HEGEMONY, AND VALUE CONSTRUCTION IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY* AND *NEVER LET ME GO*: A MARXIST READING

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

CİHAN YAZGI

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

JANUARY 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Prof. Dr. Gölge SEFEROĞLU
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral ÇİLELİ	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE	(METU, ELIT)	_____
Prof. Dr. Esin TEZER	(METU, EDS)	_____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name:

Signature:

ABSTRACT

HEGEMONY, AND VALUE CONSTRUCTION IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY* AND *NEVER LET ME GO*: A MARXIST READING

Yazgı, Cihan

M.A., Department English Literature

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE

January 2013, 115 pages

This thesis analyses the hegemonic processes that are maintained by traditions, institutions and formations by discussing over the process of value construction the characters in Kazuo Ishiguro's two novels are engaged in. A Marxist approach is used along the way and the discussions over the novels were taken as an opportunity of underlining the necessity of a Marxist approach towards art in order to make use of its propaedeutic value and extract the hegemonic substance the artwork inheres. This thesis seeks to use the propaedeutic value of Ishiguro's novels to point out to the hegemony that is prevailing over our actual lives. It argues that the person always has to relate himself to a society, and hence that society and 'the hegemonic' forces operant on that society come to shape his values and judgements at the end. In the end, what this study finds are the traces of the hegemonic processes that are hidden behind the individualized experience of Ishiguro's characters. Neither Stevens, nor Kathy can be underestimated to their individual choices. It is the hegemony, and the tradition and the institutions of that hegemony that construct their existence. Also, it is found out that it is again the hegemony that shapes the existence of Ishiguro's value judgements and his works' value schemes that are studied here.

Keywords: Hegemony, Value, Kazuo Ishiguro, Marxist Criticism

ÖZ

KAZUO ISHIGURO'NUN *GÜNDEN KALANLAR* VE *BENİ ASLA BIRAKMA* ROMANLARINDA HEGEMONYA VE ÖZDEĞER İNŞASI: MARKSİST BİR OKUMA

Yazgı, Cihan

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya YILDIZ BAĞÇE

Ocak 2013, 115 sayfa

Bu tez, Marksist bir yaklaşımla, Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Günden Kalanlar* ve *Beni Asla Bırakma* romanlarındaki karakterlerin giriştiği 'özdeğer inşası' sürecini, bu sürece etki eden 'hegemonya' kavramına odaklanarak ele alır. Romanlar üzerine yapılacak olan tartışmalar, sanatın sosyal eleştiriye eşik oluşturmadaki değerinin kullanılabilmesi ve onun barındırdığı 'hegemonik' içeriğin açığa çıkarılabilmesi için Marksist bir yaklaşımın gerekliliğinin altının çizilmesine bir fırsat olarak görülmüştür. Bu tez Ishiguro'nun romanlarını sosyal eleştiriye bir eşik olarak kullanıp, gerçek toplumlarda hegemonya varlığına ve etkisine işaret etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmada, bireyin daima bir sosyal oluşuma bağıl olarak var olabileceği ve bu sebeple, nihayetinde, özdeğerlerinin ve yargılarının onun bağlı olduğu sosyal oluşum ve o sosyal oluşuma etki eden hegemonik güçler tarafından şekillendirildiği öne sürülmektedir. Bu tartışma sonucunda Ishiguro'nun karakterlerinin yüzeyde bireysel ve bireye özgü olarak görünen yaşantılarının arkasında yatan hegemonik süreçler keşfedilmiştir. Ne Stevens'ın ne de Kathy'nin 'bireysel' tercihlerine indirgenebileceği, ikisinin de yaşantılarını ve varlıklarını inşa edenin hegemonya ve o hegemonyanın gelenek ve kurumları olduğu bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, Ishiguro'nun kendi özdeğer yargılarını ve romanlarının özdeğer şemalarını şekillendirenin de yine hegemonya olduğu da görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hegemonya, Ishiguro, Özdeğer, Marksist Eleştiri

To those who fought and died for their cause.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assit. Prof. Dr. Hülya Yıldız Bağçe for her guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insights throughout the research.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli for her suggestions, helps and encouragements.

I would like to acknowledge my best friend and my love Kübra Kulaksız for all her assistance, and for her encouragement and company along the way.

I would also like to express my gratitude towards my parents who were always encouraging me, and my friends whose names it is difficult to confine within this page.

Finally, I would like to state how indebted I am to those whom I learned Marxism from and fought side by side against inequality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Why analyse an art work? And what's more than this, why analyse an art work with a Marxist approach?

Fredric Jameson states his idea on art's value as follows: "the propaedeutic value of art lies in the way in which it permits us to grasp the essentially historical and social value of what we had otherwise taken to be a question of individual experience" (*Towards* 63). Living out the days within the horizon of one's individual existence, any member of society can easily comprehend the meanings, values and practices one experiences through their daily activities as belonging to their very own individual existence. This leads to an understanding of society as a collection of separate individual experiences. Indeed, as Jameson declares, art's value lies in its ability of providing an introduction to a further study on man's experience which is, in Jameson's view, actually a social and historical experience. Kazuo Ishiguro says in his interview with Graham Swift that he is attempting to use the butler figure in his *The Remains of the Day* (1989) as a metaphor exactly for this purpose: showing the relationship of ordinary people to whole social practice (*Shorts* 37). He says elsewhere that "[o]ften we just don't know enough about what's going on out there and I felt that that's what we're like. We're like butlers" (Ishiguro *An Interview* by Vorda and Herzinger 87). As usual with any artwork, Ishiguro is aware of the fact that his work is also a tool for understanding man's experience. Thus, the reason to analyse an art work lies in its 'propaedeutic' value of providing an opportunity to go beyond the individual experience and have a better sense of the historico-social content of that experience.

However, making use of this propaedeutic value seems to be possible only by a theory of analysis which would be able to penetrate into the art work and extract that historico-social content from it. The real essence of an art work can be perceived only when set against a historico-social background. Ishiguro's novels are quite ready for such a contextualization as Ishiguro himself admits it. He sets *Remains* at around the Suez Crisis, Summer of 1959. While the date at the extradiegetic level is 1959, a time when British Empire was undergoing a power crisis, the diegetic story that is being narrated belongs to the inter-war period. And Ishiguro authors the novel in the late 1980s when the Thatcherite conservatism is reigning in England. Similarly, *Never Let Me Go* (2005) is set in a utopia in terms of both time and space. Authored in an age when neo-liberalism announces the end of history, when genetic cloning news were spreading all over the world with bioethics prevailing over all the debates as a burning topic, and when consumerism and originality are shaping civilization's values; *Never* is a story about clones who are being harvested for their internal organs. All these issues that are inherent in these novels can be interpreted fruitfully in their social and historical backgrounds only. Extracting them and trying to analyse them by themselves produces a static view of them, and such an analysis ends up in an infertile description, the 'propaedeutic' value being missed.

Dialectic is a necessary tool here in overcoming this stasis. Dialectical perception of universe teaches us the transient nature of any phenomena; matter is in a continuous action towards its negation and then towards the negation of that negation. This gives any phenomena, including society and social forms, a historical identity. Hence Jameson's slogan: "Always historicise!" (*The Political* 9). According to Eagleton, "[t]he originality of Marxist criticism … lies … in its revolutionary understanding of history" (*Marxism* 2). Thus the reason of analysing Ishiguro's work with a Marxist approach; only a Marxist approach can . Hobsbawm confirms that "[t]he immense strength of Marx has always lain in his insistence on both the existence of social structure and its historicity, or in other words its internal dynamic of change" (*Karl Marx's* 274).

What can be the benefit of these processes? Thanks to art's propaedeutic value and to dialectic and historical approach of Marxist criticism that the essence of social

formations can be identified through an analysis of art (and an analysis of Ishiguro and his work in this case), which is always an essence of class substance in class societies as Marxism has it. Marxist criticism has the ability of identifying and declaring this class substance which is dominating the social formation. Eagleton proposes that "Marxist criticism is not just an alternative technique for interpreting *Paradise Lost* (1668) or *Middlemarch* (1871). It is part of our liberation from oppression" (Eagleton *Marxism* 35). This is liberation from class domination; or at least liberation from the ideological barriers that block our perception of that class domination. Such a liberation starts with identifying the hegemonic substance in society and this identification can be possible through an analysis of art since art works "are forms of perception, particular ways of seeing the world; and as such they have a relation to that dominant way of seeing the world which is the 'social mentality' or ideology of an age" (Eagleton *Marxism* 3).

This study aims at analysing two novels by Kazuo Ishiguro with such a Marxist approach; namely, *The Remains of the Day* (1989) and *Never Let Me Go* (2005). The aim of this study is to show how a social construction of meanings, identities, ideas and values happen within a social formation through an analysis of the protagonists of these novels, and an analysis of the novels themselves as social constructs and works by a certain author, Kazuo Ishiguro.

Yet before discussing the novels, it is necessary to account for the notions and concepts that Marxism makes use of. Chapter two aims at discussing these notions and concepts starting from the basics of Marxist social interpretations to more contemporary discussions of Marxism and explains concepts of *ideology*, *praxis*, *totality*, *hegemony*, *tradition*, *institutions* and *formations*, *art* and *Marxist Literary Criticism*. The chapter will begin with a presentation of the basics of Marxist theory of culture which are rooted mainly in Marx's famous *Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859). The *structure-superstructure* formulation will be discussed along with the necessary critical discussions on the formulation's validity. This will be followed by the presentation of the concepts of ideology, praxis, totality and hegemony; all of which are more contemporary interpretations of culture and society, and which are still rooted in the structure-superstructure formula although being upgraded with an act of

transferring the formula from a mere-theoretical basis to a position which deals with the phenomena directly in its actuality in the real world experiences of humanity. After that, a Marxist understanding of art and artwork will be presented. The chapter will close with a short definition of the use of Marxist Criticism. The chapter, as a whole, will work for setting the Marxist background of this study, and for representing why and what kind of a Marxist approach is important.

Chapter three will present a literature review of the existing major works on *The Remains of the Day* and locate the necessity of this study within that literature. Then, the chapter will present the discussion on *The Remains of the Day*. First, a discussion will be made over the protagonist Stevens, which scrutinises his busy construction of a self around certain ideas and values, and the workings of the hegemonic processes on this construction process. Then, the construction of the values of the novel itself will be discussed together with the effects of the historico-social moment on Ishiguro's writing process.

Chapter four will begin with a review of literature on *Never Let Me Go*. After that, the discussion on *Never Let Me Go* will be presented. The discussion will take place over the protagonist Kathy H. and her close friends Tommy and Ruth, the other two major characters of the novel. It will be discussed how they are shaped into the values and meanings which the hegemonic processes of the historico-social moment designate as *the* tradition to be disseminated through certain institutions.

Chapter five will summarize the findings and state the concluding remarks of this study.

CHAPTER 2

MARXIST THEORY OF CULTURE

2.1. Basics of Marxist Interpretations of 'Society'

In his one of the most quoted writings, Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx makes these statements:

> My inquiry led me to the conclusion that neither legal relations nor political forms could be comprehended whether by themselves or on the basis of a so-called general development of the human mind, but that on the contrary they originate in the material conditions of life, the totality of which Hegel … embraces within the term "civil society"; that the anatomy of this civil society, however, has to be sought in political economy. (20)

What Marx does here is to create a definition of society or, more precisely, a definition of the workings of the society. This is mainly a rejection of the idealist comprehensions of society or life in general which presuppose a developing human mind (or the *idea*), as Marx also states above, as a core generator of any dynamism in life. Marx makes this rejection mainly through an explanation of workings of politics and law in any social formation. After a critical study on especially Hegel's works, Marx comes up with a conclusion that follows as:

> In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes **the economic structure of society**, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political **superstructure** and **to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.** The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. (Marx Preface 20; emphasis added)

According to the formula stated above, as simple as it is, two main constitutive parts can be observed in any analysis of society; a structure (which can also be called as the *base* or the *infrastructure*), which is related to economic activity and made up of relations of production that humans are engaged in; a superstructure, which is related to consciousness and, roughly speaking, to mental work and which is determined by the structure since it arises upon that very structure. The structure plays the role of the determinant. It conditions, shapes and acts as the foundation in men's life. The superstructure plays the role of the determined. It arises upon the foundation the structure creates for it. Superstructure is more or less passive. This formula of Marx was challenged by the later Marxists of the twentieth century and condemned as reductive mechanical materialism. And those who keep passionately acknowledging this formula as summarized above were to be called Orthodox Marxists.

Whether it was Orthodox Marxism or not, Marx describes *mode of production*, *material forces of production* and *relations of production* to be within the structure. And what is in the superstructure, as Eagleton also notes, are "certain forms of law and politics, a certain kind of state, whose essential function is to legitimate the power of the social class which owns the means of economic production" (*Marxism* 3). Society itself is also in the superstructure, especially in the sense that, as Marx conceives of it, it is made up of "the relations of production in their totality" (*Wage* 19-20). To explain this, Marx gives an example of how social being is determined. "A Negro is a Negro", Marx says, and "[h]e only becomes a slave in certain relations. A cotton-spinning jenny is a machine for spinning cotton. It becomes *capital o*nly in certain relations. Torn from these relationships it is no more capital than gold in itself is money or sugar the price of sugar" (*Wage* 19). Marx's diagnostic statement is crucial in the sense that it indicates the influence of relations of production on individuals and other material constituents of any social formation. There seems to be no given and immanent a being or identity. Nothing is inherently *in* the objects of society. All is constructed by and within that society.

What is important here is the position of the 'individual'. Since the study's analyses will mostly concentrate on the individual entities and the sense of individuality in Ishiguro's novels, the discussions on the 'individual' gain importance. Marx discusses

how “[i]n production, men not only act on nature but also on one another” (*Wage* 19) and how “[c]onsciousness is, therefore, from the very beginning a social product” (Marx *The German* 74). Raymond Williams similarly observes that if “all social process is activity between real individuals, so individuality … is the active constitution, within distinct physical beings, of the social capacity which is the means of realization of an individual life. Consciousness, in this precise sense, is social being” (*Marxism* 41). These interpretations of society and individuality challenge the previous views on ‘human’ and ‘human mind’ propounded by idealist world views. Instead of the idealist school which starts off the universe from the *idea* and the human as its bearer, Marxism starts off the universe from the material and material activity. Louis Dupré notices this and states how, with Marxist thought, “human nature has ceased to be an abstract, ideal a priori: [and] develops with the social-economic praxis” (*Objectivism* 71). While the school of idealism that Marx objects to elevates human nature and human mind to an abstract independence and sovereignty, Marx describes them within the superstructural forms of consciousness and social being. Marx portrays the individual not as all-equipped and by himself but within his social being and within his relation to society. By this, as Dupré indicates elsewhere, “against the increasing tendency of Western culture to isolate the individual subject as the sole source of meaning and value, Marx, both in practice and in theory, placed the *social agent* at the origin of the humanization process” (*Marx’s Social* 276). Consequently, what Marxist understanding of society puts forward is that all individual activity happens *only* in relation to society and the society at hand is the sum of the ‘relations of production’.

From the Orthodox Marxist point of view, however, these previously mentioned interpretations seem to be indicating a one-way interaction. Yet, criticism against this concrete one-way interaction comes up quite early. Upon criticism against this formula of ultimate determination, Frederic Engels makes some comments in one of his letters, mentioning an interactive relationship between the structure and the superstructure. In his letter to Borgius, Engels states this again as “[p]olitical, juridical, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic, etc., development is based on economic development. But ... [i]t is not that the economic position is the cause and alone active, while everything else is only a passive effect. There is, rather, interaction on the basis of economic necessity”

(549). Here, Engels elaborates on the cause-effect relationship between the two and underlines an interaction between structure and superstructure. This, Engels says, still happens on the basis of economic necessity but at least the structure's role of being the sole active agent and cause was taken away. The superstructure is also an agent now; affecting the structure here and there. What makes this interaction possible is the human agency which appears to be the denominator between structure and superstructure. How Marx describes human labour in *Capital* is like an explanation of this agency: "what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality. At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement" (1: 257). Human consciousness gains its power back that it lost with the mechanical determinist formulas. Material social activity is affected by the human agent. As can be drawn from Marx's statement, what is important here is the fact that although the individual is a product of society, society in turn is made up of these individuals. Williams' analysis helps for a better understanding of the argument. Williams declares that "'society', or 'the historical event', can never … be categorically abstracted from 'individuals' and 'individual wills'. Such a separation leads straight to an alienated, objectivist 'society', working 'unconsciously', and to comprehension of individuals as 'pre-social' or even anti-social" (*Marxism* 87).

On this, Marx says elsewhere that "[m]an himself is the basis of his material production, as of any production that he carries on. All circumstances, therefore, which affect man, the *subject* of production more or less modify all his functions and activities as the creator of material wealth" (*Theories* 1: 288; emphasis original). Here the idea gets clearer; superstructure influences structure back through the agency of human which happens to be the subject of material production besides being the object at the same time. Dupré explains this situation as follows: "The 'superstructure' also affects the structure. Man conceives of his economic activity as he conceives of himself, and this all the more so as he progresses culturally. His practical activity increasingly reflects his cultural image" (*Marx's Social* 89). In these statements, a progressive interaction is detectable in which both structure and superstructure build on each other in a continuous cause-effect relationship. And this updates the one-way interaction pattern to an orderly progressive one.

After all these interpretations and re-interpretations one thing does not change. It is the secondary nature of the superstructure. Most neo-Marxists like Fredric Jameson, Louis Althusser or Raymond Williams argue that as long as there is a distinction of preliminary – secondary, Marxism will not be able to comprehend and interpret culture (which belongs to the secondary polar) in an appropriate way. Raymond Williams is one of these scholars who, first of all, disagrees with the idea that thought and imagination can be considered secondary in nature. Williams points out that "'thinking' and 'imagining' are from the beginning social processes … and that they become accessible only in arguably physical and material ways: in voices, in sounds made by instruments, in penned or printed writing" (*Marxism* 62). Hence, Williams thinks that "[t]o exclude these material social processes from *the* material social process is the same error as to reduce all material social processes to mere technical means for some other abstract 'life'" (*Marxism* 62). The suggestion here is the incorporation of mental processes with the material processes from which they were separated as secondary. Although thinking and imagining are spiritual forms, as Marx has it in their definition, they get involved in the social formation in material ways; language, writing, or other kinds of performance.

In fact, Williams' approach to structure – superstructure formula is much more profound than this. He says in another work of his that "for my own part I have always opposed the formula of base and superstructure: not primarily because of its methodological weaknesses but because of its rigid, abstract and static character" (Williams *Culture* 20). As clear in his statements, what he opposes the most is the long lasting tradition of reading the terms in static ways. It is true as can be understood even from the short discussion of the formula's interpretations that the most common way of seeing it results in that; there is a structure there and there is a superstructure over there and we are here as the observer – the philosopher or the scholar – watching how they influence each other. This understanding, as Williams argues, is a highly static one. Instead of this, he proposes using Antonio Gramsci's idea of *hegemony* which is to be discussed later in this chapter. But before that, Williams underscores how this understanding of the formula and its terms is against Marx's own beliefs about history of humanity. Williams expresses that "while a particular stage of the development of

production can be discovered and made precise by analysis, it is never in practice either uniform or static. It is indeed one of the central propositions of Marx's sense of history that there are deep contradictions … [and] the continual possibility of the dynamic variation" (Williams *Culture* 33). Marx's sense of history which is mentioned here, stems from his dialectical understanding. Dialectical method will be an important tool for this study's arguments on the changes in the power structures, especially when discussing *The Remains of the Day*.

Marx's statements in his afterword to *Capital*'s second German edition approves Williams' stance. In the *Afterword*, Marx sets out to describe his understanding of dialectic by putting it in contrast with Hegel's dialectic. He defines Hegel's version as a 'mystified' version and to be in full accordance with bourgeois thinking. However, Marx indicates that his version is the 'rational' version and is in full opposition to bourgeoisie: "In its rational form [dialectic] is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors … because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence" (Marx Afterword 37). As can be understood from the statement, what makes Marx's rational version an enemy to bourgeois doctrinaire thought is how it comprehends historicity and society in a fluid movement and transient nature. As Williams says, therefore, reading the structure-superstructure formula in a static and uniform way is fundamentally against Marx's dialectic. Sean Creaven defends dialectic as follows:

> If reality is not dialectical there can be no impulse towards change in either nature or society; without contradictions as well as complementarities built into the structures of reality there can only be cyclical processes of simple reproduction or repetition at work in the world …. Thus a non-dialectical worldview and method of cognition reduces the world to a dead collection of facts, devoid of life or movement; and it is this which is the basis of empiricist and theological views of unchanging 'things-in-themselves' as constitutive of the universe. (15)

As is clear, without this dialectical view, any reading of structure – superstructure formula would lead to a static understanding of the society. And in the more practical consequence of a non-dialectical understanding, "relationships, institutions and formations in which we are still actively involved are converted … into

formed wholes rather than forming and formative processes" (*Marxism* 128). As a consequence of this, certain social constructs as relationships, institutions or formations are considered to be stable, unchanging and everlasting just as it is in empiricist and theological worldviews. This, of course, leads to distorted ideas and conceptualizations among the oppressed classes about their position in society, which is mostly discussed around the term 'ideology'. Understanding of literature and arts is not exempt from this distortion either.

2.2. Ideology, Praxis, Hegemony, and Tradition

A discussion on ideology is important in the sense that when analysing Ishiguro's novels, it will be an important background for the key term hegemony. That's why, it is important to understand it full meaning first. Raymond Williams has summarized the versions of the concept of 'ideology' under three entries; three senses which are used throughout Marxist writing:

> (i) a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular class or group;
> (ii) a system of illusory beliefs – false ideas or false consciousness – which can be contrasted with true or scientific knowledge;
> (iii) the general process of the production of meanings and ideas; (*Marxism* 55)

Williams spends a long chapter on ideology in his *Marxism and Literature* and gives very good examples of how Marx himself uses the term with these three different senses. Williams concludes that we would be unable to establish a single correct Marxist definition of ideology. Among these senses, sense (ii) is the most controversial one and the most common uses of ideology by public belongs here. When it is used, it is mostly used in contrast to scientific knowledge to make the illusory nature of ideology more apparent. Sense (i) is the one most famously adopted by Lenin and Lukács. 'Ideology' can be similar to 'class interest' or 'class outlook' in class societies when used in this sense.

Jorge Larrain discusses that Marx had never meant to use ideology in the sense of false consciousness or illusory ideas (sense (ii) above). According to Larrain, what Marx did was using it only in a negative fashion to point to a distorted kind of consciousness "which conceals contradictions in the interest of the ruling class";

contradictions “whose reproduction guarantees the domination” of that ruling class (Larrain *Lukács’* 52). Nonetheless, although the sense of ‘false consciousness’ is underestimated to mere ‘negativity’ by Larrain here, this statement is still sufficiently able to create an image of ideology as ‘something bad and harmful’. Later Marxists must have realized how this notorious image of ideology may block their way to extending Socialism, the ‘ideology’ of the proletariat which Marxism so eagerly declares triumphant, that later with Lenin and Lukács, Larrain continues to explain, ideology is to lose its negative meaning and get to suggest the doctrines and ideas of all classes in struggle: “If a particular ideology is erroneous, this is not due to its being an ideology, but to the character of the class interests represented by it. … socialist ideology is supposed to be true, while bourgeois ideology is deemed to be false; but both are equally ideological” (*Lukács’* 54).

This sense of ideology seems to be a more appropriate way of interpreting the term for an analysis of class societies. Any ruling class necessarily uses its own ideological tools to safeguard the reproduction of its domination over other classes. Any struggle against the ruling class happens mostly on a basis of battling these ideological tools then, with other ideological tools surely. Thus, indicating ideology to be ‘false consciousness’ undercuts any such struggle against the ruling class in the eyes of the masses as in using one harmful thing to get rid of another one. Therefore, just as candidates in any democratic parliamentary system say ‘our party policies are better than the other parties’’, Lenin tries to take away the negativity from the term ideology *itself* and put it on the *ideology of certain groups* by proposing ‘our ideology is better than others’ ideologies’. Or else, it would be possible to refute him by declaring any Socialist idea he is putting forward is made up of ‘false and illusory ideas’. Lenin should be highly aware of this since he knows how much ideological production is important for the proletariat: “In the class struggle of the proletariat which develops spontaneously, as an elemental force, on the basis of capitalist relations, socialism is *introduced* by the ideologists” (qtd. in Williams *Marxism* 69). In this way, ideology loses its hostility and puts on an image of necessary ingredient of the class struggle in class societies.

Terry Eagleton discusses another feature of ideology. When the statements above are taken into consideration, ideology seems to be a simple phenomenon in terms of content; ideology bears the ideas of the class it belongs to. Eagleton, however, wants to object by indicating that "an ideology is never a simple reflection of a ruling class's ideas; on the contrary, it is always a complex phenomenon, which may incorporate conflicting, even contradictory, views of the world. To understand an ideology, we must analyse the precise relations between different classes in a society" (*Marxism* 3). It seems that Eagleton has sensed an incompatibility between the simplistic underestimation of ideology and what has been going on in reality, in the real living society. The complex and interrelating events or phenomena seem to reject any formulating analytical interpretation. And to overcome this, Eagleton here supports the analysis of the interrelation between different classes.

According to Dupré, this was usually what Marx and Engels were doing when they were actually analysing an event: "In their actual analysis of cultural and political events Marx and Engels pay little attention to the base-superstructure model. Instead, they view social life in its totality as a complex web of relations in which all factors remain interconnected" (*Marx's Social* 88). This points to Marx's idea of 'praxis', a concept in which Marx "attempted to reintegrate all facets of culture, the theoretical and aesthetic as well as the practical" (Dupré *Marx's Social* 280).

Marx's praxis tries to achieve a totality via this integration procedure. However, no matter what, economic activity keeps dominating the centre of this totality. Some Marxists agree with Marx both on the necessity of praxis and the economic activity being the basis within it. Lukács even thinks that praxis without a basis would be a deviation from authentic Marxist thinking and he considers economic activity, especially labour, in the centre of praxis: "in the absence of a basis in real praxis, in labour as its original form and model, the over-extension of the concept of praxis would lead to its opposite: a relapse into idealistic contemplation" (Preface xviii). Still, Dupré notices this as a fundamental deficiency on the way to full social integration: "The most serious obstacle to full social and cultural integration consists … in the primary abstraction whereby economic sphere comes to dominate all others" (*Marx's Social* 282). Thus, Dupré declares that the most fundamental obstacle of praxis is praxis' economic basis.

Williams has another approach to this discussion. First of all, he is aware of the fact that any real living society comprises of a totality. And he also recognizes the complexity and inner contradictions of this totality. Yet, he argues that although there is a complexity, societies always have a certain structure and organization which dominates this complexity: "while it is true that any society is a complex whole of such practices, it is also true that any society has a specific organization, a specific structure, and that the principles of this organization and structure can be seen as directly related to the rule of a particular class" (Williams *Culture* 36). It would not be wrong to equate Williams' urge to point out a structural or, in other words, a central element in any social totality with Marx's and other Marxists' attempts to put economic activity at the centre of praxis. However, different from their 'economism', Williams' ideas generally lead the way to the term 'hegemony' which he is so passionately supporting. In fact, hegemony is the notion that makes a true understanding of totality possible for Williams: "we can properly use the notion of totality only when we combine it with that other crucial Marxist concept of 'hegemony'" (*Culture* 37). For the discussions on Ishiguro's novels, as mentioned before, hegemony will act as a key term. It will be made use of to underline the forces and dynamics that are working upon the protagonists' social existences.

Concept of 'hegemony' is associated with Antonio Gramsci but Gramsci never makes a clear definition of the concept as Joseph Buttigieg also relates in his "Preface" to Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*: "nowhere does Gramsci specify hegemony, civil society, or the concept of the state as a rubric" (x). However, Williams writes inclusively about hegemony. To start with, he believes the notion of hegemony to be "more directly oriented to cultural process and to practical relations" than any other social theory is (*Marxism* 107). He defines hegemony in detail which is worth quoting at length here:

> it [hegemony] sees the relations of domination and subordination, in their forms as practical consciousness, as in effect a saturation of the whole process of living – not only of political and economic activity, nor only of manifest social activity, but of the whole substance of lived identities and relationships, to such a depth that the pressures and limits of what can ultimately be seen as a specific economic, political and cultural system seem to most of us the pressures and limits of simple experience and common sense. Hegemony is then not only the articulate upper level of 'ideology', nor are its forms of control only those ordinarily seen as 'manipulation' or 'indoctrination'. It is a whole body of

> practices and expectations, over the whole of living: our senses and assignments of energy, our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world. It is a lived system of meanings and values –constitutive and constituting – which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of society to move, in most areas of their lives. It is, that is to say, in the strongest sense a 'culture', but a culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes. (Williams Marxism 110)

His detailed explanation indicates how much it is possible to accept hegemony as an appropriate way of defining society in its history of class struggles. In his explanation, three basic qualities of hegemony appear: its being an internal element in society in contrast to economic determinism which is external; its being a present and lived – constitutive and constituting – and therefore a real phenomenon different from the fixed, past tense nature of ideology or economism; and its integrated and dissolved intrusion within all kinds and conditions of social being and the ways of life. Starting from these qualities of the notion, Williams, first, proposes hegemony over praxis, in terms of 'wholeness'. According to him, hegemony is an all-pervasive phenomenon that shapes social life and every single individual's life as well and more or less in an autonomous way. It is so common and lived that, for most people, it creates images of 'absolutes' which, although they are historical constructs that serve particular class interests, seem to be immutable and everlasting. This, in Williams' words, what makes hegemony more 'real' than praxis.

For Williams, one of the most important points which separate hegemony from other notions of explaining social formations is that – "hegemony is not singular;" and should not be conceived as such; although it is dominant, it does not have a concrete single structure, instead its "internal structures are highly complex, and have continually to be renewed, recreated and defended" (Williams *Culture* 38).

Williams thinks that culture, when defined as a holistic social process in which 'men' make sense of and live out their lives, is not a true way of interpreting real life conditions. He thinks this means, in a way, disregarding the real foundations of social relations and only the notion of hegemony can help understand them by relating "the 'whole social process' to specific distributions of power and influence. To say that 'men'

define and shape their whole lives is true only in abstraction. In any actual society there are specific inequalities … In a class society these are primarily inequalities between classes" (Williams *Culture* 108). When it comes to ideology, what Williams objects to most is the articulated and fixed nature of the notion. According to Williams, this fixed nature of ideology as a 'system of beliefs and ideas' is what makes ideology popular and easy to use "since a *system* of ideas can be abstracted from that once living social process and represented, usually by the selection of 'leading' or typical 'ideologists' or 'ideological features', as the decisive form in which consciousness was at once expressed and controlled" (Williams *Culture* 109; emphasis original). This is mainly what distinguishes hegemony from ideology. Hegemony refuses "to equate consciousness with [an] articulate formal system" (Williams *Culture* 109). Any such formulaic statements of society and consciousness debar the class relations and domination from its immediacy and actuality with a regular use of past tense in indicating the quality of their being articulate. The fact that they are still active in transformative and adaptive ways and are lived every single day is overlooked. Williams believes this to be a basic reason behind many static views and categorisations of society and social conditions: "from the abstractions formed … by this act of debarring – the 'human imagination', the 'human psyche', the 'unconscious', with their 'functions' in art and in myth and in dream – new and displaced forms of social analysis and categorisation, overriding all specific social conditions, are then more or less rapidly developed" (*Culture* 129-130).

Another thing that Williams rejects is the format of one-way 'determination' inherent in the structure-superstructure formula. Williams thinks that society should never be interpreted as a limiting frame that is against individual will to personal fulfilment. Instead, he believes, the limits and pressures of domination are internalized and become individual wills themselves in an actual society. Larrain explains how Gramsci also criticises determinism:

> [T]he structural correspondence can be 'studied and analysed only after it has gone through its whole process of development, and not during the process itself, except hypothetically'. … this accounts for the existence of political mistakes and errors in calculation on the part of political leaders which historical development later corrects. This is why it is impossible to relate every single … struggle to some definite elements in the social structure. (*Marxism* 81-82)

Thus, only a retrospective method can help in understanding relations of determination and this can be applied only to previous, lived social systems. When the same retrospective method is applied to contemporary social analysis, stasis is the only result.

Hegemony, therefore, seems to be a substantial and guiding notion for use while interpreting any cultural activity in its immediacy. As discussed, hegemony succeeds in putting the idea of totality or praxis on solid ground and interpreting the complex but organized society in a way other than abstract determination and simple reflection; in its internalized relations of power and domination. It succeeds in, as Williams says, becoming the: "adequate organization and interconnection of otherwise separated and even disparate meanings, values, and practices, which it specifically incorporates in a significant culture and an effective social order" (*Marxism* 115).

Within the hegemonic processes, three important and working notions become available. These are tradition, institutions and formations. Williams argues that Marx and Marxism in general overlook the workings of these three important elements in any social formation. According to Williams, these are the most practical spaces where hegemonic procedures make themselves at home and powerful. Starting with 'tradition', Williams indicates that tradition is the most evident element of any social formation that expresses and makes practical the pressures and limits of the hegemonic. It is one of the most powerful tools that are used for incorporation and identification in the interest of a dominating class. Williams expresses that "[w]hat we have to see is not just 'a tradition' but a *selective tradition*: an intentionally selective version of a shaping past and a pre-shaped present, which is then powerfully operative in the process of social and cultural definition and identification" (*Marxism* 115; emphasis original). Any tradition, no matter how it creates the air of stemming from an objective past history, is actually a *version* of that past which is selected and transformed to connect with the present social organization. That is to say, tradition is always contemporary. Hence, Williams chooses to call it not just 'tradition' but '*the* tradition' or '*the* significant past.' He stresses the process of selection in the creation of *the* tradition "in which, from a whole possible area of past and present, certain meanings and practices are chosen for emphasis, certain other meanings and practices are neglected and excluded … [Also]

some of these meanings and practices are reinterpreted, diluted" so that nothing contradictory is left behind that can distort or challenge the dominant culture or in another sense the hegemony (Williams *Culture* 39). In another work, Williams adds here that, meanwhile, the same 'selectivity' makes the dominant tradition vulnerable as well: "Vulnerable because the real record is effectively recoverable, and many of the alternative or opposing practical continuities are still available" (*Marxism* 116-117).

Institutions and formations are the next elements Williams defines within hegemony. Tradition, institutions and formations are crucial for this study since they are *the* most practical instances of hegemony and they will be heavily relied on when pointing out to the existence of hegemony in the social formations within Ishiguro's novels' narratives. Williams says that "the effective establishment of a selective tradition can be said to depend on identifiable institutions. But it is … also a question of *formations*; those effective movements and tendencies, in intellectual and artistic life" (*Marxism* 117; emphasis original). Among institutions, Williams counts family, school, specific communities or places of work. These institutions effectively transmit the meanings and values and practices of the dominant culture and the selective tradition. In families for instance "children are cared for and taught to care for themselves, but within this necessary process fundamental and selective attitudes to self, to others, to a social order, and to the material world are both consciously and unconsciously taught" (Williams *Marxism* 117). Similarly, "[s]pecific communities and specific places of work … teach, confirm, and in most cases finally enforce selected meanings, values, and activities (Williams *Marxism* 118).

Formations, as Williams' previous statement indicates, are also significant for development and subsistence of the hegemony. Williams believes the true condition of any hegemony is in an effective self-identification with the hegemonic forms of the members of the society. He thinks that this happens first at a positive direct incorporation level but if that fails it ends up with a resigned recognition and acceptance. Formations are "most recognizable as conscious movements and tendencies (literary, artistic, philosophical or scientific) … Often… these are articulations of much wider effective formations which can by no means be wholly identified with

formal institutions" (Williams *Marxism* 118-119). What is indicated by the last sentence here is that Dadaism for example, as an artistic movement, cannot be identified by means of an institution like school, family or a non-governmental organization and so forth. Therefore, it should be comprehended as a formation.

2.3. Art

A discussion on art gains importance due to the fact that the study will not limit itself to the content of Ishiguro's novels. It will try to first make the connection between art's material being and its contents, and second step out of the narratives of the novels to locate those novels themselves within a certain social formation and under the influence of certain hegemonic processes.

In terms of art, the first problematic issue is its separation from both productive activity, and totality of social formations. This separation can be explained with the concept of reification. Reification originally stems from the division of labour, and from splitting off of his product from man himself. As this division is carried further and further to create more manageable and efficient units within the material activity, production and distribution is broken into much smaller parts. As this process deepens, in William Dowlings' words, "the labour of human beings became simply one more commodity in a world given over wholly to production and consumption of commodities, so that men became, in their relations to society and to each other, nothing more than commodities or things" and this is the state of reification, 'a state of thingness' which implies "a world from which the human is being eliminated all together" (27). That is to say, reification is a process in which what is human in material processes and commodities is being erased while a non-human and 'in-itself' mechanical process is taking place in appearance. What happens consequently is, as Grondin talks about it, a "progressive disappearance of the individual, personal, and teleological character of human work, a dehumanization" (90). Work of art is scarcely exempt from this process. Reification process and, in Adorno's view, contradictions that are created by the division of labour, in especially two main senses of mental and material labour, force "the work of art to make us forget that *they have been made*. The claim implicit in

their existence and hence, too, the claim that existence has a meaning, is the more convincing, the less they contain to remind us that they have been made" (Adorno 71-72).

Here, Jameson makes a very important analysis regarding the "repression of the traces of labour on the product" which states that this is mostly promoted via the power of commodity form which is a power that "obliterate[s] the signs of work on the product in order to make it easier for us to forget the class structure which is its organizational framework" (*Towards* 64). Art, when it is separated from productive activity, from labour, ceases to be a human social construct and gets a semblance of independence or objectivity. However, as Lukács says, "irony is the objectivity of the novel" (*The Theory* 90-91). If emphasis is put only "on the use or … consumption of works, rather than on their production", this disregards the human labour inherent in the work of art and gives rise to an analysis of it on its own, separated from any actual bonds with social formation (Williams *Marxism* 49). Therefore, if a true comprehension of any work of art is what is needed to be acquired, its true quality has to be acknowledged first: it is a human construct within a specific social formation.

Other than the labour put in it, what becomes of it after its production is also of importance to any analysis of artwork. As Eagleton points out, literature for example, is not just a cultural production of mental labour and social consciousness, it is also "an industry. Books are not just structures of meaning, they are also commodities produced by publishers and sold on the market at a profit" (Eagleton *Marxism* 28). Any literary work, at the end, becomes a commodity that has a place in the market and sold at a price which will make a profit for the publisher. As Dupré argues, "Capitalism possesses an amazing ability to absorb even … the counter culture, apparently so hostile to bourgeois society, [turning it] into a successful enterprise" (*Marx's Social* 265-266).

Williams talks about how this mass market shapes not only the writer or the artist in their creative process but also the readership and the audience. Then, he discusses how economics of publication and mass market are ordinarily excluded from the analysis of literary works "for ideological reasons" (Williams *Marxism* 137); a discussion similar to Jameson's argument about the censorship on the traces of labour in

a work of art. Against these tendencies to overlook the economic, Williams promotes Marxist analysis when he says that "[a] Marxist cultural sociology is then recognizable … in studies of different types of institution and formation in cultural production and distribution, and in the linking of these within whole social material processes" (*Marxism* 138).

Eagleton says that in order to understand works of art one has to identify the relations between those works and their social content, "relations which emerge not just in 'themes' and 'preoccupations,' but in style, rhythm, image, quality and ... form" (*Marxism* 6). This is an important addendum to the previous discussion in terms that it opens up the mentioned connections between art and society and social material processes. Williams has a parallel statement to Eagleton's idea. "Indeed", he says, content and other such formations bear the social content but "an equally important and sometimes more fundamental social content can be found in the basic social means – historically variable and always active social forms of language and movement and representation – on which, ultimately, the more manifest social elements can be seen to depend" (*Marxism* 139). Elsewhere, Williams elaborates on this and indicates that just because of this more manifest social content mentioned here, the arts "contribute to the effective dominant culture and are a central articulation of it" (*Culture* 45).

Williams' latter argument shows how art creation can serve the dominant hegemonic processes. This service is thought to be a service only on the basis of a reproduction of meanings, values and practices of hegemony within the artwork. However, Williams' and similarly Eagleton's discussions indicate how art serves hegemony also through being a reproduced extension of it in the sense that it is just another material social product which bears the social content in the very language or symbols and signs it uses as a means.

Reality does not shape language, it is represented through language. Therefore, an effective predomination over the use of language will yield a sustained domination on the social content. In fact, Dupré says that "Each class attempts to turn communication into a tool for imposing its own ideas upon other classes. The class that effectively rules succeeds in presenting its particular use of language as the only correct one" (*Marx's Social* 227).

If that is so, it is a necessary analysis what Eagleton states as “All of our descriptive statements move within an often invisible network of value categories” (*Literary* 14). Eagleton’s example for his idea is impressive. He makes use of a comparison between two statements which are ‘This cathedral was built in 1612.’ and ‘This cathedral is a magnificent specimen of baroque architecture.’ In this case, if asked about which one is a factual statement and which one is a value judgement, one would generally answer that the latter is a value judgement while the former is just a factual statement. Eagleton challenges this notion at the point that the former statement demonstrates part of the unconscious system of value-judgements just as much as the latter does. It is surely not of the same kind of a value judgement as the latter statement but even “[s]tatements of fact are after all *statements*” (Eagleton *Literary* 13; emphasis original). What Eagleton wants to say is that even a statement of fact is a selection between a whole range of facts in a reality. This selection lays bare the system of value judgements behind that statement.

Dupré identifies art’s dependence on social-economic factors in another way which he calls dependence from within. He equates this to the effects of ideology and declares that “[n]ot only historical details in literary descriptions … but the entire poetic imagery, the assumed value system, and even the process of artistic formation bear the imprint of the society in which the work originated” (*Marx’s Social* 266). In Dupré’s words, it is not in the mere performance of arts (narration for literature, scenes from a movie for cinema etc.) that social-economic factors are influential, but also in the entire value system literature and other arts inherit as socio-cultural activities. This originates in the assumed immanence of ‘value’. Lukács blames the school of idealism for this stating that it was them who “put a methodological chasm between timeless value and historical realisation of value” (*The Theory* 16).

Hence, a necessary recognition of the social content, be it in the form of hegemonic cultural domination or the influence of more practical social economic activities such as wage-labour, market and distribution, in the categories themselves to which art works belong are crucial in analyses of those works. Furthermore, what is included in that category even is of dispute. As Eagleton expresses, what is included in

literature and what is left outside as other types of writing is again a selective process: "The so-called 'literary canon', the unquestioned 'great tradition' of the 'national literature', has to be recognized as a construct, fashioned by particular people for particular reasons at a certain time" (*Literary* 11).

2.4. Marxist Criticism

At the beginning of the chapter, an issue of liberation was evoked. Liberation from class domination; or at least liberation from the ideological barriers that block our perception of such class domination. And the possibility of starting this project from an analysis of an art work would be possible, it was argued, since the dominant ways of seeing the world were to inhere in the selective perceptions of any art work. Moreover, as discussed in the section titled 'art', this was to happen not only at the level of performance but also as an inherent element of art itself as a social material activity.

Arts and literature identified as such, it is necessary to discuss the notion 'criticism'. Literary theory or literary criticism, mostly institutionalized around certain academic departmentalization, or defined through fashionable formations, is the *de facto* science of dealing with literature. What is more important is the dislocation of this 'science' from and its exclusive attitude towards other social and cultural practices as usually is the case for most specialized categories of social analysis; politics being the most unwelcome category.

Fragmentation of social formation, as discussed here, is now furthered by a fragmentised analysis of its pieces; literary criticism dealing with the piece named 'literature'. Jameson argues that it is easy to distinguish the structural limitations of such specialized theory by a "juxtaposition [of them] with a dialectical or totalizing, properly Marxist ideal of understanding" (*The Political* 10). It is this 'local' ways of interpretation by which such literary theories further the fragmentation of social content and enhance the power of the hegemonic. This is why, Eagleton says, "the great majority of the literary theories … have strengthened rather than challenged the assumptions of the power-system" (*Literary* 195).

The superiority of Marxist understanding over these theories is its perception of totality and hegemony; its way of conceiving history and society within a great collective story of class struggle. Therefore, literature and literary criticism has to be acknowledged as a part of this struggle; ideological and political. Both Eagleton and Jameson, respectively, point out the fact that "[t]he idea that there are 'non-political' forms of criticism is simply a myth which furthers certain political uses of literature all the more effectively"; "[t]he only effective liberation … begins with the recognition that there is nothing that is not social and historical – indeed, that everything is "in the last analysis" political" (*Literary* 209; *The Political* 20).

Under the light of all these discussions, now the present study turns to *The Remains of the Day*.

CHAPTER 3

THE REMAINS OF THE DAY

3. 1. A Review of Literature

The Remains of the Day is maybe Ishiguro's the most famous novel, the one that turned into a universal success, and the one most read all around the world. It was Ishiguro's third novel and after its publication in 1989, it won the prestigious Booker Prize for Fiction in the same year. His previous novel *An Artist of the Floating World* (1986) had been shortlisted for the same prize but couldn't get it. *Artist* and his first novel *A Pale View of Hills* (1982) are important for a better understanding of *Remains* since as Ishiguro himself acknowledges, the three novels can be grouped around the same theme of 'wasting one's life' (*Kazuo Ishiguro: The Sorbonne Lecture* 153). In an interview with Cynthia Wong, Ishiguro states that "[i]n the first three novels, I was rewriting the same thing … my second novel was an expansion of the sub-plot of my first novel … And so, *The Remains of the Day* is a rewrite of *An Artist of the Floating World*" (*A Conversation* 208). *Remains*, however, is the last part of this trilogy since he continues with *The Unconsoled* (1995), a novel which was criticized to be utterly experimental and Kafkaesque.

What made *Remains* into such a universal success may be attributed to its rich allegorical possibilities which make several different readings of the novel possible. Up to day, along with thematic and narratological analyses of the novel, *Remains* has been used for historical and postcolonial readings which focused on the Suez Crisis (see John McCombe; Barry Lewis; Liliana Hamzea), Anglo-American tensions, clashing values of Britain and U.S., and an investigation of the historicity (see Susie O'Brien; Meera

Tamaya). There are also some interdisciplinary readings such as: an approach to Stevens-Darlington relationship as a source for a discussion of lawyer-client relationship and its ethical dimensions (see Rob Atkinson); or a discussion of individualism and Liberalism rooted in Stevens' identity crisis (see Kwame Anthony Appiah).

Unreliability, repression and memory are among the most discussed themes of *Remains*. According to Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, there are three main sources of unreliability for a narrator which are "the narrator's limited knowledge, his personal involvement, and his problematic value-scheme" (Rimmon-Kenan 100) Not the first one but personal involvement and problematic value-scheme may be counted as sources for Stevens' unreliability. Especially the third source is of importance for *Remains*. Kenan defines this source as: "A narrator's moral values are considered questionable if they do not tally with those of the implied author of the given work" (Rimmon-Kenan 101). Kenan states that the most common ways of realizing this kind of unreliability are "when the outcome of the action proves the narrator wrong…; when the views of other characters consistently clash with the narrator's…; and when the narrator's language contains internal contradictions, double-edged images, and the like" (Rimmon-Kenan 101). Kathleen Wall diagnoses some of these signs when, for example, Stevens uses a highly elevated diction and replaces 'I' with the generic 'one' to distance the reader and himself from the events (Wall 23). Cynthia Wong underlines that "he lapses from referring to himself as 'I' to 'one', as a way to dissociate his present self from his past self" (Wong 63). In fact, Ishiguro himself underlines that the language he uses in his novels "tends to be the sort that actually suppresses meaning and tries to hide away meaning" (An interview by Vorda & Herzinger 70).

Other than narrative unreliability, Lillian Furst dwells on the issue of memory in *Remains* and discusses how it can be misleading for the reader towards an understanding of what really transpired in the story. Since the first-person narrator's memory is the only report that is at hand and the reader has no direct access to the events, the fragility of the memory makes Stevens' account an unreliable one especially because Stevens uses words like 'remember', 'recall', and the dubious phrase 'as I recall' in his narrative (Furst 535-536). The other important thing according to Furst is Stevens'

fragmentation of the story. Furst says that "[t]he narration jumps disconcertingly from one period to another, drifting associatively in a discontinuous movement … The effect is one of fragmentation, as the time-line leaps between the various segments of Stevens' memories" (Furst 538). Adam Parkes similarly comments on this fragmentation that "[t]he cumulative effect of several different entries is that they relativize each other; each one has the potential to cast the others in an ironic light" (Parkes 35). On this, Wong also comments and reads this strategy as a way for Stevens of constructing his story in such a way that it helps him to clear himself up from any wrongs he had done. Wong indicates how Stevens distorts his accounts and "presents the situations in such a way as he defines carefully the terms by which he hopes to be viewed and judged" (Wong 59). Indeed, according to Wong, *Remains* in total is a project of demonstrating this kind of concealment: "*The Remains of the Day* demonstrates what care Ishiguro has taken to reveal how people simultaneously deceive and protect themselves in the language they use" (Wong 65). All these concerns about reliability, memory and concealment are necessary and successful readings of Stevens and his narration. However, they are preferred to be discussed descriptively in the sense that they are pointing out literary elements in the novel but they do not tie them up to any final statement on *Remains* or on the society that *Remains* was constructed in.

This preoccupation with reliability, reality, meaning and deception can be seen together within Frederick Holmes' interpretation of *Remains*. Holmes argues that while the novelists of the previous centuries shared a view of the nature of reality, twenty and twenty-first century writers are aware of the speculation that that reality is open to. This is the attitude of Ishiguro as well according to Holmes. Ishiguro seems to use realism but only by mixing it together with other –isms: "Though critics have said that his first three novels are grounded in historical realism, Ishiguro brings several '-isms' together in each, to show that conventional realism is best used in conjunction with other, more recent '-isms' to mirror the complexity of the contemporary world" (Holmes 20). Daniela Carpi carries this argument to the theme of identity crisis of the contemporary age. Carpi believes that

> the crisis concerning the idea of the subject is one of the main elements that typify our contemporary postmodernist era. … if some of the key words to

> understand the postmodern situation are in fact the terms uncertainty, 'homelessness', fragmentation, we may assert that the concept of subjectivity is also part of a more general transformation … the subject finds itself wavering between a plunge towards the past, in search of a lost sense of roots, and a drive to some kind of future freedom from all frets and limitations. (Carpi 183)

According to Carpi, *Remains* provides an example of this postmodern identity crisis through the character Stevens. Homelessness of Stevens in terms of class and his struggle to fashion a self for himself are clear demonstrations of this postmodern situation. Carpi states that Stevens is "the social subject, divided between tradition and … the past codes on one hand, the rejection of assessed trends and the advocacy of a new autonomy on the other hand. Living in the margins of class hierarchies, operating as an intermediary between aristocracy and bourgeoisie… the butler embodies the decenteredness and estrangement" (Carpi 168). These discussions are successful insights and they carry the former discussions on reliability or concealment a step further into a context together with other concerns. However, they cannot go farther than fashioning the post-modern situation. As long as the discussion of post-modernity is carried out within the frame of post-modernity itself and not with a juxtaposing of an oppositional value system as one that Marxism proposes, that discussion cannot go beyond deepening the problem in the sense of strengthening it.

Theme of identity is used by another scholar, Kwame Anthony Appiah in a discussion for promoting liberalism. Appiah discusses the process of individualization and the necessary socialization of this process. Appiah starts off with arguing that although most of the readers of *Remains* despise Stevens' situation, "Mr. Stevens is continuing to live out a life he has chosen" (Appiah 314). According to Appiah, this is the power of individualism and although Stevens seems to be an antonym for liberty, his choice of identity is his free choice. He "has put … generic identities-butler, son, man, Englishman-together with other skills and capacities that are more particular, and, in so doing, he has fashioned a self" (Appiah 320). However, in Appiah's view, what is wrong with Stevens is that he confuses service with servility, which is a kind of slavery. Slavery is an undignified situation, and it is in contrast to Appiah's definition of liberalism which is "the articulation of the value of a life of dignity: a life as free and equal people, sharing a social world" (Appiah 332). Appiah's statements on Stevens's situation are statements

that encourage class inequalities since any talk of equality or freedom in a class society is possible only in abstraction.

Servility and complete surrender to something or somebody else is a part of Rob Atkinson's arguments concerning *Remains*. Atkinson uses Ishiguro's novel for the purposes of discussing some ethical controversies that are surrounding the legal circles. Atkinson dwells on the relationship between lawyer and client centring around a discussion of professionalism. Stevens surrenders to Lord Darlington and gives himself away for the ideas Darlington is pursuing, never thinking of questioning or hesitating a bit. Atkinson uses this situation to talk about a type of lawyer which he names as 'neutral partisans.' Atkinson defines this situation as follows:

> The second of these two correlated principles, partisanship, entails advancing client ends through all legal means, and with a maximum of personal determination, as long as the ends are within the letter of the law. The first principle, neutrality, lets the professional claim personal disinterest in, or even antipathy toward, client ends and moral nonaccountability for helping to advance them. So … [f]or Stevens and the neutral partisans, the ultimate decision, in matters of morality and public policy, is the client's to make. … Neutral partisanship tends to reduce the human dimensions of one's professional life, to deal with its unpleasantries in abstract and impersonal terms. … We have already heard Stevens dismiss his moral qualms as foibles and sentiments. (Atkinson 185-186)

Adam Parkes is another scholar to elaborate on the issues of professionalism, together with nationalism in *Remains*. He constructs his reading of the novel around the problems of professionalism that Stevens adheres to and nationalism that seems to be working behind the back of Stevens' head. According to Parkes, one of the main problems concerning Stevens is that "he identifies himself completely with his professional role that without it he would be nothing" (Parkes 43). Parkes takes this as an issue of identity just as Appiah does and discusses the ethical side of such professionalism as in Atkinson's argumentation. Apart from his professional role, there is also the role nationalism assigns to Stevens. Parkes thinks that preoccupation with nationalism is a prevalent theme in Ishiguro's writings and in *Remains* it is symbolized by Darlington Hall which is "a miniature version of England itself, and hierarchical arrangement of social relations inside its walls reflects the state of English society at large" (Parkes 55). Parkes uses examples from the text to show how nationalism and the

mythical England symbolized by Darlington and Darlington Hall work together to construct the ideas and values that Stevens inexorably supports. During an interview with Vorda & Herzinger, Ishiguro states his discomfort with the use of Garden of Eden myth of England "with sleepy, beautiful villages with very polite people and butlers … taking tea on the lawn" as a political tool (74). According to Shaffer, in *Remains,* "Ishiguro undermines this particular ideal of England by showing how the soil in this "Garden of Eden" could nourish the seeds of a destructive fascism, and how the protagonist's professionalism – which nurtures those same seeds – could mask a self-destructive, paralyzing disengagement" (Shaffer 89). In Shaffer's view, *Remains* is an attack to "an entire nation's mythical sense of itself" (Shaffer 87). These discussions of professionalism and nationalism are of course necessary and important interpretations *Remains* is open to. However, they seem to lack the depth since they handle professionalism without the role of capitalist relations of production or division of labour, and nationalism separated from the role of social factors in its creation and its own role as a factor in certain social effects.

This national image is a strong one in *Remains*. As Ishiguro states in many of his interviews, the atmosphere, the setting and the characters he creates in *Remains* are more English than English. This image and the historical background of the novel call for historical approaches to it. Homi Bhabha analyses *Remains* as a

> three-leveled palimpsest: the authoritarian populism of the Thatcherite late1980s (its moment of enunciation), re-staging the Suez-centred mid 1950s with its post-imperial "confusions" (the historical "present" of the narrative), which, in turn, frames the country house, patrician fascism of the fellow-travellers of late '20s and '30s (the novel's *ficelle*). Ishiguro's narrative retroactivity articulates these temporalities, the "present" of each moment partialized and denaturalized by the process of the others. (Bhabha 14; emphasis original)

The political and cultural elements of these three different time periods clash with each other in the novel as Bhabha states. Yet above all, 'its moment of enunciation' in Bhabha's words takes importance. Ishiguro, although extending a theme he touched upon in his two previous novels, carries his setting from far-east to a western front and chooses a crucial time of crisis in British history as the narrative's present. Christine Berberich relates this to the atmosphere of the Thatcherite late1980s when "the

Conservative government under Margaret Thatcher" was reigning in Britain "and Britain was struggling for her place in the world hierarchy" (Berberich 135). Berberich discusses about the elements of nostalgia, Englishness and the gentleman in *Remains* which are all, according to Berberich, taken up by Ishiguro to question their validity: "These gentlemanly themes of 'dignity, self-deception, devalued ideals, repressed emotions and the high cost of displaced loyalty' will be employed to show how Stevens (mis)constructs his life" and how, at the end, while Stevens was waiting for a glorious ending to his services, he ends up being an accomplice in Darlington's fascist complicities (Berberich 140-141).

Victoria Stewart spares a short chapter on *Remains* in her encompassing study of *The Second World War in Contemporary British Fiction*. She talks about Darlington's complicity and also the indirect complicity of Stevens in Nazi aims. She reads the novel as a repression and concealment of this collaboration with the Nazis. According to Stewart, no matter how much Stevens resists to the fact that Darlington and himself have contributed to Nazi ends, "[w]hat emerges through Stevens's narration is that even those at the margins, the bystanders and accommodators, are historical subjects with a responsibility for their own actions" (Stewart 108). In Stewart's view, Ishiguro succeeds in showing that there is no need to be involved in an elaborate scheme to be an accomplice since "accommodation and collaboration could take place in mundane circumstances" as well (Stewart 107).

All three readings by Bhabha, Berberich and Stewart are successful statements of historicizing *Remains*. However, they prefer to stop once they settle the novel in a historical period and care not to go further into analyzing the causes and effects of this historicity.

Anthony Lang Jr. and James Lang relate this fatal error of complicity Darlington and Stevens make to a lack of theory in their actions. Lang Jr. & Lang read *Remains* as a possible source for discussions and samples for International Relations classroom. According to Lang Jr. and Lang, Darlington's erroneous attitudes stem from his idealism and from that "Darlington does not put his views in terms of a theory of international relations; he makes no attempts to locate his views in relation to opposing theories, and

offers no discourse on what assumptions underlay his theory" (Lang Jr. & Lang 210). His idealism stems from "a sense of noblesse oblige, his personal experience in the war, and his relationship with a German friend who dies as a consequence of the" after-war conditions in Germany (Lang Jr. & Lang 210). Lang Jr. and Lang use *Remains* also to underline how a student of International Relations should be sceptic about any account of history since any account of history bears the viewpoint of those who make that account. They give "Stevens' self-interested narrative" as an example to indicate the fact of presence of 'perspective' in historicizing (Lang Jr. & Lang 212). This reading of *Remains* is a solid ground for discussing ideology and hegemony in a social formation but Lang Jr. and Lang do not try to go that way since their discussion suffices for a paper on ideas for International Relations classroom. Similarly, the following arguments of McCombe also create the grounds for a discussion of hegemony and power relationships at the end of the imperialist and at the dawn of the neo-liberalist eras, but refrain from going that far.

John McCombe talks on the example of how the British government tried to contextualize its military action during the Suez Crisis. How after the nationalization of Suez Canal by the Egyptian government, although all public opinion around the world was against it, the British troops invaded Suez becomes a topic of discussion for McCombe. The importance of this discussion is Ishiguro's setting *Remains* in the exact year of 1956 when this Suez Crisis happened. McCombe states that "[b]ecause Ishiguro sets the novel's frame in the late summer of 1956, we can be rewarded by reading Remains with an awareness of the profound political changes that unsettled Britain … In particular, I will focus on the relationship between the Suez crisis of 1956 and the events taking place in Stevens's life" (McCombe 78). McCombe continues his study by analysing how these 'unsettling' political changes shifted the power relationships between U.S. and Britain.

Barry Lewis' reading of *Remains* is in the same direction with McCombe's reading. Lewis criticizes the values Stevens represents in the novel just as Ishiguro had said he wished to do. He reads Stevens' journey as a metaphor for a process of revelation and as an expected painful transition stage which happens before any drastic

change. At the end, Lewis thinks that it is a good thing that these values along with the certain Englishness the novel depicts are dead. Lewis says that "[i]f *The Remains of the Day* is seen as an allegory of the decline of the British Empire, it can be interpreted both pessimistically and optimistically. Stevens's failure is a fable on the passing of a certain conception of Englishness; but it is a death many would not wish mourn" (Lewis 100). Also, Lewis interprets Stevens' journey as a positive change at the end of which the silent butler gains a voice. Liliana Hamzea is another scholar who thinks the same and comments that at the end of the novel, "Stevens has acquired a voice, and a powerful one for that" (Hamzea 306). Hamzea reads Stevens as the representation of the subaltern and the process of the subaltern's integration to the oppressive values through an autonomous self-identification. However, Hamzea claims that Stevens gains a voice at the end of the allegorical journey he sets out in the novel. That is to say, Hamzea suggests a reading of *Remains* as a text which represents how subaltern goes through a process of breaking the ideological chains that is oppressing him to gain a voice of his own at the end. However, Hamzea makes this suggestion only by referring to the fact that the story is narrated by Stevens, which has to prove that he has a voice now. Yet, this argument disregards the change in the values due to a change in the hegemonic powers relations, and Hamzea confuses a change in the power structures with a removal of those power structures in total.

Meera Tamaya is another critique who reads Stevens-Darlington relationship as one of colonizer-colonized. Tamaya even includes the reader in this relationship and underlines how Stevens' narrative works as the narrative of the colonizer and gets hold of the reader to force him into collaborating with his ideas. Tamaya says "just as Lord Darlington has convinced Stevens of the importance and nobility of his diplomatic manoeuvring, the intimate tone of the narrative beguiles the reader into a curious complicity with Stevens' point of view" (Tamaya 50). One other important thing about Tamaya's work is how it builds a parallelism between Stevens in *Remains* and Caliban in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1610). According to Tamaya's parallelism, just like Caliban is freed from Prospero's tyranny only to be drawn into the tyranny of Trinculo and Stephano, Stevens is freed from the British Empire just to find himself 'on American shores' (Tamaya 54).

Both Tamaya and Hamzea read *Remains* as a post-colonial critique. Hamzea limits his analysis to a reading of Stevens's journey as salvation from subaltern voicelessness while Tamaya reads it as one of changing power relations. Susie O'Brien's reading of these Anglo-American tensions in *Remains* is similar to Tamaya's and a little more challenging. O'Brien states her reading of the novel being twofold: "first, as a narrative which is thematically constructed around an opposition between what are commonly regarded as Victorian values … and those associated with an idea of "America" …--and second, as … an exemplary product of a burgeoning "world" fiction industry" (O'Brien 788). According to O'Brien, what *Remains* manages with juxtaposing Victorian values with American values is at the end a chance for a deconstructive analysis of contemporary postcoloniality and the new forms of postcolonial imperialism today.

The literature on *Remains* is rich and has very important insights into many aspects of the novel. However, no study extends its focus to take up a Marxist approach. As discussed, the existing body of literature on *Remains* falls short at making use of the 'propaedeutic' value of the novel, and extracting the historico-social from the novel and locating the novel back within that context. The necessity of a Marxist approach defined earlier in chapters one and two becomes more evident for a better understanding and use of Ishiguro's work.

3. 2. Discussion on 'The Remains of the Day'

At this point, it will be useful to remember Fredric Jameson's statement on art's value once again. Jameson states that "the propaedeutic value of art lies in the way in which it permits us to grasp the essentially historical and social value of what we had otherwise taken to be a question of individual experience" (*Towards* 63). As discussed earlier, Jameson points out to the fact that artwork can serve as a tool on the way for a better understanding of the matters that concern the society and the members of that society. It can serve the purposes of overcoming that barrier of interpreting everything within the frame of individuality which, in the end, when eyeing any social experience, causes one to disregard the historical and social content which inheres within that experience. And our earlier discussion of adopting a dialectical approach is again

relevant here in that what makes that historico-social content visible is its temporality; it is constantly replaced anew, otherwise it would be impossible to grasp its presence since any such detection is exhaustively possible when one is able to step out of the context and comprehend it from the outside. According to this suggestion, and in the light of the previous discussions made in chapter two, it can be observed how the values and ideas one develops is shaped historically by and within the society as an extension of that specific social formation and the hegemonic processes that are at work behind this formation. This, in the end, pulls ordinary people into the hegemonic processes. Not only the individual's values, beliefs, ideas and even his identity gets shaped by the hegemonic but also that individual himself turns into an agent of hegemony, contributing to it in the end.

The Remains of the Day is a successful moment of experiencing such detection; detection of how ordinary people are pulled into the hegemonic processes. It perfectly serves as a propaedeutic tool of examining the historical and the social in what otherwise taken in terms of ordinary individual experience. Especially, the protagonist Stevens and the sort of identity crisis he is experiencing provide useful examples for such an analysis.

The identity crisis Stevens seems to be suffering from is rooted in his anachronism. As discussed earlier with the help of Homi Bhabha, *Remains* brings three time periods together. Ishiguro sets *Remains* at around a narrative present of Summer of 1959, the exact date for the famous Suez Crisis. The diegetic story that is being narrated by Stevens belongs to the inter-war period of '20s and '30s. And Ishiguro authors the novel in the late 1980s' Thatcherite England. What makes the presence of these three levels crucial at this moment is how the 'values' of the focalizer (Stevens in interwar period), the narrator (postwar Stevens) and the implied author (Ishiguro in the neoliberal era) clash and lay bare a conflict; a conflict of three different values which belong to three different periods of the twentieth century. With the help of such juxtaposing, the dialectical nature of the matter becomes visible. The reader finds the chance to observe how the values one held the dearest in one time period become anachronistic within a different time period. Stevens of the inter-war period constructs

an identity for himself based on the values exalted by the hegemonic forces at power then. When this identity clashes with the new identity Stevens is trying to construct at around 1959 post-war period, it becomes visibly anachronistic and odd. And in total, when the values of both periods clash with the ones of the implied author, they are rendered anachronistic once again. This happens just because of the changes the society is going through, and the society is changing because of the changes in the 'structure' as Marx puts it. At the end, we see that "[i]t is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness" (Marx Preface 20).

However, as it was discussed in chapter two, 'determination' relationship between consciousness and social existence is highly abstract when left as in Marx's statement. Then, one turns to 'ideology' to find a closer spot to scrutinise this relationship. If we are to remember ideology was usually defined as 'a system of illusory beliefs – false ideas or false consciousness' and it was used to describe how class domination triumphs. How ordinary people were deceived by a systematic transmission of 'false ideas' from the ruling classes to the oppressed classes. Nevertheless, ideology seems, by and large, to fall short in explaining the case. If ideology was operating as such, Lord Darlington would be a totally different character who would be seen constantly imposing one thing or another to Stevens. Yet, just as Liliana Hamzea sees it, "Lord Darlington's voice or power are rather absent in the narrative, and even when his voice is heard, it is not a haughty one, and with the exception of the episode with the Jewish maids, not really an intransigent one" (Hamzea 300). This takes us to hegemony. In *Remains*, it is not an ideological process that is at work. Rather, Stevens' case is a self imposed one. If we remember Raymond Williams' definition of the hegemonic processes, Stevens' case becomes much more understandable:

> Hegemony is then not only the articulate upper level of 'ideology', nor are its forms of control only those ordinarily seen as 'manipulation' or 'indoctrination'. It is a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living … It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of society to move, in most areas of their lives. It is, that is to say, in the strongest sense a 'culture', but a culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes. (*Marxism* 110)

As Williams brilliantly analyses the effects of the hegemonic processes on ordinary people's lives, Stevens 'lives' the dominance and subordination in a similar way. It is not something which is imposed upon him through indoctrination or false consciousness. The values, or 'the culture' as in Williams' definition, that Stevens holds dearest belong to a reality that hegemony created and a reality which is hard for Stevens to live beyond. When Ishiguro relates in one interview how 'most of us' act within the frame of our little worlds, his statement turns out true in the person of Stevens (*Shorts* 37). Stevens' case, in turn, gives us a chance to consider our own little worlds and how hegemonic processes are at work in our lives, on our identities and in our consciousness.

But then how does this happen in practice? How does the hegemony work on ordinary people and can we detect this operation in the character Stevens? It is understood from his narrative that there are some crucial concepts to Stevens' identity. As Kwame Appiah successfully summarizes it, "Mr. Stevens has constructed for himself an identity as a butler: more specifically as the butler to Lord Darlington and of the Darlington House, and as his father's son. It is an identity in which his gender plays a role (butlers must be men) and in which his nationality is important" (Appiah 320). Stevens puts these general concepts together with more specific concepts such as "dignity" (*ROD* 33), "loyalty" (*ROD* 210), "professionalism" (*ROD* 45), "greatness" (*ROD* 29), "silver-polishing" (*ROD* 142), "command of language" (*ROD* 35), "restraint" (*ROD 44*), and "good organization" (*ROD* 168) to build his identity. Appiah uses this case as an example of how Stevens, as a free individual, uses his liberty and lives a life he *himself* chooses. However, in the narrative, certain procedures are rendered visible that are at work behind this 'choice'. We can detect three procedures, all previously discussed, namely *tradition*, *institutions* and *formations* "which [are] powerfully operative in the process of social and cultural definition and identification" (Williams *Marxism* 115). As Williams puts it, these procedures are where hegemony gets operative within practical social life. And in *Remains*, we can see how they work on the construction of Stevens' identity.

Among the three, tradition seems to be the most powerful procedure that is at work on Stevens. It is useful to remember Williams' words on *selective* tradition and how tradition is built rendered through a filter of dominant values. Stories are the most

basic sources of this *selective* tradition. Stories, through their narratives, are useful in changing, manipulating, recreating and modelling. When Stevens draws too much from *the* tradition, this tradition comes to Stevens, as it comes to us in actual world, through such stories.

First of all, butlering is in itself a traditional phenomenon and it is thoroughly English. Butlering is a good example of how the dominant tradition in a hegemonic process turns the class antagonisms into 'lived dominance'. Butlering as a profession is closely related to traditions of England that are based on class domination. There is an inevitable truth of class relations behind the fact that some people are served while some other people are busy serving them. However, the class antagonism inherent in the question of 'who is serving and who is served' gets erased by avoiding that very question itself. And that question is avoided only with an act of symbolization. Serving classes and their operations are hidden behind some symbolic concepts such as dignity, greatness or nationalism that a *selective* tradition selects and serves as glorious. Servility of lower classes is glorified through a symbolization of it. While contemplating upon what distinguishes "a 'great' butler from a merely competent one", Stevens states "butlers only truly exist in England. Other countries, whatever title is actually used, have only manservants" (*ROD* 44). Here, it is clear how Stevens is affected by such symbolization. He relies upon English tradition when he identifies himself as a butler. And it is a fact how England, that is to say dominant classes of England, utilized the serving classes during the era of the Empire. Susie O'Brien relates how butlers and serving classes are important in English history. In her words, "it is suggested that England's ability to confer order on [the] more unruly parts of the world was strongly predicated on the dignity of its serving classes" (O'Brien 790).

As stated before, this tradition comes to Stevens with stories. A useful example is when Stevens mentions a story his father, Mr. Stevens senior, tells and retells habitually with much admiration. It is a story concerning an English butler who goes to India with his employer and who "served there for many years maintaining amongst the native staff the same high standards he had commanded in England" (*ROD* 36-37). Even this single statement confirms O'Brien's opinion. Just as Robinson Crusoe commands the

native he encounters on the island, this certain butler commands 'the natives of India' with 'the same standards' of back in England. Stevens recounts the story as follows:

> One afternoon, evidently, this butler had entered the dining room to make sure all was well for dinner, when he noticed a tiger languishing beneath the dining table. The butler had left the dining room quietly, taking care to close the doors behind him, and proceeded calmly to the drawing room where his employer was taking tea with a number of visitors. There he attracted his employer's attention with a polite caugh, then whispered in the latter's ear: 'I'm very sorry, sir, but there appears to be a tiger in the dining room. Perhaps you will permit the twelve-bores to be used?'" (*ROD* 37)

Later, as Stevens says, heard three gun shots and next we see the butler refreshing the teapots of the company. The very words chosen in telling the story is suggestive. Stevens is very careful in placing certain adverbs and adjectives into his hypodiegetic narrative such as 'quietly', 'proceeded calmly', 'a polite caugh', 'whispered' or 'appears to be'. If we necessarily remember Terry Eagleton's statement that "[a]ll of our descriptive statements move within an often invisible network of value categories" (*Literary* 14), it gets clear how all these choices of words contribute to the effects of this story, and how they serve the selection process that is inherent to any recounting of the past. Stevens interprets his father's obsession with this story as an urge "somehow to *become* that butler of his story" (*ROD* 37; emphasis original). Thus, this explains how that selection works on a person's identity. The fact that they do not "know the butler's name, nor anyone who had known him" (*ROD* 37) strengthens the argument that the story is simply a reworked story filtered through a selection process to serve as a generic reference point for shaping one's identity accordingly.

Just as Stevens senior has his stories that he passes onto others, our Mr. Stevens has his own stories that he passes onto *us* through his narrative and oddly enough, they are concerning his father. Stevens senior clearly plays an important part for Stevens as the latter states "[i]f I try, then, to describe to you what I believe made my father thus distinguished, I may in this way convey my idea of what 'dignity' is" (*ROD* 36). Stevens relies upon two distinct stories about his father to shape his own identity and try to '*become* that butler'. In the first story, Stevens senior is seen putting up with his employer's two drunken visitors during a car ride which the two force Stevens senior to

partake with them as their driver. These drunken 'gentlemen' in question start talking nonsense after some time and continue with shouting out insults to Stevens senior just to amuse themselves. According to Stevens' recount, his father shows "not one hint of discomfort or anger, but continued to drive with an expression balanced perfectly between personal dignity and readiness to oblige" (*ROD* 39). Stevens' selection of words is again curious. Letting alone the abstract concepts such as 'personal dignity' or 'readiness to oblige', his description of his father's state of posture as a 'perfect balance' between these two is very suggestive. At the end of the story, we learn that Stevens senior stops the car to threaten the two drunkards when they give up insulting Stevens senior only to start debasing the latter's employer instead. However, we learn that Stevens senior never utters a word during his threat nor displays "any obvious anger" (*ROD* 40). In the second story, Stevens senior now puts up with a former General who is now in business dealing with shipments from South Africa. This General seems to be the one who had caused Stevens' brother Leonard's death through his order of a "most un-British attack on civilian Boer settlements" (*ROD* 41). One day, this same General visits the house Stevens senior is working for. Stevens underlines how his father volunteers to serve the General as the latter's personal valet during his stay, merely on the grounds that Stevens senior wants to make sure that his employer's business transactions go well with this General. At the end, although Stevens senior hates the General, "so well did my father hide his feelings, so professionally did he carry out his duties, that on his departure the General had actually complimented" on his work and left "an unusually large tip" (*ROD* 43). Yet of course Stevens senior does not accept the tip and wants it to be given to charity.

What captures Stevens in these stories of dominant tradition can be summed up under three concepts 'dignity', 'restraint' and 'loyalty'. In the end, they are all interconnected and they all come together to make up the 'great butler.'

Greatness as a value, first of all, is at its roots connected to greatness of Britain for Stevens. Hence his patriotic statement: "We call this land of ours *Great* Britain" (*ROD* 29). What triggers this statement and the discussion related to this statement is Stevens' encounter with a local early along his way. Before Stevens reaches his first stop

Salisbury, he stops his car somewhere along the road and is greeted by an old man who is resting upon a small rock. This man suggests Stevens to take a narrow footpath that goes up and behind a hill so that the latter can experience the best "view in the whole of England" (*ROD* 25). Stevens listens to the man and takes his chance to see this much appreciated view and he gets struck by it. When he sits down in the evening to relate his impressions of this view he experienced, Stevens starts to discuss greatness in land and in nations:

> Now I'm quite prepared to believe that other countries can offer more obviously spectacular scenery. … [but] the English landscape at its finest – such as I saw it this morning – possesses a quality that … will mark out the English landscape to any objective observer as the most deeply satisfying in the world, and this quality is probably best summed up by the term 'greatness'. (*ROD* 28)

When Stevens utters these statements, the traces of nationalism start to emerge out of his narrative. Nationalism is at the heart of the tradition Stevens refers himself to. It is an important reference point for Stevens' identity. According to Bryan Turner, nationalism is an effective tool in framing the identity of masses. Turner argues that nationalists generally act upon the assumption that nationality is "as natural as possessing teeth or red hair and that there are certain natural divisions in humanity along national lines" (Turner 54). Nationalism, according to Turner and Hobsbawm, is designed on the assumption of the existence of a shared language, ethnicity and culture on a certain part of land. Nevertheless, as again Turner states "[i]n historical terms, the coincidence of political boundaries with the ethnic, linguistic and cultural boundaries has been rare" (Turner 55). So far, the literature on nationalism have already agreed upon one perspective which claims 'the nation' as a construct rather than a natural given. 'The nation' is usually regarded as a "product of particular, and inevitably localized or regional, historical conjunctures" (Hobsbawm *Nations* 5). Ernest Gellner states that "[n]ations as a natural, God-given way of classifying men … are a myth; nationalism, which sometimes take pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures: *that* is a reality" (qtd. in Hobsbawm *Nations* 10). Some of the most powerful Marxists devoted their time to the analysis of nationalism such as Lenin, Stalin, Kautsky, Luxemburg and Bauer. And for

Marxists such as these names, the problem of nationalism is read within the frame of class interest since nationalism generally meant "blurring class antagonisms" (Turner 60).

It is clear that nationalism works as such on Stevens. The land, the country and the nation means much to Stevens. For example, Stevens' view of country is notably distinct from American Mr. John Farraday's view. At the very beginning of the narrative, Farraday relates how it troubles him that Stevens is always stuck up in this big house never going out: "It's wrong that a man can't get to see around his own country. Take my advice, get out of the house for a few days" (*ROD* 4). For Farraday, country is mostly associated with nature, sight-seeing or amusement. However, for Stevens, country has a more political meaning. Country can well be defined within the walls of Darlington Hall. Country means the 'great' ladies and gentlemen for Stevens: "although we did not see a great deal of the country in the sense of touring the country-side and visiting picaresque sites, did actually 'see' more of England than most, placed as we were in houses where the greatest ladies and gentlemen of the land gathered" (*ROD* 4). Here, role of Darlington Hall is also visible. Darlington Hall is a minimal representation of England at a practical level and Stevens constitutes his bonds with 'the nation' through Darlington Hall and through the symbolic value it holds. When it is time to leave the house for his journey, for example, Stevens finds it strikingly difficult to leave the house: "It was an odd feeling and perhaps accounts for why I delayed my departure so long, wandering around the house many times over … It is hard to explain my feelings once I did finally set off" (*ROD* 23). That's why, once he leaves Darlington Hall, he recounts the feeling he had as "I knew I had gone beyond all previous boundaries … I did feel a slight sense of alarm – a sense aggravated by the feeling that I was perhaps not on the correct road at all, but speeding off in totally the wrong direction into wilderness" (*ROD* 24). Adam Parkes connects Stevens' situation in Darlington Hall with the issue of colonialism: "To live in a home that is not one's own, which is the undignified fate of Stevens, seems broadly analogous to the condition of a colonized subject" (Parkes 57). That is to say, Darlington Hall plays an important part in Stevens' identity in terms of the tradition it fosters and nationalism it inspires. This is strengthened by the fact that, nationalism that Stevens embraces is handed over to him within the walls of Darlington Hall. The fact that

he had never been outside the boundaries of Darlington Hall, confirms that he has learnt his nationalism. He has learnt, especially, the values this nationalism glorifies, such as calmness, concealment or restraint. These are all powerful concepts in shaping Stevens' identity. In order to discuss "what is a 'great' butler", Stevens starts with a discussion of what makes 'the great' in Great Britain. His answer to the latter question is that "it is the very *lack* of obvious drama or spectacle that sets the beauty of our land apart. What is pertinent is the calmness of that beauty, its sense of restraint" (*ROD* 29; emphasis original). When Stevens dwells upon his nationalist view of England and his descriptions of the reason for England's 'greatness' in terms of calmness and restraint, the reader anticipates how he internalizes these values in his identity.

Restraint, in terms of such calmness and emotional control, is one of the most important elements for Stevens in his identity. He uses 'restraint' as a reference point to tell real butlers from manservants of other countries: "Continentals are unable to be butlers because they are as a breed incapable of the emotional restraint which only the English race is capable of" (*ROD* 44). This feature comes to Stevens through tradition and intensified by nationalist symbols and it acts upon him to take up a subaltern position and erase his human side. The more Stevens holds on to 'restraint', the more he loses the sight of his subaltern position and, in the end, it turns into a self-imposed position. Stevens empowers his subalternity caused by class domination by fastening to the symbolized 'restraint', and through this, he also empowers that class domination which is the very source of his position. However, this process undermines him to a non-human entity and in the end breaks his organic ties to fellow humans. He gets alienated in Marxist terms.

When Marxism is the subject at hand, it will generally be considered first as a theory against capitalism, and then as an interpretation of political-economic matters. Although this seems to be the case since Marx establishes most of his writings on subjects as mode of production, labour, surplus-value and so forth, what is quintessential for Marx and his theory is 'man', who can be both the object and the subject of historical formations. Alienation, being the state man finds himself in in class societies, is a significant element of Marx's interpretation of history and society.

Alienation is based mostly on division of labour which Marx defines as the first example of a broken tie between man and one of his essential essences, his labour. Marx argues that once man's own life activity becomes alien to him, he becomes enslaved to this activity. *The German Ideology* quotes "as soon as the distribution of labour comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape" (78). In class societies, man loses the ability of such productive activity and gets reduced to performing unproductive, repetitive work. Work loses its productivity along with its bonds to real social activity in harmony with nature and its bonds to necessity. Apart from main idea of alienation, three major areas or spaces are visible for man where alienation takes place. Bertell Ollman explains these three areas aptly as: "Man is spoken of as being separated from his work …Man is said to be separated from his own products … He is also said to be separated from his fellow men" (Ollman 133-134).

For our case at hand – Stevens –, first of all, he can be counted within the third type of alienation, being separated from 'his fellow men'. The two areas, where this alienation is at work and where Stevens loses his human side, are his relationship to his father and his relationship to Miss Kenton.

At one point in his narrative, Stevens summarizes his relationship to his father as "for some years my father and I tended … to converse less and less" (*ROD* 66). From the very beginning of the narrative, the reader is bombarded with Stevens' remarks of the 'greatness' of his father. He even argues with Miss Kenton on the grounds that Miss Kenton's addressing Stevens senior with his first name, William. Stevens implicitly tells Miss Kenton off saying that she can never address such "a figure of unusual distinction" as his father in that way although, in professional terms, she has the authority to do so (*ROD* 56). Nevertheless, it is understood much later that it is not Stevens senior that Stevens is so affectionate towards. His father is more like an idea in Stevens' mind. He simply represents the ideals that Stevens identifies himself with. In reality, Stevens is cut off from Stevens senior as his father. That's why, they do not communicate as Stevens confesses. When Stevens calls Stevens senior 'father', for example, it is more like naming an object such as 'tree' or 'book', rather than addressing a kin. It is most obvious

when Stevens senior is deadly sick lying in his bed and Stevens comes to his visit. Instead of asking questions such as “Are you alright, father?’ or ‘ Father, are you feeling better?’ he simply uses ‘father’ in subject position and says “I hope Father is feeling better now? … I’m very glad Father is feeling better” (*ROD* 101). In the same scene, his father attempts at communicating with his son. Yet no matter what he asks, Stevens replies with a cold statement “I’m so glad you’re feeling better now” (*ROD* 101). Stevens diminishes his relationship to his father to third person exchanges. However, his emotions surface themselves from time to time no matter how hard he tries to keep them under restraint. While his father is lying in his death bed, Stevens is busy with the international conference taking place at Darlington Hall. At one point, Mr. Cardinal wants to engage in a short conversation with Stevens but once looking at Stevens he stops and says with concern: “I say, Stevens, are you all right?” (*ROD* 109). He repeats this question two times just to be refuted by Stevens who insists that he is ‘perfectly alright’. Immediately after Mr Cardinal, Lord Darlington feels the same need to ask Stevens if he is feeling alright and he adds “you look as though you’re crying”; a question Stevens rebuffs saying “I laughed and taking out a handkerchief, quickly wiped mu face. ‘I’m very sorry, sir. The strains of a hard day’” (*ROD* 110). And when the news of his father’s death arrives shortly after, he replies with a short “I see” and continues with his work (*ROD* 111).

Stevens’ relationship to Miss Kenton is much more dramatic, and it actually makes up the romantic plot of the novel as a whole. It gets clear from the very beginning that Stevens has some romantic feelings towards Miss Kenton which he does not want to confess simply on the grounds that and a butler cannot have such romantic attachments. The novel opens up with a letter Stevens mentions to have been sent by Miss Kenton. As we learn, Miss Kenton mentions her divorce in her letter which, presumably giving Stevens a hope for a reunion, causes Stevens to contemplate upon visiting her in Cornwall. However, from the very beginning, he keeps “underlin[ing] that it was a preoccupation with these very same professional matters that led [him] to consider” this visit (*ROD* 5). He even goes a long way of inventing how the staff shortage causes this and that problem in the house and how all these problems boil down to the lack of a housekeeper and how there is no other housekeeper than Miss Kenton who

can fully care for Darlington Hall. However, even his wording gives him away when he says "this very shortage that had been at the *heart* of all *my* recent troubles. And the more I considered it, the more obvious it became that Miss Kenton, with her *great affection* for this house…" (*ROD* 10; emphases mine). He gives away his feelings towards Miss Kenton in-between the lines. We can understand how he misses her when he says how often he consults to a geographical book to "gain some sense of the sort of place Miss Kenton had gone to live her married life" (*ROD* 12); or understand how he constantly thinks of her when he states how in his mind he has "continued to call her throughout these years" (*ROD* 50).

Miss Kenton also hints at her feelings towards Stevens. However, Stevens never seems to get them. What's more, Stevens tries to counter against these hints simply by being rude towards Miss Kenton. Two remarkable instances among many are the scene with flowers and the scene Miss Kenton asks Stevens about his future plans. In the first one, Miss Kenton comes into Stevens' parlour and brings flowers to him. Stevens tells her off quickly saying that his room is not a "room of entertainment" and he does not want flowers (*ROD* 55). The second one happens to be a night when Miss Kenton asks Stevens if he has any plans about future since he has already come a great way into his professional career. Miss Kenton clearly hints at marriage but Stevens replies with a small lecture on how he is planning to devote himself more to his employer. At this point, Stevens realizes that "[s]he may have been a little puzzled by my words; or perhaps it was that they had for some reason displeased her" (*ROD* 182). Even at the end of the novel, after their brief meeting is over and Stevens realizes that Miss Kenton has no intention of leaving his husband and coming away with him, Stevens hides away his feelings. He still tries to hide his true feelings with his heinous smile. Although he admits that his "heart was breaking", he turn[s] to her and sa[ys] with a *smile*" that everything is working fine for him with what he does have in his life now (*ROD* 252; emphasis mine).

Restraint is closely attached to another feature which tradition magnifies, namely 'dignity'. In Stevens' words, "'dignity' has to do crucially with a butler's ability not to abandon the professional being he inhabits. … The great butlers are great by

virtue of their ability to inhabit their professional role …; they will not be shaken out by external events, however surprising, alarming or vexing" (*ROD* 43-44). Basically, dignity is closely tied to professionalism and restraint as can be understood from Stevens' account of it. Stevens' understanding of dignity, a symbol of the tradition operant on him, can immediately be tied to 'division of labour' in Marxist terms. If we are to quote from *The German Ideology* again, Marx says that "as soon as the distribution of labour comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape" (78). As discussed earlier, such division of labour, diminishes man down to the specific service he provides within the relations of production and it mainly erases those qualities of what makes man a human. Stevens here carries this condition a step further and strengthens what division of labour forces upon him by internalizing and glorifying it through symbolization. He refers to *the* tradition again and hegemony turns its domination on him into a self-imposed reality: according to Stevens, dignity is keeping up with one's position; or in other words, playing your part to the utmost come hell or high water. This only means forcing oneself into being a robot in a human's skin. Restraint was phase one for Stevens in becoming that human-robot; where the feelings and emotions were erased. Phase two is now establishing an appropriate 'appearance' for a butler and never abandoning it.

In fact, appearance is really what Stevens' discussion of dignity comes down to. Throughout the narrative, we see Stevens mulling over his outlook, attitude, way of speaking or appropriateness of behaviour. Continuing his definition of dignity quoted above, Stevens talks about wearing one's profession "as a decent gentleman will wear his suit: he will not let ruffians or circumstances tear it off him in public gaze; he will discard it when… he is entirely alone. It is, as I say, a matter of 'dignity'" (*ROD* 44). As in his metaphor, clothes and appearance gets crucial to Stevens' identity. Whilst preparing for his journey, Stevens thinks out loud about how he has some certain suits "kindly passed on to me over the years by Lord Darlington himself, and by various guests" and whether they are appropriate for his journey or not, and then how he does not "possess … any suitable travelling clothes – that is to say, clothes in which I might be seen driving the car" (*ROD* 11). Especially, the last statement is sufficient in presenting the obsession with appearance which is prevalent in *the* tradition of dignity to which Stevens aspires.

One is quickly reminded of a BBC sit-com *Keeping up Appearances* run in 1990s centred on the life of a snobbish, self-serving Hyacinth Bucket who is obsessive with clothes and attitude. Just like Hyacinth in the sit-com, Stevens cannot do anything before contemplating on it and providing himself with each and every tool necessary for that act. If he is going to take a cup of tea, it must be done in a suit tailored for that act. Or as is the case here, if he's going to drive, it must and can only be done in a driving suit. Stevens is really careful that nothing happens to his clothes. He refrains from certain engagements and activities for the fear "of sustaining damage to my travel suit" (*ROD* 127). At one time, when he is crossing muddy fields at night to reach Moscombe to ask for help, he is discouraged by nothing but by the mud smudged on his shoes: "I deliberately refrained from shining my lamp onto my shoes and turn-ups for fear of further discouragement" (*ROD* 171).

It is another good metaphor here that his suits were 'passed on to him' by the members of the upper class just as the values concerning outfits and appearance were. However, suits are not the only things that are passed on to him by 'gentlemen'. His way of speaking is copied from the upper class as well. Command of language is important for Stevens, and he deliberately spends effort for perfecting it like that one time when he is caught by Miss Kenton reading a romance in his parlour. Upon being caught by Miss Kenton, the reader also finds the chance to learn that Stevens is reading light romance. At this point, feeling that he has to rationalize the situation to keep up with his appearance, Stevens explains the situation addressing the reader that the reason for his reading such a book is his belief that it is "an extremely efficient way to maintain and develop one's command of the English language" (*ROD* 176). Actually, his efforts prove profitable at the end. Because of his 'command of language' and appearance, many people mistake him with a true gentleman during his journey. One batman that he encounters welcomes him as if Stevens were a gentleman but when he remembers Stevens as a butler he explains that he was deceived "cause you talk almost like a gentleman" (*ROD* 125). Later again, villagers in Moscombe also think that he is "a true gentleman" by looking at his clothes and his way of speaking (*ROD* 194). His language also serves for him in keeping a distance between himself and others. He even succeeds in alienating the reader by his extremely formal and outmoded way of speaking. Barry

Lewis realizes the same thing and states that "Stevens's euphemisms and circumlocutions form a 'linguistic mask'. This mask hides his feelings, and his inward self, behind the façade of the fastidious valet" (Lewis 95).

A butler's 'habitat' is also important to the discussion of appearance and dignity. The place he lives is important for Stevens as a way of keeping up with his position as a butler. He resembles his parlour to a general's headquarters for that matter: "The butler's pantry, as far as I am concerned, is a crucial office, the heart of the house's operations, not unlike a general's headquarters during a battle, and it is imperative that all things in it are ordered … in precisely the way I wish them to be" (*ROD* 174). But actually, his room looks like a prison cell which represents how he is entrapped in his role forced upon him by the hegemonic processes. Bringing flowers to Stevens' parlour, Miss Kenton identifies her impression as "Mr Stevens, I thought these would brighten your parlour a little. … It seemed such a pity your room should be so dark and cold, Mr Stevens, when it's such bright sunshine outside. … It's a shame more sun doesn't get in here. The walls are even a little damp" (*ROD* 54-55). Much later in the narrative, Miss Kenton pays another visit to Stevens' parlour and this time she directly resembles the room to a prison cell: "Really, Mr Stevens, this room resembles a prison cell. All one needs is a small bed in the corner and one could well imagine condemned men spending their last hours here" (*ROD* 174). It is suggestive that Stevens himself thinks the same for his father's parlour upon entering it to relate his father the latter's new duties: "Indeed, I recall my impression at the time was of having stepped into a prison cell" (*ROD* 67). The coincidence is suggestive in the manner that they both share the same destiny.

At the end, Stevens takes up his appearance, studies it for a perfect *mise en scène*, and thinks of this process within the concept of 'dignity'. However, even Miss Kenton is irate when she asks him in anger "Why, Mr Stevens, why, why, why do you always have to *pretend*" (*ROD* 162). He plays his role to the utmost and erases his individual being to serve better and it can be done by achieving "the balance between attentiveness and the illusion of absence … I decided to minimize my presence by standing in the shadows" (*ROD* 75). As Lawrence Graver also notices it "in his impassive formality he is so breathtakingly true to type, so very much the familiar product of the

suppressive and now anachronistic social system that has produced him and to which he is so intensely loyal" (Graver 1).

The last element in terms of tradition is 'loyalty' as in Graver's statement. Loyalty is like the sentinel concept responsible for watching over Stevens so that he does never digress away from what *the* tradition bids him to do because it is portrayed as the direct opposite of critical thinking and criticism. According to Stevens "a butler who is forever attempting to formulate his own 'strong opinions' on his employer's affairs is bound to lack one quality essential in all good professionals: namely, loyalty" (*ROD* 210). Stevens bases the necessity for such loyalty on the difference between 'ordinary' people and upper class 'gentlemen'. It is obvious from what he says further that he deifies the upper class gentlemen and condemns ordinary people, likes of himself, to serving the former: "how can ordinary people truly be expected to have 'strong opinions' on all manner of things … There is, after all, a real limit to how much ordinary people can learn and know" (*ROD* 204). He believes that:

> This is loyalty *intelligently* bestowed. What is there 'undignified' in this? One is simply accepting an inescapable truth: that the likes of you and I will never be in a position to comprehend the great affairs of today's world, and our best course will always be to put our trust in an employer we judge to be wise and honourable, and to devote our energies to the task of serving him to the best of our ability. (*ROD* 211).

Stevens believes Lord Darlington to be one such gentleman: "I can declare that he was a truly good man at heart, a gentleman through and through, and one I am today proud to have given my best years of service to" (*ROD* 64).

At the end, Stevens gets entrapped as a "pawn" (*ROD* 233) manoeuvred by the people he trusts in thinking in his stead. His "silent self sacrifice", another example of many other "domestic heroes and heroines like Anne Elliot, Lucy Snowe, Wemmick and Pip, Little Dorrit, Rufus Lyon and Esther" (Cohen 152), turns out to be 'loyalty *heedlessly* bestowed'. As Meera Tamaya points out as well, "[t]he irony of this self-abasement … is that the business dealings are thoroughly unsavoury – illegal arms dealing – and both Stevens and his father do not question whether their sacrifices are for a worthy cause" (Tamaya 49). Although Stevens thinks of his loyal work as "a great privilege, after all, to

have been given a part to play, however small, on the world's stage" (*ROD* 198), it is easy to see how he has served the proto-fascist affairs of Lord Darlington. Two distinct cases of this service are the firing of two Jewish housemaids, and spying on the guests in the house.

Stevens points out to a time when Lord Darlington is very close with British Union of Fascists and Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the fascist group 'blackshirts' (*ROD* 145-146). During this period, Lord Darlington is seen to be busily engaged in arranging contacts between Nazis and British government officials. And one day, under the influence of these fascist figures, Lord Darlington bids Stevens to fire any Jewish staffs who are working at Darlington Hall for that time being. Stevens takes on the duty without much questioning and when the time comes to deliver the news to Miss Kenton, he faces an unexpected resistance from the latter who insists that firing people merely on the grounds of their race is "wrong" and a "sin" (*ROD* 157). However correct and humane Miss Kenton's statements are, Stevens answers only with one argument: "His lordship has made his decision and there is nothing for you and I to debate over" (*ROD* 157).

The second case happens during the famous conference of March 1923. Lord Darlington and his friends call a French diplomat, M. Dupont, to the conference to manipulate the latter, and change the attitude of French government for good towards the Nazi Germany. American senator Mr. Lewis learns their agenda and starts to work on M. Dupont to the contrary. When Stevens happens to stop by M. Dupont's room one evening, he hears Mr. Lewis's voice inside and realizing the fact that Mr. Lewis was "in M. Dupont's room, presumably addressing this most crucial personage, that caused me to stop my hand from knocking, and continue to listen instead" (*ROD* 99). It is obvious how he is closely interested in who and what is important or dangerous for his employer and how he takes action for his employer's benefit because immediately he "report[s] to his lordship on the matter" (*ROD* 99).

His loyalty, as mentioned, makes him an accomplice and the only person who questions Stevens' loyalty is Mr. Cardinal. Mr. Cardinal is against the affairs Lord Darlington is engaged in and he interrogates Stevens because of his unquestioning

attitude. He tells Stevens: “Ah, I suppose you believe that to be loyalty. Do you? Do you think that’s being loyal” (*ROD* 233). However, Stevens does not change his attitude even a little bit. His dedication to the concept of loyalty and through that to the ideals of his employer is evident when he declares “my vocation will not be fulfilled until I have done all I can to see his lordship through the great tasks he has set himself. The day his lordship’s work is complete, the day *he* is able to rest on his laurels … only on that day … will I be able to call myself … a well-contended man” (*ROD* 182; emphasis original).

Here, Stevens’ loyalty to Lord Darlington is a representation of his loyalty to the interests of the upper class and to the hegemony. How Lord Darlington acts as the representation of the hegemony is mostly evident through some intertextual elements and the values he deifies. The intertextual elements mentioned are comprised of the reference books Lord Darlington consults. Stevens reports that whenever Lord Darlington calls him to give him a duty or to talk to him about some ideas that are troubling ‘his lordship’, Lord Darlington “would often stand by the window and make a show of consulting” to a book and talk to Stevens “holding open a book … turning a page to and fro” (*ROD* 63; 84). Sometimes it is an encyclopaedia as *Britannica* or a book *Who’s Who*. Lord Darlington’s attitude symbolizes how he acts according to the values of his class and how he represents it in front of people from lower classes like Stevens. Another book that is important is Mrs. Symons’ *The Wonder of England*. When Stevens decides to make use of Mrs. Symons’ volumes as a “road atlas” for his journey, it again gets clear how Stevens is still loyal to the values of the upper class in 1959 (*ROD* 11).

In the end, tradition is a powerful procedure of hegemonic processes in shaping the values of ordinary people who then tend to accept the reality the hegemonic creates for them, and they internalize the class domination to turn it into a self-imposed lived subalternity. However, still, institutions and formations have their own places within the hegemonic processes mentioned.

If one is to start with institutions, three major agents can be discussed within the narrative of *Remains*, namely Hayes Society, wireless, and the press.

If we remember Williams' definition of institutions, their importance in the process of settling the hegemony becomes obvious. He says that "the effective establishment of a selective tradition can be said to depend on identifiable institutions" (*Marxism* 117). Among institutions, Williams counts family, school, specific communities or places of work. These institutions effectively transmit the meanings and values and practices of the dominant culture and the selective tradition. For instance "[s]pecific communities and specific places of work … teach, confirm, and in most cases finally enforce selected meanings, values, and activities" (Williams *Marxism* 118). Hayes Society can be counted among those 'specific communities' that shape and enforce certain meanings and values in practice. Stevens declares the power of Hayes Society by saying "[y]ou may not be aware of the Hayes Society, for few talk of it these days. But in the twenties and the early thirties, it exerted a considerable influence over much of London and the Home Counties" (*ROD* 32). According to Stevens, Hayes Society does not operate openly as expected from institutions as such. But however covertly they work, Hayes Society influences butlering profession from its bases. Stevens relates how the membership requirements that Hayes Society announces effect the butlers of his generation. Stevens himself is also deeply affected by the values Hayes Society glorifies. The most important of them are "being attached to a distinguished household", meaning, houses of the aristocrats rather than the newly rich, and to "be possessed of a dignity in keeping with his position" (*ROD* 32-33). Apart from the Hayes Society, the presence of a 'press' which is attached to the discussions around the subject of butlering becomes evident when Stevens mentions a journal named *A Quarterly for the Gentleman's Gentleman* (*ROD* 32). It is no mystery how such a journal affects the people who take up reading them, although Stevens does not dwell upon the qualities and functions of this journal.

Wireless can be counted as another institution which has its effects on Stevens. The Hayes Society is an institution of the inter-war period, which is the '20s and '30s. Wireless, instead, is an institution at work after the war, at the present of the novel's narrative. After Lord Darlington's demise, and after the new owner Mr. Farraday settles in, Stevens encounters some difficulties in adapting to 'the ways' of his new American employer. The main problem between the two is one of communication. Distinct from

Lord Darlington's ceremonious way of communicating with him, when faced with bantering remarks from his new employer, Stevens begins searching for ways of adapting to the situation. At this point, he starts to make use of a radio program that he catches on the wireless. He says: "I have of late taken to listening to the wireless … One programme I listen to is called *Twice a Week or More*, which … basically comprises two persons making humorous comments on a variety of topics" (*ROD* 139). When the Hayes Society loses its function in a context where power relations have drastically changed, wireless becomes a source of values and meanings for Stevens after the war. Stevens' conscious use of the wireless as a source of meanings, suggests how ordinary people, however possibly unconscious, get shaped by such programmes on separate branches of the media.

Institutions surely are crucial as already discussed. However, as Williams puts it, operations of the hegemony are "also a question of *formations*; those effective movements and tendencies, in intellectual and artistic life" (*Marxism* 117). Williams remarks that formations are "most recognizable as conscious movements and tendencies (literary, artistic, philosophical or scientific) … Often… these are articulations of much wider effective formations which can by no means be wholly identified with formal institutions" (Williams *Marxism* 118-119). In *Remains*, examples for such 'conscious movements and tendencies' can be found in the discussions around 'professionalism'.

Professionalism as a 'tendency' grows mainly by the help of meetings that fellow butlers hold during their visits to each other's houses. Butlers accompany their employers when they go visiting another Lord's or gentleman's house. While the gentlemen are busy with their meetings 'upstairs', butlers, 'gentlemen's gentlemen', get together to perform a simulacrum of that meeting 'downstairs': "debates over the great affairs preoccupying our employers upstairs, or else over matters of import reported in the newspapers; and of course, as fellow professionals from all walks of life are wont to do when gathered together, we could be found discussing every aspect of our vocation" (*ROD* 18). Obviously, they come together in these meetings and develop arguments about their professional values. They influence and get influenced by each other. And

when the same butlers visit other houses to meet with other butlers there, they surely bring some of the arguments they had shared in a previous meeting. Therefore, step by step, these meetings maintain a cobweb of arguments which builds into *formations* that act as an important agent in the construction of the hegemony. It is obvious how these meetings keep the butlers on track and maintain their homogeneity: "there was no serious dispute among professionals of quality" (*ROD* 30); "[w]e were all essentially cut from the same cloth, so to speak" (*ROD* 19). Silver polishing is actually a good example to the effects of formations. At one point, Stevens talks about a change which brings 'silver polishing' to an important reference position for their profession: "that change which came to push the polishing of silver to the position of central importance it still by and large maintains today" (*ROD* 142). According to him, "[i]t was Mr Marshall, it is generally agreed, who was the first to recognize the full significance of silver" (*ROD* 142). This Mr. Marshall and Mr. Lane are referred to by Stevens so many times during his narrative. Their role is clear: "If one looks at these persons we agree are 'great' butlers, if one looks at, say, Mr. Marshall or Mr. Lane, it does seem to be that the factor which distinguishes them from those butlers who are merely extremely competent is most closely captured by this word 'dignity'" (*ROD* 33). Here, formations are seen at work. An important figure builds an argument which is quickly spread among the members of the profession and eventually gets built into a value that seems as 'reality' or 'given' rather than a construct to a new generation of butlers. That's why, Stevens himself brags about his silver polishing and gets to claim that he has implicitly altered history with the power of his silver polishing. He says "that the state of silver had made a small, but significant contribution towards the easing of relations between Lord Halifax and Herr Ribbentrop that evening" (*ROD* 144). Importance of formations becomes evident once more when Stevens falls short on deciding how he should handle the bantering business. After encountering his new employer's bantering habit, Stevens worries that he is not providing his employer with the correct responses that the latter may be requiring. He is in need of the guidance of meetings that he used to join with other butlers: "Such difficulties as these tend to be all the more preoccupying nowadays because one does not have the means to discuss and corroborate views with one's fellow professionals in the way one once did" (*ROD* 18). This is an example of how formations make up a great

deal of the meanings and ideas for Stevens, and how he suffers from the difficulties of finding his way in his ordinary life without a reference point provided by such formations.

After all, it becomes more evident how the values, meanings and ideas, and even the identity one lives as *the* 'reality' without pausing to contemplate on their nature are actually constructed and shaped within the hegemonic processes. Their effects, which are worked through here in the case of Stevens, are so wide that we find ourselves caught in a net built by the hegemony for us; the "often invisible network of value categories" that Eagleton mentions (Eagleton *Literary* 14). The things discussed over a radio program that we generally listen to; casual Saturday brunches with friends from work; our membership to an innocent non-governmental organization or a club; the newspaper and the magazines that we follow; stories that our grannies told us when we were growing up; what about the stories the history or literature books tell at school; or the codes that we revere when we are thinking about our appearance in public; and so many similar things that we have already discussed with the help of Stevens in *Remains* are actually beyond the simple individual experience that we think them to be belonging into since they inhere within them values and meanings that they transmit to ourselves serving the hegemonic processes. However un-political they appear, they are all political tools within the hands of the hegemony and they serve, in the end, strengthening that hegemony by strengthening people's experience of the reality constructed by that hegemony. And according to Antonio Gramsci, this is the reason why "there is a struggle for the monopoly of the organs of public opinion – newspapers, political parties, parliament – so that only one force will mold public opinion and hence the political will of the nation" (*Antonio Gramsci* 213).

And what does it make of us? Simply victims, or rather than that, 'accomplices'? Stevens' case is again helpful here. The general tendency in the interpretation of character of Stevens is his heartbreaking victimization in the process. However, as Victoria Stewarts recognizes, "even those at the margins, the bystanders and accommodators, are historical subjects with a responsibility" (Stewart 108). A closer reading can display how Stevens is more than a victim but an accomplice in the end.

From the beginning till the end, it is Stevens who has the chance of closely observing what Lord Darlington is heading at. However, never questioning the motives, even after being warned by the likes of Miss Kenton or Mr Cardinal, he not only turns a blind eye but also gives a hand along the way. The most evident example of his contribution to Lord Darlington's proto-fascist affairs is the time when he spies on the conference guests and reports back to his employer (*ROD* 99). His loyalty extends to complicity. His nationalism and imperialistic fanaticism for the British Empire; his fanaticism of the values of 'dignity', 'professionalism' or 'restraint' that teach the necessity of erasing the human part in a process of turning into human-robots of service; these all can be discussed as the points where he is complicit with the hegemonic processes.

It is possible to extend this discussion to Ishiguro himself and *Remains* as his production. Remembering the discussion on art in chapter two, one thinks of Lukács' statement that "irony is the objectivity of the novel" (*The Theory* 90-91). As discussed in the previous chapter, the suggestion was that art, when separated from productive activity, from labour, ceases to be a human social construct and gets a semblance of independence or objectivity. Therefore, if a true comprehension of any work of art is what is needed to be acquired, its true quality has to be acknowledged first: it is a human construct within a specific social formation. Hence, bearing in mind that *Remains* as a work of art and Ishiguro as its producer belong in a certain social formation constructed under the imprint of certain hegemonic processes, what are they in reference to those hegemonic processes? Are they outside, challenging; or inside, collaborating? In coming up with an answer to this, what Christine DeVine states is an important clue: "As feminist and post-colonial criticism have shown, it is important to try to recognize the ideological forces at work in the historical context that surrounds a text of any kind, and indeed, *that are at work within the text*" (DeVine 137; emphasis mine). The links between *Remains* and "the socio-political background out of which it emerged" are obvious just by looking at the themes or images the novel takes up (Sim *Globalization* 119). The themes of gentleman/butler, patriotism, unhurried elegance, Victorian values of loyalty and reverence all are the values which were revoked by the Thatcherite government at the time when *Remains* was written by Ishiguro. As Wai-Chew Sim notices, it is sufficient to cite "Margaret Thatcher's … general election

campaign, in which she vowed to restore "Great"-ness to Britain, … the conservative appeal to Britons throughout the eighties to return to "Victorian" values" (Sim *Globalization* 121).

Apart from recognizing this, it is important recognizing *to what end* Ishiguro makes use of these themes and elements in his novel. In fact, he himself underlines his purpose in his interviews most of the times, saying that the reviews of *Remains* gathering around political and historical discussions is something troubling him. He wants it to be read as a "parable" for the personal entanglements of ordinary people (An Interview by Vorda & Herzinger 83). He underlines that he is interested in the emotional aspect: "I'm not overwhelmingly interested in what really did happen. What's important is the emotional aspect, the actual positions the characters take up at different points in the story" (Mason 342). If we remember Susie O'Brien's discussion of the novel, Ishiguro's position will get more evident. O'Brien sees *Remains* as a narrative of opposition between "Victorian values –formality, repression and self-effacement, summed up under the general heading of 'dignity'—and those associated with an idea of 'America' that has expanded, literally into a New World –freedom, nature, and individualism" (O'Brien 788). Our suggestion, starting off with O'Brien's evaluation, would be reading *Remains* as an extension of the hegemony of neoliberal values which are mostly associated by American way of thinking.

Ishiguro's work, bares the imprints of appraisals towards an 'American' way of seeing things. Ishiguro maintains this mostly with the element of regret. Ishiguro arouses the 'regret' element through a revelation plot by which the reader slowly learns how Stevens ended up in a miserable situation, trying to make up for the chances he had lost long ago because of all those 'ideals' he devoted his life to. That is to say, Ishiguro uses the Victorian ideals and values as a means for giving credit to neoliberal values indicating that Victorian ideals ruin your chance for happiness (as you can observe what happened to Stevens) while neoliberal libertarian values (contaminated by all the self-serving and ignorant philosophy of free-market predominance) will lead you to personal –emotional– happiness which is all you should strive for in your life. A chance of romantic union with Miss Kenton is the most dominant one of these 'chances

to happiness'. At the end of the novel, Ishiguro makes Stevens renounce all the ideals he had supported so far in a touching speech which goes: "at least [Lord Darlington] had the privilege of being able to say at the end of his life that he made his own mistakes … As for myself, I cannot even claim that. You see, I trusted. I trusted in his lordship's wisdom. … I can't even say I made my own mistakes. Really – one has to ask oneself – what dignity is there in that" (*ROD* 256). Stevens labels, what he used to consider an important pillar of dignity, his 'loyalty', an undignified act now and gets soothed by the man sitting next to him, a retired butler happy and content in contrast to Stevens, and who insists that Stevens should "keep looking forward … enjoy yourself" (*ROD* 256). Setting off from the repressed atmosphere of the past, Ishiguro compares it to the much more independent and happy atmosphere of a present and possible future which is ruled by the neoliberal American values of freedom and individualism. Looking down on a depressing portrait of the past from a future of a progressed society, the reader is led by *Remains* to affirming the values of the contemporary society. And when Stevens announces it wrong that he "trusted" in Lord Darlington, it comes to suggest that one should not 'trust' to any ideal. This is, as Parkes also observes, "Ishiguro's … desire … to defeat politics in general" (Parkes 61). He suggests a *de*-politicization to become free in our simple individual lives; disregarding the fact that ignorant and self-serving individuality is actually the new politicized way of living under the hegemony of neoliberal free-market philosophy.

Remains fulfils such an aim mostly over the presence of the American characters in the narrative. The novel juxtaposes American gentlemen with English gentlemen, and evaluating their attitudes in reference to one another rather than in reference to external criteria or objective criticism, ends up appraising the attitudes of the former. The reader meets two American gentlemen in the novel. First of them is the new owner of the Darlington Hall, with a name that has some symbolic implications in it, Mr. Farraday. The second gentleman is a congressman invited over a conference in 1923, Mr. Lewis. Mr. Farraday is portrayed as a warm-hearted man and his warm relationship with Stevens is underlined on the first page of the novel. Before starting to talk to Stevens, Mr. Farraday "put his volumes down on a table, seated himself on the *chaise-longue*, and stretched out his legs" (*ROD* 3). This is contrasted with the much more

formal way Lord Darlington addresses Stevens. In contrast to Darlington's distant attitude, Farraday's friendliness gets appreciated. In the end, it is not Darlington but Farraday who is "genuinely" troubled by establishing Stevens' well-being (*ROD* 4). The choice of 'genuinely' should be underlined in this statement. Then, he lends his Ford to Stevens, "footing the bill for the gas" (*ROD* 4); a car which, in the end, not only makes it possible for Stevens to drive-off for his "dreams" (*ROD* 189) but also to get respected by the people he meets along the road (*ROD* 125, 193). Bantering is also related to Mr. Farraday. Bantering troubles Stevens from the very beginning of his narrative. He constantly compares it with the formal and ceremonious way of addressing during the interwar period. Bantering is always shown as an American way of interaction between people (*ROD* 16) and is usually despised by Stevens as something rude. However, at the end, bantering is regarded as the "key to human warmth" (*ROD* 258). Stevens recognizes that "people can build such warmth among themselves so swiftly … with this skill of bantering. … It is, I would suppose, the way many people like to proceed" (*ROD* 257). The second American the reader meets, Mr. Lewis, represents a much more political stance in the narrative. As mentioned before, he is an invited guest of the 1923 conference. Here is the first impression of Stevens upon seeing Mr. Lewis which can be easily contrasted to the former's formal descriptions of English gentlemen in the novel: "My recollection of Mr Lewis is that of a gentleman of generous dimensions with a genial smile that rarely left his face … [his] engagingly informal manner" (*ROD* 89). As it was with Mr. Farraday, Mr. Lewis' friendliness and geniality is underlined in the narrative in direct contrast to English gentlemen's formality and distance. Mr. Lewis' speech at the end of the conference is another important thing about this American gentleman. When all the European guests of the conference agree upon easing the suppression on Germany, Mr. Lewis criticises them being the only one who disagrees with this result. He calls the European gentlemen amateurs and naïve dreamers and goes on to say that "[g]entlemen like our good host still believe it's their business to meddle in matters they don't understand. … You here in Europe need professionals to run your affairs. If you don't realize that soon you're headed for disaster" (*ROD* 107). For the reader, looking at the event from the perspective of somebody who knows what the Second World War brought to Europe, Mr Lewis becomes the victor. Indeed, the

Merchant-Ivory film version of the novel underlines this victory much powerfully by making the new owner of the Darlington Hall the same person who called Darlington an amateur in 1923 conference; indicating towards a reading of the script as 'victory of the American gentleman'.

Language is also important for the purposes of this discussion. In an interview, Ishiguro says that "I'm writing, using a certain kind of translationese" (Mason 345) meaning that he is writing in English but that he is constantly trying to use a filtered English 'translationese' so that his novels can easily be understood by an international readership (*Sorbonne Lecture* 145). The importance of this statement on the features of the language he is using can be better understood in the light of the arguments around 'language's role' within the hegemony. It was discussed in chapter two, with Williams' and similarly Eagleton's arguments, how art serves hegemony also through being a reproduced extension of it in the sense that it is just another material social product which bears the social content in the very language or symbols and signs it uses as a means. Reality does not shape language, it is represented through language. Therefore, an effective predomination over the use of language will yield a sustained domination on the social content. In fact, Dupré says that "[e]ach class attempts to turn communication into a tool for imposing its own ideas upon other classes. The class that effectively rules succeeds in presenting its particular use of language as the only correct one" (*Marx's Social* 227).

In the case of Ishiguro, the 'class' element Dupré mentions is operant more in the sense of a colonizer-colonised relationship. Ishiguro is defined as a "Japanese-born British novelist" (*Britannica*) and as a "migrant writer" (Walkowitz 532), and he writes in English. Dupré's statement 'each class attempts to turn communication into a tool for imposing its own ideas' gets clearer and underlines the role of English language in the process of Ishiguro's integration to the hegemonic processes. Gauri Viswanathan, in her book *Masks of Conquest*, underlines the role of English language in England's colonies by saying how "English came into its own in an age of colonialism, … no serious account of its growth and development can afford to ignore the imperial mission of educating and civilizing colonial subjects in the literature and thought of England, a mission that in the

long run served to strengthen Western cultural hegemony in enormously complex ways" (2). What Viswanathan states is exactly what is happening about Ishiguro and many other transnational writers producing in English. At this point, it is important to remember that Ishiguro is the winner of the Booker Prize in 1989 for his *The Remains of the Day*. For a work to be eligible for the Booker, it has to be a work by "English-language writers from the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth countries, and the Republic of Ireland" (*Britannica*). The prize is sponsored by Booker McConnell Company and the story of the prize's birth goes back to "a tax loophole in a Harold Wilson government finance bill in the late sixties" which the company made use of and the fact that part of the profits thus gained were used "to establish a fiction" Booker Prize (see Davies C23).

It is useful to inquire the company's profile a little here to have a better understanding of the prize's motives. Booker-McConnell Co. is a company which started its business with sugar plantations in Guyana when the country was a colony of the British Empire and became to monopoly the Guyana's economy (see Susie O'Brien; David Twiston Davies). It is now England's one of the leading food wholesaler (*bookergroup.com*). A brief reading into its history online marks an important date when Jock Campbell takes over the company chairmanship and rehabilitates the sugar plantations in Guyana. According to Clem Seecharan's book on Jock Campbell *Sweetening Bitter Sugar*, Jock was the one who rehabilitated sugar plantations in Guyana and reformed the living conditions of the Guianese workers. However, despite all the rehabilitations and reforms, the fact should not be overlooked that it was still a British company running the business in a colony and making all the profit over exploiting the labour of the Guianese and the Guianese resources. Therefore, it becomes evident that these were not rehabilitations simply to 'humanize' the conditions of the workers but investments of a company for better profits. This aim can be found in the British policies concerning Guyana around the same period. When the first general election of Guyana in 1953 results with a triumph of Communist People's Progressive Party, British Government removes the party from power with a *coup d'état* after the party gets serious about nationalising the sugar plantations (see *Report Of The British Guiana Constitutional Commission 1954*).

It is suggestive that a prize established and sponsored by such a company with colonial bases is given to 'English-language writers from' the former colonies of Britain. Up until now, only a minor part of 46 prizes in total are given to out-and-out British writers; most of them being given to writers from countries like South Africa, Nigeria, India, Trinidad, Australia or Canada (*Britannica*). Susie O'Brien is not the only person critical about the role Booker Prize plays for English Literature when she says that "English literature has expanded, along with Booker Inc., into the global marketplace. If some of the racial and cultural barriers of the old colonial order have been maintained, it is only so that they can be triumphantly transgressed by the liberationist forces of the new world literary order" (O'Brien 798). That is to say, *Remains* plays the role that a new internationalism in the fields of arts and letters attributes to it. It contributes to that 'triumphant transgression' of the racial and cultural barriers which is possible only as long as those barriers are somehow maintained. Viswanathan is in line with this argument when she asks "[p]recisely where is English literature produced" ("An Introduction" 22). The answer, according to her, points out to the agent that unifies "the concept of 'England' and 'English studies,' but primarily through the impact of groups considered external to it"; "be they the Irish, Scots, and Welsh …, or the Jews, Dissenters, and Catholics …, or colonial subjects inducted into the colonial administration through English education" (Viswanathan "An Introduction" 23).

Whilst doing this, *Remains* points to the neoliberal values derived from neoliberalism "which became the cornerstone of economic policy in the United States under President Ronald Reagan (1981–89) and in the United Kingdom under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (1979–90)" (*Britannica*), the period when Ishiguro was writing the novel. Elsewhere, Ishiguro explains his success as if he was completely aware of what he was contributing to: "Ishiguro asserts that one of the reasons he made his career rapidly in Britain in the 1980s was because of the specific needs of that era. There was then "'a great hunger' for anything that could be labelled a 'new internationalism'" (Sim *Kazuo* 21). In fact, another remark that he makes in a British Council pamphlet published in 1988 shows that he was indeed aware of that and he was consciously working to be a part of new internationalism: "If the novel survives as an important form into the next century, it will be because writers have succeeded in creating a body of

literature that is convincingly international. It is my ambition to contribute to it" (qtd. in Sim *Kazuo* 20). As it was quoted from Eagleton, literature is not just a cultural production of mental labour and social consciousness, but it is also "an industry. Books are not just structures of meaning, they are also commodities produced by publishers and sold on the market at a profit" (Eagleton *Marxism* 28). Any literary work, at the end, becomes a commodity that has a place in the market and sold at a price which will make a profit for the publisher. Bo Ekelund interprets the situation for Ishiguro and Ishiguro's work, *Remains*: "In short, the world of the servants can be recognized as a metaphor for the world of artists and critics. … In the analogy with literature, a total identification with the literary institution as such is the standard of value within the field" (Ekelund).

Hence, a necessary recognition of the social content, be it in the form of hegemonic cultural domination or the influence of more practical social economic activities such as wage-labour, market and distribution, in the categories themselves to which art works belong are crucial in analyses of those works. After scrutinizing *Remains* within this frame, the indication is one of those warnings against *de*-politicization. Stevens' case is helpful in revealing the hegemonic processes that are at work in the society and on the members of that society. It lays bare how the values and meanings that we attribute to our individual frame of 'reality' are actually constructed into a 'lived dominance'. Art can work as a tool for liberation from this domination but by only making use of its 'propaedeutic' value through an all-penetrating Marxist reading of it which not only analyses the content of the artwork but also the artwork itself as a content of the hegemonic.

CHAPTER 4

NEVER LET ME GO

4. 1. A Review of Literature

Never Let Me Go (2005) is Kazuo Ishiguro's last full-length novel proceeding *When We Were Orphans* (2000) and preceding his first collection of short stories *Nocturnes* (2009). It was shortlisted for the Booker Prize in 2005, which his *The Remains of the Day* triumphantly won in 1989. But this time he lost it to an Irish novelist John Banville's *The Sea* (2005) which has more or less similar concerns to Ishiguro's such as memories of childhood and attempts at reconciliation with the deaths of the closest.

Never got immediate attention after its publication, being the work of a now much more a public-figure Ishiguro; and being shortlisted for the Booker, again, was always enough in itself for a novel to get such attention. Since Ishiguro was best known for his style in *Remains*, *Never* was criticized as something out of Ishiguro's range, and as a failure because of how it was attempting at a sci-fi setting while lacking almost all the fundamentals of the genre. There were of course other readings which disregarded the sci-fi plot and considered it only as another tool Ishiguro uses for his allegorical ends. After such initial response to the novel, more scholarly readings were done of course. Scholarly response to *Never* take up approaches to the novel from the perspectives of human rights, critical science fiction, theology, psychoanalysis, arts and humanities, heteronormativity, and more political readings.

The initial response to the novel can be observed to be divided into two main camps, those who appreciate *Never* as a return to Ishiguro's first triad in terms of its concerns with humanity and being human, and those who read the novel as a further

digression for Ishiguro from what was within his range. *The Unconsoled* and *When We Were Orphans*, which Ishiguro got published in-between the period from *Remains* until *Never*, were already criticized for being pretentiously Kafkaesque. *Never* was criticized yet as another failure by some reviewers. Frank Kermode thinks that "the novel seems to be, though only by the standards Ishiguro has set himself, a failure" (21). Max Watman thinks in line with Kermode and finds the novel uninteresting: "Ishiguro's world can grab no one by the throat, because it is not real. It would have been more effective, for instance, if we learned that all these characters interacting on the page were cows" (65). Another example is a review by Philip Hensher. According to Hensher, the novel is not only boring as Watman suggests but also implausible and uninventive: "It is an awful thing to say, but I believed so little in any of the people, their situation, or the way they spoke … In the past, Ishiguro has been an exceedingly interesting novelist, but he looks increasingly like one at the mercy of his limited linguistic inventiveness" (*The Spectator*).

The other camp of the initial response appreciates Ishiguro's work as another of his successful attempts at deciphering what it is to be human. Andrew Barrow's review can be summarized with his following statement: "In this deceptively sad novel, he simply uses a science-fiction framework to throw light on ordinary human life, the human soul, human sexuality, love, creativity and childhood innocence" (*The Independent*). In another review, Jonathan Yardley announces *Never* "the best Ishiguro has written since the sublime *The Remains of the Day*. It is almost literally a novel about humanity: what constitutes it, what it means, how it can be honoured or denied" (*The Washington Post*). Although the common reception of the novel is within the frame that it is a novel about cloning, most of these reviewers underline that it "has as little to do with genetic engineering and the cloning controversy as *The Remains of the Day* has to do with butlering or *When We Were Orphans* to do with detective work" (Andrew Barrow). As John Harrison indicates, "[t]his extraordinary and, in the end, rather frighteningly clever novel isn't about cloning, or being a clone, at all" (*The Guardian*). Siddhartha Deb points out that "Ishiguro uses the subject of cloning to focus on questions of human existence" (*New Statesman*) and, in Ruth Scurr's words, "[i]n making Kath and her friends clones, compressing the time-frame of their lives …, Ishiguro has found an ingenious way to evade banality and bring the reader to a raw confrontation

with death -- loss -- and the unendurable fragility of everything we love" (*The Times Literary Supplement*).

The initial response, as can be noticed, happens at a thematic level as more or less expected. More scholarly approaches divert to other directions though. Cynthia Wong, one of the leading scholars on Ishiguro, locates *Never* within all the other novels Ishiguro produced up to then and states that Ishiguro continues to deal with a concept he has announced in early-career interviews, namely the emotional stories of his characters that are left at the mercy of larger forces which these characters cannot comprehend. According to Wong, in *Never*, "Ishiguro explores the degree to which people accommodate the cards dealt to them, and to what extent accumulated knowledge of those cards' contents yield them a course for change or revision, whether of physical reality or of emotional adjustment" (Wong 84-85). Wong reads the novel as one of those approaches of Ishiguro to people in such a situation, and she appreciates the way Ishiguro "conveys their suffering" (Wong 103). Her arguments are successful in exploring the themes and motifs of personal suffering and the emotional burden of not being able to live one's life to its utmost. However, Wong's focus gets confined at the descriptive level. That is to say, her reading is acritical and does not build up to any criticism in the end. Anne Whitehead reads the novel to inquire into the relationship between literature and empathetic response to the suffering. However, she then turns to a questioning the function of "literature as productive of an empathic sensibility, and such a sensibility as an inherently moral virtue" (Whitehead 55). Whitehead underlines the thematic discussion in the novel on the relationship between literature and emphatic responsibility, which is represented by the novel's stress on the arts and humanities education at Hailsham. Then, she goes on to discuss that the novel shows the "moral dangers of basing a society or politics on empathy" and it exposes what lies behind empathy, which are named to be "identity and similarity, and hence … exclusion and ethnocentrism" (Whitehead 57). At the end, Whitehead tries to present a corrective for such 'discriminatory empathy' and offer a "more altruistic" version (Whitehead 57). Arguments Whitehead arouses are useful for a political discussion of *Never* but Whitehead refrains from taking her arguments further into that area and limits her focus to atrocity and altruism.

A similar approach to *Never*, that it somehow 'conveys the suffering', is built around its integration of genres 'bildungsroman' and 'autobiography' in its narrative. Titus Levy is one of the scholars who aim at such a reading. Levy's article in *Journal of Human Rights* "examines Kazuo Ishiguro's novel *Never Let Me Go* as a type of Bildungsroman … It shows how autobiographical storytelling functions within the novel as a form of rights claim that gives voice to the suffering of an oppressed social group" (Levy 1). Levy appreciates Ishiguro's sensitivity to the experiences of such groups. According to him, Ishiguro pays great attention to individual psychologies and traumatic experiences people are living through, and while doing this, Levy indicates, Ishiguro also draws attention to how aestheticized forms of such experiences are consumed by the general public. In the end, Levy finds out that Ishiguro's novel is concerned with human rights issues and human rights paradoxes such as "the conflict between personality development and submission to a society that both offers and constricts individual freedoms" (Levy 6). In his words, "*Never Let Me Go* covers a multitude of human rights issues. Ishiguro constructs his novel as a type of human rights narrative that invokes the power of autobiographical storytelling to affirm the humanity of individuals and the democratic rights of oppressed communities" (Levy 15). Levy attempts at announcing autobiography as a weapon against oppression and a stair to individual freedom. However, he never questions that individual freedom as a value nor he considers that an autobiography is a *selective* narrative in the end. On the other hand, his argument concerning the conflict between society and individual is very insightful and useful.

Keith McDonald is another scholar who is interested in the autobiographical narrative in *Never*. She states her aim in reading *Never* as to "explore the ways in which the tropological features of autobiography are employed in this novel" (McDonald 76). McDonald's analysis ends with her finding that "Ishiguro invites us to abandon the veil of authenticity and bear witness to a memoir from another reality … where Science Fiction again calls on our imaginations to act as a lens by which to scrutinise contemporary social dilemmas" (McDonald 82). McDonald wants to extract the ethical lesson or moral that the novel relates at an allegorical level; the lessons to be learned, by and large, being related to our contemporary societies. She uses many other texts for examples and comparisons along the way as *Villette* (1853), *Frankenstein* (1818), *Brave New World*

(1932) or *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857). According to McDonald, the major theme that is common to all these fiction is a kind of 'education'. Especially, McDonald "suggest[s] that novels which depict schooling provide a fruitful forum by which the narrator's agency in a complex power structure can be framed, questioned, and understood" (McDonald 77). McDonald's approach is a bit more sophisticated than Levy's in terms of political reading. Her implication of 'power structures' is inspirational. However, her focus lies elsewhere and she does not go on to scrutinise those power relationships other than hinting at their presence.

Gabriella Griffin's reading of *Never* can be counted to be mostly similar to the points Keith McDonald has pointed out. Similar to McDonald's idea of *Never* as a 'science fiction with a contemporary moral', Griffin indicates the novel to be a 'critical science fiction', a term she borrows from Eugene Thacker. She summarizes Thacker's distinction between two types of science fiction using short descriptions of these types as: first, 'science fiction of actualisation', which deals with modelling the future; and second, 'critical science fiction', which aims at commenting upon the present. In sum, Griffin concludes that the novel's "function is not to actualize science in quasi-mimetic fashion but to comment critically on the history of the present" (Griffin 653). According to Griffin, among all the contemporary concerns, *Never* draws special attention to 'categorization' of the differences. What Griffin wants to suggest is that through using clones, Ishiguro means to interrogate the motives behind the attitudes toward 'the different one', "which we designate potentially non-human" (Griffin 656). The novel "challenges conceptions of difference as absolute categories and contests the ethical imperatives underlying the insistence on such absolute difference" (Griffin 653). In fact, Ishiguro himself expresses such a deliberate aim of choosing clones: "I found that having clones as central characters made it very easy to allude to some of the oldest questions in literature … 'What does it mean to be human?' 'What is the soul?' 'What is the purpose for which we've been created, and should we try to fulfil it?'" (*The Guardian*). Similar to McDonald, Griffin confines her reading within the range of description. She successfully shows how the novel can be used to shed light on the contemporary dilemmas while falling short at carrying her discussion one step further; to a discussion of those actual contemporary social dilemmas.

Deborah Britzman takes up a different stance and approaches *Never* with psychoanalytic concerns. She suggests in her article that "Ishiguro's *Never let me go* is … an occasion for thinking about reading as an allegory of psychic development" (Britzman 307). Britzman makes use of a term 'slow reader' to explain her point, which is used in the sense that there is always a conflict between what we anticipate and what turns out to be the actual consequence. According to Britzman, *Never* presents us with our phantasies "of being born without parents, of our worries that we may have to donate our insides, of having to go to school without knowing why, … of having sexuality without reason, and of the wishing for immortality with our little hope for a deferral" (Britzman 317). And represents how we become slow readers in understanding these phantasies and how we struggle for meaning in our lives: "we are always reading between the lines, wagering meaning and deferring it" (Britzman 317). Britzman's focus of analysis of *Never* is limited to psychoanalytic concerns.

Tiffany Tsao takes up a more theological approach to the novel. She concerns herself with what *Never* says about religion, life and biotechnological creativity. She handles the matter around the concept of 'purpose.' Tsao's reading suggests that *Never* may be underlining the mistake of perceiving religion and biotechnology as merits: "namely, religion's ability to provide its adherents with a sense of purpose, and the benevolent purposes for which biotechnological research is undertaken" (Tsao 214). Tsao extends her arguments to Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667) and Shelley's *Frankenstein*, and discusses *Never* mostly in relation to these two other works. What she discusses in the end is the "culture of purpose-driven living" (Tsao 224). Her main concern is that it is a mistake that we try to shape our lives within a teleological frame. She goes on to suggest that "it is high time we considered the possibility that life can go on in a meaningful way, even when one has no reason to live" (Tsao 230). Tsao's arguments are powerful in that the article scrutinises 'purpose' as a prevalent value. However, the discussion does not offer an option to 'purpose', nor it does focus on to locate the value of purpose within a more comprehensive context.

Just as Tsao discusses 'purpose' as a meaning of existence, Rachel Carroll discusses 'heterosexual reproduction' as a meaning to identify human existence using

Never. In an article in *Journal of Gender Studies*, Carroll states that "[i]n order to trace how a fiction of human cloning might give rise to questions of heteronormativity, I will foreground issues of reproduction and their relationship to normative constructions of heterosexuality" (Carroll 59). In the end, she argues that heterosexuality passes itself unmarked and thus turns itself invisible in a process of constructing the 'normative' for human identity. According to Carroll, Ishiguro's characters provide an occasion for making heteronormativity visible when the clones in *Never* are "embodying a heterosexual identity" but, since they cannot reproduce, it is a version "disempowered and marginalised by heteronormativity; as such they reveal the tensions and contradictions at work within and between heterosexuality as an institution and an identity" (Caroll 60). Carroll's arguments are compelling. She investigates how heterosexuality is used in the novel "in definitions of the human – and in the discourses of rights to which humans have a claim" (Carroll 63) but the arguments necessitate a wider context; where heteronormativity can be located within the power structures and ideologies and how it is maintained as a prevalent value.

There are, of course, more political readings of *Never* by other critics. Benjamin Kunkel is one of these critics. In his article, Kunkel discusses fiction that is produced after nineties, that is after the cold war was over and after the "dawning of a millennium of capitalist democracy" (Kunkel 89). He focuses on two types of literary production, namely 'dystopian' and 'apocalyptic' fiction. He analyses these two types of fiction as literary responses to post cold war atmosphere in the world. According to his definition, "[t]he end of the world or apocalypse typically brings about the collapse of order; dystopia, on the other hand, envisions a sinister *perfection* of order. … dystopia is a nightmare of authoritarian or totalitarian rule, while the end of the world is a nightmare of anarchy" (Kunkel 90). Settling with these definitions, Kunkel analyses *Never* as a dystopian novel. In his words, clone novels such as *Never*, by and large, suggest "a nightmare of perfected neoliberalism" (Kunkel 92). Kunkel reads the novel as a dystopic anticipation of a totally commodified world which reigns in a totalitarian neoliberal rule. His arguments are very successful in pointing out the relationship between actual global setting and the fiction that is produced within that context. He uses many other literary works to state his point other than *Never*. Yet, he misses the chance of using *Never* or

any other literary work he mentions for the purposes of embarking on an analysis of the power structures inherent in that context. Wai-Chew Sim's discussion of the novel is more or less in line with Kunkel's discussion in that Sim reads the novel as a critique of the capitalist system. According to Sim, *Never* "uses the predicament of the protagonists to stir up existential apprehension, the anxiety generated by our cognisance of their truncated lives being channelled into a critique of the capitalist system by the novel's emphasis on the dominance of commodity culture in this world" (Sim *Kazuo* 30). Sim believes that by doing this, "Ishiguro gestures at the need for alternative ethico-economic arrangements in *our* world, one that avoids the waste and injustice sanctioned by the current system" (SIM *Kazuo* 31; emphasis original). Again, as with Kunkel, Sim does not identify the workings of the capitalist system and the hegemonic processes that maintain its existence.

As discussed, the existing body of literature on *Never* falls short in focus at making use of the 'propaedeutic' value of the novel, and embarking on an exhaustive analysis of it within the historico-social context. The necessity of a Marxist approach defined earlier in Chapter one and two is evident for a better understanding and use of Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*.

4. 2. Discussion on 'Never Let Me Go'

Never Let Me Go is Kazuo Ishiguro's sixth novel, also his second novel to be filmed after *The Remains of the Day*. It was shortlisted for Booker prize just like *Remains*, as mentioned before. That is to say, it was received much like *Remains* was received in 1989. This may be attributed to the reasons already discussed previously; that is, it carries the same concerns as *Remains*; humanity and being a human.

This time, the novel is narrated by a female protagonist who introduces herself with the opening sentences of the novel: "My name is Kathy H. I'm thirty-one years old, and I've been a carer now for over eleven years" (*NLG* 3). Just like it is with *Remains*, the novel revolves around a sentimental romance story but has much farther reaching concerns in-between the lines. *Never*'s story is divided into three major blocks, three adjacent time periods. First period depicts the Hailsham years. Hailsham is kind of a

boarding school and it is the first place the reader meets the protagonist and her two friends, the other two major characters of the story Tommy and Ruth. We witness their 'childhood' during these years and how they were 'reared'. Then, after their 'graduation', the three friends move to the Cottages, where we witness their adolescence. Cottages is meant to be an equivalent of the university period, and Kathy and her friends spend more or less two years here. Then, we witness the friends' career in the last part of the novel; the 'work' that they were 'supposed' to do in the end.

Never is a difficult text in that, adding to its slowly revealing plot, the pseudo sci-fi setting also confuses the reader and challenges all the anticipations he or she may develop along the way. A meta-narrative commentary indicates the setting to be "England, late 1990s". However, just around the middle of the text, we learn that this England is different from our reality of 1990s; it is kind of a parallel reality because biotechnology has peaked and now human clones are produced to be harvested for their internal organs. Kathy H. and all her 'school friends' at Hailsham are clones. They are regarded as non-human entities by the society that created these clones, and they were brought to this world to serve 'the human'. They are supposed to come to a certain age in order to donate their vital organs and 'complete'. This strikes the reader as an exceedingly cruel system, which is built upon the bodies of the clones. It looks really inhuman and barbaric; and at first, the reader refuses that such a scheme can be continued. However, it *is* continued and we learn that it has been going on really for a while.

Yet, how is it continued? How is this system perpetuated? Throughout the narrative, the reader follows the memories of Kathy H. starting from her childhood to her career as a 'carer' before donations. The most striking thing about Kathy's, and by extension about the other clones', case is that although they are aware of what is going to happen to them, they never attempt at running away or hiding; they don't even contemplate on such a possibility. What is more surprising is that they are neither caged nor chained in any sense. Especially after Hailsham, they have every opportunity and they live on their own as 'normals' do. Yet, they 'sheepishly' follow the path which is already all planned out for them. So, asking again, how is this maintained if there is no evident coercion?

The previous chapter discussed how Stevens the butler was 'living the dominance'. It was underlined how Ishiguro's choice of a subaltern position, a butler, was effective in analysing the hegemonic processes operant on ordinary people. Ishiguro, now, uses 'the clone' in his novel, which helps out for such an analysis again by completely removing the net of 'human nature' out of the picture. That is to say, the clone element provides us with a window into simply 'how hegemony works on people', without being entangled in a debate with any confronting argument which possibly goes as 'but the human nature *itself* is ...'. Ishiguro makes it possible to strip the so-called human nature inheritance from the subjects of scrutiny by making them clones, that is, entities brought into the world outside the inheritance line of humanity. Hence, *Never* is open to allegorical reading of the clones. I would like to suggest that clones represent the oppressed classes which fulfil their roles under the influence of the hegemony in the age of the ultimate phase of commodity capitalism. And since there is no possible explanation to the values they come to accept under their silent oppression by just saying that 'these values are inherent in the human nature', it gets easier to focus on the hegemonic processes at work; the hegemonic processes that shape those values and meanings become more and more disputable. In other words, it makes more sense, in the case of clones, when Williams says of hegemony: "It is a whole body of practices and expectations, over the whole of living: … It is a lived system of meanings and values … It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of society to move" (*Marxism* 110). We come to witness how that 'reality' is shaped for these clones from the very beginning and how they come to accept that reality.

Put as simply as possible, the question is this: Clones know that they are brought up to be cruelly harvested for their vital organs but they never try to run away from it, nor even think of questioning it. Why? Or rather, how? The answer to this question is actually the answer for many contemporary questions that a person living in our actual neoliberal capitalist world may ask oneself. We know what awaits us in the future, in terms of life chances, and our role in a world ruled by the free market and the class that is running it. We are aware of the inequities in the society, globally. We know about the imperialist wars all around the world, people getting killed in the wars for wealth;

people starving somewhere while somewhere else people are living off the surplus-value accumulated at the *others*' expense. Even in the case of biotechnology, we know how cosmetics or new medicine are tried out on the citizens of 'third world' countries (see SIM *Globalization*, 87). However, we mostly lack volition to question these things, let alone attempting at stopping them. We just live out the role we were 'supposed' to play just like the clones are doing. Why? Or again rather, how?

And, yet again, how do we get to learn about our role? At this point, the hegemonic comes onto the stage again. *Never*, as mentioned before, gives one the chances of witnessing the hegemonic processes which are starting to operate with the 'childhood' and 'education', and continuing through one's senility period. In fact, schooling or education is the major visible actor of hegemony in *Never*. We had already, in chapter two, identified school as an important 'institution' of the hegemonic processes and discussed the importance of the institutions in the light of Williams' arguments as: "the effective establishment of a selective tradition can be said to depend on identifiable institutions" (*Marxism* 117). Here, in the case of *Never* as a clone novel, the 'tradition' that is mentioned in William's statement will be discussed to be symbolizing 'the tradition of *humanness* of a neoliberal age'. In other words, clones, which are 'regarded non-human', are schooled to be humanized, which is, in the last analysis, humanization of the neoliberal era. And the institution that sets out to establishing this tradition is Hailsham. Hailsham is the name of the camp, the boarding school, where the clones are reared until their adolescence. It is mostly within the walls and fences of this 'Hail'-'sham' (a suggestive combination of two words) that we witness how the mechanisms of denial and self-repression are installed. While we are observing how students of Hailsham are shaped, we are also hinted at the processes of how *we* were exposed to similar processes. How we were all schooled, as these clones are, to learn to be normal 'humans'.

Yet, what is this humanization comprised of? Through the end of her narrative, coming across Miss Emily, warden of Hailsham, Kathy H. maintains to ask the following questions: "Why did we do all that work in the first place? Why train us, encourage us, make us produce all of that? If we're just going to give donations anyway, then die, why

all those lessons? Why all those books and discussions?" (*NLG* 254). The most important thing about these questions is actually the mood that they are being asked in. Here, the tone Kathy takes up within the conversation is striking in the sense that although there is talk of donations and death, Kathy is completely calm, and her purpose is not *really* questioning the situation. She is just questioning the motives behind their education, merely out of curiosity, having no intention of challenging those motives. Once directed this question, Miss Emily answers that "we were able to give you something, something which even now no one will ever take from you, and we were able to do that principally by *sheltering* you. … Yes, in many ways we *fooled* you. … But we sheltered you during those years, and we gave you your **childhoods**" (*NLG* 263; boldface mine). While Miss Emily and Kathy's conversation is evolving around these questions and answers, we as the readers get to learn that Hailsham is a project which is different from many 'government homes' (*NLG* 260) where other clones are "reared in deplorable conditions" (*NLG* 255). Two important things become visible in Miss Emily's answer regarding the Hailsham project; one is the act of 'fooling', in the sense of hiding things from the clones and deceiving them in many respects; second is giving them a 'childhood'. It is mainly with the help of these two things, actually, oppression of the clones come to shed light on the processes of how people in actual world are given a shape. Our suggestion at this point is reading childhood as a part of *the* tradition of humanness that the school, as an institution, is providing here; and reading the act of fooling as the 'education' which serves the purposes of the former.

Sociologist Phil Scratton states about childhood that it "is not a static, objective and universal fact of human nature, but a social construction which is both culturally and historically determined" (qtd. in McDonald 77). Keith McDonald goes on to say that "[t]his social construction is fundamentally involved in a nexus of ideological forces, where the notion of childhood is often bound up in a register of nurturing, benevolence, and protection that can also reveal social injustices and discourses of power" (McDonald 77). These arguments strengthen the argument that childhood can be read to be representing the tradition of 'humanness' mentioned previously. Childhood is, as any concept is a construct as ever, a constructed concept which inherits the hegemonic ideologies within. The argument gets clearer when a further question is asked:

‘Hailsham was to give the clones a childhood. But what is the reason for giving them a childhood?’ Miss Emily’s explanations of Hailsham project hint at the answer. Her explanations show what they were thinking of that “if students were reared in humane, cultivated environments, it was possible for them to grow to be … as any ordinary human being” (*NLG* 256). Here the relation gets clearer. Childhood, as Scratton and McDonald as well argued, is not an objective and universal fact. Instead, it has close associations with being an ‘ordinary human being’. In other words, being like us, like the reader. In that case, yet, another question must be asked; what does it mean to be an ‘ordinary human being’?

Marx’s statements, discussed at the beginning of chapter two, on ‘how man is shaped within the relations of production’ are a proper answer to this question. Yet, as they were not directly designated as an answer to our exact question, Gramsci’s contemplations on the same matter are useful quoting at length here. Gramsci sees the question of ‘what does it mean to be an ‘ordinary human being’?’ as an important and political one and in his *Notes*, he analyses the matter as the following:

> But is the 'human' a starting-point or a point of arrival, as a concept and as a unitary fact? Or might not the whole attempt, in so far as it posits the human as a starting-point, be a 'theological' or metaphysical residue? Philosophy cannot be reduced to a naturalistic 'anthropology': the nature of the human species is not given by the 'biological' nature of man. The differences in man which count in history are not the biological - race, shape of the cranium, colour of skin, etc. ... Nor has 'biological unity' ever counted for very much in history ... Nor yet have 'faculty of reason' or 'the mind' created unity, and they cannot be recognised as a 'unitary' fact as they represent a purely formal and categorical [nondialectical] concept. It is not 'thought' but what people really think that unifies or differentiates mankind. That 'human nature' is the 'complex of social relations' is the most satisfactory answer, because it includes the idea of becoming (man 'becomes', he changes continuously with the changing of social relations) and because it denies 'man in general'. (*Selections* 673-674)

Gramsci points to a vital contradiction in the attempt of defining ‘man’ within a static, non-dialectical general concept. He suggests defining man as ‘historical man’, in opposition to the nondialectical ‘man in general’. *Never* can be read as a useful occasion for a discussion over the opposition of ‘historical man’/‘man in general’ even if it is possible to limit the novel to a work on biological and theological concerns that depart

from the clone/human opposition. In terms of biology, clones' invasion of reprosexuality, "the interweaving of heterosexuality, biological reproduction, cultural reproduction, and personal identity" as Michael Warner defines it (9), is an example to these limited concerns. And for theological concerns, Tsao's arguments on 'spirit' and 'purpose of creation' can be regarded as examples, which were recounted in the review of literature part. However, these biological or theological concerns all turn out to be historical concepts in themselves. They exist as concerns, only within certain given social formations. That's why, a limitation of the arguments with these concepts would certainly end up in a truncated discussion. As Gramsci argues, the only healthy way of answering the question of 'what is man' is to locate him within the 'complex of social relations'. That is to say, to "conceive of man as a series of active relationships (a process)" (*Selections* 669).

In that case, the answer to our question, what does it mean to be an 'ordinary human being', turns out to be belonging to a historical stage of a complex of social relations; and it is, in this case, the stage of neoliberal nexus. Hence, when Miss Emily states that Hailsham is providing the clones with a childhood to give them the chance to be ordinary people, what is happening is a construction of the clones as members of a neoliberal society who are educated in the tradition of neoliberalism, a tradition which depends on the complete submission to the system and to the axiom that "the system (now grasped as the free market) is part of human nature; that any attempt to change it will be accompanied by violence" (*The Politics of Utopia* 35). The same tradition teaches the clones to embrace the values of privatization, professionalization, conformity to class structures and discriminatory categories, and it asks for complete complicity with the hegemony at the end.

If we are to start with privatization, *Never* is full of references to the 'private', 'personal' and 'special'. The important point is that these references are always made in opposition to the 'mass' or the 'batch' which comes to connote 'cloning' and the clone characters' own situations; – a batch of copies. Starting from her days at Hailsham, Kathy is engaged in a pursuit of the 'private'. It starts with a pursuit of 'privacy for groups of friends' and breaks down to the personal from there. The first thing that we

observe to get privatized is certain parts of Hailsham grounds. At the beginning of her narrative, we hear Kathy comment on the sports pavilion within Hailsham grounds. The pavilion seems to be a place where students can spend some time free from the anxiety of being monitored by the guardians. But then, we understand that, it is not only a sanctuary of escapade, but an important possession item which secures certain groups 'privacy' from the other students. Kathy says: "ideally you and your friends wanted the place just to yourselves, so there was often jockeying and arguing. … in practice, you needed to have some strong personalities in your group to stand a chance of getting the pavilion" (*NLG* 6-7). We see Kathy in an everlasting search for private places at Hailsham at different times. She tries some back paths to run away from the others, remote spots around a pond or classrooms which are not used. She explains the motive behind her search as "getting away from everyone else" (*NLG* 44). Privacy of the individual and privacy of the group are always in conflict with the curiosity of the 'mass'. Secrecy is an important possession for the students. Private talks with each other, and sharing and keeping secrets that come up during these private talks become an important thing to hold on to: "to have a private talk … you were trying to sneak off for… the whole place seemed to sense it within minutes" (*NLG* 22). We then see that it gets no different in the Cottages, the college-like place where the clones move after graduating from Hailsham (*NLG* 150). In this way, it gets clear how Hailsham plays the role of the source of *the* tradition that is spreading among the students and that teaches the clones about 'privacy' and the importance of possessing privacy.

Moreover, private property is also what is sought after. The concept of private property is mostly settled into the clones' value judgements by the help of the Hailsham custom 'Exchanges'; a kind of exhibition-cum-sale. Exchanges play an important role behind the concept of private property and behind the dominance this concept has over the clones' developing values. The students' obsession of building up a personal material collection is hinted at by Kathy. Kathy explains how Exchanges were important for them in order to get hold of "stuff that might become your private treasures" (*NLG* 16). The word choice of 'treasure' is especially suggestive here. It is not private possessions, or private property or even private belongings maybe. It is private treasure and it hints at a parallel term in economics, 'capital accumulation'. It is underlined in Kathy's statement

that accumulating a personal treasure of properties has become an end in itself now. It is much clearer when shopping at Exchanges is further defined by Kathy as a time when "[w]e'd become preoccupied … with personalising our desks. And of course, we had our 'collections' to think of" (*NLG* 38). This statement discloses another important concept the clones get to learn within the tradition Hailsham is spreading: personal and personalising. 'Personalising' spreads around with the tradition as an important thing to indulge in to differentiate oneself from the mass. We see how the students are permanently anxious about personalising their bedsits, their outlook and many things they get the possession of. Later in the novel, one of the students talks about buying birthday souvenir cards: "We like buying them in big batches. … you end up with a lot of cards the same, but you can put your own illustrations on them. You know, personalise them" (*NLG* 154).This is a good example that shows how personalising is in a tense conflict with the collective, urging the students to value personalisation. This 'personalisation' business peaks in the idea that they are all clones. Personalisation is much more important to them since these clones were developed from original humans and were manufactured in an 'industrialist fashion' of mass-production established by Fordism and Taylorism, two industrialist notions which will be mentioned again later in this chapter.

In fact, this takes us to a discussion on 'personhood'. There are further allusions to copying and cloning in the text. Debates and comments over personality become important. The reader can observe how anxious Kathy is about finding personality adjectives for her friends and for herself. For example, at one point she describes herself saying "I was never sort of kid who brooded over things for hours … Laura … could worry for days" (*NLG* 55-56). She tries to define everybody she knows under 'sorts' of persons, and she is trying to understand their lives through adjectives of personality which help her 'sort' herself and her friends. There are two important metaphorical instances about personality in the text. The first one revolves around a tape recording album *Songs After Dark* by Judy Bridgewater (*NLG* 64). Kathy gets hold of this tape during a Sales, another custom similar to Exchanges but this is a time when goods from 'the outside' are now being sold. Kathy is deeply tied to one of the songs on the album and when the tape is stolen, she falls into deep sorrow. Later, in their adolescence, Tommy and Kathy find the

tape at a second-hand shop in a town called Norfolk. When Kathy describes the tape they find as completely the same as her own copy that she has lost, Tommy asks Kathy if it can be the '*actual*' one she lost years ago. Kathy refuses by saying that "there might be thousands of these [tapes] knocking about" (*NLG* 170). This statement, when it comes after Kathy's recurring contemplations on her tape's originality and the distinctive features of its cover, works at a metaphorical level to reflect on the clones' copied personalities. More than that, it works as a discussion point of originality in an age of digital and industrial mass production. A good is always produced exactly as the first copy with industrial production methods. A digital file or a document can be copied immediately into millions on a computer or on another electronical device. At this point, it gets impossible to talk of originals if each copy is exactly the same as the original. The fact that the reader is also given no hint about the tape the characters find (is it really the one Kathy lost or is it another copy?), increases the tension around this argument. The other metaphorical instance about 'personality' concerns a batch of helium balloons. At one point in the story, Kathy bumps into a clown who is holding a bunch of helium balloons in his hand, probably headed to a private home party. Kathy happens to be walking in the same direction with this clown and she explains what she sees as: "As I came closer, I could see the balloons had faces and shaped ears, and they looked like a little tribe, bobbing in the air above their owner, waiting for him. … I kept worrying that one of the strings would come unravelled and a single balloon would sail off up into the cloudy sky. … I thought about Hailsham closing" (*NLG* 209). In this statement, the anxiety of possessing a personality among the batch gets more evident at a metaphorical level. The fear of being the same, being copies of an original falls down on Kathy. Just as she looks closer to the balloons to learn their personalities, she is always trying to dive into individual personalities she and her friends have, which are all-the-same-looking from afar in the eyes of the public. Another important thing about this statement is the clue of Hailsham's role in their personalities. Hailsham acts as a unifying point for the clones' personalities just as the clown's hand acts as the same for the 'tribe of balloons'. Here this source, Hailsham, is the source for the values and meanings which build into personalities for the clones.

Sorts and categories Kathy H. uses are not limited to the so-called-given personalities. This takes us to the concerns about discrimination categories and class structures mentioned previously. Prevalence and importance of discriminatory categories can be sensed from the very beginning of *Never* when Kathy states that "when you get a chance to choose, of course, you choose *your own kind*" (*NLG* 4; emphasis mine). Ruth blames Kathy with the same words again later in the novel (*NLG* 122), and this underlines once again how Kathy and the other clones learn about discriminatory categories which teaches them to use maps of 'kinds' and 'sorts'.

One quick category that evolves for Kathy and her friends is being a student of Hailsham. Hailsham's already mentioned difference from government homes that board clones in deplorable conditions indicates Hailsham's speciality. Yet, it doesn't end there. When the guardians tell the clones at Hailsham "[y]ou're … *special*" (*NLG* 68), both the reader and the clones themselves are not ready to understand its full meaning. Later in the text, when Kathy observes that "a separate set of rules applied to us Hailsham students" (*NLG* 143), we understand the privileged position of Hailsham students among all the clones around. By this, as the story progresses, the reader observes how being a 'Hailsham' develops into a category of definition and discrimination. The main difference of Hailsham students is grounded in the conditions they were reared as Miss Emily proposes: "you grew up in wonderful surroundings. … you can appreciate how much we *were* able to secure for you. … You've had good lives, you're educated and cultured" (*NLG* 256). This may be read as a parallel to proletariat and lumpen-proletariat distinction. Marx differentiates ordinary proletarians from lumpen proletarians who are "the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of the old society" such as thieves, criminals or sex workers (*The Communist* 55). Here, the clones reared 'without being educated and cultured' unlike Hailsham students can be read as the lumpen proletariat, which marks how schooling as an institution can help create discriminatory categories.

Another discrimination category is the gender roles. The first instance when we come across the gender roles in action is when Tommy wants to apologise from Kathy after breaking her heart in front of her friends. During a medical check up session,

Tommy bumps into Kathy on the stairs going up to one medical room and calls out to her by her name. At that point, we hear Kathy say that "[b]ut we were thirteen by then, and this was a boy running into a girl in a really public situation" (*NLG* 13). Here, Kathy uses the gender roles as a category which discriminates her and Tommy. This happens very early in the text. Thus, when we read these lines, we completely take it as a normal reaction expected from a normal girl at the age of thirteen. This is actually a clue itself that how we come to accept socially constructed meanings around gender roles with no questions and no apparent realization of them as constructed categories and meanings. But on a second reading of the novel, what this scene does stand for becomes more evident considering that we have learnt that these 'students' are clones. They are created without familial bonds, and they don't have families or other relatives to serve as the 'public opinion' for them while they are growing up. Therefore, the reader is led to contemplate that this shows either that these categories that we think of as social constructs are really god given and they are given to us with our birth (or else how may they know about these things given that they have no 'family education'), or these students are 'shaped' in accordance with these categories and meanings later during their Hailsham education. Clone novel setting comes in handy here again, as we already discussed. Since these students are clones, not 'created by god' or by 'normal reproductive activity', given-by-birth argument cannot work for them. In fact, we came to learn that there are "sex lectures" at Hailsham given by Miss Emily herself (*NLG* 82). That's how it becomes evident that Hailsham provides the category of gender role for the clones it boards, just as how the society always produces and provides them in reality.

Sex, in terms of sexual activity, is taught to Hailsham students as well, so that they can learn the 'humanness' and rules of being a human. When Kathy remembers one of the sex lectures given by Miss Emily, she remembers how Miss Emily brings a "life-size skeleton" to the class to show the students "how it was done" and even "the different variations" (*NLG* 82). During the same class, Miss Emily also teaches them how "out there sex meant all sorts of things. Out there people were even fighting and killing each other over who had sex with whom. … We had to respect the rules and treat sex as something pretty special" (*NLG* 82). The reader realizes that the clones are taught about

the ‘rules’ that apply in normals’ society and they are urged to obey these rules. They are taught to imitate the sexuality of the normals. It becomes apparent when Kathy comments on gay sex: “at Hailsham we definitely weren’t at all kind towards any signs of gay stuff” (*NLG* 94). She says that even the mention of ‘gay sex’ among boys would “easily end in a fight” (*NLG* 94). They are definitely taught about the codes and taboos about sex that comes to prevail over the society of the normals, which build around the concept of ‘heteronormativity’. Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner explain how heteronormativity prevails over the society as follows: “Heteronormativity … is produced in almost every aspect of the forms and arrangements of social life: nationality, the state, and the law; commerce; medicine; and education; as well as in the conventions and affects of narrativity, romance, and other protected spaces of culture” (Berlant & Warner 554–555). Berlant and Warner go on to identify the heterosexual culture that is scaffold around heteronormativity. In the end, Hailsham comes to act as a source of these categories for the clones. Just as everything else, sexuality and the culture attached to it are given to the clones within their Hailsham education. The clones judge everything from the standpoint of those meanings they were taught to value at Hailsham as it is evident with the following statement Kathy makes on Tommy’s interesting drawings: “what I was looking at was so different from anything the guardians had taught us to do at Hailsham, I didn’t know how to judge it” (*NLG* 185).

The major discrimination category in *Never*, of course, is the one between ‘normals’ and the clone copies. All along the novel, the reader is made to feel the tension of this opposition that is all pervasive in the clones’ lives, no matter how little it is being explicitly spoken of. Ishiguro does never turn this situation into an argument to be openly debated. In this way, he comes close to the actual case about the discrimination categories that we are living with, with a similar refrain from openly discussing them. ‘Class’ is no doubt the most important one of these discriminatory categories of our actual world.

In *Never*, according to Michiko Kakutani from *The New York Times*, “the class system isn't between rich and poor, or aristocrats and commoners, but between so-called ''normals'' and those like the Hailsham students who aren't” (Kakutani). As

Kakutani observes, normal/clone distinction can be read as an allusion to the class system. However, this distinction is never made clear since it is never discussed substantially. Kathy states that "[w]e knew a few things about ourselves – about who we were, how we were different from our guardians, from the people outside – but hadn't yet understood what any of it meant" (*NLG* 36). This is completely similar to the case of 'class structures' in reality since, as DeVine also observes, practically, class system is never discussed substantially as well: "Social class is difficult to discuss with any precision and without feeling as though one is using stereotypes and making sweeping statements. … it appears to be recognized by all, but completely understood by none" (DeVine 3). Anne Whitehead also notices the allegory to actual class structures in *Never*: "Expected to perform the care work as well as to end their own lives prematurely in the isolated and run-down treatment centers, the clones powerfully engage questions of class concerning who is "carer" and "cared for" in society" (Whitehead 62-63). Whitehead thus underlines how the clones make up the 'serving' mass, which creates its opposite on 'human' side who are 'served'. This makes 'the clones' the "instrumental class", a term Gramsci uses to define the proletariat in his *Prison Notes*.

Further on this matter, Eva Feder Kittay's arguments are like an answer to the question that Whitehead mentions in her statement above, 'who is carer and cared for'. Basing her article on the comprehensive studies carried out in New York, Kittay states that "paid carework is frequently supplied by noncitizens. It is these workers *who* put up with work that is poorly remunerated, lacks either benefits or status… we recognize that there exists a class of workers (… "aliens") who … constitute a crucial part of the labour force that do the hands-on carework" (Kittay 140-141; emphasis original). Benjamin Kunkel's arguments are also similar to Kittay's. Kunkel indicates how the clone novel can be read as an allusion to the state of 'alien' migrants all around the world: "In the clone novel, class society—in what may be a lurid reflection of our distinction between citizens with full legal rights and "illegal" foreign workers without them—hardens into a strict demarcation of castes" (Kunkel 92).

It is evident that, *Never* comes to depict how 'outsiders' are treated. The clones are aliens as the impression of their first encounter with Madame, one of the initiators

of Hailsham project, indicates: "Madame *was* afraid of us. But she was afraid of us in the same way someone might be afraid of spiders" (*NLG* 35; emphasis original). The clones are created by the 'human' to serve the human without any benefit or acceptance from the latter. It is just like the distinction of classes or citizenship in reality. In actual societies, the members of the ruling class are aware of the instrumental classes that serve them, but they refuse to consider the latter's conditions and prefer seeing them naturally devoid of any rights to the living conditions they enjoy as the ruling class members; they think of the 'lower' classes' existence as merely instrumental. The migrants, as Kittay and Kunkel observes, are taken advantage of by the society they migrated into while getting no benefit from that society in return. On a global scale, this can even be read as the distinction between First World/Third World nations. First World nations, which are – not surprisingly – comprised of Western nations, are aware of the 'deplorable' situation Third World nations are in. However, they prefer to keep them in shadows and use them as instruments for their ends, as markets or industrial resource farms. Miss Emily uses a similar rhetoric when she explains to Kathy and Tommy how humanity was considering the clones:

> However uncomfortable people were about your existence, their overwhelming concern was that their own children, their spouses, their parents, their friends, did not die from cancer, motor neurone disease. So for a long time you were kept in the shadows, and people did their best not to think about you. And if they did, they tried to convince themselves you weren't really like us. That you were less than human, so it didn't matter. (*NLG* 258).

It is easy to sense the metaphor here. People are regarding the clones 'less human' as European colonialists used to do when rationalizing their imperial conquests of African or Indian lands and nations. Titus Levy reminds us of the times when the "argument that Africans were somehow inferior to Europeans was an effective tool for proslavery advocates" (Levy 8). Thus, *Never* underlines a corrupt rhetoric that have been used for imperialist and colonialist purposes, and still comes to be used against lower classes, 'alien' migrants, or Third World nations. The power struggle inherent in this rhetoric is also evident as Judith Butler notices:

> To be called a copy, to be called unreal, is one way in which one can be oppressed … To be oppressed means that you already exist as a subject of some kind, you are there as the visible and oppressed other for the master subject, as

> a possible or potential subject … To be oppressed you must first become intelligible. To find that you are fundamentally unintelligible … to find yourself speaking only and always *as if you were* human" (Butler 30; emphasis original).

Butler's statements perfectly suit the situation of the clones in *Never*, or in other words, the clones create a perfect metaphor for what Butler explains about the power struggle of the oppressing/oppressed subjects in the actual world. It is the same concern visible in Miss Emily's statement: "It reminded people … of a fear they'd always had. … a generation of created children who'd take their place in society? Children demonstrably *superior* to the rest of us?" (*NLG* 259). It is, first of all, this power struggle that forces humans to declare the clones non-human or less than human; just like it is in reality.

Having mentioned privatization and discriminatory categories, we can now turn to professionalism, another feature of the neoliberal 'humanness' that Hailsham transmits to its students in the name of humanizing them. Kathy's opening remarks, her description of herself as we mentioned previously, is indicative of the discourses of professionalism and professional competency of the capitalist industrial working conditions. Before turning to these opening remarks, it may be useful to locate the clones' place in the relations of production. Their labour can be categorized as 'productive' and 'reproductive' or 'unproductive' labour, but only to state that these activities somehow intersect in the end. Marx states that the "difference between productive and unproductive labourers [is], inasmuch as the former, apart from minor exceptions, will exclusively produce *commodities*, while the latter, with minor exceptions, will perform only personal services" (*Theories* 1:161). That is to say, productive labour is simply labour which produces commodities for the market that will provide surplus-value for the capitalist. Reproductive labour is a kind of unproductive labour and it does not create surplus value of any kind, but contributes to the capital accumulation in another way. Reproductive labour comes to be as important as productive labour in the end since if surplus-value can only be created over human labour, without human worker, surplus-value cannot exist. Therefore, reproduction of the workforce is highly crucial to the capitalist. Reproductive labour can be said to be securing this reproduction: "Reproductive labour at its crudest can be taken to mean the reproduction and maintenance of workers" (Anderson 3). It includes activities as

cooking, child rearing, any kind of housework, and health and care services. The way that the clones produce 'replaceable' organs, in this case, is their productive activity. Marx speaks of productive activity as follows: "This is … saying that it reproduces on an enlarged scale the sum of value expended on it, or that it gives in return more labour than it receives in the form of wages" (*Theories* 1: 152). Just as in Marx's explanation, we learn from the text that the clones are brought to life; are reared in plantations; provided with shelter, food and healthcare; given cars and small apartments to reside later in adolescence; that is to say there is a huge amount of investment that they receive. In return, they produce vital, life saving organs for the investors. That is to say, they give their lives in return; more than 'the sum of value expended on them'.

In fact, this is the point where their productive and reproductive activities intersect. Before they come to donate their organs, the clones serve as 'carers' as Kathy H. explains in her opening remarks. She defines herself as a 'successful' carer who helps other clones who are donating now. The main objective of a carer is to keep the donors 'calm' and help them with adapting to their slowly diminishing life conditions (*NLG* 3). Donors are the labour power that creates the surplus value the investors are targeting at. Therefore, as stated above, their services must be perpetuated, reproduced. And by providing the care services that the donors are in need of, carers are the ones who engage in this reproductive activity. However, what the donors are doing comes to signify another thing on a larger scale. The donors provide vital organs that save lives of many 'humans'. If we think of these humans as the productive labour force for the capitalist production in the actual world, donors by donating their organs to the former and by extending the formers' lives, engage in a reproductive activity as well. They maintain the reproduction of the actual human labour force.

Hailsham, apart from rearing these clones to be engaged in productive and reproductive activities, provides another thing. The government homes mentioned before just boards these 'non-human' entities and, in a way, produces them. Hailsham, a project different from the government homes, takes on another responsibility, that is, to teach the clones the culture of the capitalist industrialism in order to 'humanize' the clones, as we discussed above. And this culture happens to represent professionalism

and professional competency. The traces of this culture can be found within the activity of donations. Through the end of the novel, Kathy makes a remark which she bases on her twelve years of observations as a carer. She states that "there's this odd tendency among donors to treat a fourth donation as something worthy of congratulations" (*NLG* 273). This statement indicates how so well the clones were taught in the professional culture that they own their deaths as something that they do with dignity, just as our old Mr. Stevens from *The Remains of the Day*. They congratulate themselves in being so professionally competent with what was expected of them.

The other thing is of course their careers as carers. The clones attribute a lot to their professional careers as carers. Through the end of the novel, a conversation between Kathy, Tommy and Ruth goes as follows: "[Tommy:] I wasn't much good as a carer. … I think that's why … I'm a pretty good donor. … [Ruth:] I was pretty much ready when I became a donor. It felt right. After all, it's what we're *supposed* to be doing" (*NLG* 223). It is suggestive that their conversation does not evolve around the essence of what they are doing; that is preparing to die so that their organs can be harvested, and taking 'care' of *the dying*. They consider the things they are doing just as a mechanic considers his job, or a housekeeper considers the activity he is doing. They consider donations and caring as professional careers that they engage in. This may again work as a metaphor for the situation of the labourer in the capitalist system. The labourer in the capitalist system sells his labour for a wage and produces goods for the market, goods which he cannot possess directly. Ownership of those goods comes to be the capital owner's rather than the labourer who directly produced it, and the surplus value that emerges when the goods are sold in the market (indeed back to the labourer who produced it at first-hand) becomes the capitalist's profit. This crude summary of capitalist relations of production and consumption is to signify that, in reality, the labourer, who is under the influence of the hegemonic, cannot locate himself within these relations of production and altruistically engages in his labouring activity with concerns of developing himself in accordance with the culture of professional competency. He attempts to be as the best labourer as he can be but never being aware of 'to what end' his labour is being used. This indicates, in the end, how hegemony is effective for people's adaptation to the relations of production just as it is effective on the clones in *Never*.

Another parallelism in *Never* is the way the clones are reared, which reminds of the notions of Fordism and Taylorism. It is possible to read *Never* as an example of the extended production systems maintained by the famous industrialists of the twentieth-century; Henry Ford and Frederick Winslow Taylor. These two historical figures are known for the mass production systems and scientific management techniques that they developed early in the twentieth century to increase labour productivity. Gramsci explains these mass productive systems with their reason as: a will "to give supremacy in national life to industry and industrial methods, to accelerate, through coercion imposed from the outside, the growth of discipline and order in production, and to adapt customs to the necessities of work" (*Selections* 597). As Gramsci puts it, it is possible to consider Fordism and Taylorism as initiatives of creating hegemony over every aspect of the workers' lives and over the customs they value so that they will serve the production processes at an utmost level of discipline and order. That is to say, they will live merely to do two things: breathe and produce. But what is the motive behind Fordism and Taylorism exactly, and in what ways are they similar to the situation of the clones in *Never*?

It may be useful to quote Gramsci's comments on the processes of Fordism and Taylorism at length to find an answer to this question:

> [T]he new methods of work are inseparable from a specific mode of living and of thinking and feeling life. One cannot have success in one field without tangible results in the other. In America rationalisation of work and prohibition are undoubtedly connected. The enquiries conducted by the industrialists into the workers' private lives and the inspection services created by some firms to control 'morality' of their workers are necessities of the new methods of work. People who laugh at these initiatives (failures though they were) and see in them only a hypocritical manifestation of 'Puritanism' thereby deny themselves any possibility of understanding the importance, significance and objective import of the American phenomenon, which is *also* the biggest collective effort to date to create, with unprecedented speed, and with a consciousness of purpose unmatched in history, a new type of worker and of man. (*Selections* 597)

As can be understood, American industrialists develop systems of inspection and control in order to interfere with the lives of their workers. They try to shape them into a new type of worker who will contribute to productive activities with utmost energy. In

other words, “American industrialists are concerned to maintain the continuity of the physical and muscular-nervous efficiency of the worker. It is in their interests to have a stable, skilled labour force” (*Selections* 599). They interfere with the workers’ private lives and force them to change and adapt their habits such as taking alcohol, gambling or sexual life because they think that “[a]buse and irregularity of sexual functions is, after alcoholism, the most dangerous enemy of nervous energies” (*Selections* 600).

In his book *Principles of Scientific Management*, Taylor says that “it would be possible to train an intelligent-gorilla so as to become a more efficient pig-iron handler than any man can be” (Taylor 18). Gramsci reflects on this statement saying that “Taylor is in fact expressing with brutal cynicism the purpose of American society - developing in the worker to the highest degree automatic and mechanical attitudes” (*Selections* 598). All this is very similar to the conditions of the clones in *Never* who can call each other “Mad animal” (*NLG* 12) just as Taylor implicitly calls the worker a ‘trained gorilla’. The case of clones is an allegorical parallel of what industrialism does to proletarians. Just as industrialism shapes the lives of the proletarians, Hailsham shapes the clones by regular medical check-ups, and by control over sexual activities, habits of smoking and taking alcohol. Kathy H. states how they “have some form of medical almost every week” (*NLG* 13) and how “the guardians were really strict about smoking” (*NLG* 67). We already discussed the issues concerning the sex lectures on sexual activities. The clones are ‘developed’ as that ‘new man’ the American industrialists were planning to create. They grow up with a complete dependence on professional competency culture.

In the end, their professional careers as carers turn into a complicity with the system that exploits their labour and their lives (for the clones it is also their bodies that is being exploited). At the beginning of the novel, Kathy states:

> they’ve been pleased with my work, and by and large, I have too. My donors have always tended to do much better than expected. Their recovery times have been impressive, and hardly any of them have been classified as ‘agitated’, even before fourth donation … it means a lot to me, being able to do my work well, especially that bit about my donors staying ‘calm’ (*NLG* 3)

The ‘professional’ codes that Kathy embraces are traceable in her statements. It is obvious how important it gets for her that ‘they’ are pleased with her work. She is happy

to be serving for 'their' cause, and 'it means a lot to her' that she is serving 'well'. Her definition of her job 'keeping the donors calm' or avoiding them to be classified as 'agitated' is really suggestive. According to OED, one of the three meanings of 'agitate' is "campaign to arouse public concern about an issue in the hope of prompting action." Ishiguro's choice of a word with political connotations, and emphasizing it within single quotation marks help the word-play here. It can be argued that the carers work as agents of the hegemony who accompany the donors and by keeping them calm, they keep the latter from agitating against the system. It is very suggestive how people can get directly complicit with the system just by doing the work assigned to them when they never attempt at questioning that work.

Apart from direct complicity, being a bystander, or being the one who turns a blind eye to the events evolving around is a form of complicity to which there are many references in the text: being a bystander and passively watching the things happening as if watching a play at the theatre (*NLG* 128; 216). For instance, early in the novel, the reader is informed about a plan to provoke Tommy so that Tommy would get angry and start yelling, just to end up being ridiculously funny. Kathy and her friends do not directly engage in this plan, but as Kathy confesses "although we hadn't had any part in this latest plan to rile Tommy, we *had* taken out ringside seats" (*NLG* 10; emphasis original). Elsewhere, Kathy again confesses their silent complicity when she says "we each played our part in preserving the fantasy and making it last for as long as possible" (*NLG* 52). Although they do not directly participate in the schemes that evolve before their eyes, they do not interfere with them either. By keeping silent, they somehow play their part in preserving the system. This reminds us of our silent complicity with the system that rules in the actual world; how even when we do not engage in the schemes directly, we do not stand against them, and somehow contribute to those schemes.

Yet, of course, this does not happen because the clones, and we, just openly choose to let the system perpetuate itself. As this study is discussing from the very beginning, our integration is maintained by the hegemonic processes; 'the lived dominance' that comes to be our reality which we cannot go beyond, as Williams states; how that dominance builds itself into an impenetrable *de facto* through assimilating the

masses according to a tradition it has built. Gramsci sees this as a “problem of education of the masses, of their 'adaptation' in accordance with the requirements of the goal to be achieved” (*Selections* 428). Education can be seen as just one of the pillars of this process of adaptation. Language, law, media and education work altogether as institutions that maintain the assimilation by disseminating the tradition necessary for it.

Gramsci sees this dissemination precisely as the “function of law” (*Selections* 428). He defines law as a correspondence which is “coercive in the sphere of positive law technically understood, and is spontaneous and free in those zones in which 'coercion' is not a State affair but is effected by public opinion, moral climate, etc”(Gramsci *Selections* 428). The rules of Hailsham can be regarded as the first type of correspondence in Gramsci’s definition, that is, coercion from the outside. However, the stronger type is the second one when there is no coercion and the law appears in a disguise of ‘public opinion’ or ‘moral climate’. This is the type that is prevalent in the lives of the clones. References to ‘unspoken rules’ prevail over the text starting from the Hailsham days to the donation period. A good example is when Kathy H. explains why they refrain from talking about ‘the gallery’ that is being built with their art works. She says that “there was an unspoken rule that we should never even raise the subject in their presence. I’d suppose now it was something passed down through the different generations of Hailsham students” (*NLG* 31). This points out to two things; how ‘the law’ builds into unspoken rules that people see as the normal or the common, and how the law is directly attached to tradition. As Kathy says, it is not written anywhere nor it is spoken of openly yet it is inherited from generation to generation as a tradition. There is another good example which again indicates how these rules spread among the group: “mention of Madame became, while not taboo exactly, pretty rare among us. And this was something that soon spread beyond our little group” (*NLG* 37). Kathy and her friends begin to develop a behaviour and it quickly spreads to other students on a larger scale. The rules turn into rules that they “imposed on [them]selves, as much as anything the guardians had decided” (*NLG* 32).

Language is also important for the tradition. Kathy’s narrative is intertwined with certain vocabulary that confuses the reader from the very beginning. When the

reader starts to see vocabulary as 'donor', 'carer', 'complete', 'medicals', 'guardians' or 'exchanges', he starts to feel the tension between the meanings of these words in his actual vocabulary repertoire and the uneasy feeling these words cause within the narrative. Of course, when the real plot is revealed that these words are created in order to specify certain periods and elements of clone harvesting organization, their role in that organization becomes clearer. The special language built around this system – that uses 'donor' in exchange with clones to be harvested, 'complete' to replace death or murder, 'carer' instead of in-system policing – works to conceal the real essence of the system. As Sim also draws attention to it, "*Never* demonstrates through such use of language how hegemony is maintained and consent managed" (Sim *Globalization* 263).

We can now turn to media, which is maybe much stronger an institution than language and law in disseminating *the* tradition. *Never* shows how media (television or printed media like magazines) form a strong influence on people in the process of shaping their values and meanings. Kathy realizes that the clones are mostly copying the things they see on TV: "how so many of their mannerisms were copied from the television" (*NLG* 118). She further explains the case saying how certain programs, especially the American sit-coms, act as a source of meaning and manners for the clones in their isolated habitat: "stuff came from an American series, one of those with an audience laughing along at everything … I began to notice all kinds of things the veteran couples had taken from TV programmes: the way they gestured to each other, sat together on sofas, even the way they argued and stormed out of the rooms" (*NLG* 118-119). However, immediately after she makes this criticism, she acts in a certain way which points that how she herself should be directed with this criticism. She argues with Tommy on a trivial matter and finally storms out of the room in the end in an air that one comes across in those sit-coms (*NLG* 134). No matter how she examines the other clones, she cannot see the extent to which she is also copying herself from those TV programs. Another instance also gives her away. On the onset of a car journey together, Ruth, Tommy and Kathy are to sit at the back of the car. Eventually, the three sit in a position where Ruth sits in between Kathy and Tommy since Ruth and Tommy are dating. Kathy explains this choice as an unconscious one saying "[t]hat was what had felt

natural, and we'd got in like that without thinking about it" (*NLG* 145). She is copying exactly what she has said before, that is, how couples are 'sitting together'.

A much more explicit example revolves around Ruth. On a walk which Kathy and Ruth take together someday, Ruth sees a thrown out magazine on the side of the road. The magazine is open, and there is a big advert visible in it. The advert is about an 'open plan office' showing smiling people happily conversing at the office with a motto written in big letters: "Are you the dynamic, go-ahead type?" (*NLG* 142). Ruth stops to take a good look at the advert and states her impression of the picture. Then, a few days later, when Kathy and Ruth are having a conversation with some other clones at the Cottages, Ruth begins to talk about "the sort of office she'd ideally work in" (*NLG* 142). Kathy immediately recognizes the images and gives the reader the hint that although Ruth is explaining it as her own original dream, she is actually copying her ideas from the magazine advert she has seen before. According to Kathy, Ruth may not be aware of it but she goes into "all the details" of the magazine picture and even announces that she would like to work with "dynamic, go-ahead types" (*NLG* 142). This reminds the way people copy from TV programs and magazine articles or pictures in reality. It is out of the scope of this study to engage in a discussion of how advertisement works on people. Yet, it can be argued how the case of Ruth is similar to our case in reality that we are mostly copycats of what we see or watch.

The last institution that we mentioned to be discussed is, surely, education. Education happens to be the first area *Never* strikes the reader and asks the question: why do we not question our childhood and our education? When Kathy H. starts narrating her story, we, as the readers, feel no significant urge to make sense of the things that we encounter in her narrative; in fact, neither does Kathy. Everything seems 'normal' to the reader; there is a boarding school, students are attending classes, producing art pieces, doing sports out in the open and there is some dormitory gossip. It perfectly suits anybody's childhood memories. However, when we come to learn that this is no regular school but a clone camp, an incompetency occurs. There emerges an area of inquiry behind the veil of 'normativity'. The education of the clone-camp-school makes itself open to analysis and this gives the reader the chance to analyse by extension his or her actual schooling.

Education is one of the major elements Gramsci discusses in his famous *Prison Notebooks*. He spares many pages on discussing the role of education and schooling within the hegemonic dominance processes. Particularly, he talks about the difference between vocational schools and traditional, or classical, schools. He immediately diagnoses that while vocational schools are established for the instrumental classes, the classical schools are for dominant classes and intellectuals "who do not have to worry about assuring themselves of a future career" (Gramsci *Selections* 166). Another thing Gramsci says is also striking because of its similarity to what is happening at Hailsham in *Never*. Gramsci says that school is a place where "the pupil's destiny and future activity are determined in advance" (*Selections* 166). Gramsci's statement reminds another statement Miss Lucy, a guardian at Hailsham, makes during a conversation with her 'students': "your futures, all of them, have been decided" (*NLG* 80).

It is for sure that the clones' futures are technically decided since they are brought into this world with a definite purpose. However, apart from that, the education at Hailsham becomes a representation of actual schooling which, in a real sense now, decides and shapes one's futures. We already discussed Hailsham's construction of values and meanings around the neoliberal 'human' ideal which includes values such as professionalization, privatization, discriminatory categories or complicity to the system. Yet, it is possible to talk about some details that strengthen this argument and underline the processes of this schooling better.

More and more into the story, Kathy's narrative makes many references to their education at Hailsham whenever she feels the necessity of explaining why she or one of her friends acted in a certain way in a certain context. Her explanations, shortly, come to this resolution that "we *have* been taught about all that" (*NLG* 29; emphasis original). At a few instances, Kathy and Tommy find the chance to get together and indulge into an inquiry of how come that whenever a piece of new information about their existence is revealed, they neither get surprised nor feel any unfamiliarity against the information. An explicitly discussed example is the fact that they are infertile by creation. Kathy, in the end, arrives at a resolution that "[i]t's just possible I'd somehow picked up the idea when I was younger without fully registering it" (*NLG* 72). That is to say, she feels

familiar with the information and thus feels no surprise at the face of it since it was unconsciously given to her somehow when she was younger. Another instance is when they realize that they were never aware of Miss Lucy's situation, that is, the tension between the school board and her ideas, before Miss Lucy was fired. Kathy and Tommy understand that this was because they'd "been taught to think about each other, but never about the guardians" (*NLG* 87). All in all, it comes to a judgement that:

> [T]he guardians had, throughout all our years at Hailsham, timed very carefully and deliberately everything they told us, so that we were always just too young to understand properly the latest piece of information. But of course we'd take it in at some level, so that before long all this stuff was there in our heads without us ever having examined properly. … In other words … the guardians managed to smuggle into our heads a lot of the basic facts about our futures. (*NLG* 81)

This is a judgement Kathy and Tommy arrive at after contemplating on all the processes they went through at Hailsham. It is highly suggestive in the sense that, in reality, it is the same with actual schooling that we have. People get educated about the facts and meanings at a younger age and it is possible to read the case of the clones in *Never* as an allegorical parallel to what we experience in reality.

There are many things that are included in the Hailsham curriculum that helps to this 'smuggling'. For starters, there are "Culture Briefing" lessons at Hailsham. As Kathy states, these are lessons where they "role play various people … out there – waiters in cafés, policemen, and so on" (*NLG* 108). That's why when they are daydreaming about future possibilities, all their dreams revolve around "becoming a postman or working on a farm" (*NLG* 141). Also, Exchanges and Sales are important parts of the Hailsham education. They have a similarity to actual economics of 'national market' and 'imports' respectively. Both act on "tokens as currency", similar to capitalist marketing, and both have market regulations such as "you could only buy work done by students in your own year" (*NLG* 16). That's why, throughout the years, a capitalist competition air develops in students' behaviours, and they develop a "keen eye for pricing up anything we produced [and] become preoccupied with T-shirts, with decorating around our beds, with personalising our desks" (*NLG* 38). Everything turns into "marketable stuff" for them (NLG 39), and even for a person's poetry they liked, they cannot "just borrow it

and copy down ourselves any old afternoon" (*NLG* 17); it has to be marketed. They learn about the fierce competition behaviours, so the Sales happen in an atmosphere "crowded and noisy. In fact the pushing and shouting was all part of the fun" (*NLG* 42).

Apart from culture briefings and Exchanges, Hailsham controls the art the students are producing and the art they are receiving. The clones are mostly given Victorian novels to read (*NLG* 113), and even the essay assignments they are given later are about Victorian novels (*NLG* 244). Some books get censored such as "the Sherlock Holmes ones" or some books get partially censored and get a "page torn" (*NLG* 67). For geography and demography, they learn about the country through lessons and it is easy to see how they are taught about the country with generic, stereotyped images:

> There'd be little villages with streams going through them, white mountains on hillsides, old churches behind fields; if she was telling us about a coastal place, there'd be beaches crowded with people, cliffs with seagulls … after all these miles I've covered as a carer, the extent to which my idea of the various counties is still set by these pictures Miss Emily put up on her easel (*NLG* 64-65)

And it is important to see how all the guardians work to preserve the system at Hailsham, except for one: Miss Lucy. Miss Lucy is the equivalent of Senator Mr. Lewis or Mr. Farraday from *The Remains of the Day*. She is very friendly with the clones in contrast to other guardians. For instance, contrary to the formal and threatening way of speaking that most guardians take up against the clones, when it is a conversation with Miss Lucy, for example, Tommy finds himself "seated in Miss Lucy's *easy* chair" (*NLG* 27; emphasis mine). One is quickly reminded of how Mr. Farraday was conversing with Stevens by stretching his legs on a *chaise-longue* (*ROD* 3). Miss Lucy is the one who is against the exploitative system that Hailsham develops. She defends that the students should be told about everything clearly, without any misinformation or underreporting:

> The problem, as I see it, is that you've been told and not told. You've been told, but none of you really understand, and I dare say, some people are quite happy to leave it that way. But I'm not. If you're going to have decent lives, then you've got to know properly. None of you will go to America, none of you will be film stars. And none of you will be working in supermarkets … Your lives are set out for you. You'll become adults, then … you'll start to donate your vital organs. … You were brought into this world for a purpose, and your futures, all of them, have been decided. … If you're to have decent lives, you have to know who you are and what lies ahead of you. (*NLG* 80).

Later we learn that her full name is “Lucy Wainright” (*NLG* 262), which again evokes Mr. Farr-a-day from *Remains* because of the suggestive word play on ‘Wain-right’; hinting at the impossibility of the right thing happening within a system of wrongs.

Yet, in the end, is it really a vain thing to pursue what is ‘right’ as Miss Lucy’s full name suggests? *Never* represents an allegorical reading of the lives of the clones as a parallel to our actual lives. It acts as a propaedeutic occasion for us in the way to understanding the hegemonic processes that we are influenced by in reality. As we discussed, the main characters in *Never* are clones and they are ‘born’ out of the line of inheritance of humanity. They do not have any familial bonds and they are exempt from any arguments that limit the discussion of values and meanings with ‘human nature’, arguments that strengthen the *status-quo*. The clones are like empty canvasses, a human groundwork, on which the features of ‘ordinary human’ are being constructed. In that way, we as the readers find the chance to witness how the values and meanings that we embrace in our lives are step by step ‘smuggled’ into the brains of the clones; how they are schooled in assimilation so that they can be humanized, or in other words, shaped according to *the* tradition of the historico-social hegemony.

Hailsham comes to signify the most important figure of these adaptation processes with the education and schooling it provides as *the* institution of the hegemony. Language, law and media come to represent the other important institutions. The way these institutions work upon the clones, and how the clones slowly shape into ‘personalities’ which become representatives of the neoliberal human; the way they come to accept the scheme that is running at the expense of their blood; the way they become complicit with the system by providing the reproductive labour that is necessary to perpetuate the system; the way they lack volition and, as represented by the ‘boat’ that is left ashore (*NLG* 212; 222), never taking any chance to question or to simply run away from the inequities and atrocities; these all remind the reader the same processes that he or she is going through. *Never* gives the reader the chance to observe the hegemonic processes of ‘how come’ that the clones, and the reader, are shaped in a way to internalize and contribute to this system.

In the end, the world that Ishiguro portrays is one of 'vain rights', loss, barbarism, despair and chaos. The words that Kathy uses to describe the world before she dies are suggestive in that manner:

> I found I was standing before acres of ploughed earth. There was a fence keeping me from stepping into the fields, with two lines of barbed wire, and I could see how this fence and the cluster of three or four trees above me were the only things breaking the wind for miles. All along the fence, especially along the lower line of wire, all sorts of rubbish had caught and tangled. It was like the debris you get on a seashore: the wind must have carried some of it for miles and miles before finally coming up against these trees and these two lines of wire. Up in the branches of the trees, too, I could see, flapping about, torn plastic sheeting and bits of old carrier bags. … I was thinking about the rubbish, the flapping plastic in the branches, the shore-line of odd stuff caught along the fencing, and I half-closed my eyes and imagined this was the spot where everything I'd ever lost since my childhood had washed up, and I was not standing here in front of it, and if I waited long enough, a tiny figure would appear on the horizon across the field, and gradually get larger until I'd see it was Tommy, and he'd wave, maybe even call. … I just waited a bit, then turned back to the car, to drive off to wherever it was I was supposed to be" (*NLG* 281-282)

The world that Ishiguro creates in *Never* is a "neoliberal dystopia [which] defend[s] love and individuality against the forces threatening to crush them" (Kunkel 95). What Ishiguro depicts in the end, serves to "demonstrating our utter incapacity to imagine [a better] future – our imprisonment in a non-utopian present without history or futurity – so as to reveal the ideological closure of the system in which we are somehow trapped and confined" (*The Politics of Utopia* 46). And the only thing that Ishiguro embraces against this non-utopian present is the inner world the individual should take sanctuary within. Just as he makes his characters state that "[i]t was up to each of us to make of our lives what we could" (NLG 138), Ishiguro himself says that "one of the sad things about people's lives is that they are rather short. If you make a hash of it, often there isn't time for another go" (An interview with *Nermeen Shaikh*). He wants to indicate that a pursuit of the personal joy is what is crucial in one's life to strive for. As Harrison notes, what is left after *Never* is an urge to "have sex, take drugs, run a marathon, dance - anything to convince yourself that you're more alive, more determined, more conscious, more dangerous than any of these characters" (Harrison).

This indicates how Ishiguro *de*politicises his story, which makes it all the more important to take up a political stance when reading it.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This study started with the following questions: Why analyse an art work? And why analyse an art work with a Marxist approach?

In order to give an answer to these questions, and provide the reason for a Marxist reading of Ishiguro's works thus and so, Fredric Jameson's statement on art's value was used as a starting point. Jameson was talking about 'the propaedeutic value of art' which, according to him, was stemming from the chance the artwork provided us to fathom the historical and social value of the experiences of our ordinary lives. In other words, a critical analysis of the arts was believed to give us a chance to go beyond the limiting frame of 'individual experience'. I tried to discuss that it was possible for any ordinary person to try to undermine everything down to that limiting frame of his individuality, which is what detains him from a full understanding of the historico-social essence of any given social formation. Therefore, I pointed out, this denies us the chance of comprehending the totality of the society and comprehending the hegemonic processes that can only be observed within that understanding of totality. Exactly because of this, I underlined the importance of making use of the propaedeutic value of art. Art was defined as a springboard, a tool to gain impetus in our struggle to reach to a full understanding of the society and the hegemonic forces operating on it. To be able to make use of this propaedeutic value was discussed possible only by a theory of analysis which would be able to penetrate into the art work and extract that historico-social content from it. I discussed that, the real essence of an art work can be perceived only when set against a historico-social background. Hence, in order to achieve this aim, I argued that we turn to a Marxist approach and to dialectics, because only in that way we would be able to analyse art without limiting our discussions of it to descriptive

categories or to concepts that have relevance only within temporal historical settings; and use art for identifying the hegemonic substance in society. All in all, I discussed that this was important for us to liberate ourselves from class domination; or at least to liberate ourselves from the ideological barriers that block our perception of that class domination.

I started with a discussion of the notions and concepts that Marxism makes use of to set the Marxist background of the study, and to represent why and what kind of a Marxist approach is important. I started off with the basics of Marxist social interpretations which depend mostly on Marx's Preface to his *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, and his structure-superstructure formula there. Then, I gradually moved on to more contemporary arguments and concepts as *ideology*, *praxis*, *totality*, *hegemony*, *tradition*, *institutions* and *formations*. I mentioned the discussions on the validity of deterministic approaches that most of these arguments and concepts inheres. In the end, I discussed *hegemony* and the concepts of *tradition, institutions* and *formations* related to hegemony as the most contemporary and healthy way of scrutinising any social formation. This was followed by a discussion of the Marxist understanding of art and artwork. I mentioned art's essence, that is, human labour put in it. Then, I discussed art's quasi-objectivism and tried to locate it within the material productive activities. I discussed the influence of the dominant hegemony on art and how it was a product for 'the market' and how it was shaped according to the urges of this market. Then I tried to make a short definition of the use of Marxist Criticism and how important it was for a full understanding of art and artwork.

Under the light of these discussions, the study set out to analysing two novels by Kazuo Ishiguro; namely, *The Remains of the Day* (1989) and *Never Let Me Go* (2005). The aim of the study was stated as, by using a Marxist approach discussed above, showing how the meanings, ideas, values and even identities that we consider to be parts of our individual lives and individual choices were in fact constructs, shaped within a certain social formation in accordance with the hegemony that prevails over that social formation. To realize this aim, I scrutinised the protagonists of these novels, and

scrutinised the novels themselves, regarding them as social constructs as well, 'laboured' by a certain author.

First, a discussion on *The Remains of the Day* was presented. The protagonist Stevens was scrutinised in terms of his acts of constructing a self around certain meanings and values, and the workings of the hegemonic processes behind those meanings and values. Then, the novel itself was analysed in terms of the effects of the historico-social moment on Ishiguro's writing process.

Discussions on Stevens were very fruitful. I analysed Stevens' allegorical journey to the 'West' as a transition period that marks the differences in the power structures of pre- and post-war periods; it marks how the Victorian values of the Empire leave the stage to American neoliberal values. Stevens comes to epitomize this transition in person. His first-person narration reveals some contradictions that are stemming from a clash of these two different value schemes. In the end, this contradictory situation urges him to contemplate on his past. During this process of contemplation, Stevens continuously tries to rationalize his past behaviours referring to certain values and meanings like dignity, loyalty, professionalism or restraint. Meanwhile, both the reader and Stevens himself gradually come to understand how Stevens was manipulated through these values and meanings, and how he was turned into an accomplice of the hegemonic. More importantly, it was observed how this manipulation was something Stevens was imposing on him himself. Moreover, it was discussed how this 'revelation' was also hinting at the hegemonic processes. As stated above, I analysed that the contradiction which was urging Stevens to contemplate on his past was stemming from a clash of Victorian and neoliberal values. Hence, the revelation that the values and meanings Stevens was embracing in the past were elements of a manipulating tradition was made possible only by an analysis of these values and meanings from the point of view of neoliberal values. At this point, the novel's place within the hegemonic was discussed. I argued how the novel was implicitly promoting American neoliberal tradition by pointing out to the failures of the traditions preceding it.

In the end, I discussed how a Marxist reading of *Remains* was useful in showing that the values, meanings and ideas, and even the identities people embrace as *the* 'reality' without any questions regarding their sources were actually constructed and shaped within the hegemonic processes. By referring to Stevens, the discussion related how the programs or broadcasts we listen to or watch; casual meetings with friends or colleagues; our relations to organizations or clubs; the paper or the magazines that we read; stories that we hear from parents or others; our schooling; or the codes of appearance in public; all exist within an invisible net of hegemonic values and are actually beyond the simple individual experience that they are thought to be belonging to. We discussed how seemingly un-political things *are* in fact political tools within the hands of the hegemony and how they serve, in the end, strengthening that hegemony by strengthening people's experience of the reality constructed within that hegemony; by turning people into accomplices of that hegemony.

Then, a discussion on *Never Let Me Go* was presented. The discussion took place over the protagonist Kathy H. and her two close friends Tommy and Ruth. It was discussed how these characters were shaped into the values and meanings which were designated as *the* tradition to be disseminated by certain institutions within the hegemonic processes.

The discussion on *Never* was mostly focused on the allegorical reading of the lives of the clones as a parallel to our actual lives. I discussed that the fact that the main characters in *Never* are clones and hence they are 'born' out of the line of inheritance of humanity was helping the reader to scrutinise the clones' lives as constructs. In that way, the reader was provided with a chance of witnessing how the values and meanings that we embrace in our lives are step by step 'smuggled' into the brains of the clones; how they are schooled in assimilation so that they can be humanized, or in other words, shaped according to *the* tradition of the historico-social hegemony. *Never* creates the chance of observing how 'humanization' was taking place on the clones. By this, it was revealed what this 'humanization' meant. In this way, it was mentioned that *Never* acts as a propaedeutic occasion for us to understand the constructed nature of any value or

meaning that was attached to 'humanness'. I discussed how any argument of 'humanization' was in fact stemming from a static understanding of 'what is human' and a description of 'man in general' and how in the end it was strengthening the *status-quo*. This description was opposed with Gramsci's description of human as 'historical man'.

Moreover, *Never* was used as a chance to analyse the workings of certain institutions. Hailsham, the boarding school (or camp) where the clones are reared was the most important institution that was openly serving the hegemonic value construction processes. I discussed the importance of Hailsham, and schooling in general, as an element of hegemonic adaptation processes. The values of privatization, professional competency, discriminatory categories and codes, and personalization were used as points of inquiry while discussing how schooling was working to shape its objects, students, in accordance with the prevailing hegemonic tradition. Language, law and media were also discussed as important institutions, and I tried to show how they were acting as the tools for the hegemony that it used for perpetuating itself; the way they come to secure inclusion and complicity on the clones' side. This was used as an occasion of underlining how we come to accept the hegemonic dominance and turn it into a self-imposed one; how we also become complicit with the system and lack volition to question or simply act against the inequities and atrocities that is taking place globally. That is to say, *Never* was said to give the reader the chance to observe the hegemonic processes of 'how come' that the clones, and the reader, are shaped in a way to internalize and contribute to the system. It is also important to credit Ishiguro's struggle to point out to these concerns in his work. As discussed before, Ishiguro wants to underline the processes of how *we* are globally manipulated to overlook these atrocities and inequities.

In the end, by the help of these analyses of Ishiguro's novels, I wanted to underline the necessity of the recognition of the social content art inheres to any analyses of art; whether in the form of hegemonic cultural domination, or as the influence of more practical social economic activities such as wage-labour, market and

distribution. Then, I wanted to point out to a necessary warning against *de*-politicization of art and artwork. By analysing Ishiguro's writing, I tried to underline that art *is* a political tool and an institution that works on people within certain hegemonic processes, and thus it should be read and analysed accordingly.

This study points out to a necessity of further study into contemporary art since, as discussed by this study, the main obstacle in the way of liberating ourselves from the hegemonic is the diffusion of its dominance in every aspect of our thinking and thought. The tendency to analyse everything through fully-uttered systemic categories as ideology, class interest or economic determination causes our analyses to turn into 'past-tense' analyses in the last instance, and it denies us the possibility of grasping the prevalence of the dominance in the *present*. As it is discussed by this study, art's political nature should be considered to pull through this tendency, and art's propaedeutic value, in the way of diagnosing and locating the hegemonic processes, must be made used of.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adorno, Theodor W. *In Search of Wagner*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. London: Verso, 2005. Print.

"agitate". Oxford Dictionaries. April 2010. Oxford Dictionaries. April 2010. Oxford University Press. 18 January 2013

Anderson, Bridget. "Reproductive Labour and Migration." *Working Paper Series WPTC* 02.01 (c2001): *n.pag*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Liberalism, Individuality, and Identity." *Critical Inquiry* 27.2 (Winter, 2001): 305-332. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Atkinson, Rob. "How the Butler Was Made to Do It: The Perverted Professionalism of The Remains of the Day." *The Yale Law Journal* 105.1 (Oct., 1995): 177-220. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Barrow, Andrew. "Never Let Me Go by Kazuo Ishiguro: Artist of a Floating World." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The Independent* 25 Feb. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Berberich, Christine. *The Image of the English Gentleman in Twentieth-Century Literature*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. Print.

Berlant, Lauren and Michael Warner. "Sex in Public." *Critical Inquiry* 24.2 (1998): 547-566. *JSTOR*. Web. 02 Sep. 2012.

Bhabha, Homi. "Unpacking My Library Again." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 28.1 (Spring, 1995): 5-18. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Bookergroup.com. Booker Group PLC, Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Bormann, Daniel Candel. *The Articulation of Science in the Neo-Victorian Novel: A Poetics (and Two Case-Studies)*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. Print.

Britzman, Deborah P. "On Being A Slow Reader: Psychoanalytic Reading Problems in Ishiguro's Never Let Me Go." *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education* 13.3 (2006): 307-318. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Butler, Judith. *Undoing Gender*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Buttigieg, Joseph. Preface. *Antonio Gramsci Prison Notebooks*. Vol. 3. Trans. Ed. Joseph A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia UP, 2011. vii-xii. Print.

Carpi, Daniela. "The Crisis of the Social Subject in the Contemporary English Novel." *European Journal of English Studies* 1.2 (1977): 165-183. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

Carroll, Rachel. "Imitations of Life: Cloning, Heterosexuality and the Human in Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Journal of Gender Studies* 19.1 (2010): 59-71. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Cohen, Monica F. *Professional Domesticity in the Victorian Novel: Women, Work and Home*. 1998. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Creaven, Sean. *Marxism and Realism: A Materialistic Application of Realism in the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

DeVine, Christine. *Class in Turn-of-the-Century Novels of Gissing, James, Hardy and Wells*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005. Print.

Deb, Siddhartha. "Fiction – Lost Corner." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *New Statesman* 7 Mar. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Dowling, William C. *Jameson, Althusser, Marx: An Introduction to The Political Unconscious*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984. Print.

Dupré, Louis. *Marx's Social Critique of Culture*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983. Print.

---. "Objectivism and the Rise of Cultural Alienation." Rockmore 70-85.

Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. 1976. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

---. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 1983. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989. Print.

Ekelund, Bo G. "Misrecognizing History: Complicitous Genres in Kazu Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*." *The International Fiction Review* 32.1 (2005): *n.pag*. Web. 20 Oct. 2010

Engels, Frederick. "Engels to H. Starkenburg." *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Correspondence*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Pub. House, 1953. 548-550. Print.

Furst, Lilian R. "Memory's Fragile Power in Kazuo Ishiguro' Remains of the Day and W. G. Sebald's "Max Ferber"." *Contemporary Literature* 48.4 (2007): 530-553. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Antonio Gramsci Prison Notebooks*. Vol. 3. Trans. Ed. Joseph A. Buttigieg. New York: Columbia UP, 2011. Print.

---. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Trans. Ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: Electric Book Co., c2001. Web. 20 Oct. 2010.

Graver, Lawrence. "What the Butler Saw." Rev. of *The Remains of the Day*, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The New York Times* 8 Oct. 1989: *n. pag.*. Web. 17 Sep. 2012.

Griffin, Gabriele. "Science and the Cultural Imaginary: The Case of Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Textual Practice* 23.4 (2009): 645-663. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Grondin, J. "Reification from Lukács to Habermas." Rockmore 86-107.

Hamzea, Liliana. "The Subaltern Voice and Professional Ethics." *Bulletin of the Transilvania University Braşov* 3.52 (2010): 299-306. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Hardt, Michael, and Kathi Weeks, eds. *The Jameson Reader*. Padstow, Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing, 2000. Print.

Harrison, John M. "Clone Alone." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The Guardian* 26 Feb. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Hensher, Philip. "School for Scandal." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The Spectator* 26 Feb. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.

---. "Karl Marx's Contribution to Historiography." *Ideology in Social Science: Readings in Critical Social Theory*. Ed. Robin Blackburn. London: Fontana, 1972. 263-283. Print.

Holmes, Frederick M. "Realism, Dreams and the Unconscious in the Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro." *The Contemporary British Novel*. Eds. James Acheson and Sarah C. E. Ross. Edinburgh: Edinburg UP, 2005. 11-22.Print.

Ishiguro, Kazuo. *The Remains of the Day*. 1989. London: Faber and Faber, 1999. Print.

---. "A Conversation about Life and Art with Kazuo Ishiguro." By Cynthia F. Wong and Grace Crummett. Shaffer and Wong 204-220.

---. "An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro." By Allan Vorda and Kim Herzinger. Shaffer and Wong 66-87.

---. "An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro." By Brian W. Shaffer. *Contemporary Literature* 42.1 (2001): 1-14. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

---. “An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro.” By Gregory Mason. *Contemporary Literature* 30.3 (1989): 335-347. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

---. “Kazuo Ishiguro’s Interior Worlds.” By Nermeen Shaikh. *AsiaSociety.org*. Asia Society. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

---. “Kazuo Ishiguro: The Sorbonne Lecture.” By François Gallix. Shaffer and Wong 135-155.

---. *Never Let Me Go*. 2005. London: Faber and Faber, 2010. Print.

---. “Shorts: Kazuo Ishiguro.” By Graham Swift. Shaffer and Wong 35-41.

---. “Future Imperfect.” *The Guardian* 25 Mar. 2006: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Ishiguro, Kazuo, and Oe Kenzaburo. “The Novelist in Today’s World: A Conversation.” *Boundary* 18.3 (1991): 109-122. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. 1981. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991. Print.

---. “Towards Dialectical Criticism.” Hardt and Weeks 61-70.

---. “The Politics of Utopia.” *New Left Review* 25 (January, February 2004): 35-54. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Kakutani, Michiko. “Sealed in a World That’s not as It Seems.” Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The New York Times* 4 Apr. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Kittay, Eva Feder. “The Global Heart Transplant and Caring across National Boundaries.” *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 46 (2008): 138-165. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Keeping Up Appearances. BBC. BBC, London. c2012. Television.

Kermode, Frank. “Outrageous Game.” Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *London Review of Books* 27.8 (2005): 21-22. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Kunkel, Benjamin. “Dystopia and the End of Politics.” *Dissent* Fall 2008. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Lang, Anthony F., Jr., and James M. Lang. “Between Theory and History: The Remains of the Day in the International Relations Classroom.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31.2 (Jun., 1998): 209-215. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Larraín, Jorge A. *Marxism and Ideology*. 2nd ed. Aldershot: Gregg Revivals, 1991. Print.

---. “Lukács’ Concept of Ideology.” Rockmore 52-69.

Levy, Titus. “Human Rights Storytelling and Trauma Narrative in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go*.” *Journal of Human Rights* 10.1 (2011): 1-16. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Lewis, Barry. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000. Print.

Lukács, Georg. Preface to the New Edition. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. 2nd Ed. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. London: Merlin Press, 1990. ix-xxxix. Print.

---. *The Theory of the Novel: A Historico-Philosophical Essayon the Forms of Great Epic Literature*. Trans. Anna Bostock. Cambridge: Mass. M.I.T. Press, 1971. Print.

Marx, Karl. Preface. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Trans. S. W. Ryazanskaya. Ed. Maurice Dobb. 2nd ed. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977. Print.

---. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. Ed. Frederick Engels. Vol. 1. London: Electric Books Co., c2001. Web. 20 Aug. 2010.

---. Afterword. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. Ed. Frederick Engels. Vol. 1. London: Electric Books Co., c2001. 26-37. Web. 20 Aug. 2010.

---. *Wage Labour and Capital*. 1976. N.p: Kessinger Publishing, c2004. Print.

---. *The German Ideology*. Ed. C. J. Arthur. London: Electric Book Co., c2001. Web. 20 Aug. 2010.

---. *Theories of Surplus Value*. Trans. Emile Burns. 1963. Ed. S. Ryazanskaya. Vol. 1. Moscow: Progress Publishers, c1975. Print.

---. *The Communist Manifesto: A Road Map to History’s Most Important Political Document*. Ed. Phil Gasper. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2005. Print.

McCombe, John P. “The End of (Anthony) Eden: Ishiguro’s “The Remains of the Day” and Midcentury Anglo-American Tensions.” *Twentieth Century Literature* 48.1 (Spring, 2002): 77-99. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

McDonald, Keith. “Days of Past Futures: Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Never Let Me Go* as “Speculative Memoir”.” *Biography* 30.1 (Winter, 2007): 74-83. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

O’Brien, Susie. “Serving a New World Order: Postcolonial Politics in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day*.” *Modern Fiction Studies* 42.4 (1996): 787-806. Web. 17 Sept. 2012.

Ollman, Bertell. *Alienation: Marx’s Conception of Man in Capitalist Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976. Print.

Parkes, Adam. *Kazuo Ishiguro's The Remains of the Day: A Reader's Guide*. New York: Continuum, 2001. Print.

"Report Of The British Guiana Constitutional Commission 1954." *Guyana.org*. Mohammed A. O. Ishmael, *n.d*. *n.pag*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. 1983. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Rockmore, Tom, ed. *Lukács Today: Essays in Marxist Philosophy*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1987. Print. Sovietica Vol. 41.

Scurr, Ruth. "The Facts of Life." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The Times Literary Supplement* 13 Mar. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Seecharan, Clem. *Sweetening "Bitter Sugar": Jock Campbell, the Booker Reformer in British Guiana, 1934-1966*. Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2005. Print.

Shaffer, Brian W. *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro*. 1998. Columbia: South Carolina UP, 2008. Print.

Shaffer, Brian W., and Cynthia F. Wong, eds. *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*. Jackson: Mississippi UP: 2008. Print.

Sim, Wai-Chew. *Globalization and Dislocation in the Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2006. Print.

---. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.

Stewart, Victoria. *The Second World War in Contemporary British Fiction: Secret Histories*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2011. Print.

Tamaya, Meera. "Ishiguro's "Remains of the Day": The Empire Strikes Back." *Modern Language Studies* 22.2 (Spring, 1992): 45-56. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. 1911. Dover: Courier Dover Publications, 1998. Print.

Tsao, Tiffany. "The Tyranny of Purpose: Religion and Biotechnology in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Literature & Theology* 26.2 (2012): 214-232. Web.

Turner, Bryan S. *Marx and the End of Orientalism*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978. Print.

Walkowitz, Rebecca L. "The Location of Literature: The Transnational Book and the Migrant Writer." *Contemporary Literature* 47.4 (Winter, 2006): 527-545. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Wall, Kathleen. "*The Remains of the Day* and Its Challenges to Theories of Unreliable Narration." *The Journal of Narrative Technique* 24.1 (Winter, 1994): 18-42. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Oct. 2010.

Warner, Michael. "Introduction: Fear of a Queer Planet." *Social Text* 29 (1991): 3-17. *JSTOR*. Web. 02 Sep. 2012.

Watman, Max. "Ignorant Armies Clash by Night." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The New Criterion* 23.9 (2005): 61-67. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Whitehead, Anne. "Writing with Care: Kazuo Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*." *Contemporary Literature* 52.1 (2011): 54-83. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Materialism: Selected Essays*. London: Verso, 2005. Print.

---. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.

Wong, Cynthia F. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. 2nd ed. Tavistock: Northcote House, 2005. Print.

Viswanathan, Gauri. "An Introduction: Uncommon Genealogies." *Ariel: A Review of English Literature* 31.1 (2000): 13-31. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

---. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. London: Faber, 1990. Print.

Yardley, Jonathan. "Never Let Me Go." Rev. of *Never Let Me* Go, auth. Kazuo Ishiguro. *The Washington Post* 17 Apr. 2005: *n. pag.*. Web. 16 Dec. 2012.

APPENDIX

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : .....
Adı : .....
Bölümü : .....

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : .....
.....
.....
.....
.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın. ☐

2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullancılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ☐

3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ☐

Yazarın imzası ..... Tarih .....