in their connections with the national Church of England and the Protestant state, maintaining a bulwark where the tenets of Anglicanism were preserved and transmitted, ensuring that the future religious, social and political leaders of the nation could be relied upon to serve the state and defend the faith. By the early nineteenth century, however, this Reformation view of their function had fossilised, leaving the universities removed from the rapidly changing social and political make-up of the nation and the currents of modern life. Moreover, although possessed of great wealth, Oxford and Cambridge had ceased to yield much worthwhile educational return. Thus, the English universities no longer either reflected or served the nation and reformers pressed for them to embrace the new condition of England. (9)

As the above quotation makes it clear, higher education needed to keep up with the changing circumstances both in scientific knowledge and technological advancements. In 1826, University of London was established. It took important steps in these respects and "developed new subjects relevant to a modern urban society, removed the requirement of residence, even of attendance, and eventually, admitted women to degrees" (Vernon 52). It did not apply religious tests for the students or the professors. Moreover, the Non-conformists had the chance of a university education in England for the first time. Therefore, it made possible a university education to "those who were actively excluded from Oxbridge on religious grounds, were too poor to meet the costs of collegiate education, or who wanted a curriculum more relevant to modern urban life" (Vernon 52-3).

With the purpose of consolidating and modernising the education given at Oxbridge, a state intervention took place despite the fact that these two universities

were economically independent from the state. In 1850, the first Royal Commission was launched upon the petition of former Oxbridge graduates in order to "enquire the best ways of reforming Oxford and Cambridge" (Neild 84). The commission failed to make a radical change. Still, the government continued the attempts to improve Oxbridge with The Oxford University Act of 1854, Cambridge University Act of 1856 and another act in 1871 to remove the remaining religious restrictions. It also gathered the second Royal Commission in 1872 which clearly displayed the strong contradictory opinions about reforms among the Cambridge scholars divided as radicals and conservatives. These interventions were not mere attempts at educational betterment, they also prove that "the state was crucial in the development of the English universities and was actively shaping the configuration of the universities from the middle of the nineteenth century" (Vernon 7).

As for women, education was generally felt to be unnecessary for them as they need not to survive in public life; they belonged to domestic life. In *A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture*, Heyck explains the common Victorian view about women's receiving education: "women were not suited by temperament or intellect either for the clergy or for public life, and that they were not capable of the sustained, rigorous work required by the university studies … advanced education would spoil women's cherished innocence and nurturing instincts" (198). Therefore, the process for them to be able to attend universities took a long time. They were only accepted to universities in the last third of the century, but even then, they were not granted degrees at Oxford and Cambridge before 1920 (Bogen 14).

Post-War England till Thatcher Years (1945 – 1979)

There is a century between the Victorian and the Thatcher era so many things have changed in this course of time. However, as it is a very long process, it would be unnecessarily long to recount what happened between all these years. Therefore, the years after the Second World War till Thatcher became the prime minister are going to be briefly mentioned in this part. By summarizing the social and political circumstances in England just before Thatcher came to power, the study aims to provide a clear picture of Thatcher's influence on the country; how things were before her, and how they changed when she became the first woman prime minister of the

country. By this means, it will be easier to discern what changes she brought to the country and how Thatcherite ideology worked in the society.

After the war, in 1945, the Labour Party won the general elections and gradually established a well-fare state system which was a natural result of the growing demands for social democracy during the war years. In order to achieve this goal, the government made serious initiations: many institutions were nationalized; free health care was provided for the people; national insurance system and public housing schemes were introduced; child allowances were given. The well-fare state system continued to exist even after the government changed and was not abandoned until the Thatcher government came to power in 1979. All these practices bore fruit: "most working-class people, the vast majority of the population, viewed the years since 1945 as much the best that had been generally known since the late-Victorian heyday. Wages rose to 30 per cent above their 1938 level. There were higher living standards, guaranteed employment, and more satisfying environmental and educational facilities" (Morgan 64).

In the post-war Britain, education system was also regulated in accordance with the well-fare system: "[f]rom the 1940s to the 1970s, education policy was largely based on a liberal democratic consensus that governments should regulate and resource education to achieve more social justice and provide equal opportunity" (Tomlinson 26). Therefore, class was no longer a determining factor in order to receive education and even if it was slow a comprehensive system in education was achieved in the 1960s and 1970s. Moreover, in 1960s, academic research gained great importance and received much more support from both the government and other organisations (Stewart 150).

Transformations in society, starting especially after the Second World War, such as the fading away of religion, the changes in the structure of middle class, the growing power of feminist discourses which questioned the traditional role of women influenced the way people regarded sexuality and the institution of family. In addition to these factors, in the 1960s, there was a rise in consumer society and many forms of culture. Books, films, magazines filled with striking sexual themes reached a wider section of society through television sets which became available in millions of

people's houses. All these developments made it inevitable for the government (indeed both Conservative and Labour parties) to make some legislations in order to enhance the moral liberty of people. In the legislations, they changed the "measures on the death penalty, suicide and gambling … the law on obscenity so that material would be judged as a whole and could be defended on the grounds that it contributed to the public good" (Durham 7). These reforms also included "the ending of theatre censorship, a second Obscenity Act and legislation concerning family planning, divorce and the death penalty … legislation … on prostitution … the liberalisation of abortion and the decriminalisation of homosexual acts between adults in private" (Durham 7-8). All these reforms made the 1960s to be known as 'the permissive society'.

The rising living standards, the increasing number of educated people and the prevalence of television were remarkable during these years. As a result, pre-marital sex came to be regarded as acceptable; using contraceptives became prevalent; the procedures for divorce became easier and cheaper; homosexuality and abortion were no longer illegal. These changes were perceptible in all forms of art, as well. For example, there was a relaxation of censorships in literature, theatre or cinema. All these developments may reflect a change in public opinion but this does not mean that the majority of people in Britain were living against the traditional family patterns in these years. However, the Thatcherite discourse changed the way people remember the 1960s. After Thatcherism, these years began to be associated only with perverse sexuality.

The 1970s came with some severe economic problems: "The oil crisis, the return of mass unemployment and worsening industrial relations are typical fare on the menu of the 1970s" (Clapson 8). The deteriorated economic conditions in the country made ground for Thatcher's rise towards the end of the decade. She successfully established a powerful discourse and created an illusion that all these problems would have been solved if Britain was to return to Victorian values. In forming this perception, she attacked the 1960s' society. Tony Williams expresses this as follows:

> One of the chief platforms of Thatcherism was an assault on the 1960s phenomenon of the 'permissive society', especially on one-parent families and gay men and lesbians. This resulted in ideological re-

emphasis on the traditional family unit. Despite increasing cuts on welfare and family allowances, Thatcherite discourses led to successful attacks on feminists, gay men and lesbians, minorities and single-parent families, resulting in the increasing isolation of all those outside the family norm. (245)

Therefore, it was not only Victorian values but also the permissiveness of the 1960s that gained a new perspective with the re-evaluation of Thatcherism. Victorian values started to sound like sacred values; they were associated with everything good, while the 1960s society became a target for harsh criticisms and gained negative connotations.

Thatcherite England

Margaret Thatcher, known also as the iron lady, has left a mark on British politics since she became the first woman Prime Minister in Britain between 1979 and 1990. Thatcher was born in Grantham, Lincolnshire in 1925 to a lower-middle-class family. She went to a grammar school after which she, supported by a scholarship, attended Oxford University to study Natural Sciences. She worked as a chemist for a while, yet she finally became a lawyer after being successful in bar finals. Finally, she went into politics serving the government in different positions for years before she became the leader of the Conservatives in 1975 (Gillespie 291). She won three general elections in a row and became the longest-serving prime minister in Britain. Evans refers to her impact on politics below:

> [S]he exercised the most profound effect on the structure and social composition of the Conservative Party … Her influences on the Labour Party was scarcely less substantial. 'New Labour', it might be argued, was the logical response to Thatcherite hegemony in the 1980s. Thatcher also profoundly altered the nature and orientation of the governmental machine. She required a fundamental reappraisal of the role and loyalties of the civil service, which, like most professional structures, she was determined to turn upside down. (1-2)

She was such an influential figure that her political ideas were called Thatcherism which was regarded by some as an ideology. To illustrate, Collette and Laybourn state that "Thatcher gave her name to an ideology, Thatcherism, which stood for a limited but firm government, the rolling back of the welfare state, the end of consensus politics, and a staunchly anti-European and independent attitude on many vital issues"

(5). However, it is disputable to consider Thatcherism as an ideology because it does not present original ideas or does not give a new and different perspective on anything. Still, even if it is not like the well-established ideologies such as Marxism or Liberalism, it is an undeniable fact that Thatcherism also created a significant degree of repercussion. Letwin confirms this claim by stating: "But if Thatcherism is nothing like an 'ideology', it does produce a similar impression of movement, direction, and purpose" (31). Evans also maintains that although Thatcherism may not be a coherent ideology, it still consists of a set of related political approaches; he even compares it to Bolshevism in its initial strength (146). He summarizes Thatcherism as follows:

> Thatcher had no difficulty identifying what she was against: state interference with individual freedom; state initiatives that encourage an ethos of 'dependency'; woolly consensuality; high levels of taxation; the propensity of both organised labour and entrenched professional interests to distort market forces; and a reluctance to be 'pushed around', either personally or as a nation-state. In one sense, being 'against' all of these implies that their obvious antitheses will guide policy; individual rights; private enterprise within a free market; firm, perhaps authoritarian, leadership; low levels of personal taxation; union and vested interest bashing; simple patriotism. (3)

As the above quotation confirms, Thatcherism was formed through considering what Thatcher was against and which policies and values she tried to promote. Her most influential strategy which helped her to strengthen her power was her false commitment to Victorian values and life style. By this reference to Victorian period, she indeed intended to instil in people's minds that reviving those Victorian values would bring back the glamorous days of the British Empire. However, she displayed many paradoxes in her attitude and was often criticised for that. Kate Mitchell draws attention to some of her contradictions: "While praising the Victorians and advocating a return to 'their' values, she attacked such Victorian establishments as the public service ethic, the Universities, the Bar, the House of Lords and the Church of England, and she deregulated the City of London" (51). Mitchell concludes that Thatcher's adherence to these values are no more than "a political ploy that enabled her to appear to be protecting stability and tradition when in fact she sought change, transformation and the new" (51). Thatcher was quite selective and dubious in her reference to Victorianism. She focused on the Puritan work ethic, family values, and parental authority, and she easily disregarded the values, such as charity or government

paternalism, which contradicted her aims. In his article, Raphael Samuel evaluates her attitude in her insistence on Victorian values as follows:

> Victorian Values were similarly double-coded, a programme for the future disguised as a narrative about the past. The watchwords may have been conservative, but they were used for subversive ends, to destabilise established authority; to mobilise resentment against the status quo; to give historical precedent to what was essentially a new turn. She could thus appear simultaneously as a fierce iconoclast and a dedicated restorationist, an avatar of the future, pointing the way forward, and a voice from the past, calling on the British people to return to its traditional ways. (24)

Although Thatcher was criticized fiercely by many, still she continued to be influential even after her death. Pilcher and Wagg state that "[d]espite the departure of Margaret Thatcher in 1990, few would dispute the continued reverberation of Thatcherism as an identifiable cluster of arguments and assumptions in British political culture in the 1990s" (3). Her long-lasting influence is undoubtedly derived from the fact that ideologies within the body of Thatcherism were carefully embedded in social institutions throughout her leadership. In the following part, the social institutions of class, family and education in 1980s Britain are discussed extensively.

Class

In 1980s Britain, the concept of class, in its prior context, lost its significance due to Thatcherite economic policy. Coming from a lower-middle-class family, Thatcher declared her antagonism towards the concept of class at every opportunity. Her insistence on individualism, hard work and self-reliance, and her appreciation of self-made man also make a reference to her stance against inherited titles and wealth. In one of her speeches she even blamed Communism to be responsible for the existence of the concept of class. She expressed her hostility against the notion of class as follows:

> It [class] groups people as bundles and sets them against one another. I remember practically exploding when I heard some Americans talking about "the underclass," as if they weren't individuals with feelings. Each one is entitled to his own dignity, to develop his talents and abilities. Underclass? Socialist claptrap! That's why I began by talking about liberty. The more you talk about class – or even about

"classlessness" – the more you fix the idea in people's minds.
(Thatcher, "Don't Undo My Work" 131)

Thatcher's identifying class as a communist concept was indeed one of her strategies to encourage individualism in society (Mullen 232). Hence, by means of associating class with communism, she created a kind of antagonism toward this concept which had been a determining element in the social structure of Victorian times.

There was a change in class system in society during Thatcher's rule but this was not about a decay of this distinction; it was more about a change in the concept of class. Mullen explains this transformation by stating that "Thatcherism's focus upon the individual constituted a new class identity which disrupted traditional models of social class: men and women of this description had become economically middle-class, but they remained culturally working-class" (232). He means that even if some lower-class people (most of them were middle class and few of them were working class) had the chance to improve their economic situation to an extent by means of entrepreneurship, in terms of education and self-improvement, they remained ignorant. This derived from the fact that money became much more important than previously highly regarded education and manners.

Although Thatcher's discourse was based on a classless society, her policies indeed made the class distinction more discernible by increasing the gap between the working class and the upper classes. She tried to diminish the responsibility of the government in order to cut down on expenses. Walsh et al. focus on this aspect of her governments and state: "Thatcher governments were based on what the state wouldn't and shouldn't do. It was felt that the state had gone too far in providing welfare and was, in fact, creating 'welfare dependency'" (52). Therefore, in order to save money on such welfare expenses, she made a radical departure from the welfare state system. This policy in economy influenced mostly the working- class people and naturally deteriorated their economic situation while indirectly contributed to the well-being of middle-class people. Duff refers to this outcome by stating that Thatcherite policies in economy were criticized for that they "created an exclusive economic opportunity for wealthy individuals and the upper middle classes at the expense of marginalized identities including gay, lower class, immigrant and the unemployed" (183). As a

result, in contrast to Thatcher's claims about eradicating class in society, the gap between the classes increased during her governments.

Although Thatcher's constant claim was on creating a classless society, her policies served the purpose of enriching and enlarging the new middle-class people who were ideally conservative, religious and self-sufficient. Her ideal middle class constituted a clear contrast to its ideal Victorian counterpart who were supposed to be progressive, educated and charitable. Gunn draws attention to her government's attitude in this respect: "When the Thatcher government came to power in 1979, it quickly set about sweeping away the privileges of professional groups such as doctors, civil servants, and academics. The middle class was to be saved by being recast in the image of the enterprise culture and the private sector" (64). Therefore, in the 1980s, the middle-class sector mostly consisted of business enterprisers who were mostly lowly educated and culturally ignorant. Indeed, the clash between the 'knowledge class' and the 'business class' was a central issue during this decade. It even became one of the major themes of the novels of the 1980s; most of them satirized these class and money versus education discussions (Martin 113). Lodge's *Nice Work*, Amis's *Money* or Drabble's *The Radiant Way* all set good examples for such novels.

Family

When Thatcher came into power in 1979, the influences of the permissive society of 1960s were not totally erased from the society and there were serious economic and political problems in the country. Therefore, she established her discourse on an attack on the 1960s' society and what it represented and she designated the permissiveness of the society as the cause of all the problems in the country. Her promise to bring back the old Victorian values which were centred round the traditional form of family provided the society with a hope of returning to those glorious days of the British Empire by holding onto those values especially onto family. Kate Mitchell verifies Thatcher's intention in doing so and states that: "Thatcher used the term 'Victorian values' as a message against which to identify the social ills of her milieu – a regulated economy, welfare dependency and the decline of the family – and to advocate a return to laissez-faire economics, to a reliance upon individual charity and to strong family discipline" (48). In an interview in *Women's*

Own in 1987, Thatcher even denied the existence of society and claimed that there are only men, women and families. By this means, she tried to establish individualism and to destroy the demand for a welfare state in people's minds because then people would have to rely on themselves and their families to satisfy their demands rather than to expect help from the state. Therefore, her insistence on holding onto traditional Victorian family structure was directly related to capitalism. Morgan also confirms this relationship: "the patriarchal, heterosexual, nuclear family is … a handmaiden of capitalism. It is the site where the labour force is reproduced, both biologically and socially, and provides the setting for the unpaid domestic work and caring of women which keeps the cost of servicing today's and tomorrow's workers low" (82).

Thatcher's understanding of family was constituted by traditional forms of it or, to put it more accurately, a typical middle-class Victorian family. Kate Mitchell confirms Thatcher's focus on family by stating that "Thatcher's invocation of the Victorian era centred upon her particular re-creation of the Victorian family, with the heterosexual marriage relationship as the permissible locus for sexual activity" (48). She further argues that Thatcher's policies aimed to establish binary oppositions in terms of normalcy of family forms in order to strengthen the traditional forms of it. Therefore, in contrast to what was done in the 1960s, Thatcher's governments made legislations in order to encourage 'normal' family patterns. For example, through the Clause 28 of the Local Government Act (1986), they aimed to discourage homosexual relationships (K. Mitchell 48). Family was pivotal in their policy. Nick Frost states that, in 1983, *the Guardian* published some state papers which were related to the family policy of the state. He concludes from these paper that "the idea of family was central to government policy. All policies were to be assessed in terms of their impact on families" (323). Therefore, he provides an official proof concerning the interference of the government into the institution of family.

The ideal family that was intended to be encouraged during Thatcherite period was the patriarchal nuclear family in which the mother belonged to the kitchen; the father was considered to be the provider and children had to be submissive to their parents. Different patterns were regarded as a subversion by Thatcher governments. The above-mentioned Local Act is a clear illustration of this understanding as it

targeted 'pretended family relationships'. Nick Frost expresses his view on how Thatcherite social policies regarded different family patterns: "Single parent families are seen as a cause of poor results in school, vandalism, football hooliganism, to name just a few social problems, and pose a threat to the 'health of society'" (325). Apparently, during Thatcher's rule, alternative family patterns such as homosexual couples or single parents were considered to pose a threat to society or in fact to the governmental authority.

In spite of the powerful feminist discourse spread all around the country especially during the 1960s and the woman prime minister of the country, there was a return to the traditional role of the woman in the family. Women were again considered only in their roles in family as the caretaker of other family members. Beers draws attention to Thatcher's attitude toward the role of women and points out that "it's important to emphasise the extent to which Thatcher perceived the family in distinctively gendered terms: as the primary sphere in which women's lives achieved value and purpose" (119). This return to Victorian 'angel in the house' role of woman, as explained beforehand, served the purpose of capitalism well.

Children, in this traditional family pattern, were kept under surveillance. This surveillance was aimed to be accomplished first through the institution of family; that is by parents, and at a later stage through schools and the education system. Although during Thatcher's rule, attempts were made to extend children's rights through some legislations, it was mainly theoretical and deceptive. The acts passed by the government concerning this matter were more about children's being protected but not about their rights to make their own decisions. It was mostly their parents or more accurately the government who made the decisions concerning the future of children. Winter and Connolly evaluate the influence of these acts as follows:

> [C]hildren's rights amount to little more than their right to remain within the confines of their family, wherever possible, and to express an opinion on their future. However, … these opinions are largely confined to social services' intervention and are not meant to facilitate children's criticisms of the ways in which their parents care for them. Furthermore, given the continued dominance of these traditional models of childhood, the views which children do express are open to very loose interpretation and can easily be dismissed as being socially naive. (41)

As the above quotation makes it clear, there were serious problems with the acts which were passed with a pretended aim of enhancing children's rights. Both the acts they passed and their general attitude toward children in different spheres such as family, education, and society caused Thatcher's governments to receive severe criticisms from several different perspectives. For example, Oppenheim and Lister criticize the acts: "The Social Security Act rejigged priorities, but did nothing more than churn the incomes of the poorest. The Child Support Act was not about tackling child poverty among lone parents, but about reinforcing parental responsibility and clawing back money for the Treasury" (130). Therefore, the acts did not serve their pretended original purpose.

Another problem in Thatcher's governments' child policy was that they tried to impose a view of children as asexual creatures. Hence, their policy about children was based on protecting them via withholding sexual knowledge. This effort caused children to remain unaware of sexuality and hampered their process of sexual maturation. There was sex education at schools but how it was given depended on the school administrators and also in 1980s new regulations were made to empower the parents with the right to exclude their children from this education. The Act of 1986, complying with Thatcherism, ensured that sex education at schools encouraged morality along with traditional family patterns and values. Haydon criticized that "[c]ircular 11/87 defined a moral framework for sex education. 'Facts' were expected to be presented objectively enabling pupils to understand different sexual attitudes and behaviours; know what was legal; consider their own attitudes; make informed, responsible decisions about personal attitudes at school and in adulthood" (183). Moreover, leaving children ignorant in such matters made them more vulnerable to sexual abuses.

In contrast to the above-explained hegemonic intentions, the number of pre-marital cohabitations, divorces, and single-parent families were on the rise in the 1980s. Therefore, this rise in subversive family patterns in Thatcherite England may be interpreted as the failure of Thatcherite hegemony not in theory maybe, as it reshaped most of the social institutions but in practice. In addition to the existing alternative family structures in the 1980s society, there was another challenge to

hegemony through subversiveness in patriarchal family patterns. Berry and Foyster confirm the deviancy from patriarchal authority by referring to some family studies made in the 1980s. They claim that "[f]ar from being passive subordinates, some women developed strategies to modify or resist patriarchal authority, including marshalling support through friends, neighbours and kin to circumvent their putative subordination to their husbands" (3). These subversive family patterns were also reflected in the novels written or set in 1980s England such as Drabble's *The Radiant Way*, Swift's *Waterland*, Hollinghurst's *The Line of Beauty*.

Education

When Thatcher came into power in 1979, the education system was mostly in parallel with the regulations put down by the 1944 Education Act. According to this act, education was provided at these levels; primary, secondary, and further (university education). Primary and secondary schools were free. Secondary education was given in three different types of schools: grammar schools based on academic training; technical schools based on practical instruction, and modern secondary schools which provided a poor education. Children were expected to take an exam at the age of eleven which was called the 11 Plus Exam and the ones who passed the exam were accepted to grammar schools while the rest were sent to modern secondary schools (Moore 250). Starting from 1965, though, schools of secondary education were gradually united under the name of comprehensive schools which tried to use the curriculum of grammar schools and give a wider range of study fields. Although with all these reforms it was aimed to achieve equality in educational opportunities, they were not enough to eradicate the class distinctions in society. So, money continued to play an important role in the kind of education people received.

In public interviews, Thatcher's discourse on education was based on removing the class inequalities in education. However, since her main concern was about cutting down on welfare benefits as much as possible, the reforms her governments made tightened the noose in this respect. Her actual aims in education were indeed "to change the school system from a public service into a market, and to transfer power from local authorities to central government" (Graham-Matheson 20). In compliance with these objectives, Thatcher and her governments adopted a strictly tight fiscal

policy in education. It was to such an extent that Britain spared less money on education than many other states. 1980s education policy necessitated many cut-backs in the educational sector. Schools were required to make their own budgets with the little money they were funded with and were expected to deal with the expenses themselves. This situation inevitably caused problems at schools and influenced the quality of education (Böttcher 4-5).

The cut-backs in education were also made on certain specific study fields such as arts which were regarded in Thatcherite ideology as not very important. In spite of this hegemonic tendency to disregard arts, the 1980s witnessed an impressive success of cultural productions. Evans remarks this stunning achievement of arts in this period: "British opera and British film were two cultural forms that attracted worldwide critical admiration in the 1980s. Artistic managers discovered unsuspected entrepreneurial and marketing talents of managers … attracted unprecedentedly large numbers to the commercial musical theatre" (141). There was also a boom in the production of books and magazines in these years (English 172). This contrasting situation may be taken as a reaction to the government policy.

Thatcher's education policies created an antagonism between her and some universities. She did not respect professors and the values they represented in academic spheres. What is more, she made an eighteen per cent cut in universities' budgets over three years. The tension was so serious that Oxford University "refused her an honorary degree in 1985, arguing that her education policies were doing 'deep and systematic damage to the whole public education system in Britain'" (Evans 141). Her expansion policy in higher education ended up with a rise in the number of students at universities but not in the quality of education along with causing economic problems because universities were not financially supported enough by the government to keep up with this expansion rate. Evans touches upon the consequences of this policy by stating: "Universities became more productive but hardly better. Students were taught in larger classes and scrabbled for library books whose number did not increase pro rata; they had less personal contact with tutors whose research and administrative performance, as well as their teaching skills, were now being measured" (142). Although the evaluation of tutors' performances might be considered a progressive

incentive, it was criticized by higher education leaders for it put political pressure on academics (Brennan and Williams 484).

Thatcher's governments considered some subjects to be more important than others and organised not only the state budget for education in accordance with this priority but also the education curriculum. Initially with the 1986 Act, they diminished the influence of the local educational authorities (LEAs). Later with the 1988 Education Reform Act, also known as the 'Baker Act', they transferred all the power of LEAs into the hands of the Secretary of State and prepared a central curriculum. Wagg summarizes the reforms introduced by the act as follows:

> The main provisions of the act are well known: a national curriculum of ten compulsory subjects, arranged around a core of three – English, maths and science; the provision for state schools to 'opt out' of local authority control and instead become maintained by direct government grant; 'open enrolment', giving schools the right to admit, and by implication to reject, as many pupils as they pleased; and the submission of children to regular tests, the results of which must be made public. (18)

Although it seems that the schools gained a certain degree of freedom through the act, it was totally deceptive because they were kept under strict surveillance of assessment councils. The act also brought new rules about religious instruction and collective worship. Therefore, national education system, as an ideological apparatus, played a part to establish Thatcherism through this act because the act brought both centralisation and conservatism to education. Through such acts Thatcher also kept the content of education under her strict control. For example, she even determined what was to be taught in history classes (Middleton and Woods 148).

Another important education policy in the 1980s was to establish the rhetorical discourse on 'parent power' in education. Students were regarded as passive receivers and their parents as active consumers who had to choose the best school for their children. Therefore, education was not intended to be student-centred; rather the ideal was to make it appealing to the parents. Children were thought too immature to decide for themselves so it was regarded as parents' duty to make decisions for their children. Despite the fact that 'parent power' seems to be central to 1980s education system, in practice parents were not given any opportunity to express their views on the

implementation of these reforms in education. Wagg confirms that "[t]he term 'parent power', so often the ideological sound and fury surrounding the 1988 Act, seldom carried much conviction outside the government and its more ardent supporters and advisors" (19).

In conclusion, 1980s education system was constituted with a Thatcherite agenda which established the central authority of the government and a conservative curriculum. With neo-liberal incentives, privatisation was extended to education. Although the number of people educated at universities increased, the quality of education became poorer and because of the cut-backs in education, many people in the education sector lost their jobs. Moreover, the aim of progressivism in education left its place to conservatism.

CHAPTER TWO

2. Dissidence in the Victorian Canon: *Hard Times* and *North and South*

Hard Times

Dickens wrote *Hard Times* upon an investigation about the living conditions in Preston, a manufacturing town in Lancashire during a strike (Davis 8). *Hard Times* centres around the effects of industrialization in a fictional industrial city of England, Coketown. Mr. Gradgrind is a wealthy, retired merchant. His world is based upon utilitarian philosophy which disregards everything beyond facts. He owns a school and tries to educate not only his students at school but also his children, Louisa and Tom upon this principle. He lives with his wife and two children and also accepts Sissy Jupe, one of his students, to live in his house after the disappearance of her father. Sissy's mother died when she was little, and she was brought up by his father, a circus entertainer. Mr. Gradgrind tries to educate Sissy with his utilitarian view of education at his school but Sissy, with her rich imagination and sentimentality, fails to understand a logic based on pure facts.

Mr. Bounderby, a middle-class merchant who always boasts about being a self-made man, is a close friend of Mr. Gradgrind and shares his utilitarian view of the world. He pays great attention to Louisa, who is some twenty years younger than him, as she grows up and he proposes to her when she is old enough to get married. Not knowing how to respond to such a proposal, she asks her father what to do because she knows nothing about feelings. She is brought up with facts and is always told to stay away from sentimentalism and imagination; feelings are something she has no idea about. Her father explains the reasonability of her marriage to Mr. Bounderby and she gets married to him. However, time proves that it was a big mistake for her. She never becomes happy with Mr. Bounderby and falls in love with a young man, James Harthouse. Meanwhile, Mr. Bounderby turns out to be a liar: His self-made man stories are refuted by his mother. Louisa, on the other hand, struggles between her love and honour. In the end, leaving both Mr. Bounderby and Harthouse, she goes back to her father's house.

Tom grows up to be a selfish man. He gambles, loses a lot of money and gets into trouble. He, as a fugitive, runs away from the country with the help of his father, Sissy and Sleary, the owner of the circus where Sissy used to live with her father. While Louisa and Tom lose their prospects of being happy, Sissy manages to lead a happy life through establishing a family of her own in the future. Causing Tom and Louisa's failure in life by his ineffective utilitarian teachings, Mr. Gradgrind lives the rest of his life in regret.

North and South

North and South provides a microcosm of Victorian society through characters from different classes and backgrounds. The story starts with a transition for Margaret, the heroine, who leaves her comfortable life in London behind and starts a new life in a small town which has been alien to her. As a child, she had to leave her parents and her hometown to live with her wealthy aunt but when her cousin gets married and leaves the house, she, a teenager then, goes back to live with her parents. In spite of the great gap between her previous and current life, she never complains and feels at home immediately. However, as a result of her father's leaving his job as a clergyman and his desire to live in a totally different place from their hometown, the family is obliged to move to Milton, an industrial town. They all have great difficulty in getting accustomed to the different life style this industrial town forces upon them. Margaret loses both her mother and father there but throughout her time there she becomes aware of the different worlds of the Miltoners: both the workers' and the factory owners' worlds. Moreover, she falls in love with a factory owner, Mr. Thornton, whom she has at first detested because of the differences between their accustomed way of lives. After many hardships, the story ends with the union of these two lovers implying that people from different spheres of life may eliminate the boundaries between their worlds and understand each other through common sense.

One of the most striking themes in the novel is the contrasting differences between the *North and South* of England as it is discernible from the title. The advancements and their consequences did not appear all at once and spread through the country simultaneously. The transition was more gradual in southern parts compared to the northern parts. The widespread industrial development in the latter

accelerated this transition period while the first preserved its conventional structure for a longer period. The consequent difference between the north and the south is stated as "urbanization ... created dramatically expanding cities, predominantly in northern England that were wholly alien in their physical and social make-up to these still working on the land or in provincial towns" (Plunkett 4). The overall outcome of the developments was a transformation in terms of physical environment, social structure, values, attitudes, living conditions and religion. The extent of this transformation distinguished the north from the south: the south stood for the decaying Victorian norms while the north represented the changing dynamics of the age. The novel lays bare these differences in the best way upon Margaret and her parents' moving to industrial Milton from rural Helstone.

Class

Considering the social and economic circumstances of the time, it is not surprising that class is a common concern dealt with in all Victorian novels, including *Hard Times* and *North and South*, either consciously or unconsciously. However, this paper does not simply intend to study the evidences of the class distinction reflected in these novels. It argues that there are important subversive elements in the class structure represented in the novels.

Class used to determine how people behave, speak, and think. People were all supposed to live in accordance with their classes and it was very important to regard this class distinction both in personal and social spheres. Therefore, people who did not conform to the rules of their class and behaved against them were subversive in that society because, in this way, they posed a threat to the hegemony. Both *Hard Times* and *North and South* depict such characters who may easily draw the reader's attention in that they violate the social norms of their class. These characters challenge the generally accepted notions about a member of aristocracy or a member of middle class.

In *Hard Times*, Mrs. Sparsit is always reminded to be a 'born lady' whose ancestors have been well-known and highly regarded in high society. Mr. Bounderby, at every possible opportunity, addresses her upper-class origin and high connections. For example, when he was warning Stephen, a working-class man, about how he has

to speak in front of Mrs. Sparsit, he introduces her by saying: "Now you know, this good lady is a born lady, a high lady. You are not to suppose because she keeps my house for me, that she hasn't been very high up the tree—ah, up at the top of the tree!" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 71). He even despises Louisa comparing her to Mrs. Sparsit without giving her name and says to Mr. Gradgrind: "there are ladies—born ladies— belonging to families— Families! —who next to worship the ground I walk on … Whereas your daughter … is far from being a born lady". He goes further and humiliates Louisa acting on Mrs. Sparsit's words: "I say this, because highly connected females have been astonished to see the way in which your daughter has conducted herself, and to witness her insensibility. They have wondered how I have suffered it. And I wonder myself now, and I won't suffer it" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 225).

As the above paragraph makes it clear, Mr. Bounderby pays great respect to Mrs. Sparsit for her upper-class origins. However, she proves to be unworthy of this regard and behaves like a person from a lower class. There is no dignity in her actions: "She was a most wonderful woman for prowling about the house. How she got from story to story was a mystery beyond solution. A lady so decorous in herself, and so highly connected, was not to be suspected of dropping over the banisters or sliding down them" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 180). She, moreover, makes it her business to observe Louisa's every step, in order to find a fault in her and enjoy her failure in marriage and in life: "She erected in her mind a mighty Staircase, with a dark pit of shame and ruin at the bottom; and down those stairs, from day to day and hour to hour, she saw Louisa coming" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 188). The discrepancy between Mrs. Sparsit's upper-class origins and her actions display that there is a criticism of upper-class people. She embodies none of the defining upper-class characteristics of this status in the Victorian period such as dignity, kindness or charity. Her being depicted in a contrasting way to these values is a subversion of the class norms in an apparent way.

Another subversive element presented through Mrs. Sparsit is that although she has high social origins, she leads a life like a person from lower-middle class. Besides, she is in need of help from Mr. Bounderby, a merchant. Her maternal ancestors are the Powlers who are introduced in the novel as: "The better class of minds, however, did

not need to be informed that the Powlers were an ancient stock" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 45). She marries a member of the Scadgers who are also a very respected upper-class family. Her husband inherits a considerable amount of wealth but he spends it lavishly before he dies and leaves nothing to Mrs. Sparsit. So, she is obliged to work: "And here she was now, in her elderly days, with the Coriolanian style of nose and the dense black eyebrows which had captivated Sparsit, making Mr. Bounderby's tea as he took his breakfast" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 46). People from upper class did not usually descend the social scale. It was quite unprecedented for someone from such a high status to fall into such a desperate situation.

At a time when the new rising class of industrial bourgeoisie was recognised, but still was disdained by the upper class, it is challenging to present a former member of high society as a homeless 'declassed woman who has to earn her living by serving a merchant and live in his house. When he gets married, he offers a place in the apartments at the Bank to Mrs. Sparsit so she has to move out from his estate. She is worried about the suitability of the place to a high-born lady like herself and inquires: "if the position I shall assume at the Bank is one that I could occupy without descending lower in the social scale" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 102). Mr. Bounderby promises to provide her with enough means to lead a life as a lady: "You'll have your own private apartments … and your candles, and all the rest of it, and you'll have your maid to attend upon you … and you'll be what I take the liberty of considering precious comfortable" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 102). Bounderby keeps his promise and ensures that she has all these comforts. However, this lifestyle is not enough to make her a member of the upper class because it is provided by someone to whom she is not related. She, herself, summarizes her condition to Mr. Bounderby: "In yielding up my trust here, I shall not be freed from the necessity of eating the bread of dependence" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 102). Moreover, her facilities are not enough to an upper-class status, after all she is going to live in an apartment and she is no more than a dependant.

Her current social status makes Mrs. Sparsit a subversive element in the class structure because she no longer belongs to any class in the traditional sense; she embodies none of the necessities of any class any more. She is a transgressor of social order as she does not fit into any of the previously defined status. In "Heritage and the

market, regulation and desublimation", Sinfield states: "racism, like class prejudice, misogyny and homophobia, derives partly from a superstitious fear of contamination by the different" (257). As stated by Sinfield, people are afraid of difference; they regard it as a threat to order. In the same vein, people who do not conform to the social norms pose a threat to hegemony. Therefore, here, Mrs. Sparsit holds such a position which makes her a subversion in the class structure.

Sissy Jupe is another character whose status in society is also ambiguous. She used to belong to working class but being accepted by Mr. Gradgrind to his house changes the situation. She no longer lives in poor conditions, and she does not work at Gradgrind's estate in order to make a living. Although, at first, she is kept at a distance by the family, she later becomes like a member of the family. Therefore, she and Mrs. Sparsit are ironically brought to the same social level no matter what their origins are. Jupe is even in better circumstances than Mrs. Sparsit at the end of the novel as she is totally accepted by the Gradgrinds and builds a family of her own while Mrs. Sparsit is no longer welcomed by Mr. Bounderby and is left homeless looking for a new benefactor. Reversing their status in society is a daring attempt to change the class structure. Moreover, this change in their status does not derive from any personal endeavour or failure of these characters; their circumstances are determined out of their control and this implies that anyone may experience such a change in their status at any time. Therefore, the novel instils a sense of insecurity for the class structure.

The primary defining factor in social class was thought to be blood relation in Victorian times. In this sense, Sissy Jupe and Mrs. Sparsit offer a challenge to this hegemonic conception for the fact that Sissy finds a place in society through people whom she has no family bond while the latter still tries to find a place in the social ladder at the end of the novel although she has living relatives. Therefore, the role of blood connections in class structure is diminished in this way.

The way the novel presents the middle-class values offers another subversion to the class structure. Traditional Victorian values are made up of middle-class values which are mainly hard work, sexual morality, the idealization of family life, and individual responsibility. As an obvious representative of middle class, Mr. Bounderby boasts throughout the novel about how hard he worked and gained his wealth. He

always emphasizes his disadvantaged background: "I hadn't a shoe to my foot. As to a stocking, I didn't know such a thing by name. I passed the day in a ditch, and the night in a pigsty. That's the way I spent my tenth birthday. Not that a ditch was new to me, for I was born in a ditch" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 19-20). He is very proud of being a self-made man and explains how he achieved this at every possible opportunity in details. He tells Mrs. Gradgrind that his current situation is the product of his prior hard work. He dramatizes how he trained himself in very hard and pitiable conditions: "Josiah Bounderby of Coketown learnt his letters from the outsides of the shops, Mrs. Gradgrind, and was first able to tell the time upon a dial-plate, from studying the steeple clock of St. Giles's Church, London, under the direction of a drunken cripple, who was a convicted thief, and an incorrigible vagrant" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 21). However, upon the arrival of Bounderby's mother Mrs. Pegler, all these self-made man stories turn out to be fiction. It comes out that he has had a loving caring mother who has provided support to him in his childhood; he even had some formal education, if not much. Contrary to his claim of his being left by his mother, he had left his mother.

The truth about Bounderby and all the lies he tells degrade the afore-mentioned middle class values. He is a middle-class merchant and his life is based on stories he makes up. Highly regarded Victorian values of self-sufficiency and hard work are treated as though they were nothing more than a myth. There is also no trace of the Victorian idealization of family in the novel. Bounderby first leaves his mother and later separates from his wife. Therefore, the middle-class values are allusively mocked at a time when hegemonic ideology tries to promote them. This is a powerful subversion of middle-class values.

There are even more powerful subversions represented in *North and South.* The plot of the novel starts upon a radical decision; Margaret's father Mr. Hale, one of the main characters, decides to resign his post as a vicar. He says that he has not lost his faith in religion but that he has doubts concerning the authority of the Church. He even confesses his sympathy towards the dissenters: "'I have been reading to-day of the two thousand who were ejected from their churches … trying to steal some of their bravery; but it is of no use—no use—I cannot help feeling it acutely" (Gaskell 35-6). This quotation illustrates how the church deploys its ideology. Dollimore, in his

introduction to *Political Shakespeare*, explains how this process progresses. He states that first the people in power create a sense of feeling as if they were serving for the good of the society even though they are indeed looking out for their own interests and through this pretence they legitimate their claims. Legitimation gives their claims the status of 'natural law' (7). In the novel, it is obvious that the church has legitimated its ideology in this way and defined its own criteria of 'natural' or 'normal'. The truths or orders it enforces are the only legitimate ones, there is no other way for people, this is why Mr. Hale feels so uncomfortable about his doubts against the church and about his ungovernable sympathy towards the dissenters. He feels that he is committing a sin by questioning the church because it offers the natural law.

Dollimore goes on to explain how ideology tries to eliminate the dissidence: "Legitimation further works to efface the fact of social contradiction, dissent and struggle. Where these things present themselves unavoidably they are often demonised as attempts to subvert the social order" (7). As he suggests, the church demonises the dissenters by ejecting them from their churches because they pose a threat to the authority of the church. However, these dissenters are only referred in the novel once whereas Mr. Hale is one of the main characters. Moreover, they are dismissed from the church so they are in a way impoverished while Mr. Hale continues to be regarded as a man of religion in society in spite of his resignation. For example, when Higgins talks to Mr. Hale, he addresses him as a representative of religion. As a result, in the north where a new culture is forming, the authoritative figure of religion is the former vicar who has no trust in church. All these circumstances make Mr. Hale a more dangerous or a more powerful threat to the hegemony. The most respected group of middle-class people throughout the Victorian period was no doubt the clergymen because The Church of England was a great hegemonic power and the clergymen were an important instrument to substantiate the power of the church. Therefore, presenting a respected vicar as having doubts about the authority of the church and his resigning from his position for that, offers powerful subversion.

Mrs. Hale is aware of the consequences of her husband's decision and says to Margaret: "if your father leaves the Church, we shall not be admitted into society anywhere. It will be such a disgrace to us! Poor dear Sir John! It is well he is not alive

to see what your father has come to" (Gaskell 46). Mr. Hale also knows that it is going to be difficult for them to find a place in society as a dissenter. He wants to move to Milton, a fictive city in the north of England, because he thinks that religion has a smaller place in people's lives in an industrial city. He is right in his thought. He becomes less subversive in Milton because there seems to be many dissenters among working-class people. Moreover, the name of the town might be linked to the poet and the polemist John Milton. He was in fierce conflict with the Church of England and maintained that the state should not engage in religious affairs (Hostettler 98). Considering the revolutionary social structure of this fictive town, it is quite possible that Gaskell chose the name Milton on purpose. Therefore, the town is a subversive element not only because of its social structure but also because of its evocation of John Milton.

People in the north, because there is so much debate going on in the society about justice, equality and rights, are sceptical about religion. Thomas Heyck's claim in *A History of the Peoples of the British Isles* about religious doubt among working-class people in a way supports this generalisation. He states that working-class people are mostly non-believers "because they saw the churches and their teachings as instruments of social control" (313). It is easy to confirm this perception in the novel through Higgins. He expresses his doubts about religion to Mr. Hale whom he regards as a man of religion and claims that if Mr. Hale had been brought up there, he would not have so much faith. He acknowledges that he himself is not a knowledgeable man in these matters as he has to work hard all the time to earn a living but he states that there are wiser and better-learnt people who are religious only "for form's sake" and never care about religious matters; instead, they are only engaged in material gains and they search for ways of increasing their wealth. Higgins explains how religion works as an ideology: "If salvation, and life to come, and what not, was true – not in men's words, but in men's hearts' core – dun yo' not think they'd din us wi' it as they do wi' political 'conomy? They're mighty anxious to come round us wi' that piece o' wisdom; but t'other would be a great conversion, if it were true" (Gaskell 226). Higgins' questioning religion and supposedly religious people stands for the science versus religion debate of the time as he stresses that he only believes what he can see. Hence, through Higgins the established religion and the social order are questioned.

Therefore, in the novel, a working-class dissenter and a middle-class vicar share the same doubts and question the authority of the church and also the class structure. They are in this sense brought to the same level, for they have the same social concerns even though the first is an illiterate man. Yet, he has been able to come to this consciousness without the help of any formal education. Indeed, Higgins may even be considered a step above Mr. Hale as he says his thoughts out loud whereas Mr. Hale abstains from putting them into words.

In the novel, Helstone stands for the traditional Victorian society and its values whereas Milton represents the unavoidable change that is going to take place in every part of England as a result of industrialization. The social structures of the two towns differ greatly. Helstone society is made up of farmers, the clergyman (as a middle-class man) and landowners. Mrs. Thornton refers to southern parts as "aristocratic countries" (Gaskell 77). Hence, it constitutes a traditional Victorian society which provides no means to advance in social status. However, there is a hint that even the south cannot stay free from the growing effects of industrialization as a result of which trade became a means of increasing wealth. In the novel, Margaret and Mrs. Hale (her mother) talk about a family who became wealthy through trade. Still, it is apparent that such people are rare in the south and they are not highly regarded by the society. Margaret despises them when her mother brings their names into the discussion: "Are those the Gormons who made their fortunes in trade at Southampton? Oh! I'm glad we don't visit them. I don't like shoppy people. I think we are far better off, knowing only cottagers and labourers, and people without pretence" (Gaskell 19). She also praises educated people and people who work on land: "I like all people whose occupations have to do with land; I like soldiers and sailors, and the three learned professions, as they call them. I'm sure you don't want me to admire butchers and bakers, and candlestickmakers" (Gaskell 19). It is clear that the new professions occurred as a result of urbanization are rare in the south and they are not readily accepted by the people in the south.

The social structure in Milton is far removed from that of a conventional Victorian society is. In contrast to people in Helstone, Milton society holds a high opinion of manufacturers because here the society is made up of workers and

employers who mostly become rich through trade. Thanks to the dynamics in working life, the social stratification is not fixed in Milton. People are able to increase their wealth through working hard though it is not easy. For example, Mr. Thornton starts out as a worker but makes a considerable amount of wealth on his own and becomes a manufacturer in the end.

There is a newly rising social class; the working class in the north. They are not like the submissive farm workers or domestic servants in the south. For example, when Margaret reprimands Dixon, a house servant, the narrator says she admires Margaret because "Dixon, as do many others, liked to feel herself ruled by a powerful and decided nature" (Gaskell 49). However, factory workers are rebellious because they earn less than they deserve and cannot live on the money they receive. They work hard at factories to feed their families and still live in very bad conditions: they barely find bread in order not to starve. Moreover, they witness the extravagant way of life the factory owners lead and cannot accept this huge gap between the two classes. This gap between the employees and employers is strikingly put forth in the novel: on the one hand there are children starving to death, on the other hand there is an extravagance of wealth at dinner parties and wedding ceremonies. Therefore, the employees fight for their rights and establish Trade Unions through which they become more powerful when compared to the employers. Even the depiction of factory people coming out of factories makes it clear that the workers in the north are not weak unlike the ones in the south: "They came rushing along, with bold, fearless faces, and loud laughs and jests, particularly aimed at all those who appeared to be above them in rank or station. The tones of their unrestrained voices, and their carelessness of all common rules of street politeness, frightened Margaret a little at first" (Gaskell 71).

As the different conditions in *North and South* reveal, the dominant ideology concerning the class changes in Milton. Contrary to the containment theory, Greenblatt claims in "Invisible Bullets" that subversion may never be achieved as it is created and regulated by the authority itself. Milton, as a whole, may be regarded as a subversion which has achieved constructing its own reality or normality. The end of the novel also supports the success of subversion. The story ends with the union of Margaret and Mr. Thornton implying that people from different spheres of life may eliminate the

boundaries between their worlds and understand each other through common sense. Indeed, more than the union of the two lovers, the mutual understanding achieved between Higgins and Thornton is a more obvious example of subversion. The narrator explains the growing sympathy and understanding between the two as follows:

> And by-and-bye, he [Mr. Thornton] lost all sense of resentment in wonder how it was, or could be, that two men like himself and Higgins, living by the same trade, working in their different ways at the same object, could look upon each other's position and duties in so strangely different a way. And thence arose that intercourse, which though it might not have the effect of preventing all future clash of opinion and action, when the occasion arose, would, at any rate, enable both master and man to look upon each other with far more charity and sympathy, and bear with each other more patiently and kindly. Besides this improvement of feeling, both Mr. Thornton and his workmen found out their ignorance as to positive matters of fact, known heretofore to one side, but not to the other. (Gaskell 410)

In the novel, the chartist and the trade union movements fail but, in the long run, with the changing conditions and the pressing demands of the working class, the dominant ideology is subverted. As Dollimore suggests in his introduction to *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, "subordinate, marginal or dissident elements could appropriate dominant discourses and likewise transform them in the process" (12). This appropriation is achieved in the novel. By bringing the hands and the rulers together, the boundary between classes is eradicated. In the traditional class system, members of the classes are not expected to understand one another; they just do whatever they are expected to do without questioning. However, the reconciliation between Mr. Thornton and his workers manifests that the class system is subverted.

Family:

Hard Times seems to draw a traditional Victorian family structure and present an ordinary upper-middle-class family through the Gradgrinds. However, there are important subversions embodied in the family pattern in the novel. Mr. Bounderby and Louisa's marriage is an important subversion in this respect. The age gap between the spouses was very common in Victorian England because marriages mostly took place considering the social status rather than feelings. Therefore, even a huge age gap was

readily accepted and did not receive any criticism from the locals only if the man was older than the woman.

Mr. Bounderby is only one or two years younger than Louisa's father, still he has no hesitations concerning their suitability to each other while proposing to Louisa. Mr. Gradgrind makes a calculation about the reasonability of a marriage between the two when Louisa asks for his opinion. He tries to consider the 'facts of this case'. He compares their ages and tells that there is an age difference of about thirty years. He, then, asks if this age gap would be a problem in their marriage. He answers his own question by referring to some statistical date:

> In considering this question, it is not unimportant to take into account the statistics of marriage, so far as they have yet been obtained, in England and Wales. I find, on reference to the figures, that a large proportion of these marriages are contracted between parties of very unequal ages, and that the elder of these contracting parties is, in rather more than three-fourths of these instances, the bridegroom. It is remarkable as showing the wide prevalence of this law, that among the natives of the British possessions in India, also in a considerable part of China, and among the Calmucks of Tartary, the best means of computation yet furnished us by travellers, yield similar results. The disparity I have mentioned, therefore, almost ceases to be disparity, and (virtually) all but disappears. (Dickens, *Hard Times* 95)

As the above quotation confirms, Mr. Gradgrind approves of the marriage, as well, and it is understandable considering that a big age gap in marriages was prevalent at that time. Louisa and Bounderby's break-up in the end may seem like a simple criticism of such marriages. However, taking a closer look shows that there is more than a mere criticism of the age gap in marriages.

There is a perversity in the relationship between Mr. Bounderby and Louisa because it suggests paedophilia. Mr. Bounderby has known Louisa since she was a little girl. When he gets married to her, he says to Mrs. Sparsit: "I am this day married to Tom Gradgrind's daughter. I am very glad to be so. I have watched her bringing-up, and I believe she is worthy of me" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 104). He confesses that he has observed her as a child thinking of her as a prospective wife. In fact, he does not only observe her, he, at times, wants to interfere with Mr. Gradgrind's decisions about her. For example, when Mr. Gradgrind wants to take Sissy to their house, Mr.

Bounderby never approves of his decision and wants to deter him from doing it, thinking that "the little puss [Louisa] can get small good out of such companionship" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 47). He does not think of the advantage Sissy would get out of it. Upon hearing Mr. Bounderby's concerns about Louisa, Mrs. Sparsit says: "You are quite another father to Louisa, sir" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 47). However, Mr. Bounderby does not accept this saying: "If you had said I was another father to Tom— young Tom, I mean, not my friend Tom Gradgrind—you might have been nearer the mark. I am going to take young Tom into my office. Going to have him under my wing, ma'am" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 47). This proves that he has the intention of getting married to her even when she was a child.

When Mr. Bounderby warns and consoles Louisa and Thomas about their disgraceful behaviour (peeping at the circus), he treats them like a father and remarks: "It's all right now, Louisa: it's all right, young Thomas … you won't do so any more. I'll answer for it's being all over with father. Well, Louisa, that's worth a kiss, isn't it?" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 24). He then takes his kiss saying: "Always my pet; ain't you, Louisa?" (25). This scene offers Mr. Bounderby's perverse sexual interest in children especially when it is clear that he has never felt like a father towards Louisa. Even Louisa's reaction against this small kiss makes one suspicious about the innocence of the action. The narrator describes it as: "He went his way, but she stood on the same spot, rubbing the cheek he had kissed, with her handkerchief, until it was burning red. She was still doing this, five minutes afterwards". Her brother asks "[w]hat are you about, Loo? … You'll rub a hole in your face" and Louisa replies "[y]ou may cut the piece out with your penknife if you like, Tom. I wouldn't cry" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 25). All these details in Louisa's childhood seems to be perverse upon learning Mr. Bounderby's intention of getting married to her. His later intention proves that his earlier special interest in Louisa was not derived from a fatherly or a brotherly love towards a child.

Their marriage offers a 'faultline' story as Sinfield puts it. In *Cultural Politics: Queer Reading*, he explains that there are some controversial issues which are hard to prove with conditions of plausibility and are always open to dispute in all times: "These I call 'Faultline' stories. They address the awkward, unresolved issues; they

require most assiduous and continuous reworkings, they hinge upon a fundamental unresolved ideological complication that finds its way, willy-nilly, into texts" (4). In this respect, the marriage between Mr. Bounderby and Louisa brings up the issue of the big age gap in marriages which is the faultline story dealt with here. The novel displays a different perspective from the traditional Victorian attitude which readily accepts such a gap: it brings up the idea of paedophilia in its treatment of the issue. Therefore, their marriage is a subversion of a generally accepted inclination of the Victorian men getting married to much younger women than themselves.

There is another subversion presented through Louisa and Mr. Bounderby's marriage. The Victorian hegemonic ideology of marriage was that it should last for a lifetime. Divorce was regarded as a degradation and was strictly discouraged both through the pressures of the social circles and through official law procedures. For example, when Stephen wants to divorce his alcoholic wife, he comes to Bounderby and asks for his advice:

> I ha' read i' th' papers that great folk (fair faw 'em a'! I wishes 'em no hurt!) are not bonded together for better for worst so fast, but that they can be set free fro' their misfortnet marriages, an' marry ower agen. When they dunnot agree, for that their tempers is ill-sorted, they has rooms o' one kind an' another in their houses, above a bit, and they can live asunders. We fok ha' only one room, and we can't. When that won't do, they ha' gowd an' other cash, an' they can say "This for yo' an' that for me," an' they can go their separate ways. We can't. Spite o' all that, they can be set free for smaller wrongs than mine. So, I mun be ridden o' this woman, and I want t' know how? (Dickens, *Hard Times* 73)

Here, Stephen expresses the social injustice the poor are subjected to and beseeches Mr. Bounderby to think of a solution to his problem. However, Mr. Bounderby tells him that he needs a great deal of money in order to complete all the legal procedures to get a divorce. He, moreover, gives voice to the general Victorian attitude towards marriage by saying to Stephen: "You didn't take your wife for fast and for loose; but for better for worse" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 75). As it is clear, although Stephen explains the injustice in the society concerning the issue of divorce in a reasonable way, his claims are circumvented by the established ideology about marriage. This is an example of Althusserian concept of 'interpellation'. People are interpellated by the idea that marriage is for a lifetime and divorce is out of question. They have

internalized this idea to such an extent that they are unable to discern or question why things are different with the ruling class.

However, this same general view of the marriage is subverted when things go wrong in his own marriage and he hears the same things told to him by Mr. Gradgrind: "You have accepted a great charge of her [Louisa]; for better for worse, for—' (Dickens, *Hard Times* 226). At this point, the narrator reminds the reader of his conversation with Stephen: "Mr. Bounderby may have been annoyed by the repetition of his own words to Stephen Blackpool, but he cut the quotation short with an angry start" and Mr. Bounderby rebuffed Mr. Gradgrind: "I don't want to be told about that. I know what I took her for, as well as you do. Never you mind what I took her for; that's my look out" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 226). Hence, even if Mr. Bounderby does not want to accept, he himself cannot stay loyal to his own thoughts. He breaks up with Louisa and leads a bachelor's life. His failure in marriage, as a man of reason, suggests that anyone may experience marital problems and may want to separate. Therefore, divorce starts to sound like a more natural process which contradicts the hegemonic ideology of the time.

Alternative family structures offer another important subversion in *Hard Times*. Here, the reader witnesses that the ideal Victorian middle-class family (the Gradgrinds) falls apart because all the relationships within the family are problematic. Although Mr. Gradgrind tries hard to ensure the happiness of his family, he fails and all of the family members, including himself, are disappointed in the end. Thomas dies at a hospital as a runaway. Louisa never gets married and have children of her own. As for their little sister Jane, she is raised by Sissy and she and her father do not seem to have a real relationship, as Mr. Gradgrind is mostly away from home and is busy with his political duties. As a result, he fails as a father.

As for the husband-wife relationship between the Gradgrinds, there is no mutual affinity between them. They do not have any conversation about anything. It is hard to notice Mrs. Gradgrind in the novel; she hardly has a voice. When Louisa comes to visit her mother on her death bed, Mrs. Gradgrind forgets her own pains and wants to know how her daughter is: "I hope you are going on satisfactorily to yourself. It was all your father's doing. He set his heart upon it" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 185). It

seems that she has not approved the marriage in the first place. She has had no say in her daughter's marriage as in all other matters. She, then, wants her daughter to excuse her for her silence, saying: "You must remember, my dear, that whenever I have said anything, on any subject, I have never heard the last of it: and consequently, that I have long left off saying anything" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 186). Therefore, she has always been neglected and ignored as a wife. Just before her death, she realizes that something has been missing in their lives but she is unable to identify what it is: 'But there is something … that your father has missed, or forgotten, Louisa. I don't know what it is. I have often sat with Sissy near me, and thought about it. I shall never get its name now. But your father may. It makes me restless" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 186). Although they seem to have no marital problems and to represent an ideal Victorian couple, it turns out that this has been a deception both for them and for the reader.

The relationship between Louisa and Thomas is not as it should be between siblings. Receiving no affection from her mother, Louisa tries to make up this absence by showering Thomas with all the love and affection she herself needs. She indulges him with her unconditional love and unrestrained trust in him. However, Thomas does not seem to be worthy of her love as he selfishly tries to use her for his self-interest. As a result of his father's strictness, his mother's indifference and his sister's indulgence, Thomas turns out to be an irresponsible and selfish person. As for Jane, she is more like a stranger to Louisa and Thomas while it seems that it is Jane and Sissy who have formed such a bond. In conclusion, the unhappiness of the Gradgrinds illustrates the fall of the idealized Victorian family structure.

As opposed to the Victorian ideal family structure presented through the Gradgrinds, there is Sleary's circus which stands for the changing family structures. The ideal Victorian society or family is a self-serving one but Sleary's circus is an altruistic community which becomes a big family for its members. The scene when Sissy goes back there to ask for help for Thomas makes it clear that there is a familial bond between the members of the circus:

> These various changes, Mr. Sleary, very short of breath now, related with great heartiness, and with a wonderful kind of innocence, considering what a bleary and brandy-and-watery old veteran he was. Afterwards he brought in Josephine, and E. W. B. Childers … and the

Little Wonder of Scholastic Equitation, and in a word, all the company. Amazing creatures they were in Louisa's eyes, so white and pink of complexion, so scant of dress, and so demonstrative of leg; but it was very agreeable to see them crowding about Sissy, and very natural in Sissy to be unable to refrain from tears. (Dickens, *Hard Times* 259).

People in the circus do not have a blood relation but they are like a big family and they are happy in their own way. They even help Mr. Gradgrind in sending his fugitive son away. On the one hand, there is the ideal family whose members fail to help one another in the right way, and on the other, there is the despised community that manage to survive and support one another when necessary. Therefore, the circus is a powerful subversion which is a precursor of the changing family structures. Sissy in the Gradgrind family also provides such a subversion for she is neither related to the family by blood nor works for the family. She is accepted as a family member: "Since the time of her leaving home, Sissy had lived with the rest of the family on equal terms" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 185). Coming from a working-class family, she manages to fit into an upper-middle-class family.

In *North and South*, the patriarchal society of the time and the established gender roles are questioned and the oppression of women both in the domestic and in the public spheres is subverted through Margaret. She displays a very strong and sociable character unusual for the gender of her class. For example, when Mr. Hale is preparing to attend Mrs. Hale's funeral, he is overwhelmed with grief and does not want to attend it alone. He plans asking Mr. Thornton to accompany him at the funeral but Margaret pleads to go with him. Her father is startled and tells her that women do not generally attend funerals. However, Margaret is decided and replies her father by stating her difference from the rest of her gender: 'No: because they can't control themselves. Women of our class don't go, because they have no power over their emotions, and yet are ashamed of showing them. Poor women go, and don't care if they are seen overwhelmed with grief" (Gaskell 261). She assures her father that she will not be a problem if she goes. As it is clear, she is not like a woman of any class in the established sense; she is more like a man who is supposed to be strong enough to hide his feelings. Her ability to stay calm and her attempt to protect Mr. Thornton during the fierce riot in front of his house is another example of her unfeminine

character because it is generally men who are supposed to protect women from violence. She draws a direct contrast to Mr. Thornton's sister Fanny who has been extremely scared even inside the house and has cried hysterically.

Her sociable and entrepreneurial spirit is another masculine feature at least for her time. To illustrate, she takes the responsibility of taking care of people around her in Helstone: "nursed their babies; talked or read with slow distinctness to their old people; carried dainty messes to their sick; resolved before long to teach at the school, … but she was continually tempted off to go and see some individual friend—man, woman, or child—in some cottage in the green shade of the forest" (Gaskell 19). She continues her outdoor activities in Milton, as well. She even goes a step further and engages in the issues concerning the industrial life there, such as the conflicts between the capital holders and the factory workers.

Towards the end of the novel, Margaret receives a considerable amount of inheritance upon the death of Mr. Bell. Therefore, she is upgraded to the upper class, and her living conditions change. However, she continues to act like a lower-class woman. Edith complains about this to Dixon: "how my aunt allowed her [Margaret] to get into such rambling habits in Milton. I'm sure I'm always expecting to hear of her having met with something horrible among all those wretched places she pokes herself into ... They're not fit for ladies" (Gaskell 416). Margaret also feels that she has to be more involved more in serious business matters. She even helps Mr. Thornton to save his business. It is generally the woman who raises her social status through marriage but it is different this time: Mr. Thornton upgrades his status thanks to Margaret.

Love did not play a significant role in marriages in Victorian times; the suitability of the couples to each other in terms of wealth and family name was more important so such decisions which used to be made logically rather than emotionally although there were few exceptions. Therefore, the union between Margaret and Mr. Thornton is an important subversion not only because Margaret is superior to the latter in every respect (money, social status, education) but also because Margaret marries for love instead of reason. Henry Lenox is a more suitable suitor for her considering his education and his family but Margaret turns him down for the fact that she loves Mr. Thornton. Mrs. Thornton initially warns his son against Margaret for that she is

not rich enough for her son: "Take care you don't get caught by a penniless girl, John … Perhaps our Milton girls have too much spirit and good feeling to go angling after husbands; but this Miss Hale comes out of the aristocratic counties, where, if all tales be true, rich husbands are reckoned prizes" (Gaskell 78). However, her son loses his money in the end and Margaret becomes rich. The most subversive event here is probably Margaret's buying his factory. Hence, in a patriarchal society, a woman challenges and reaches the highest position she can get in that public sphere. Moreover, she plays a significant role in the formation of a new understanding between different classes of society. Therefore, the ideological formations of patriarchy are subverted in the novel because throughout the novel it is neither Mr. Hale nor Mr. Thornton but Margaret who defines the circumstances and shapes the course of events.

Similar to *Hard Times*, *North and South* also presents an alternative family structure in addition to the traditional nuclear family. In both novels, there is an inclination to create a new concept of family with people from different families. The blood bond which used to be very decisive in familial relationships is subverted through such alternative family types. For example, Higgins takes the responsibility of Boucher's children when he dies and becomes a father to them. When Mr. Thornton asks him whose children they are he says: "They're not mine, and they are mine" (Gaskell 318). Mr. Bell is another example. He becomes a father to Margaret after her father's death. He does not have a family of his own but accepts her as his daughter and leaves all his assets to her.

The Union is a more striking example for such new formations of family. Although it fails in the novel, it is surely an effective community as it has managed to bring the working-class people together creating a big family and to break the prevailing hegemony of the capital holders. The union intimidates the factory owners and they have to take precautions against the growing power of the workers.

The failure of the ideal middle-class family may be noted in *North and South*, as well. The Hales represent this ideal family structure in the novel. However, when looked closely, there are important problems in the family. Firstly, although Margaret loves her parents a lot, she has spent her childhood away from her family. Hence, she is not brought up by her own parents. She leaves her house as a child and returns there

as a young lady. Frederick is a fugitive in a different country and they can rarely see each other. As for the husband-wife relationship, Mr. and Mrs. Hale are very distant. The narrator informs the reader that Margaret spends a good deal of time during the day visiting their neighbours. However, it is hard for them to spend the evenings together as a family:

> But the evenings were rather difficult to fill up agreeably. Immediately after tea her father withdrew into his small library, and she and her mother were left alone. Mrs. Hale had never cared much for books, and had discouraged her husband, very early in their married life, in his desire of reading aloud to her, while she worked …So he withdrew, while the children were yet young, into his library, to spend his evenings (if he were at home), in reading the speculative and metaphysical books which were his delight. (Gaskell 21)

Mr. Hale cannot tell his wife about his doubts, his resignation or his intention of leaving their hometown. He makes all the decisions himself without even asking for her opinion. Moreover, it is Margaret who tells her mother about her father's decisions. Like the Gradgrinds, the Hales also illustrate that something is wrong or missing in the ideally constructed Victorian family structure.

As opposed to them, the Higginses as a working-class family, in spite of all the hardships they experience, hold on together. There is no mother figure in the Higgins family but Nicholas Higgins and his two daughters, Betsy and Mary, seem to manage well even without a mother. Although he has a sick little daughter, he does not get married. Hence, this may be regarded as a different family structure. They are far from the ideal family structure both because of economic problems and because of the lack of a mother figure. Moreover, Higgins takes the responsibility of another person's children. When Margaret goes to visit Boucher's wife, she finds he does more than his duty: "She found Nicholas busily engaged in making a penny spin on the dresser, for the amusement of three little children, who were clinging to him in a fearless manner. He, as well as they, was smiling at a good long spin" (Gaskell 316). The family he establishes is not an ordinary or an ideal one but he tries to play his part in the best possible way. To conclude, in the novel, there are alternative family types which were ignored or despised during the Victorian period and they challenge the hegemonic ideology concerning the family because they offer a happier and a more fulfilling life for its members. Moreover, the established traditional roles in a family are also

questioned and other possibilities, such as a daughter's playing the role of a father by making decisions and being active both in domestic and in public sphere, are reflected.

Education:

Earlier in the historical background section, it has been stated that education system in the Victorian period was centred round two philosophies: utilitarianism and evangelicalism. The two theories are in contrast to each other in their basic forms because utilitarianism does not accept religion as it is emotional and irrational. However, the Victorians created a different kind of utilitarianism which could co-exist with religion. Their understanding of utilitarianism was commitment to reason in education and life but religion was tried to be held separate. Secular education was not an option for the Victorians as moral instruction was an important objective in formal education.

In *Hard Times*, Dickens satirizes the utilitarian incentives throughout the novel explicitly. The failures of the characters mainly derive from the wrong and deficient education system they are subjected to. The education in Mr. Gradgrind's school is based on pure reason and facts. The novel starts with the talk Mr. Gradgrind gives at the school laying bare his utilitarian education policy:

> NOW, what I want is, Facts. Teach these girls and boys nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon Facts: nothing else will ever be of any service to them. This is the principle on which I bring up my own children, and this is the principle on which I bring up these children. Stick to Facts, Sir! (Dickens, *Hard Times* 7)

As the above quotation makes it clear, the students are all conditioned to understand the world only through reason and disregard imagination totally. They are allegorically drawn to represent the pure productions of the ideology of utilitarianism. They make sense of their surroundings through this perspective. Utilitarianism establishes the conditions of plausibility for them. Sinfield states that conditions of plausibility "govern our understanding of the world and how to live in it" (*Faultlines* 32). Gradgrind's students and his school is a microcosm of the society to illustrate how ideology works and shapes one's world view.

Mr. Gradgrind tells his students: "You must discard the word Fancy altogether. You have nothing to do with it. You are not to have, in any object of use or ornament what would be a contradiction in fact. You don't walk upon flowers in fact; you cannot be allowed to walk upon flowers in carpets" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 12). Anything that may lure the students away from realities and lead them to wonder is avoided. Louisa and Thomas are subjected to this philosophy all through their lives. They are interpellated with the ideology of utilitarianism. That is why Mr. Gradgrind is startled to discover his children around a circus watching it with a peculiar interest because they are never supposed to wonder. Gradgrind expresses his concern to Bounderby: "[I]t would appear from this unexpected circumstance of to-day … as if something had crept into Thomas's and Louisa's minds which is—or rather, which is not—I don't know that I can express myself better than by saying—which has never been intended to be developed, and in which their reason has no part" (Dickens *Hard Times* 22-23). This quotation raises the question once Sinfield asked and explained with reasonable examples. In *Faultlines*, he questions "if we come to consciousness within a language that is continuous with the power structures that sustain the social order, how can we conceive, let alone organize, resistance?" (35). Later, he explains that there are faultlines in ideologies because all the dominant ideologies contain conflicts and contradictions. In order to prevail against these conflicts, these ideologies try to substantiate their claims and, in their attempt to do so they create the scope for dissidence (35). For example, in the novel, Mr. Gradgrind tries to establish utilitarian philosophy and wants to make it the absolute truth for them by telling them to stay away from fantasy and wonder. In this way, the students are introduced to these concepts. Hence, they learn that a different world exists other than theirs: This is how dissidence occurs. In spite of all the repressions Louisa and Thomas are subjected to, they still might be distracted from their world of realities and might have an interest in a circus out of wonder.

Fantasy, wonder, and imagination are all regarded as a threat to logical thinking by Mr. Gradgrind. Reading novels which merely talk about unreal events was no more than wasting time for him. He cannot understand the drive to wonder at all. Thinking about the people who come to library to read novels, he feels that it is not only "a disheartening circumstance, but a melancholy fact, that even these readers

persisted in wondering" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 52). He disdains them for their choosing De Foe and Goldsmith over Euclid and Cocker (Dickens, *Hard Times* 52). Therefore, he brings up his children away from such novels and stories which could trigger their imagination. However, Gradgrind's this attitude turns out to be the basic reason of Louisa's failure in life because she had no means to discover her feelings. She accepts Bounderby's proposal only because she has never fallen in love with a man. The only love she knows is that which is felt towards a father or a brother. Her father assures her that there is no reason to refuse his proposal on grounds of logic. Hence, she gets married but soon she realizes that she does not love her husband; she indeed hates him. Upon realizing that the reason of her unhappiness is derived from her inability to recognize her own feelings because of her upbringing and education based on only facts and she knows nothing about feelings, Louisa blames her father: "if I had been stone blind … and had been free, while I knew the shapes and surfaces of things, to exercise my fancy somewhat, in regard to them; I should have been a million times wiser, happier, more loving, more contented, more innocent and human in all good respects, than I am with the eyes I have" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 201-202).

In contrast to Louisa, Sissy Jupe is brought up in a more liberal environment through which she has developed an emotional maturity. The stories which nurture her imagination have contributed to her personal development. Sissy tells Louisa that she used to read such books which were forbidden at the school as though she were confessing a sin she committed: "I used to read to him to cheer his courage, and he was very fond of that. They were wrong books — I am never to speak of them here" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 61). She tells that they have helped her father to forget things that troubled and relieved him. Hence, Sissy's early life constitutes a contrast to Mr. Gradgrind's philosophy. She is regarded as a failure at school because she is not able to adapt herself to a self-reliant mentality. For example, Sissy tells Louisa that no matter how hard she tries she cannot give the right answers to questions and tells her about one of the occurrences at school:

> Then Mr. M'Choakumchild said he would try me again. And he said, This schoolroom is an immense town, and in it there are a million of inhabitants, and only five-and-twenty are starved to death in the streets, in the course of a year. What is your remark on that proportion? And my remark was—for I couldn't think of a better

one—that I thought it must be just as hard upon those who were starved, whether the others were a million, or a million million. And that was wrong, too. (Dickens, *Hard Times* 59)

Initially, Gradgrind is sure that the education Sissy will receive at his school will make her a refined lady: "I shall have the satisfaction of causing you to be strictly educated; and you will be a living proof to all who come into communication with you, of the advantages of the training you will receive. You will be reclaimed and formed" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 50). However, in time, he regards her as a misfit for his education system and blames her prior experiences in life for her failure at school: "I can only suppose that the circumstances of your early life were too unfavourable to the development of your reasoning powers, and that we began too late" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 89). As a result, Sissy becomes a failure at school while Louisa proves to be a very successful student. However, in real world, things turn out to be different for them. While Sissy makes better judgements and becomes happier in life, Louisa fails to do so.

In spite of the 'perfect education' they receive, Thomas and Louisa cannot make the right decisions in life and both fail. Thomas loses a lot of money at gambling and becomes a thief. His life ends as a fugitive hiding somewhere. Louisa breaks up with Mr. Bounderby and she never has a family of her own again. Their failures in life represent the failure of utilitarian view of education. In contrast to them, Sissy's survival and happiness in life challenges this hegemonic ideology of the time. Therefore, Sissy and her success in life is a subversion because, as explained in the above paragraphs, she embodies features that the utilitarian education system regarded as useless.

North and South is less critical about the utilitarian view of education. Instead, it rather focuses on the reasons which drag people into a utilitarian education system in the newly industrialized country. The novel initially draws a contrast between the north and the south of England. In the aristocratic south, most young children even in poor families attend schools whereas education seems to be a luxury for almost all the children in the north. The narrator makes an evaluation about the pupils whom Mr. Hale is going to give private lessons as follows:

> They were mostly of the age when many boys would be still at school, but, according to the prevalent, and apparently well-founded notions of Milton, to make a lad into a good tradesman he must be caught young, and acclimated to the life of the mill, or office, or warehouse. If he were sent to even the Scotch Universities, he came back unsettled for commercial pursuits; how much more so if he went to Oxford or Cambridge, where he could not be entered till he was eighteen? So most of the manufacturers placed their sons in sucking situations at fourteen or fifteen years of age, unsparingly cutting away all off-shoots in the direction of literature or high mental cultivation, in hopes of throwing the whole strength and vigour of the plant into commerce. Still there were some wiser parents; and some young men, who had sense enough to perceive their own deficiencies, and strive to remedy them. (Gaskell 69)

The above quotation reveals the reason why most children in the north are devoid of education. In a self-dependent society where the necessary support of a welfare government does not exist, people find their own solutions to survive. Therefore, in Milton, people first try to survive, and if they are able to feed themselves and their families, then they feel the need for education and personal development.

In the novel, Mr. Thornton is presented as a victim of this self-help society at an early age. He had to leave school and work in order to feed his mother and sister. Therefore, education of any kind was a luxury for him as a child. When he grows up and earns enough money to meet the expenses of his family, he feels an urge to improve himself. As a result, he takes private courses from Mr. Hale. However, Mrs. Thornton, his mother, does not understand his desire to learn classics as, for her, they do not serve to his purposes in life in any way. She says "I have no doubt the classics are very desirable for people who have leisure … Classics may do very well for men who loiter away their lives in the country or in colleges; but Milton men ought to have their thoughts and powers absorbed in the work of today" (Gaskell 113). Mrs. Thornton, like most other northerners, regard classics unnecessary for they have no direct effects on the amount of the money they earn. Even Margaret, an educated lady, does not see any point in a manufacturer's learning about literature. When she hears that her father is going to be a private tutor in Milton, she is totally surprised and says: "What in the world do manufacturers want with the classics, or literature, or the accomplishments of a gentleman" (*Gaskell* 40).

Formal education was thought to be a waste of time by most people in England both in the south and in the north. For example, when Margaret goes back to visit Helstone with Mr. Bell, she wants to see Susan but finds out that she is at school. Upon learning that the little girl, before starting school, used to be of great help to her mother at home and that the mother used to teach her what little she knew, Mr. Bell, an Oxford academic, makes a surprising comment by saying "the child was getting a better and simpler, and more natural education stopping at home, and helping her mother, and learning to read a chapter in the New Testament every night by her side, than from all the schooling under the sun" (Gaskell 380). Even an academic like Mr. Bell thinks that formal education is not very necessary. However, something happens that changes his mind. Margaret learns that one of the women in the neighbourhood, Betty Barnes, has roasted Susan's mother's cat acting on superstitious beliefs. She exemplifies the consequence of lack of education in a dramatic way. After Mr. Bell hears about this event, he realizes how serious the consequences of ignorance may be, such as 'practical paganism', and confesses that he has been wrong about schooling.

Although formal education was not supported by many people throughout the country, still compared to the northerners, children in the south were luckier in that there were not paid jobs they could work at, a very early age. Therefore, sending children to school did not cost as much as it did in the north as a result of which literacy rates were higher there. This is observable in the novel, as well. Children in the south are depicted at schools receiving education whereas children in the north are depicted working at factories. Even the speeches and manners of working-class people in the north reveal their lack of education.

North and South is more subversive than *Hard Times* in terms of education because it directly targets the hegemonic system which keeps people in ignorance. Margaret makes a point of it while discussing the disagreements between the hands and the factory owners with Mr. Thornton: "I heard, moreover, that it was considered to the advantage of the masters to have ignorant workmen — not hedge-lawyers, as Captain Lennox used to call those men in his company who questioned and would know the reason for every order" (Gaskell 119). Here, she draws attention to the possibility of a deliberate intervention of the capital holders to debar people from

education, thinking that it is easier to control and rule illiterate people. It was a rare and rightful criticism of the hegemonic powers for the time.

Mr. Hale is another subversive element in the novel. He is a clergyman who resigns his position and becomes a private tutor at a time when discussions about the place of religion in education were still ongoing. When Mrs. Hale asks Margaret why Mr. Hale does not start giving courses at Oxford rather than being a private tutor in Milton, Margaret responds: "You forget, mamma! He is leaving the Church on account of his opinions—his doubts would do him no good at Oxford" (Gaskell 47). Here, the importance attached to religion at a university is emphasized and it is implied that religious suspicions have no place at universities at that time. Therefore, religion, in spite of all the suspicions and discussions taking place, was extremely influential and depicting Mr. Hale as choosing education over religion is an important subversion of the hegemonic ideology.

To conclude, it is true that the Victorian period was under strict surveillance by the oppressive hegemony through ideological state apparatuses such as religion, education or family. Still, there was dissidence which was observable in different spheres of life and it is possible to trace this dissidence in the Victorian novels through a close look. In this chapter, it has been revealed how and where this dissidence occurred in the selected novels. It has also been illustrated how, at times, this dissidence got powerful and turned into a powerful subversion of the hegemonic ideologies of the time in the institutions of class, family and education.

CHAPTER THREE

3. Subverting the Thatcherite Ideology: *Waterland* **and** *The Radiant Way*

The Radiant Way

The Radiant Way, published in 1987, is the first book of a trilogy following the lives of three women from the 1950s. *A Natural Curiosity* (1989), and *The Gates of Ivory* (1991) are the other two. However, in this study only the first book is studied because the focus of this book is on Thatcherite England and it provides this study with enough material about the period. It reflects the spirit of the 1980s' England through depicting three women protagonists: Liz, Alix and Esther. They meet in 1950s when they just start to study at Cambridge, all on scholarships. They come from different economic and social backgrounds, yet the moment they meet, they become life-long friends. It is 1980s, and at the age of forty-five, Liz is a successful psychotherapist. She is married to Charles Headleand, a successful television executive. Despite their lower class origins, Liz and Charles are upper-class people living in the best part of London in a grand house with five children, three of them from Charles' prior marriage. Charles is making plans of moving to America for business with a woman of aristocratic origins, Lady Henrietta, with whom he has an affair. Liz learns the news unexpectedly at the new year's party she has given. Her relationship with her parents is not good, either. She does not remember her father and knows nothing about him. She has a problematic relationship with her mother and her sister Shirley. Later, towards the end of the novel it turns out that her father has seduced her as a child. Hence, Liz tries to overcome the traumatic effects of the divorce and the sexual abuse.

Alix studied English literature but she is engaged in minor part-time teaching jobs because literature and arts are among 'the less important' areas of study in Thatcherite England. Her second husband Brian is a socialist who also teaches English at an adult education centre. She has two sons, one from her ex-husband, the other from Brian. She falls in love with one of Brian's friends, Otto, who is also married. As a result, she tries to cope with both financial problems and her feelings. Otto is also

attracted to her and they experience some intimacy, yet, in the end she decides to repress her feelings and continue with Brian.

Esther is an art historian but she also earns her life through giving lectures on different topics and earns more than Alix. She is not married and she never has a longer relationship with men. It is implied that she may be either lesbian or bisexual. She is not concerned about morality in her relationships and dates married men who have eccentric interests or habits. She does not form an attachment to anyone or to any place for a long time. The only permanent relationship in her life is the one she established with her friends and, yet, she seems to be the happiest of the three.

Along with dealing with the personal problems of the characters, the novel sheds light on the general atmosphere of the Thatcherite England through them. The economic, social, and political problems of the time are reflected through these three friends who are from different classes and who have different points of view. The novel also compares the 1980s with the 60s and the 70s, and highlights the developments along with the regressions throughout these times. Gender roles, marital problems, sexuality, education, economic cutbacks and class are some of the concerns of the novel.

Waterland

Waterland depicts the story of a history teacher, Tom Crick, who is dismissed from his school because of the economic cutbacks of the 1980s but the problems in his private life are suggested to be a fair reason for his early retirement. His wife Mary, who is in depression as she desperately wants to have a child but is sterile, has recently abducted someone else's baby. Tom and Mary have returned the baby soon to the mother but Mary is sent to a rehabilitation centre. Therefore, by showing this event as an excuse, the schoolmaster Lewis wants to dismiss him. Both Lewis and the students of history class are happy to get rid of the history lessons. However, before he goes, Tom decides to tell a long story in his last classes. Through linking the public to the personal, he tells the students the story of his grand ancestors. His story dates back to the eighteenth century.

It is the story of his maternal and paternal ancestors, of the Atkinsons, and of the Cricks. The Atkinsons have been the masters of a town for centuries, they have been the rich entrepreneurs who have come to a region called Fens, a swamp area, and have turned that area into a farmland. The Cricks, on the other hand, have always worked for them for generations. They have always worked hard and never had the far-sight to start a business of their own or improve their status in some way. Tom's story moves back and forth in time. He tells the story of these two families for several generations till it comes to Tom and Mary who are living in the 1980s England. He also recounts the important historical improvements and events that took place in the meantime. His story embodies many important issues concerning class, economic problems, gender roles, familial and marital problems, sexuality, education, politics, and so on. At the end of his classes, he gains the support of his students and they even protest his dismissal from the school.

Class

Throughout the time from Victorian to Thatcherite era, the concept of class has been reshaped by once marginal groups. At the beginning of the Victorian period, class was decisively determined by birth; there was no social mobility because people had no means to improve their economic conditions and class in society was extremely divisive: People from different classes were not in any personal or social interaction. However, from the middle to the end of the Victorian period, the concept of class changed gradually and the social interaction between different classes of people improved slightly. The Industrial Revolution and the spread of education enabled social mobility to a certain extent. People with money even if they were not highly born could get a place among the upper-class members of society.

At the end of the nineteenth century, people who, in spite of their lack of education, improved their social status through commerce were a subversive group in the social ladder. However, this once subversive group became a part of the hegemony especially in 1980s. There was an ideologic war against the concept of class by the prime minister herself. Although Thatcherite policies generally widened the gap between the upper and the lower classes, the changing discourse of class upset the reverence for the upper classes. Moreover, there was a social mingling: People from

different spheres of life came together in social and personal platforms more often. In this respect, television played an important role: It contributed to the creation of a sense of empathy between the middle and the working classes. As a result, the aristocracy soon sounded like a myth from old times. Indeed, they turned out to be a subversive group whereas the middle class became part of the hegemony.

The Radiant Way lays bare the changing dynamics about the current class issues. The three main characters of the novel display the friendship of three women from different backgrounds and classes. The oddity or even impossibility of this diversified group of friends for a Victorian novel is stated as: "Esther, Liz and Alix, who in Jane Austen's day would never have met at all, met in Cambridge in 1952" (Drabble 84). The differences they display and the different aspirations they have do not discourage them from getting to know each other. "Alix was applying to read English Literature, Liz to read Natural Sciences (with a view to medicine) and Esther to read Modern Languages. This should have safely prevented any rapport between them, but did not" (Drabble 84).

It is possible to note in the novel that definite class boundaries of the early nineteenth century extended considerably to the second half of the twentieth century. The boundaries related to economy existed for sure but people did not refrain from personal or social interaction with others who had different living standards. Liz, Alix and Esther exemplify this social mingling. Although they come from different economic backgrounds, from the moment they meet, they cannot resist the temptation to know more about different people and share their future ambitions with each other. "'I would like,' said Liz … 'to make sense of things. To understand.' By things, she meant herself. Or she thought she meant herself. 'I would like,' said Alix, 'to change things.' By things, she did not mean herself. Or thought she did not mean herself. 'You reach too high,' said Esther. 'I wish to acquire interesting information" (Drabble 85). These big ambitions belong to 1950s when they attend Cambridge. The novel largely depicts the 1980s when their living conditions and social status have changed considerably in time, and yet, they continued their friendship. The general spirit of 1980s England is conveyed through the aspirations, daily concerns and problems of people from different classes.

It has been mentioned in this study earlier that social mobility, although difficult, came to be possible in the second half of the nineteenth century through commerce. Education was not a means of improving social status then, because it was already only the upper-class or the upper-middle-class people who could have that privilege. However, almost a century later, it became possible to improve one's living standards through education because people, even though limited in number, had the chance to receive scholarships either from governmental or private institutions. Middle-class or even working-class people could get a scholarship and improve their living standards through education in time.

The three heroines of the novel, although they come from different economic backgrounds, all receive a scholarship to study at Cambridge. For example, Liz, coming from lower class origins, manages to get a scholarship as a result of her mother's directions and her dedicated studies: "Liz Ablewhite was offered, and graciously accepted, the Alethea Ward-Scholarship … Great Expectations. Is there anything more peculiar, more idiosyncratic, more circumscribed in these expectations than in those of Pip, or of Dickens himself, towards being a gentleman" (Drabble 86). Liz is compared to Pip in that both have great expectations but they live in different times. With the opportunity offered by a scholarship in 1950s, Liz manages to graduate from Cambridge and changes her social status which was almost hereditary in the past. Therefore, she is able to avoid the disappointing end Pip faces.

The most obvious subversive element concerning the class structure in the novel is offered through the three main characters Liz, Esther and Alix. They are all at the margins in society in different ways and the narrator points out that it is the very thing that holds them together although even they themselves are unaware of this fact: "a sense of being on the margins of English life, perhaps, a sense of being outsiders, looking in from a cold street through a lighted window into a warm lit room that later might prove to be their own? Removed from the mainstream by a mad mother, by a deviant ideology, by refugee status and the war-sickness of Middle Europe" (90). Liz is brought up by her 'mad' mother; Alix is brought up by radically left-wing parents with revolutionary ideas. As for Esther, she is a Jewish immigrant whose parents moved to Britain from Germany in order to escape from Hitler. The depiction of their

being brought together by their difference, which make them marginals in society, is a direct criticism of class structure.

Of the three, Liz is the one who achieves 'the great expectation' of the Victorian times. As a child, she is the most disadvantaged of the friends. She was brought up by a single parent, her mother, with her sister Shirley, in very poor conditions: "It had been dark, and cold: low-watt electric bulbs had to be extinguished each time one left a room, a corridor, noting could be left lit or burning. Bedrooms were unheated there was a single-bar electric fire in the dining-room which Shirley and Liz would carry secretly upstairs in bitter weather" (Drabble 181). Wittlinger evaluates Liz as: "Generally speaking, Liz, probably the closest one to being a Thatcherite heroine, does quite well in spite of a difficult childhood and other serious setbacks later on in life" (Drabble 106). However, Liz embodies important subversive elements for a Thatcherite heroine considering the issues concerning class, family, and education which are going to be dealt with consecutively.

In spite of her lower-class origins and her current upper-class living standards, Liz is not able to overcome the insecurities she feels about her social status. In contrast to the luxury she has in her life currently, she has spent her childhood in great poverty. Therefore, she is extremely afraid of poverty and hates thrift as it reminds her of her old days. "Aristocratic largesse: *fin-de-siécle* waste: warmth, life, light" are the things that relieves her anxiety (Drabble 183). Especially upon learning that Charles wants to get a divorce because he has an affair with a woman called Henrietta Lathcett, Liz feels that she will return to her old poor days: "She does not wish to turn back, to cut back, to live in a reduced style as a divorced woman" (Drabble 183). This is indeed a baseless fear because she herself earns enough to maintain her living standards. In addition to her fondness for affluence, she is obsessed with the concept of class in a Victorian sense:

> She knows she is not the true princess, but only a fake princess, a scullery maid dressed up by a Cambridge scholarship and her own wits, and rescued by a dubious prince. Henrietta Lathcett is the true princess. Blue blood flows in her veins. It is embarrassing to have to admit this, but Liz Headland, who knows she should know better, has taken to trying to work out Henrietta Latchett's pedigree from *Who's Who*. (Drabble 183)

Her class-conscious attitude is also observable when she is talking to Shirley about their mother's mental illness. She makes a distinction between her mother and her own patients stating that "they're a different class of mad people" (Drabble 225). Here, she gives away her real thoughts about class distinction. However, the moment she says this out loud she feels awkward and regrets saying it. She has always tried to keep her segregationist side to herself and in her conversations with her friends she acted like a professional and stated that: "psychiatric problems observed no class or economic frontiers, that most forms of disturbance manifest themselves equally among the rich and the poor, that the dynamics of family abuse … or Down's syndrome, or schizophrenia were largely unaffected by income,   by environment" (Drabble 128). Therefore, her discourse is based on equality but she is obviously class-conscious.

The fact that Charles leaves Liz for an aristocratic woman disturbs Liz deeply. She starts searching Henrietta's ancestry and gets even more overwhelmed when she learns that Henrietta has very high connections whereas Liz has no such respected connections: "She traces the family name, Oxenholme, and its delicate interweaving with the Hestercombes and Stocklinces. *Debrett*, were she to sink so low, would tell her more. Her own name, in Charles's entry stands bleakly … When Charles divorces, her will she be excised?" (Drabble 184). She develops irrational fears about losing her status in society. She is, indeed, very well aware that these concerns are groundless and ridiculous, still, "she feels that Charles's abandoning of her for a more ancient lineage threatens her solidity, her survival. He has withdrawn his approval, and she has become nobody. People will laugh at her behind her back, they will not want to come to her parties any more" (Drabble 184). Being a professional psychiatrist, Liz is aware of her psychologic condition: She knows that her fears are rootless and delusional. Still, she cannot avoid them completely because of the inferiority complex she feels concerning her own lower-class origins. In spite of her distinctive success for a woman from a disadvantaged background, her obsession with class, especially with aristocracy, makes her a subversive character in Thatcherite England at a time when the privileges of birth are disdained by the hegemonic ideology.

Lady Henrietta represents the decaying Victorian values as a member of a disappearing class which was highly revered in the past but is mocked in 1980s: "Lady

Henrietta neatly laid her knife and fork together on her plate, as she had been taught to do thirty years before by a dragon of a nanny … Most of her education had been devoted to the art of getting and keeping a man" (Drabble 119). She is contrasted to self-made Liz who has a Cambridge degree in medicine. Although Thatcherite England supports self-sufficiency and promotes a classless society, both Liz and Charles are charmed by Henrietta's high-born status. Charles compares them in his mind, as well: "Liz's mother, of course, was barmy. Mad, quite mad. Why hadn't he found that at all worrying, all those years ago? Had he really believed that one could make oneself, make one's own life, ignore genetics, ignore history, make a fresh start" (Drabble 117). Unlike Liz, Henrietta's parentage is well-known. She is an aristocratic lady connected with important families: "Her entries in reference books were dense with cross-references, dense with a tangled web of titles and a maze of mysteriously transforming family names. Earls, barons … viscounts, baronets mingled in her ancestry ... Lady Henrietta was herself the daughter of a marquess" (Drabble 117).

Charles was a passionate left-wing voter in the post-war period. He is against private education and believed in "the brotherhood of man and the saving of mass culture" (Drabble 118). He also becomes famous in "the late 1950s and 1960s with his punchy social-conscience documentaries" (Drabble 118). Considering his political stance in the past, his choice of Henrietta over Liz is quite subversive: "Did he himself detect a paradox in this? Did it ever occur to him that in some respects Lady Henrietta closely resembled the dead wood to which, as a younger man, he had taken the axe" (Drabble 118). His inconsistency is also remarkable in his 1980s' works which contradict his early political views. This is also indicated in the novel: "Did it occur to him that the post he had accepted, with all its dignities, all its trappings, was precisely the kind of post that was designed to arrest the activities of the kind of young man that he himself had been" (Drabble 118).

In the 1960s and the 70s, Charles had ideas and tried to contribute to the development of his country when he was young. He made TV programmes to show 'the evils that flow from a divisive class system' and to promote education among people from all classes. He did what he believed to be right (Drabble 174). However, in the 1980s, he is a Thatcherite hero. He betrays everything he used to defend in the

past. He becomes an ideological state apparatus in Althusserian terms: "He negotiates from a semi-governmental position, the future is partly in his hands: he is a spy for his country, keeping track of cable television, satellites, video equipment, teletext systems, the ever-increasing dissemination of images, of news, of horrors" (Drabble 173). He is aware of his betrayal of his old self, and this is the reason why he does not want to think about the past. He sometimes feels a 'moral dilemma' about what to do; "support the old regime, as he is paid to do, or tell the truth about the future and thereby precipitate collapse?" (Drabble 173). Although he propagates the hegemonic ideology, he is a subversive figure because he is the embodiment of a 'faultline' in hegemony. He is full of contradictions and he even does not believe in the rightness of the ideology he tries to substantiate.

Liz, Alix, Esther, Brian and Charles were all once left-wing voters in 60s and 70s. For all of them, it was easier then to support Marxist views because they themselves were on the margins. In the post-war period until Thatcher takes control of the country with strict measures and serious cutbacks in the welfare state system, there was a more liberal atmosphere in the society and people were more optimistic about future:

> The Brave New World, it would be, and the new populist and popular medium of television would help to bring it into being. The team itself, with its mixed skills, its mixed social origins, its camaraderie, its common purpose, was a microcosm of what would come about. A forward-looking, forward-moving, dynamic society, full of opportunity, co-operative, classless. The Chinese meal was a classless meal; it brought no echoes of the ancient regime. All over Britain, from Berwick to Broadstairs, from Peterhead to Penzance, Chinese meals were consumed, with or without fried eggs on top. Sound technician sat down with producer, graduate with van driver, artist with engineer. (Drabble 176)

The gap between the classes became more visible in 1980s compared to 1960s and 70s because Thatcherite policies were based on dismantling the welfare state. As a result of this elimination of welfare state benefits, rich people became richer while the poor became poorer. The novel summarizes the 1980s' England by stressing this fact: "The steel strike continues ... Class rhetoric flourishes … Survival of the fittest seems to be the new-old doctrine. Unemployment rises steadily … People have short memories, many of them are carried along with the new tide. They are fit. The less fit

get less and less fit, and are washed up on the shore" (Drabble 172). Contrary to the hegemonic discourse of creating a classless society, Thatcher governments disappointed the hopeful generation of the 1960s and the 70s. The novel reflects this faultline in hegemony by illustrating the disparity between the discourse and the implementations of the government.

Charles blames the unions for the growing gap between the classes. He believes that "[a]s the classless society moved forward, film crew members were no longer satisfied with Chinese meals … They became vain and temperamental, coy and hard to please. They considered themselves an élite: they developed appropriate tastes, appropriate demands" (Drabble 177). He is unable to realize that he is one of them. The more he earned the less he cared about lower-class people, and this is also true about Liz. Although the class distinction became more apparent and more people suffered from this distinction, the 1980s upper-class people like Liz and Charles became less concerned about class distinction.

Of the three friends, Alix is the one who is the most radical left-wing voter. She is "sentimentalist about class … This is why she found herself teaching working-class children in Newham, and prisoners in Garfield; why she talks to drinking men on park benches; why she married Brian Bowen. … Brian's attraction for her was massively, deeply connected with his class origins" (Drabble 168). She is consistent in what she thinks and what she does almost until the end. However, towards the end of the novel, she realizes that she has an attraction to one of their friends Otto who is a political member of the Social Democratic Party, a new political party which consisted of nonradical leftist people. She betrays not only Brian but also her political views as she reviews them when she realizes she has feelings towards Otto. Brian's radical leftist views start to disturb her and after her interrogating herself, she decides that her views are indeed closer to Social Democrats. Her turning back to her former views and the appearance of the Social Democratic Party demonstrate that there are faultlines among the subordinate ideological groups, as well. This is implied to be the reason of Thatcher's winning the elections three times consecutively in spite of the large number of people who suffered from the ills of Thatcherite policies.

In conclusion, *Radiant Way* lays bare the class-based society of 1980s against the Thatcherite discourse of creating a classless society. It reveals that a classless society is a delusion created by the hegemonic ideology of that time. Thatcherite ideology is not truly based on eliminating the class barrier: It only creates such a discourse. Alix realizes at some point that the problem is the economic system: "Brian was right, of course he was right. The cause of all this pain, this grinding, this deep misery, was the economic system itself. This system under which she lived. There was no hope in it" (Drabble 342). Therefore, in the twenty first century, England is still class based but the class concept in Thatcherite England is quite different from the one in Victorian times. It is all about money; birth, education and manners are no more decisive in one's status. However, in the novel, Brian's unchanging attitude and belief in an egalitarian society are subversive elements in such a society. He provides a subaltern resistance to hegemony: "[T]he British Labour movement in general, the manufacturing North more specifically, and Brian Bowen his old friend in person were all in danger of worshipping an old wooden cotton reel. Some called it class solidarity (Drabble 234). All the characters in the novel change their views along with their status in the society in time except for Brian.

Waterland does not deal with the class issues directly. However, it is possible to deduce the influence of class on people's lives. Moreover, it provides an opportunity to evaluate the concept of class in different times at a safe distance and through the perspective of a Thatcherite period writer. Tom Crick, the main character, is in 1980s' England and the story he tells goes back to the eighteenth century. He tries to show the circularity of history but he also unconsciously reveals the changing dynamics in the society, as well.

Crick's story centres around his maternal and paternal families: the Atkinsons and the Cricks. The Atkinsons are wealthy entrepreneurs of the eighteenth century while the Cricks are only peasants and have always worked for the Atkinsons. The Atkinsons have worked out the operation of hegemony long ago and they have built their empire in line with it:

> Have they [the Atkinsons] not brought improvement to a whole
> region, and do they not continue to bring it? Do they not travail long
> and indefatigably in the council chamber as well as in the boardroom,

for the welfare of the populace? Have they not established, out of their own munificence, an orphanage, a town newspaper, a public meeting-hall, a boys' school (black uniform), a bath-house – a fire station? And are not all these works, and others, proof of that great Idea that sways them; proof that all private interest is subsumed by the National interest and all private empires do but pay tribute to the Empire of Great Britain (Swift 97-8)

Therefore, the Atkinsons have discovered not only how to make money but also how to support this economic power with ideological state apparatuses such as media and education.

The Cricks, on the other hand, have never had a vision about how to make money. They have not believed in progress because they have never seen the outside world for centuries. They have been fatalistic and have satisfied their imagination only through making up stories. As a result, the Atkinsons have been the masters and the Cricks have been the workers; their relationships have been kept in this circle for several generations. Tom draws a comparison between the two families by stating: "While the Atkinsons made history, the Cricks spun yarns" (Swift 25).

In the 1870s, Thomas Atkinson a wealthy Norfolk farmer comes to Fens and seizes an opportunity. He buys the marshes around a river called Leem at very low prices and tries to turn them into farm lands: "He hires surveyors, drainage and dredging experts. A confident and far-seeing man, a man of hearty and sanguine, rather than phlegmatic, temperament [unlike the Cricks], he offers work and a future to a whole region" (Swift 23). Soon, it turns out that he has made a good decision. He gains a lot of money and prestige in the region. In 1815 and 1816, he faces some hardships, yet, he and his wife Sarah overcome these problems thanks to their handling things in an early Victorian manner; through charitable acts (such as providing food and money to the needy people) and also through following a wise strategy of continuing to keep employment in order to avoid any rioting caused by dismissals (Swift 79).

Thomas Atkinson manages to go through the times of crisis successfully, he expands his wealth. In 1918, he almost builds his own empire in the Fens. However, his relationship with his employees changes: "He can no longer stand by one of his new drains and clap the shoulder of the man who has helped dig it. The labourers who once worked beside him – the Cricks perhaps among them – now touch forelocks,

venerate him, regard him as a sort of god" (Swift 80). In fact, Thomas does not put the distance intentionally, still he cannot keep his previous personal relationships with them. He orders his man something to drink when he wants to display proximity (Swift 80). This growing distance between Thomas Atkinson and his employees may be regarded as an expression of class distinction in early Victorian period. The class distinction existed even in the eighteenth century as it is apparent in the novel, as well, but it gets even more apparent in the nineteenth century through the personal boundaries drawn by the landowners.

In the mid-Victorian period, the Atkinson business is taken over by Thomas Atkinson's sons Alfred and George. They continue the business with growing success. They also realize the importance of discourse and take advantage of the power of the British empire in the best way:

> How many times does the Union Jack flutter above the arched and motto-inscribed entrance to the New Brewery to mark some occasion of patriotic pride? How many times do George and Alfred and Arthur pause in their boardroom addresses, hands on lapels, to allude to some new instance of imperial prowess? And how often do those barrels and bottles of Atkinson Ale find new wonders to celebrate? 'The Grand '51'; ''The Empress of India'; 'The Golden Jubilee'; 'The Diamond Jubilee.' (Swift 98)

The Atkinsons support their economic power with political power. In 1874, Arthur, George Atkinson's son, enters the Parliament. Therefore, their power continues to grow through generations along with the class distinction between the Atkinsons and all the local people.

It is not until the twentieth century that there occurs a possibility of transcending the limits of class between the two families. This possibility is first foreshadowed in 1915 during a military parade (Swift 217). Ernest Atkinson, Arthur Atkinson's son, attends the parade with his daughter Helen. Charmed by Helen's beauty, the soldiers cannot march properly; they bump into each other and drop their riffles (Swift 219). Helen has a subversive role in this event as she disrupts the order in a parade in which the hierarchy is very important and she will soon provide a stronger subversion in terms of class distinction.

After the parade event, Ernest Atkinson realizes both his daughter's beauty and the power of beauty. Moreover, he recognizes that he has feelings towards his daughter; he is in love with her. He thinks that his daughter will not share Sarah Atkinson's (the first brewer's daughter) fate whose beauty has also been well-known in the town. Sarah has gone mad and died at a mental hospital. Earnest Atkinson's belief that his daughter will not face the same end as Sarah, derives from two reasons: "Because, firstly, she [Helen] is in possession of her mind, which for fifty years of her life, Sarah Atkinson was not. And, secondly, she belongs not to Gildsey and its credulous citizens, but to her father" (Swift 215). Therefore, he regards the Atkinsons above all other people. He even does not want to mix their blood with that of another family. He wants to have a child from his daughter; he believes that this child will be "a very special kind of child" (Swift 228). He even talks about the child as "the Saviour of the World" (Swift 228). From his desire to have a child with pure Atkinson blood, it may be inferred that the class distinction is very important for him.

In 1922, Helen, again, becomes a means of subversion of the ever-growing class distinction in the society. She falls in love with a man, Tom Crick's father Henry Crick and they get married soon (Swift 225). This is the union of an Atkinson and a Crick. Therefore, the class distinction is subverted at the beginning of the twentieth century through the marriage of a woman from an upper-class upbringing to a working-class man. The year 1922 brings another demise for the Atkinson empire; Earnest Atkinson's business does not go well in spite of all the hegemonic power the Atkinsons hold, and their empire shrinks (Swift 27).

Last important subversion concerning the class issues in the early twentieth century is presented in the novel through the child of Earnest and Helen Atkinsons. The pure blood Atkinson becomes officially a Crick, Dick Crick, because Helen wants to keep the facts about her child's father as a secret. Hence, in spite of his high-born origins, Dick is condemned to be a Crick, a family who have been farmers for centuries. Moreover, Dick Crick, the so-called 'Saviour of the World', is not only born as mentally retarded but also kills a child whereas Helen's second child Tom who is from Henry Crick is a healthy child. Therefore, it may be inferred that the union of different classes does not precipitate a calamity, but discrimination may lead to such

an end because the main reason why Henry Crick wants a son from his daughter is that he does not want to contaminate the pure blood of the Cricks by mixing their blood with the blood of another family. He thinks that the Cricks are superior to all other families because, in that region, there is no single family that is equal to the Cricks in wealth and in nobility.

In the novel, as the events take place in the past, the present is intended to be interpreted through the past events, class issues of the 1980s are disregarded. However, from this attitude it may be concluded that class is not a major concern of these years. The problems of 1980s derive not from the class distinction but from the economic policies of the government. People do not suffer from class discrimination. They suffer from the economic cutbacks and the novel continuously makes reference to these cutbacks which enlarge the gap between the rich and the poor. Tom, in the first place, starts to tell his stories about the past because he is forced for retirement as a result of these cutbacks. His school headmaster Lewis Scott gives him the news: "we're being forced to economize. We're cutting back on history. You should take early retirement" (Swift 13). Tom also refers to how people who are not influenced by the cutbacks manage to ignore others' sufferings and continue their lives with an unconscious fear of riots:

> How even in the no-nonsense and pragmatic twentieth century, this future schoolmaster quaked in his bed at night for fear of something – something vast and void – and had to be told stories and counter stories to soothe his provoked imagination. How he piously observed, because others observed them too, a catechism of obscure riots. When you see the new moon, turn your money in your pocket; help someone to salt and help them to sorrow; never put new shoes on a table or cut your nails on a Sunday. An eel-skin cures rheumatism; a roast mouse cures whooping cough; and a live fish in a woman's lap will make her barren (Swift 25-6)

The above quotation reminds Sinfield's explanation of the reason of class distinction in his article "Heritage and the market, regulation and desublimation", he asserts that it derives not only from a superstitious fear of difference but also from real interests and fears: "Subordinated groups, by definition, have a lesser stake in the system than dominant groups. Their subcultures afford opportunities for understanding this, bases for combining to alter it. That is why they must be declared inferior and suppressed"

(257). In this sense, it is obvious that the headmaster Lewis Scott's fear derives from real interests and fears.

To conclude, *Waterland* sheds light on the class distinction in the Victorian period with the advantage of being at a safe distance to that period and the 1980s class issues are preferred to be implied through the economic recession and the subconscious fear of riots, as mentioned in the above paragraph. In *Waterland*, the general attitude to explain the historical events or the power relations is in line with the view that "[n]othing moves far in this world. And whatever moves forwards will also move back. A law of the natural world; and a law, too, of the human heart" (Swift 78). Therefore, it denies the existence of the ever-lasting power of any hegemony. Like the fall of the Atkinsons, the history witnesses the rises and falls of any hegemonic power. Hence, subversion is always at work and it sometimes appropriates hegemony or it may even take its place.

Family:

The Radiant Way explicitly denies the moral impositions of traditional family types onto society. Contrary to the hegemonic encouragement of traditional nuclear family model and Victorian morality, the novel offers alternative family structures and also questions the concepts of family, gender relationships and gender roles promoting existential independency. In the novel, there is not, a single happy marriage example; the couples cheat on each other; divorce is common; family relationships are generally weak; there are implications of sexual abuse, incest and lesbianism.

To detect the subversions in the institution of family, it is necessary to remember the hegemonic impositions of the time concerning family which have been discussed earlier in the study. Thatcherite ideology, like any other repressive ideology, established norms of family and gender roles by creating a discourse based on dualities of normalcy. The promoted norms were heterosexual nuclear family, sexual activity within marriage and traditional gender roles. Therefore, alternative family structures, homosexual relationships, pre-marital sexual activities and divorces were all regarded as a threat to hegemony (K. Mitchell 48). Thatcher's ideal was to bring back the so-called Victorian morality and eliminate all the alternative family structures or relationships: "In her [Thatcher's] eyes, the key to the revival of Britain was moral

recovery and regeneration: the hedonism of the 1960s and the dependency culture of the welfare state must both be renounced and the more vigorous and admirable qualities … must be re-discovered, proclaimed and espoused" (Cannadine 278).

The first subversion is observable in the presentation of the main characters being all independent working women. The novel reflects them not only as housewives or mothers, it rather focuses on their individual existence, their intellectual capacity, their educational success, their inner desires or fears. Each of them embodies subversive characteristics for Thatcherite discourse of women and family. They have no concerns about morality in the Victorian sense. None of the main characters has a lasting happy marriage, and yet, they are not desperate or unhappy: they find their own way to be happy. These women prove that they can survive in an oppressive society in spite of their divergent stance.

Liz is brought up by her mother. She has never known her father. In her forties, she learns that her father was a convicted paedophile and committed suicide when she was a small child. Upon learning this reality from old newspaper cuttings her mother kept, she realizes the reason of her feeling guilty about sex as she remembers her being molested as a child by her father: "She had rubbed herself like a kitten up and down, sitting astride her child-molester father's knee … Enjoying the coarse fabric of his trousers. Enjoying his illicit smell. Giggling as he tickled her and played with her. Damp between her innocent infant's legs" (Drabble 386). Seduced by her father and never received any affection from her mother, Liza has not been able to form strong family connections either with her mother or with her sister. She, indeed, does not have a clear reason for her dislike of her mother: Rita did her best to bring them up in the best way and tried hard to provide the right education for them (Drabble 148). Still, Liz hates her mother; she wishes that her mother dies soon and when she dies, Liz feels relieved; almost happy. Liz is apathetic towards her sister Shirley and she feels that Shirley hates her. When she tells this to Alix, she says that sisters do not need to love each other (Drabble 379). Therefore, family bond is something she has failed to build with her parents or with sister.

Liz's first marriage lasts a short time as her first husband Edgar prefers to stick to traditional gender roles and expects Liz to do so, yet Liz is not a traditional woman.

She is not a submissive wife and has no intention of being one: "Her own domestic incompetence (which was indeed extreme … Edgar's male chauvinism (though this was a phrase not yet current) and his expectation that his work was always, would always be of greater importance, than her own" (Drabble 99-100). As a result, her marriage lasts eight months, and she gets a divorce. Seven months later, she marries Charles who has three little boys from his prior marriage.

As her first sexual desires have been evoked by her father, Liz, as a child, has felt that sexuality was bad. Even as an adult, Liz has felt guilty for her sexual desires: "Guilt, furtiveness, shame, concealment. Liz had experienced more of these in her girlhood than might, she had later discovered, be considered normal. She had known early that sex was wicked, that the changes in her body augured delinquency, that the satisfying of its urges would bring disaster" (Drabble 140). Feeling guilty about sexual desires, she has repressed them for a long time and her first husband has failed to satisfy her. Therefore, the adult Liz feels fulfilled in her marriage with Charles because they as a couple manage to overcome her inhibitions. She tells her friend Alix that her marriage with Charles is different from her first marriage as she achieves orgasm for the first time with Charles (Drabble 101). They enjoy sensual pleasures together and this is what their marriage is established on and how their marriage works for a long time:

> She and Charles connived with one another in the satisfaction of the body, they understood one another well. It had seemed a harnessing of perversion, a permitted exploration of the psyche and the flesh, an odyssey of the 1960s. Marriage and children merely brought to their liaison an added piquancy. In bed, in long drives in the car, in respectable restaurants, in corners at parties, in darkened studios watching rushes of Charles's early socially conscious documentaries, they manifested their shadow selves, their sexual selves, and in the daylight their fortified solid beings conducted negotiations in another style on quite other matters. (Drabble 142)

Liz manages to become a family with Charles thanks to their satisfying each other's sexual needs and when this sexual connection is lost in their relationship, there occurs problems in their marriage. The novel, not only through Liz and Charles but also through other main characters, emphasizes the importance of sensual pleasures which were disregarded or rather supressed by the hegemonic discourse. This focus on

sexuality in the novel is a powerful subversion of Thatcherite ideology which constantly reminds the sanctity of Victorian morality.

Through Esther a stronger subversion of traditional norms in terms of sexuality and morality is achieved. At university, she is said to have had a relationship with her brother (Drabble 87). She does not have moral concerns and seems to be bisexual or lesbian: "Esther Breuer was quite well aware of the fact that her emotional relationships throughout her life had been based partly on her desire to avoid normal sexual intercourse" (Drabble 346). Dollimore, in his introduction to *Political Shakespeare*, suggests that sexual deviancy may be regarded as subversive considering the attitude of the hegemony of the time towards sexuality (14). Dollimore, here, refers to the Elizabethan age but this assumption may also be true for Thatcherite England considering that Thatcherite hegemony regarded only heterosexual relationships as 'normal'. Therefore, Esther's sexual deviance is subversive as Thatcherite hegemony tried to establish the norms of Victorian sexual morality. She goes out with married man who have quite different habits or interests: a 'satanic anthropologist' and a 'hard-drinking architectural journalist', and she even makes fun of them to her friends Liz and Alix (Drabble 106).

In spite of her short-term, perverse relationships, Esther seems to be the happiest of them: "Esther, unmarried, appeared happy. She pursued her studies … She continued to go out to dinner with academics, to receive the hard-drinking architect. She embarked on a new and even more enigmatic liaison with an Italian anthropologist of satanic reputation … He too was a married man" (Drabble 100). Throughout the book, all the married couples have marital problems and suffer from unhappiness although they do not always share these problems with others. However, Esther is never portrayed as coping with any sorrow or regret. She seems to represent the permissive society of the 1960s and stands as a subversion to Thatcherite England because she achieves happiness escaping from the pressures of the imposed gender roles, social and moral concerns and familial bonds. In *Faultlines*, Sinfield states the importance of language in shaping the reality and gives 'reputation' as a simple example of this relationship (29). As he suggests, the language the novel adopts in describing Esther establishes the view that Esther achieves happiness with her way of

life. It is a discourse created by the novelist either consciously or unconsciously, but this discourse contributes to the subversion of conventional norms of family and sexuality by sublimating alternative relationships and life styles.

There are frequent references to incestual relationships in the novel. As a child, Liz is molested by her father, and the implications of such relationships are brought into question later as the main characters become grown-up women:

> Liz Headland suspects that Alix Bowen is in love with Nicholas Manning, and wonders if she knows it. Alix Bowen, for her part, has strong suspicions about Liz's relationship with her three stepsons, but considers her own feelings for Nicholas entirely natural. Esther Breuer is not much interested in the distinction between the natural and the unnatural. Both Alix and Liz are of the opinion that Ester's relationship with her niece, with whom she shares her flat, is very odd indeed, but it is not to their advantage to discuss this with one another, or with Esther herself, and they never mention it. (Drabble 81)

Their tendency to keep these suspicions to themselves imply that there is some truth in them. Incestuous relationships existed in Victorian England, as well, but it was not spoken out loud; it was an expurgatory topic to touch upon even in novels. However, the explicit articulation of such desires is a subversion of Thatcherite ideology and exhibits that the denial of the existence of some kind of divergence or the attempt to supress it does not destroy this divergence. In this respect, it may be concluded that the more people feel free, the less they tend to be subversive. In a comparison of the 1970s to the 1980s, it is noted in the novel that: "The seventies had been less euphoric: infidelities, small betrayals, small conflicts. But beneath that, Liz had assumed an abiding loyalty, and abiding unity" (Drabble 142). It may be noted in the novel that although the 1980s' society is under strict surveillance, there seems to be more problems concerning morality.

Alix, also, suffers from her repressed and unsatisfied sexuality. She is a virgin when she first gets married and they cannot consummate the marriage for a while. Moreover, her husband is implied to be a homosexual which discourages Alix from having sex: "She had suggested to him, although of course not in words, that it would be a good idea to alter their pattern of lovemaking to something a little more adult, but he had moved away: shrunk, dwindled, and moved away. And since that movement,

that rejection, Alix had felt her own desire diminish" (Drabble 97). They have an intercourse later on but Alix knows that something is wrong about him, and she regrets ever getting married to him: "She should not have married Sebastian. She doubted Sebastian. She'd betrayed herself and Sebastian by marrying Sebastian … Deborah [his mother] also doubted Sebastian, although she never let it show, or hoped she did not let it show" (Drabble 97). In her second marriage, she is in love with her husband Brian but her love seems to derive from her respect for Brian for his left-wing political stance. She does not feel sexually attracted to him after years of marriage and she falls in love with one of her husband's friends who is also married. She does not get a divorce but she cannot deny her feelings for another man although she never puts these feelings into words.

The novel presents alternative family structures through each of the main characters. Liz has two daughters from Charles and Charles has three sons from his prior marriage. They all live together and manage to become a large family. She has no blood connection with her step sons but she forms a strong maternal attachment to them. Although she has failed to establish familial bonds with her parents and her sister; she prefers to choose her own family. Liz and Charles form a strange connection in time. Even when Liz learns that Charles has been cheating on her with Henrietta for a long time and that they have already made plans to move to America together, Liz continues living with Charles till he moves to America as though the situation was quite normal: "Aaron [her step-son] rose, and put his arms around her, and kissed her on her forehead, as was his way: Charles patted her vaguely, in what had lately become his way, and, like a normal family, like a normal affectionate family, they mumbled good night to one another and went to their separate rooms" (Drabble 124). Moreover, Liz continues to live with her step sons after Charles leaves the house and gets married to Henrietta.

Liz and Charles have also managed to become a family with their friends in the 1960s: "it gave him pleasure to sit down with sound technician and lighting man, … make-up girl … to invite them all round to his … home and sit up late as Liz yawned and laughed and poured glasses of cheap wine and produced, occasionally plates full of spaghetti, occasionally crying babes. A family" (Drabble 176). Like Liz, Alix

marries twice. She has sons from both of her husbands. As for Esther, it seems that she does not have a concept of family either with her parents or with any of her dates as they are generally already married and she does not have such a concern as getting married sometime.

The only traditional family type is offered through Liz's sister Shirley. As imposed by the hegemonic ideology of the time, she belongs to the domestic world: "Sighing, Shirley wiped the imitation marble tiles, wiped stainless-steel sink, hung up her dishcloth. She was bored. Underemployed, bored. She herself no longer read books. Books seemed irrelevant to her life. They portrayed other people, other lives, other worlds" (Drabble 149). She is married to a middle-class business man and takes care of her house, her husband, her daughter and also of her mother. She and her family represent the ideal family type pertaining to traditional gender roles. She is dependent on her husband and has no say in life: "Shirley wishes she could work but Cliff would not like it" (Drabble 198). Even though she has a stable marriage, she is not happy and she does not seem to have an individual existence. Therefore, the novel presents the only conventional family example as a failure but it sublimates the alternative family structures.

The end of the novel also strengthens the subversion of the traditional family model. Having separated from Charles, Liz has dated several times but does not want anybody special in her life anymore. She feels happier on her own than ever (Drabble 365). She prefers her cat to a lover: "She no longer needed Charles. She would continue as she was, alone. With her tabby cat. A smile rose irrepressibly, at the thought of the tabby cat. The cat would be watching for her return, from her seat on the window-sill, her lookout place: she would run, eagerly, to the front door" (Drabble 314). Some of her children have already moved out and she knows that she is going to be alone soon, but she is happy to be a family with her 'tabby cat' and maybe with her old friends, Alix and Esther, and does not consider of taking anybody else into her life. Therefore, at the end of the novel, she is not with her children or sister; she comes together with Alix and Esther for Ester's fiftieth birthday. They are depicted happy in a picturesque landscape. To conclude, the novel subverts traditional family patterns and offers new patterns such as single-parent or bisexual relationships through preferring the

alternative family types to traditional ones and adopting unconventional gender roles. Sinfield proposes that, in order for a subculture to be affective, it needs to achieve more than producing different readings; it has to change the criteria of plausibility (*Faultlines* 51). *The Radiant Way* achieves to do so through shifting the norms of family structure and gender roles.

Waterland presents subversive elements concerning family in both Victorian and Thatcherite England. Such subversions are not expressed in Victorian novels as explicitly as they are in *Waterland* because of the oppressive Victorian hegemony. Therefore, *Waterland* evaluates and reveals the subversions in the Victorian period away from the oppressive surveillance of the hegemony of that period. In Victorian society, women were regarded and treated merely as ornaments; as though they had not had any intellectual capacity or personal desires. They had to abide by the traditional gender roles imposed on them. Hence, the aim of a married woman's existence was to please her husband, and defiance of her husband's wishes was out of question; she had to be submissive. Divorces and sexual deviations were not acceptable in Victorian society.

Considering the above-mentioned norms of Victorian society, there are several strong subversions presented through the Atkinsons and the Cricks. The first one occurs through an important event in Thomas Atkinson's life in 1820. The age gap between Thomas and his wife Sarah is more than twenty years. Sarah is only eighteen when she gets married and has an enviable beauty. Thomas adores his wife's beauty, after all Sarah is an ideal Victorian woman. They have children and years pass. However, as the years pass, Thomas gets older and becomes more jealous than ever while his wife retains her beauty (Swift 81). One day in 1820, deluded by his jealousy, he loses his temper and hits his wife: "Having been struck, Sarah not only fell but in falling knocked her head against the corner of a walnut writing-table with such violence that though, after several hours, she recovered consciousness, she never again recovered her wits" (Swift 82). After then, she never becomes her old self, and yet, always preserves her beauty. She is thirty-seven at the time of the incident and lives a long life to be ninety-three. All these years, she watches the town from the window of the same room where she has lost her consciousness, without understanding anything.

However, the narrator draws the image of Sarah with all her beauty looking out of the window in such a way that Sarah gains some kind of unexplainable power over the society "Her upright, forward-looking posture will convey an undeniable grace. Even in old age when her flesh has shrunk but the firm mould of her bones remains (for in such a state her portrait will be painted … what a perfect sitter she will make!), she will preserve the sadly imperious demeanour of an exiled princess (Swift 83). This description brings the Victorian 'woman in the attic figure' into minds. She represents all Victorian women who were in someway subordinated by hegemonic masculinity. However, in the novel, Sarah's eternal beauty and silence seems to subvert Victorian patriarchy because she gains power through her silence which becomes a life-long torture for Thomas. He suffers for the rest of his life for what he has caused. She had been ineffectual when she had wits. She could talk, but it was in vain. Therefore, her current inability to talk does not affect her that much for she is used to not being heard, but it makes Thomas impotent in spite of his masculinity or his wealth. He brings many doctors and does everything to give her health back, yet, nothing can help her anymore. With all the money and power he has, he becomes ineffectual. His helplessness signifies the subversion of the power of masculinity and patriarchy.

Thomas spends his last years looking into his wife's eyes and dies in 1825 in the same room that he hit his wife: "that death occurred, and that the two were discovered, the one stone dead, the other not batting an eyelid – this once vigorous and hearty man … worn out with remorse, is released from his misery" (Swift 86). In 1874, Sarah's children built an asylum in honour of her birthday and put her into the asylum "as guest of honour" (Swift 100). The same year Sarah dies, she is buried beside her husband's grave. A flood follows her funeral for several days and causes loss of lives and financial harm to the town (Swift 104). The disaster is interpreted as Sarah's insurrection because of her being buried next to her husband. Hence, even in her grave, she is not allowed to escape from her husband, the very person who is responsible for her destruction. However, this rumour about her resurrection empowers her with some kind of immortality. People of the town, even one of her grandchildren claims to have seen her after the funeral for years and the narrator gives them credit, as well: "Rumour is but rumour. But several rumours of similar vein, from different sources, cannot be ignored" (Swift 107). It is believed to be a curse by the people of the town and her

ghost haunts them for generations; a price they have had to pay for victimizing a woman to their patriarchal society. Through this, the patriarchal society is again subverted through Sarah because they are left helpless in the face of a ghost.

The second subversion is achieved, again through a female character, is presented through Tom Crick's mother Helen. Just like Sarah, Helen is a beauty and people cannot take their eyes off her and she falls victim to a man, as well. Her beauty and its power are discovered during a parade by her father when the soldiers, startled by her beauty, fail to march. Even then, this event, like several other calamities that occurred since then, is thought to be the hauntings of Sarah by some people in the town: "It's her [Sarah]. It's her work. She stirred up these floods in '74 when she should have been lying quiet in her coffin, then she got inside those bottles of beer, drove everyone crazy and got the brewery burnt down; and now she puts the jinx on our recruiting parade" (Swift 219). Helen's beauty turns out to be more of a curse than a blessing, contrary to her father's belief. He, Earnest Atkinson, falls in love with his daughter: "adoration turns to desire, and desire to cleaving, and cleaving to union. And all these stages it is possible, if it is not natural, for a father and daughter to undergo together. To all these stages the daughter assented, because indeed she adored her poor father and pitied his sorrows" (Swift 227). Therefore, this time, in 1922, it is Helen who is sacrificed to a patriarchal society because she only 'assents' to her father's wishes. She even cannot recognize what is natural and what is not as her whole world is made up of her father.

When Earnest Atkinson wants to have a child from her daughter, she first resists her father's desire feeling that something is wrong about that. However, when she falls in love with a man, she again assents to her father's wish of a child from their union in return of her 'freedom' so that she can marry Henry Crick, Tom's father. She gets married to Henry and gives birth to her father's child on condition that the child should be known to be from her husband. Earnest Atkinson is convinced that "only from out of this beauty will come a Saviour of the World" (Swift 220). However, the child proves to be "NOT A SAVIOR of the world. A potato-head. Not a hope for the future. A numbskull, with the dull, vacant stare of a fish" (Swift 242). Earnest does not see his son's birth and never learns about his backwardness:

> So Dick grows up, deft-handed, broad-shouldered, strong in body if not in mind, by the banks of the Leem … a Velocette 350, which some might say was of all things the thing Dick understood most intimately and cherished most dearly, a motor-bike, in its brainless efficiency, in its mechanical animation, bearing a pretty close resemblance to Dick himself. (Swift 243)

As in Sarah's story, the patriarchal society is again subverted through Dick because, in the end, Helen is saved from her father and married for love, despite the class gap between them. However, there are two men to suffer from this misdeed. On the one hand there is her father who, having lost his daughter and retreated from the society, is depressed and shoots himself. Moreover, he never meets the son whom he has wanted so much. On the other hand, there is Dick, a man, who is condemned to a mental illness because of his father and is going to suffer from it for the rest of his short life. As a result, it is not only the women who are victimized by the patriarchal society but also the men; the whole society is responsible from the wrongs done to women and they all pay a price somehow.

The last subversion that is to be explained here concerning the issue of family is the absence of a traditional family structure in Thatcherite England. Family in the 1980s England is represented through different family patterns: the classroom where Tom Crick teaches, a small solidarity group called the 'Holocaust Club', and Tom's family which consists of him and his wife Mary. The class consists of people from different economic and cultural backgrounds, and in time the students in this history class establish a shared understanding among them. The Holocaust Club is established by students who want to support Tom against the hegemonic ideology which regards Tom and his history classes as unnecessary: "Our society. The Holocaust Club – the Anti-Armageddon League. We haven't decided on a name yet" (Swift 237). It is a group which challenges the hegemony and which is not based on kinship but on solidarity among students with a common purpose. As for Tom and Mary, they are closer to the model of a traditional family, but they have no children and there is not even a prospect of one because Mary is sterile. The novel offers not a single example of an ideal Thatcherite family pattern. Hence, the novel presents children without parents or siblings, and parents without children in the 1980s. This is a subversion of the hegemonic ideology which lays emphasis on traditional family patterns.

In conclusion, *Waterland* provides important subversions concerning the family issues in the Victorian period from a Thatcherite perspective. The main reason for these flashbacks to the Victorian period derives from the fact that Thatcherite era deals with similar problems. Both periods face with oppressive hegemonic ideologies which impose certain patterns and norms on the society, and try to ostracise the subversive groups through forming dualities of normalcy. However, the novel not only lays bare the subversions which managed to exist in spite of the hegemony in the first period but also challenges the impositions in the latter period.

Education:

In the 1980s, education was regarded as a burden on the government, and therefore, every school was given small amounts of money and they were required to meet all their expenses with that money. As a result, the schools were forced to make cuts in some of their expenses. The cutbacks of the government were inevitably made in certain fields which were regarded to be less important compared to others, such as arts, history and literature. The Thatcherite policy did not support scholarships, either because she was against the welfare state. As a result of the education policies followed in the 1980s, education became more expensive compared to the 1960s and the 70s. It is possible to observe the influences of these Thatcherite policies on education both in *The Radiant Way* and in *Waterland* explicitly. They also reveal powerful subversions of this Thatcherite hegemony in education.

The Radiant Way presents the first remarkable subversion in education through the three main characters Liz, Alix and Esther. They all receive scholarships to study at Cambridge in 1950s, and they improve their living standards thanks to this education. The novel also states that, even in 1950s, Liz, Alix and Esther are among the lucky ones to receive such grants because not everybody, such as Liz's sister, Shirley, benefits from them. However, it is also noted in the novel that Shirley has never had a real interest in learning: "Shirley and Liz had quite enjoyed the lessons, in their different ways. Shirley enjoyed the outing, simply as an outing: a different room, different flowers on the carpet … Liz liked the poetry … 'Goblin Market', Don John of Austria, Edith Sitwell, A. E. Housman, even, daringly, a little Dylan Thomas" (149). Rita Ablewhite gives the same opportunity to her daughters Liz and Shirley and does

her best to provide them with a good education but Shirley herself does not make any effort to continue her education and gets married early. Therefore, it may be concluded that not everybody could get a scholarship but at least the hardworking ones who really wanted to continue their education were able to find an opportunity in the 1950s and till the Thatcherite years. However, compared to previous years, the 1980s' generation had less opportunities in this respect. This is illustrated through the students who are obliged to give up their university education because they cannot afford it in 1985 (Drabble 188). The government did not support scholarships, especially in social sciences because Thatcher's governments considered such welfare state benefits as a burden on the government. Considering this attitude of the hegemony of the time, empowering all three main characters, all women and members of subordinate groups, to have a professional career in public sphere with the aid of scholarships is quite subversive.

The Thatcherite education policy was based on categorizing some academic fields as important or less important. Therefore, the allocation of resources in academic fields was determined with specific ideological concerns and, in this respect, the primary cutbacks were made especially in literature, arts and history. The underlying reason for this circumstantial censorship in social sciences is that they provide appropriate environment for the representation of subcultures and, as Sinfield maintains in "Heritage and the Market, Regulation and Desublimation", subcultures play a decisive role in legitimation of dissidence (267). Hence, the government aimed to prevent the consolidation of the dissidence in the first place. In the same article, Sinfield confirms that conservative governments made cutbacks on their funding for arts since 1979 (268).

In spite of the above-mentioned cutbacks, Thatcher did not refrain from using the prominent historical figures of literature or arts such as Shakespeare or historical periods such as Victorian times in order to establish a powerful discourse and benefit from the market value of these topics. The novel makes references to this faultline in Thatcherite hegemony, although indirectly. For example, Alan's thoughts reveal the disparity between the implementations and the discourse of the government. The narrator describes Alan as: "trying to explain about inflation and unemployment and

monetarism and the economic implications of the new rhetoric praising the Victorian values of family life" (Drabble 16). Moreover, there are frequent references to the cutbacks in arts and literature and their influences on people's lives. Engaged in literature and arts, Alix, her husband Brian and Esther are inevitably affected by these cutbacks. Being an immigrant, Esther cannot understand the cutbacks in arts and questions it: "She cannot see why harmless leisure activities, in a society of increasingly high levels of unemployment, should not be more encouraged" (Drabble 187). In the novel, Italy is also given as a subversive example to Thatcherite hegemony concerning these economic cutbacks: "He [Robert Oxenholme] told me [Esther] that he knew of an Italian bank that would be only too delighted to sponsor my unwritten masterpiece on Crivelli. He said that in Italy all art books are sponsored by banks" (Drabble 248). Living in England, Esther cannot publish her work which is most probably going to be sponsored by the Italians.

Esther reveals the above-mentioned faultline in hegemony in another example. Thatcherite discourse was based on promoting nationalist feelings by reclaiming the Victorian values or the imperial power. However, the education policy Thatcher followed produced a contrary outcome: "Her [Esther's] course at the Feldmann Institute is also threatened. English students are failing to get grants. Luckily there seems to be a supply of wealthy young foreigners who like to while away a year or two studying art history. For the moment, they fill up places" (Drabble 186). As it is clear, more than the outsiders like Esther and these young foreigners, the English people who study or teach English suffer from the cutbacks. Contrary to the hegemonic discourse, the government does nothing to encourage the spread of English culture because culture spreads through literature, art and history all of which are subjected to economic cutbacks.

Within the scope of these economic cutbacks, some of the previously opened educational institutions which aimed at the education of mature students, such as Brian's Adult Education College in the novel, were closed in the 1980s. The Open University, established by the Labour Party in 1968 in order to offer an opportunity to adults who could not attend the classes physically for some reason, also received heavy criticisms by the Tories in the 1980s but, to their surprise, Thatcher supported it

considering it as an economic way to educate adult people (Campbell 204). In the novel, some of these criticisms are voiced: "The Open University was also the subject of debate between Alix and Bowen and Teddy Lazenby of the Department of Education and Science … Teddy … revealed what were clearly his own opinions on the inadvisability of wasting money on the education of housewives and taxi drivers" (26). When College of Adult Education is closed on grounds of economic savings, his boss offers Brian to give private courses of commercial English, which is in line with the liberal economic initiatives in these times. However, he refuses stating that he would rather like to teach "D. H. Lawrence, and Blake, Bunyan and George Eliot" (Drabble 186). Therefore, he starts to give courses for the Open University but the future of it is also in question as "[t]he New Right continues to complain that the Open University is wasting taxpayers' money on Marxist propaganda" (Drabble 186).

The prison where Alix gives courses, Garfield, is another example for an adult education institution in the novel. Garfield is regarded as a modern prison for that it provides some 'privileges' such as education, to the prisoners. However, considering the hegemonic attitude in adult education, the closure of this prison or at least the removal of these privileges is inevitable:

> Garfield, the pride of the prison service, the showplace, may not survive. It faces cuts in staffing, in medical expenses, in laundry bills, in catering. The Warden has always maintained his faith in the civilizing influence of tablecloths and reasonably leisurely meals. Tablecloths do more to rehabilitate than the drugs, or mailbags, Eric Glover, the Warden, has been heard to declare … But they will vanish, within the next two years, she suspects. And she herself may vanish with them, for the civilizing effect of classes in English Language and Literature is also open to debate. A luxury. (Drabble 185-6)

As it is clear, in spite of the economic cutbacks and the discouragement of the hegemonic ideology, Garfield stands as a powerful subversion of the education system on grounds of three reasons. Firstly, it offers an equal education to all the prisoners from different classes. Secondly, the quality of education given there challenges the ones given at expensive schools: "Jilly had passed her A- level in English Literature the summer before, having notably failed to acquire any qualifications except a pass in O level Divinity at her expensive school: now she was hoping to qualify for a course

at the Open University" (Drabble 77-78). Lastly, it provides a safer environment than the outside world as there are protests full of violence all over the country and serial killers freely living in society. To illustrate, when Alix visits one of her former students from prison, Jilly Fox, she is appalled to see Jilly, who has already lost her hope about future, living in a gross place located in a troublesome neighbourhood. Alix tells her that she had been better at prison (Drabble 327). Soon after her visit, Alix learns that Jilly falls victim to a serial killer, Paul Whitmore, who has been Esther's neighbour for a while and has been described again by her to be 'an unremarkable man' (Drabble 371). Therefore, the outside world, compared to a prison which provides a safer environment and a better education to its members, is not an appealing place. As a result, representing the subordinate groups, Garfield subverts the hegemonic institutions of formal education by offering a better service with limited opportunities.

There are also subversions concerning the content and aim of education in the 1980s. Even Esther, who is not very concerned about serious matters, says: "We're bound to get it wrong, and have far too many people making microchips and not enough people making wire netting" (Drabble 187). The cutbacks in literature and arts served allusively as a means of censorship by the government. Abolishing certain works which would pose a threat to hegemonic ideology through Marxist ideas or which would harm the so-called Victorian morality encouraged by Thatcher through obscene scenes, would most probably lead them to gain in popularity. Therefore, instead of abolishing them, the government tried to ensure its omnipotence by such discouragements as the cutbacks in these fields. There are certain references to this attitude of the government through some literary works in the novel. For example, Otto and Alix discuss Orwell's 1984, and the totalitarian state; Stephen reads Auden, Spender, T. E. Lawrence; Liz and Stephen refer to some 'obscene' words used in Lady Chatterley; Alix reads feminist poems by Sylvia Plath, Peter Redgrove and Penelope Shuttle to her students at Garfield (Drabble 159; 315; 166; 154). The veiled surveillance in education is also given as a reason why Brian did not continue his career as a writer:

> Brian, who was so good with his hands, taught classes in English
> Literature to middle-class housewives, because that was the nature of
> adult education. He also tried to write the great pedestrian realistic

112

working-class novel of the 1970s and 1980s, but he had moved to London, married a middle-class wife, and acquired too good an education to write what he wanted, as he wanted. (Drabble 170)

The last remarkable subversion in *The Radiant Way* concerning education is a reference to Thomas Hardy's novel *Jude the Obscure*. It is noted in *The Radiant Way* that "Jude is employed by a local farmer to scare the crows from his corn" (188). Considering the Thatcherite discourse of returning to Victorian values, it is quite subversive to draw a comparison between these two periods through a job such as scarecrows to indicate the regressing economy which is even worse than the Victorian period. Still, at least, it offers some money to the unemployed young generation of the time: "In the summer of 1985, a Midlands farmer … will offer unemployed school-leavers a wage of £50 a week and free self-catering lodging to scare birds from his fields of cherries. I feel sorry for youngsters today, with no hope of a job … Human scarecrows, the headline in a progressive paper will read" (Drabble 188). The metaphor of 'human scarecrows' is a meaningful attribution to the products of the current education policy of that time. To conclude, the novel implies that the adopted policies in education does not help to decrease the unemployment. Moreover, the government does not encourage education which would, to a great extent, solve other problems in the society such as violence or the widening social division or the rising unemployment.

Waterland largely focuses on the economic cutbacks in history. As stated before, the hegemonic discourse of the 1980s was based on a return to Victorian values through which it was aimed to conjure up the glorious times of the British empire. However, the education policy was in contradiction with the discourse as when the economy deteriorated, the initial field the government resorted to impose economic restriction became history along with other social sciences. In the novel, Tom Crick reveals the importance of history and also surfaces the reasons of a desire to diminish the importance of history through catechetical lectures he gives in his classes. His stories also embody subversions concerning the morality in education during the Thatcherite period. The moral concerns of the period have been already mentioned before; obscenity was not approved by the hegemonic ideology as there were frequent references made to Victorian morality, and Tom does not refrain from explaining any

detail about sexuality while recounting his stories even when he talks about his teenage sexual experiences with his wife.

At the beginning of the novel, all the students seem to be indifferent or even happy about the dismissal of the history teacher because they have no real interest in history thinking that it is unnecessary. Price, one of his students, protests the history class saying: "What matters … is the here and now. Not the past. The here and now – and the future" (Swift 14). In the novel, Price is depicted as though he were a subversion in the classroom because he challenges the teacher who is the authority there. However, he is the voice of the hegemony as he defends the futility of studying the past. Considering the discrepancy between the Thatcherite discourse and the Thatcherite policy in education, the deceptively portrayed stance of Price is understandable. Tom, on the other hand, is on the margins of the society. He, in his own way, starts a challenge against the hegemonic ideology which disregards history. He does not leave the school silently and tries to make his students grasp the importance of history before he leaves: "I believed, perhaps like you, that history was a myth. Until a series of encounters with the Here and Now gave a sudden pointedness to my studies. Until the Here and Now … informed me that history was no invention but indeed existed – and I had become part of it (Swift 67). Hence, he aims to draw their attention by binding the personal and public history which are, indeed, integrated and inseparable. By doing this, he also illustrates the plurality of history and truth because he presents the historical events from a different perspective. Moreover, his story reveals how time weakens the memory and how ideology distorts and shapes the reality.

The hegemony is presented not only through Price but also through the headmaster of the school Lewis: "He [the headmaster] believes that education is for and about the future – a fine theory, an admirable contention. Thus a subject, however honoured by academic tradition, which seeks as its prime function to dwell on the past is, ipso facto, first to go" (Swift 28). This is, in fact, the view that the government believed when proposing cutbacks in history. The hierarchy in the representation of the hegemony is clear then. Price represents the headmaster and Lewis stands for the government. Therefore, Tom aims to make his defence of history to the students in the

class especially to Price, and to change their views so that this way he will be able to subvert the hegemony.

Tom first emphasizes that it is not possible to live only here and now. He points out that only animals are capable of living here and now because unlike people, they do not have a memory. He describes man as 'the story-telling animal' and explains that it is in man's nature to leave a trace in the world and in order to do that he keeps telling stories: "Even in his last moments, it's said, in the split second of a fatal fall – or when he's about to drown – he sees, passing rapidly before him, the story of his whole life. (Swift 68). Therefore, story-telling is a natural part of human beings and, so is history. People who are against history tend to regard history as "the fabrication, the diversion, the reality-obscuring drama" (Swift 46). However, Tom urges students to question what reality is because "the reality of things … only visits us for a brief while" and then "time blurs details" (Swift 40; 41). At this point, there comes history to remind people what they forget or fail to remember truly. History teaches us "to avoid illusion and make-believe, to lay aside dreams, moonshine, cure-alls, wonder-workings, pie-in-the-sky – to be realistic" (Swift 113).

Human beings are not able to master time as time flows quickly and a person needs to look back in order not only to comprehend but also to explain now: "life is one-tenth Here and Now, nine-tenths a history lesson. For most of the time the Here and Now is neither now nor here" (Swift 67). Hence the past covers a larger part in one's life than the now because history moves in circles: It repeats itself in some way. Tom refers to Napoleon and Hitler stating that they followed the same war strategy; the first in 1805 and the latter in 1940 (Swift 182). Therefore, this circularity proves that it is not vain to study history as it is never a dead past but a bridge to future which has the power to shape the now and the future. Tom gives further explanation on the necessity of history emphasizing the fact that it provides answers to the most demanding question of why:

> What is the point of history? Why history? Why the past? I used to say… But your 'Why?' gives the answer. Your demand for explanation provides an explanation. Isn't this seeking of reasons itself inevitably an historical process, since it must always work backwards from what came after to what came before? And so long as we have this itch for explanations, must we not always carry round

> with us this cumbersome but precious bag of clues called History? Another definition: Man, the animal which demands an explanation, the animal which asks Why. (Swift 111)

As Tom makes his point about history, he does not talk theoretically. He recounts the story of his ancestors going back to the eighteenth century and relates them to publicly known or disregarded historical events and people. Soon, thrilled by their teacher's sensational past, the students start asking 'why' and they wonder what happened next. As a result, the number of the students who attend history class increases day by day. They wonder the cause and effect relationship between the events (Swift 112). Tom draws a comparison between history and an investigation: "Suppose we have on our hands a corpse – viz., the past. A corpse not always readily identifiable but now and then taking a specific and quite personal form. For example, the headless trunk of Louis XVI. Do we say… a corpse is a corpse and corpses don't revive? No, we do not. We ask: Why did this corpse come to be a corpse?" (Swift 112). He also tells the interesting death of one of their friends, Freddie Parr, as a child, and later reveals that he has been killed by his dumb half-brother. Therefore, his stories uncover not only some important facts both on personal and public level but also reveal the power of history or historian in shaping reality. This power is what makes the study of history a subversion for the hegemony.

The driving force of cause and effect relationship which is the essence of history, as stated in the above paragraph, is curiosity. In *Hard Times*, Mr. Gradgrind advises his students to avoid 'vulgar curiosity' which is derived from 'idle imagination' (23). Therefore, Mr. Gradgrind regards curiosity as a threat to the world he has established for his students only with his own 'realities' because he cannot control the outcomes of curiosity; it may lead them to a different reality other than his established 'facts'. In the twentieth century, Thatcherite education policy follows the same path as Mr. Gradgrind with the same concerns. However, Tom encourages his students to be curious, to imagine and to ask the question of why and warns against the absence of curiosity: "Children, be curious. Nothing is worse (I know it) than when curiosity stops. Nothing is more repressive than the repressions of curiosity … People die when curiosity goes. People have to find out, people have to know. How can there be any true revolution till we know what we're made of" (Swift 207).

In the novel, civilization is also noted to be a product of history as "[i]t's built by the learning process; by trial and error" (Swift 333). It is formed through the collective conscious; through the accumulation of past experiences. Tom draws attention to the fact that it is not naturally formed; it is an artificial creation so it is vulnerable to annihilation: "It breaks easily. No one said it couldn't fall to bits. And no one ever said it would last for ever" (Swift 333). Hence, drifting away from history may cost humanity dear; it may result in the fall of the civilization. He states that people get rid of most superstitious ideas, such as the end of the world would come sometime in the future, through experiences; through witnessing in time that these rumours are 'old mumbo-jumbo' and that they never come true (Swift 334). However, the superstition about the end of the world is implied to be metaphorically possible through the fall of the civilization if people turn their back to history.

Tom's story-telling achieves its aim at the end of his classes. Even rebellious Price forms an inexplicable bond with the teacher. When he sees his teacher drunk outside the school, he wants to help him which startles Tom, as well: "And how is it our disruptive Price displays such temperance and rectitude? When I succumb to just another one, he asks for straight tomato juice" (Swift 307). Tom considers the awkwardness of the situation: "Teachers shouldn't be drunk. They should be upright, exemplary and sober. Ridiculous for that. Not for playing the clown. The pupil shouldn't have to guide the master. The rebel shouldn't have to prop the tyrant" (Swift 307). During Tom's farewell speech, the students, who have been initially almost happy to get rid of the subject of history, protest his dismissal from the school by chants: "Fear is here! Fear is hear!" (Swift 331). It surprisingly turns out that 'the rebel props the tyrant' as Price takes his side among the protestors: "the rebel voices are stilled. Silence for Mr Crick. But what is this? From the centre point of the recent eruption, in the midst of the silence, comes a sudden solitary cry, strangely urgent and imperative, devoid of schoolboy insolence: 'No cuts, keep Crick!' Price" (Swift 332). At the end, Tom leaves the school but he achieves a great success; he beats the hegemonic ideology which disregards history. He changes his students' views and convinces them in the necessity of studying the past. As a result, *Waterland* embodies a subversion in education system which overcomes the Thatcherite hegemony in the end.

To conclude, Waterland and The Radiant Way embody important subversive elements regarding the institutions of class, family and education. In spite of the sublimation of the Victorian period and the Victorian values by Thatcherite hegemony, these novels clearly attack on this cherished period and its values. Moreover, they sublimate alternative ways and views against the hegemonic ideology of the time. As studied in this chapter, these selected novels to represent the Thatcherite period embody a great variety of dissidence and exemplify the power of subversion in this period. It may also be noted that the great number and variety of works of arts in this period also indicate the power of subversion.

CONCLUSION

The study has discussed the subversion in the social institutions of family, education, and class from a cultural materialist perspective in the novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England. Four novels have been chosen considering their canonical characteristics. *North and South* by Elizabeth Gaskell and *Hard Times* by Charles Dickens are the Victorian period novels whereas *Waterland* by Graham Swift and *The Radiant Way* by Margaret Drabble are the novels of Thatcherite England studied in the study. The novels of these periods have been chosen because the hegemonic ideology of the 1980s reclaimed the values of the Victorian period. Therefore, the study has revealed the similarities and disparities of the hegemonic ideologies and the subversive elements of the two periods.

In the first part of the study, some background information about cultural materialism, the concept of subversion and the general characteristics of the periods in terms of education, class and family have been given. Some influential events and developments that took place between the two periods have also been explained. The rest of the study have tried to highlight how hegemonic ideology operates in society and how dissidence occurs even under strict surveillance of hegemony and how subversion is achieved with the illustrations from the selected novels. It has revealed that dissidence is not as weak as the new historicists claimed. It is, on the contrary, quite significant in the appropriation of the hegemonic ideology. In spite of all the efforts of the oppressive ideologies to contain the dissidence and destroy it in the first place, it finds a means to survive and sometimes achieves subversion. The analysis of the books has proven that the ideological state apparatuses such as the government, education or media serve as a means of surveillance to hegemony. However, they also serve to the means of subversive elements to form a solidarity against the oppressive ideologies.

The analysis of class, family and education in *Hard Times* has revealed that there are important subversions implied in the novel. *Hard Times* presents the subversions in class through Mrs. Sparsit, Sissy Jupe and Mr. Bounderby. The first two characters belong to two distinct classes normally: Mrs. Sparsit is a lady from upper-class origins whereas Sissy is a working-class member of the society. However,

the novel subversively provides both of them an ambiguous status in the society and in a way equalizes them in terms of the place they occupy in the class structure. In fact, they switch their positions as Sissy ends up having better living conditions in Mr. Gradgrind's house accepted as a member of the family whereas Mrs. Sparsit is dismissed from the place she lives and she ends up homeless at the end of the novel. In a strictly class-conscious society, this is a powerful subversion of the class distinction. Mr. Bounderby is also used to present the subversion of class values through degrading the highly regarded middle-class values and turning his self-made man story into a myth. Subversions connected to family are offered through alternative family patterns through Sissy and Sleary's Circus. Even though these subversions in the family structure do not threaten the traditional family structure, yet at least, they offer that alternative family structures are also possible and that they can exist along with the traditional ones. It implies that the generally accepted relationships, which seem to fit into the traditional family structure, may not always be right like the one between Louisa and Mr. Bounderby as their marriage suggests some kind of paedophilic relationship. Louisa and Mr. Bounderby's divorce is a subversion of the hegemonic ideology concerning marriage as it is then a very degrading situation especially for people of high status. Lastly, the failure of utilitarian education system in the novel illustrates the subversion in education.

The subversions presented in *North and South* are more challenging. At the beginning of the novel, the credibility of the Church of England is questioned through Mr. Hale. As a clergyman, he is a respected member of middle class and he gives up all the privileges of being a man of religion. Furthermore, by moving to the north of England, he turns his back to the traditional Victorian values. In the novel, the south of England, Helstone, represents the traditional Victorian society and its decaying values whereas the north of England, Milton, stands for the newly emerging groups and values which are closer to the twentieth century England. The reconciliation between the hands and the factory owners, presented through especially Mr. Thornton and Higgins, subverts the sharp class distinction in the period. Different family patterns are brought into mind through Higgins' parenting Boucher's children. The Union, also, presents such alternative structures to the nuclear family pattern. The patriarchal society, the established gender roles and marriage with concerns of social

rank are all subverted through Margaret. As for education, *North and South* brings more serious criticisms to education system of the time than *Hard Times* as it directly questions the hegemonic system which intentionally tries to keep people illiterate.

Subversions in Thatcherite period are presented more explicitly compared to the novels of the earlier period deriving from the fact that the society in the 1980s encompasses the multifarious characteristics of divergent subcultures in spite of the oppressive hegemony. *The Radiant Way*, therefore, exemplifies powerful subversive elements to Thatcherite hegemony. The class distinction took a different form in this period compared to past years because there were no longer distinct social boundaries among people other than the economic ones. To put it more correctly, there was no remarkable discrimination based on class distinction in society. People from different economic backgrounds mingled easily and formed small subgroups based on different tastes or interests. Thatcher's discourse was based on eradicating all the class distinctions and returning to Victorian values but her policies enlarged the gap between the rich and the poor day by day as she eliminated the welfare system. Therefore, *Radiant Way* presents subversions concerning these practices of the Tory government. Lady Henrietta and the economic cutbacks provide a means of subversion in the novel. It, in a way, subversively, accomplishes the ideal of bringing the Victorian moral values to the twentieth century through presenting an aristocratic lady from those times while the economic cutbacks are causing severe distinctions among people. Concerning family, there are many subversive elements studied in the novel because the 1980s society was not a conservative society in spite of the repressing pressures of the hegemonic ideology. People in the 1980s had a background in the 1960s permissive society so it was not as easy to domineer these people as it was with the Victorian society. Therefore, there were many subcultures in the society to challenge the Thatcherite hegemony and the novel reflects this rich subversive atmosphere of the time through offering many different family structures as all have been studied in this study. The focus of the subversions concerning education is on the faultlines in Thatcherite hegemony.

The subversions studied in *Waterland* seems to reveal more about Victorian society but the focus on Victorian period implies that there are similarities between the

two periods: Victorian and Thatcherite England embody similar oppressive hegemonic ideologies. For that reason, the problems in class, education and family seem to be similar but the power of the resistance changes to a great degree. The issue of class is dealt in a different way in the two periods. In the Victorian part of the novel, family plays an important role in determining one's class and this is reflected through two families: the Atkinsons (the upper class) and the Cricks (the working class). However, in the Thatcherite part of the novel, there were no distinctions based on family names and this is presented through a child, Tom Crick, who is from the union of these two families. In this part of the story, there are problems deriving from the economic distinctions. The subversions concerning family in the novel are mostly based on the victimization of the women by the patriarchal society and on the traditional gender roles. Lastly, as for education, the focus is the same as *The Radiant Way*: the economic cutbacks in education and the ignorance of some vital subjects in education especially history by the hegemonic ideology. Tom Crick subverts the Thatcherite hegemony through turning the seemingly unimportant subject of history into an object of interest at his school and through this, he gains the support of the students even the ones who have been initially challenging his authority in the class like the student Price. The subversion is achieved when the students of history protest the hegemony which dismisses history. Hence, it exemplifies a dissidence in education which achieves its aim and subverts the hegemonic ideology.

There was a powerful hegemony in both Victorian and Thatcherite England. The hegemonic ideologies of these periods legitimated themselves through forming binary oppositions and creating the conditions of plausibility. They also consolidated their power through ideological state apparatuses and tried to eliminate the dissidence or subversion in both periods. However, there were faultlines in these hegemonic ideologies through which dissidence occurred. This dissidence was legitimated by means of subcultures and, in time, dissidence appropriated hegemony or at times even took its place. This study has illustrated these processes through the selected novels. In short, the power relations in both periods have been explained from a cultural materialist perspective.

The study has discussed the subversions in the novels of Victorian and Thatcherite England. The hegemonic ideologies of both periods were oppressive and they tried to take full control of the country through ideological state apparatuses. However, the structures of the societies were different. The Victorian society was more submissive and more homogenous compared to the latter period and therefore the resistance was not as powerful as in the latter period. However, there started a transformation towards the end of the nineteenth century, which influenced every sphere of life, in the north of England deriving from the changing economic factors. The transformation initially began as changes in the economic structure of the society but later spread into other areas such as social, political and cultural structures. From the north of England, these transformations expanded to the whole country and proceeded in the twentieth century. In the 1980s, there were many subcultures challenging the authority of the hegemony. That is why the subversions presented in the novels of Thatcherite England are more powerful and more explicit.

In conclusion, the assumptions that hegemony is omnipotent and that it may never be defeated are not more than illusions created by the hegemonic ideology. It is a strategy to attribute such an immense power to hegemony adopted by the hegemonic ideologies in order to eliminate dissidence in the first place; to discourage such an attempt to subvert hegemony. However, as the cultural materialists such as Dollimore and Sinfield proposed, there is always a faultline in hegemony. This faultline gives way to dissidence which may in time grow into subversion of hegemony. This is an ever-lasting process that repeats itself in every society and at all times. Still, what changes in time is the position of ideologies: what represents hegemony at one time may be a part of dissidence at a different time, and vice versa. So, the dynamics of power relations change in time. This study proves this claim through comparing two different centuries. It is clear from the illustrations in the selected novels that discourse is a powerful servant of hegemony and that it is inevitably subjected to change in time. The study has revealed that the hegemonic ideologies in the institutions of class, family and education could not escape from this change and were reshaped by the subversive elements of those times.

WORKS CITED

Altholz, Josef L. "The Warfare of Conscience with Theology." *Religion in Victorian Britain*, edited by Gerald Parsons, Manchester University Press in association with the Open University, 1988.

Althusser, Louis, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, edited by Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, Blackwell Publishing, 1998.

Arnold, Matthew. *Culture and Anarchy,* edited by Jane Garnett, Oxford University Press, 2009.

Barnard, Edwin. *Exiled: The Port Arthur Convict Photographs*. National Library of Australia, 2010.

Beers, Laura. "Thatcher and the Women's Vote." *Making Thatcher's Britain*, edited by Ben Jackson and Robert Saunders, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 113-131.

Berry, Helen, and Elizabeth A. Foyster. *The Family in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Black, Eugene C. *Victorian Culture and Society*. MacMillan, 1973.

Bogen, Anna. *Women's University Fiction, 1880-1945*. Routledge, 2016.

Böttcher, Janina. *Education in England: Gender Inequalities in Secondary Schools*. GRIN Verlag GmbH, 2009.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Brennan, John and Ruth Williams. "Accreditation and Related Regulatory Matters in the United Kingdom." *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area (2007 Ed)*, edited by Stefanie Schwarz and Don F. Westerheijden, Springer, 2007, pp. 465-490.

Brooker, Joseph. *Literature of the 1980s: After the Watershed*. Vol. 9, Cambridge University Press, 2012

Brown, James M. *Dickens: Novelist in the Market-Place*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1982.

Brown, Julia Prewitt. "Class and Money." *The Victorian Novel*, edited by Harold Bloom, Chelsea House, 2004, pp. 69–90.

Campbell, John. *Margaret Thatcher: Volume One: The Grocer's Daughter*. Vintage Books, 2000.

Cannadine, David. "Apocalypse When? British Politicians and British "Decline" in the Twentieth Century." *Understanding Decline: Perceptions and Realities of British Economic Performance*, edited by P. Clarke and C. Trebilcock, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007, pp. 261-284.

Cazamian, Louis. *The Social Novel in England 1830-1850 (rle Dickens): Routledge Library Editions: Charles Dickens*, Vol. 2., translated by Martin Fido, Routledge, 2013.

Clapson, Mark. *The Routledge Companion to Britain in the Twentieth Century*. Routledge, 2009.

Collette, Christine, and Keith Laybourn. *Modern Britain Since 1979: A Reader*. I.B. Tauris, 2003.

Cunningham, Gail. *The New Woman and the Victorian Novel*. Macmillan Press, 1978.

Davis, Paul B. *Critical Companion to Charles Dickens: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. Facts on File, 2007.

Dickens, Charles. *A Tale of Two Cities*. James Nisbet and Company, 1902.

---. *Hard Times*. London: Macmillan Collector's Library, 2016.

Dollimore, Jonathan. "Introduction: Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and the New Historicism." *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, edited

by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, Manchester University Press, 1994, 2-17.

---. "Shakespeare Understudies: The Sodomite, the Prostitute, the Transvestite and their Critics." *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, Manchester University Press, 1994, 129-153.

---. "Transgression and Surveillance in Measure for Measure." *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, Manchester University Press, 1994, 72-87.

Drabble, Margaret. *The Radiant Way*. Knopf, 1987.

Duff, Kim. "Let's Dance: The Line of Beauty and the Revenant Figure of Thatcher." *Thatcher and After: Margaret Thatcher and Her Afterlife in Contemporary Culture*, edited by Louisa Hadley and Elizabeth Ho, Palgrave, 2010, 180-198.

Durham, Martin. *Sex and Politics: The Family and Morality in the Thatcher Years*. Macmillan Education, 1991.

Eliot, T.S. *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014.

English, James F. "Book Prizes in the Boom Years, 1980-2000." *A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1945 – 2000*, edited by Brian W. Schaffer, Blackwell Pub, 2013, pp. 160-176.

Evans, Eric J. *Thatcher and Thatcherism*. Taylor and Francis, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism: A Reader*, edited by Kiernan Ryan, London: Arnold, 1996. 11 – 16.

--- *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Vintage Books, 1973.

Frost, Ginger S. *Victorian Childhoods*. Praeger, 2008.

126

Frost, Nick. *Child Welfare: Major Themes in Health and Social Welfare*. Routledge, 2005.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *North and South*. Edited by Angus Easson. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gillespie, Gordon. *Historical Dictionary of the Northern Ireland Conflict*. Rowman and Littlefield, 2017.

Gramsci, Antonio, Quintin Hoare, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. International Publishers, 1972.

Graham-Matheson, Lynne. *Essential Theory for Primary Teachers: An Introduction for Busy Trainees*, Routledge, 2015.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Invisible Bullets*." Literary Theory: An Anthology*, edited by Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, Blackwell Publishing, 1998. 786 – 803.

--- . "Resonance and Wonder." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism: A Reader*, edited by Kiernen Ryan, Arnold, 1996.

--- . "The Victorian Age." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature,* 9th Edition, Vol. 2., edited by Stephen Greenblatt, W.W. Norton, 2012. 1889-1910.

Gunn, Simon. "Between Modernity and Backwardness." *The Making of the Middle Class: Toward a Transnational History*, edited by A Ricardo López and Barbara Weinstein, Duke University Press, 2012, pp. 58-73.

Guy, Josephine M. "Part IV: Sex and Gender." *The Victorian Age: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*, edited by Josephine Guy, Routledge, 2002, pp. 463-472.

Haydon, Deena. "Sex and Sexuality Education." *The New Handbook of Children's Rights: Comparative Policy and Practice*, edited by Bob Franklin, Routledge, 2005, pp.182-195.

Heyck, Thomas William. *A History of the Peoples of the British Isles: From 1688 to 1914*. Hoboken, Taylor and Francis, 2013.

---. "Educational." *A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by
Herbert F. Tucker, Blackwell Publishers, 1999, pp. 194-211.

Hindman, Hugh D. *The World of Child Labor: A Historical and Regional Survey*,
Routledge, 2015.

Hostettler, John. *Dissenters, Radicals, Heretics and Blasphemers: The Flame of
Revolt That Shines Through English History*. Waterside Press, 2012.

Heyck, Thomas. *A History of the Peoples of the British Isles: From 1688 to 1914*.
Taylor and Francis, 2013.

Hughes, Linda K. "1870." *A Companion to Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited
by Herbert F. Tucker, Blackwell Publishers, 1999, pp. 35-50.

Jensen, Richard L, and Malcolm R. Thorp. *Mormons in Early Victorian Britain*.
University of Utah Press, 1989.

Letwin, Shirley R. *The Anatomy of Thatcherism*. Transaction Publishers, 1993.

Laybourn, Keith. *Modern Britain Since 1906: A Reader*. I.B. Tauris, 1999.

Malcolm, David. *Understanding Graham Swift*. Univ. of South Carolina Press, 2003.

Martin, Bernice. "Symbolic Knowledge and Market Forces at the Frontiers of
Postmodernism: Qualitative Market Researchers." *Hidden Technocrats: The
New Class and New Capitalism*, edited by Hansfried Kellner and Frank W.
Heuberger, Transaction Publishers, 1994, pp. 111-156.

Middleton, Peter and Tim Woods. *Literatures of Memory: History, Time and Space
in Postwar Writing*. Manchester Univ. Press, 2000.

Mitchell, Kate. *History and Cultural Memory in Neo-Victorian Fiction: Victorian
Afterimages*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Mitchell, Sally. *Daily Life in Victorian England*. Greenwood Press, 2009.

Moore, Stephen. *Sociology Alive!*. Nelson Thornes Ltd., 2001.

Morgan, Patricia. "The Family versus the Counter-culture." *Margaret Thatcher's Revolution: How It Happened and What It Meant*, edited by Subroto Roy and John Clarke, Continuum, 2006, pp. 82-121.

Mullen, A. "Taste and Class." *Social Class and Television Drama in Contemporary Britain*, edited by David Forrest and Beth Johnson, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Nassaar, Christopher S. "Introduction to the Victorians: A Major Authors Anthology." *The Victorian Novel*, edited by Harold Bloom, Chelsea House, 2004, pp. 91-101.

Neild, R R. *The Financial History of Trinity College, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Granta Editions, 2008.

Nelson, Claudia. *Family Ties in Victorian England*. Greenwood Publishing Group, 2007.

Nightingale, Florence. "Cassandra." *Cassandra and Other Selections from Suggestions for Thought*, edited by Mary Poovey, New York University Press, 1993.

Oppenheim, Carey and Ruth Lister. "The Politics of Child Poverty 1979–1995." *Thatcher's Children?: Politics, Childhood and Society in the 1980s and 1990s*, edited by Jane Pilcher and Stephen Wagg, Routledge Falmer, 1996, pp. 115-135.

Parvini, Neema. *Shakespeare and Contemporary Theory: New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2012.

Pilcher, Jane, and Stephen Wagg. "Introduction: Thatcher's Children?" *Thatcher's Children?: Politics, Childhood and Society in the 1980s and 1990s*, edited by Jane Pilcher and Stephen Wagg, Routledge Falmer, 1996, pp. 1-7.

Plunkett, John, et al., editors. "Introduction." *Victorian Literature: A Sourcebook*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Ryan, Kiernan. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism: A Reader*. Arnold, 1996.

Samuel, Raphael. "Mrs. Thatcher's Return to Victorian Values." *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 78, 1992, pp. 9-29.

Sinfield, Alan. *Cultural Politics: Queer Reading*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

---. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Clarendon Press, 1992.

---. "Heritage and the Market, Regulation and Desublimation." *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, edited by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, Manchester University Press, 1994, 255-280.

Steinbach, Susie L. *Understanding the Victorians: Politics, Culture and Society in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, Routledge, 2016.

Stevenson, Randall, and Jonathan Bate. *The Oxford English Literary History*. Vol. 12, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Stewart, W. *Higher Education in Post-war Great Britain.* The Macmillan Press, 1989.

Strezova, Sonja Vitanova. "Subversion of the Victorian Values: The Unique Female Characters in Dickens's Great Expectations." *Values Across Cultures and Times*, edited by Vesna Lopicic and Bilijana Misic Ilic, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014, pp. 131-142.

Swift, Graham. *Waterland*. Poseidon Press, 1983.

Thatcher, Margaret. "Don't Undo My Work." *Newsweek*. Vol. 119. Newsweek, 1992.

Tomlinson, Sally. *Race and Education: Policy and Politics in Britain*. Open Univ. Press, 2008.

Vernon, Keith. *Universities and the State in England, 1850-1939*. Routledge, 2014.

Wagg, Stephen. "Don't Try to Understand Them: Politics, Childhood and the New Education Market." *Thatcher's Children?: Politics, Childhood and Society in the 1980s and 1990s*, edited by Jane Pilcher and Stephen Wagg, Routledge Falmer, 1996, pp. 8-29.

Walsh, Mark, et al. *Social Policy & Welfare*. Stanley Thornes, 2000.

Whelan, Lara B. *Class, Culture and Suburban Anxieties in the Victorian Era*. Routledge, 2010.

Weltman, Sharon Aronofsky. "Sexuality and Gender." *The Cambridge Companion to John Ruskin*, edited by O'Gorman, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2015, pp. 157-169.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." *Culture and Materialism: Selected Essays*. Verso, 2005.

---. *The Long Revolution*. Broadview Press, 2001.

Williams, Tony. "The Masochistic Fix: Gender Oppression in the Films of Terence Davies." *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*, edited by Lester D. Friedman. Wallflower, 2006.

Winter, Karen and Paul Connolly. "'Keeping it in the Family': Thatcherism and the Children Act 1989." *Thatcher's Children?: Politics, Childhood and Society in the 1980s and 1990s*, edited by Jane Pilcher and Stephen Wagg, Routledge Falmer, 1996, pp. 30-43.

Wittlinger, Ruth. Thatcherism and Literature: Representations of the "State of the Nation" in Margaret Drabble's Novels. 2001. Herbert Utz Verlag, PhD dissertation. Google books, https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=SxUD9SgkeakC&lpg=PA126&dq=Drabble's%20classless%20chinese%20meal&hl=tr&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false

Wolfreys, Julian. *The English Literature Companion*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Young, Arlene. *Culture, Class and Gender in the Victorian Novel: Gentlemen, Gents and Working Women*. Macmillan, 1999.

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name Surname   **:** Ebru Ceker Gündogdu

Date and Place of birth   **:** 20.05.1985, Sivas / Turkey

E-mail   **:** e.ceker@hotmail.com

                eceker@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

Address   **:** Halil Rifat Pasa Cad. Altuntabak Mah.

                Meteoroloji Müd. Loj. Kat:1 No:2

                Sivas / Turkey

EDUCATION

Phd – Atilim University – English Culture and Literature

Masters Degree – Erciyes University – English Language and Literature – 2014

Thesis Research at Lancaster University, UK – 2010 (for three months)

Bachelor's Degree– Ataturk University – English Teaching – 2006

WORK EXPERIENCE

2009 – (Current Position) Cumhuriyet University School of Foreign Languages– Instructor

2006 - 2009 The Ministry of National Education – High school Teacher

LANGUAGES

Turkish (mother tongue)

English (near native level)

German (A1)

PUBLICATIONS

Yazarlar	Article Title	Journal	Cilt / Sayfa / Sayı	Tarih
Ebru Çeker	A Psychoanalytic Approach to the Irresistible Appeal of Serial Killer Novels	Published in a book called: *Fearful Symmetries*		2012
Ebru ÇEKER	"The Sadomasochistic Serial Killer Protagonist in The Killer Inside Me"	International Journal of Arts and Sciences	7/4	2014
Ebru ÇEKER	"A Cultural Materialist Reading of E. M. Forster's The Machine Stops"	International Journal of Arts and Sciences	8/4	2015
Ebru ÇEKER	"Identity Formation and the Clash between Individual Identity and Multiple Social Roles in Lessing's "To Room Nineteen""	Atılım Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi	5/1	2016
Ebru ÇEKER	"The Representation of Evangelical Society in Winterson's Oranges Are Not The Only Fruit"	International Journal of English Literature and Culture	4/3	2016
Ebru ÇEKER	"An Analysis of the Disadvantaged Position of Ethnic Minorities in Kureishi's "Borderline""	International Journal of English, Literature and Social Sciences	1/1	2016

Conferences attended:

- May 2014, International Conference for Academic Disciplines at Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- September 2011, 5th Global Conference – Fear, Horror and Terror, Oxford, UK
- April 2010, 5th International IDEA Conference: Studies in English, Ankara, Turkey

Grants received:

- Erasmus Grant in 2012
- Conference support by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) in 2011
- Thesis research support by The Council of Higher Education (YÖK) in 2010
- Project support by EU 'Youth in Action' Programme in 2013

Ebru Çeker

%**5**
BENZERLIK ENDEKSI

%**4**
İNTERNET KAYNAKLARI

%**2**
YAYINLAR

%**4**
ÖĞRENCI ÖDEVLERI

BIRINCIL KAYNAKLAR

1	**Submitted to Atilim University** Öğrenci Ödevi	%**1**
2	publishing.cdlib.org İnternet Kaynağı	<%**1**
3	www.arthursbookshelf.com İnternet Kaynağı	<%**1**
4	Joyce E. Salisbury and Andrew Kersten. "Family Life in Victorian England", ABC-Clio, 2010. Yayın	<%**1**
5	etheses.whiterose.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%**1**
6	www.britac.ac.uk İnternet Kaynağı	<%**1**
7	www.slideshare.net İnternet Kaynağı	<%**1**
8	John Brannigan. "New Historicism and Cultural Materialism", Springer Nature America, Inc,	<%**1**