ÇANKAYA UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
ENGLISH LITERATURE AND CULTURAL STUDIES

HEGEMONY, CLASS ANTAGONISM AND CAPITALIST POLICIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: POST-WAR CAMPUS NOVELS BY KINGSLEY AMIS, MALCOLM BRADBURY AND DAVID LODGE

PhD Dissertation

Sibel ERBAYRAKTAR

JUNE, 2018

Title of the Thesis: **Hegemony, Class Antagonism and Capitalist Policies in Higher Education: Post-War Campus Novels by Kingsley Amis, Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge**

Submitted by : **Sibel ERBAYRAKTAR**

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences, Çankaya University

Prof. Dr. Mehmet YAZICI
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem UZUNDEMIR
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 Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem UZUNDEMIR
Supervisor

Examination Date: 25.06.2018

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem UZUNDEMIR (Çankaya University) _____

Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul KOÇ (Çankaya University) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zeynep Zeren Atayurt FENGE (Ankara University) _____

Dr. Lecturer Berkem SAĞLAM (Çankaya University) _____

Dr. Lecturer Defne Tutan (Başkent University) _____

STATEMENT OF NON-PLAGIARISM

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. 25.06.2018

Name, Last Name: Sibel ERBAYRAKTAR

Signature : 

ABSTRACT

HEGEMONY, CLASS ANTAGONISM AND CAPITALIST POLICIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: POST-WAR CAMPUS NOVELS BY KINGSLEY AMIS, MALCOLM BRADBURY AND DAVID LODGE

ERBAYRAKTAR, SİBEL

Department of English Literature and Cultural Studies

Ph. D. Dissertation

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özlem Uzundemir

June. 2018, 246 Pages

This study aims at analysing six post-war campus novels *Lucky Jim* (1954) by Kingsley Amis, *Eating People is Wrong* (1959) and *History Man* (1975) by Malcolm Bradbury as well as David Lodge's campus trilogy consisting of *Changing Places* (1975), *Small World* (1984) and *Nice Work* (1988) within the framework of post-war class dynamics and hegemonic power relationships among academics. Based on the analyses, it is concluded that the books touch upon many dysfunctional aspects of higher education with direct and indirect references to the education policies of the time and the penetration of the capitalist ideology into the universities. The education acts, reports, procedures, as well as the governmental stance in each period will be examined in relation to how socio-political dynamics is criticised in the novels. Within these discussions, the theories of Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams, Pierre Bourdieu, T.S Eliot and Michael Young will be utilized. In each novel, the residues of the old class-based system in English academia, hegemony resulting from class antagonism, and capitalist competition will be the focus together with carnivalesque elements, such as excessive drinking and sexual affairs at the parties.

The first novel, *Lucky Jim*, narrates the struggle of a lower-class academic, who tries to secure his position at a provincial university in England. However, he is excluded from the academic circle in various forms specifically by the bourgeois

academics who find his manners vulgar. His reaction to culture and art is tested by the upper class whose sophistication and intellectuality are already suspicious because of their pretentious attitudes. His senior, professor Ned Welch also abuses Jim Dixon by assigning him all the petty and boring works at the department; thus, building a hegemonic pressure upon him using his seniority and prestige.

Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong* which is again a novel from the fifties, deals with a very similar case, the exclusion of lower-class humanities professor, Treece, and one of his undergraduate students, Louis Bates, by the upper-class academics at his university. Starting from the seventies, the rise of a lower-class academic in Bradbury's *History Man* connotes that lower-class move up the social ladder via education, yet goes through a painful process in which he sometimes loses his organic ties with his own class by imitating the life style of bourgeoisie.

The implication that the lower-class feel stuck between their working-class origins and bourgeois luxuries goes on in David Lodge's Trilogy with characters who display similar hesitant attitudes in defending egalitarian philosophy but adapting a bourgeois life style. Within the discussion of meritocracy, the lower-class academics in David Lodge's trilogy try to rise up the social scale through education. A common observation in all novels is that since majority of academics who find the prestigious positions at universities have already got the necessary network and educational background, the skilful candidates from lower class cannot find equal opportunities of employment at universities.

The post-war campus novels, which are mainly considered as satirical and light comedies of their time, are specifically chosen for this study to exemplify the problems of the academics such as low-salaries, rivalry, hegemony and the exploitation of their labour power. The books also picture the conditions of post-war provincial universities, which welcome lower classes or financially disadvantaged individuals. However, it is observed in the novels that these universities cannot resist against capitalisation in higher education, and start to get smaller by losing their funds and members in time. Briefly, universities in England witnessed drastic economic and social changes during the post-war period, and the campus novels selected for this study include subtle criticisms of the fluctuations in higher education.

Keywords: Campus novels, hegemony, class antagonism, capitalist ideology, academia

ÖZ

KINGSLEY AMIS, MALCOLM BRADBURY VE DAVID LODGE'UN KAMPÜS ROMANLARINDA HEGEMONYA, SINIF ÇATIŞMASI VE KAPİTALİST POLİTİKALAR

ERBAYRAKTAR, SİBEL

İngiliz Edebiyatı ve Kültür İncelemeleri
Doktora Tezi

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Özlem Uzundemir
Haziran 2018, 246 Sayfa

Bu çalışma Kingsley Amis'in *Şanslı Jim,* Malcolm Bradbury'nin *İnsanları Yemek Yanlıştır* (1958) ve *Tarih Adam* (1975) ile David Lodge'un *Yerleri Değiştirme* (1975), *Dünya Küçük* (1984) ve *İyi İş* (1988) romanlarından oluşan kampüs üçlemesini, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrası akademisyenler arasındaki sınıf dinamikleri ve güç ilişkileri çerçevesinde incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, dönemin eğitim politikaları ve kapitalist ideolojinin üniversitelere sirayet edişi romanlardaki örneklerle tartışılacaktır. Her dönemin eğitim politikaları, raporları ve hükümet kararlarının yanısıra Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams, Pierre Bourdieu, T.S Eliot ve Michael Young gibi düşünürlerin fikir ve kuramlarından yararlanılacaktır. Romanlarda temel olarak, eski sınıf kökenli sistemin kalıntıları, sınıf ayrımından kaynaklanan hegemonya, kapitalist rekabet ortamı ve bölüm partilerinde ortaya çıkan karnaval ögeler işlenecektir.

İlk roman olan *Lucky Jim*'de İngiltere'de yerel bir üniversitede akademik pozisyonunu güvence altına almaya çabalayan alt sınıfa ait bir akademisyenin mücadelesini anlatmaktadır. Lakin kendisi tavırlarını kaba bulan üst sınıftan olan akademisyenler tarafından akademiden farklı yöntemlerle dışlanmaktadır. Jim Dixon'ın kültür ve sanata olan ilgisi, entellektüel görünmeye çalışan üst sınıf tarafından sürekli sorgulanmaktadır. Yöneticisi konumundaki Ned Welch bölümdeki

tüm gereksiz ve sıkıcı işleri Jim'e yükleyerek onun emeğini de sömürmekte ve bu şekilde konumunu kullanarak Jim üzerinde baskı kurmaktadır.

Malcolm Bradbury'nin aynı dönemde yazılmış olan *Eating People is Wrong* romanı da çok benzer bir konuyu, alt sınıftan bir insani bilimler profesörü, Treece, ile Louis Bates adlı öğrencisinin, akademiden dışlanma sürecini işlemektedir. Yetmişli yıllardan itibaren, Malcom Bradbury'nin *History Man* romanında bulunan alt sınıf akademisyenin yükselişi, eğitim sayesinde sosyal sınıf olarak ilerleyebilme ihtimalini işaret eder. Ancak alt sınıf akademisyenin bu uğurda eleştirdiği burjuva sınıfını taklit edip kendi sınıfı ile olan organik bağını kaybettiği sancılı süreci de anlatır.

Alt sınıf akademisyenin kendi sınıfı ile burjuva sınıfı arasında sıkışmış hissetmesi David Lodge'un kampüs üçlemesinde de bulunmaktadır. Lodge'un romanlarında eşitlikçi yaşamı savunduğu halde burjuva lüks yaşantısını benimseyen akademisyen portreleri yer almaktadır. Üniversitede saygın pozisyonlar edinen akademisyenlerin çoğunun zaten gerekli bağlantı ve eğitim alt yapısına sahip olması nedeniyle, alt sınıfa mensup yetenekli adayların üniversitelerde istihdamı hususunda eşit fırsat yakalayamamaktadır.

Genellikle hafif komedi ve hiciv olarak incelenen savaş sonrası kampüs romanları bu çalışma için özellikle seçilmiş ve romanların dönemin sosyo-politik dinamiklerine doğrudan veya dolaylı göndermeler yaparak yükseköğretimin aksayan birçok yönüne yer verdiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu bağlamda romanlar akademisyenlerin aldığı düşük maaş, birbirleri arasındaki rekabet, hegemonya ve emek sömürüsü gibi sorunları dile getirmektedir. Eserler ayrıca savaş sonrası kurulan alt sınıfa ve maddi açıdan dezavantajlı bireylere kucak açan yerel İngiliz üniversitelerinin koşullarını da anlatmaktadır. Bu kampüsler yükseköğretimin genişleme ve yaygınlaşmasına temel sağlamıştır ancak romanlarda sözü edildiği gibi bu üniversiteler yükseköğretimin ticarileşme sürecine direnememiş ve zaman içerisinde ödeneklerini ve hocalarını kaybedip küçülmeye başlamıştır. Özetle, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında İngiliz üniversiteleri köklü sosyal ve ekonomik değişimlere şahit olmuştur ve bu çalışma için seçilen kampüs romanları yükseköğretimdeki bu dalgalanmaların eleştirisini içermektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kampüs romanları, hegemonya, sınıf çatışması, kapitalist ideoloji, akademi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my dear thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr Özlem Uzundemir for her invaluable guidance, warm support and strong motivation throughout this study without which I could have never completed this dissertation. I would also extend my gratitude to Prof.Dr Aytül Özüm and Dr. Berkem Sağlam for their valuable feedback during thesis progression meetings. I also would like to thank the external jury members who contributed to my thesis by accepting to attend my final jury.

My sincere thanks are to my family who are always beside me, and supported me whenever I lose my patience or motivation. My little daughter Dila Ada Erbayraktar made the biggest sacrifice during the process by waiting her mother patiently when she needs to study for this dissertation.

Finally, I am grateful to my mother who made the process for me a relatively less painful one with her loving and caring attitude. She was always there whenever I needed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF NON-PLAGIARISM iii

ABSTRACT iv

ÖZ vi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

INTRODUCTION 1

Definition of the Genre 2

The Rise and the Early Examples of the Genre 3

General Features and the Style of the Genre 7

Corporatization of English Universities and Campus Novel 13

CHAPTER ONE: 20

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 20

1.1 Basic Marxist Notions and The Concept of Class 23

1.2 Gramsci's Theory 28

1.2.1 Hegemony 28

1.2.2 Model of Society 31

1.2.3 Formation of Intellectuals 33

1.2.4 Education and Educational Practices 40

1.3 Althusser's Theory Related to Education 41

1.4 Raymond Williams's Theory 43

1.4.1 Hegemony 43

1.4.2 The Dominant, the Residual and the Emergent 48

1.5 Mikhail Bakhtin and the Carnival 49

1.6 Education and Advancement of the Working Class 51

1.7 The Rise of Meritocracy and British Higher Education 55

CHAPTER TWO: 59
KINGSLEY AMIS'S *LUCKY JIM* 59
2.1 Introduction and Background 59
2.2 Class Conflict and Hegemony in *Lucky Jim* 63
2.3 Irony and Pretension in *Lucky Jim* 75
2.4 Criticism of Capitalist Policies in Higher Education 80
2.5 Carnivalesque Elements in *Lucky Jim* 82
2.6 Conclusion 86
CHAPTER THREE: 89
MALCOLM BRADBURY'S CAMPUS FICTION 89
3.1 Introduction and Background 89
3.2 *Eating People is Wrong* 96
3.2.1 Post-War Academic Disillusionment 97
3.2.2 Class and Hegemony 101
3.2.3 Criticism of Capitalist Policies in Higher Education 107
3.2.4 The Duality of Normality and Abnormality 112
3.3 *The History Man* 117
3.3.1 Hegelian Dialectic: Class and Hegemony 119
3.3.2 Capitalism and the Fashion of Nonconformity 129
3.4 Conclusion 139
CHAPTER 4: 142
DAVID LODGES' CAMPUS TRILOGY 142
4.1 Introduction and Background 142
4.2 *Changing Places: Tale of Two Campuses* 146
4.2.1. Academic Mobility 148
4.2.2 Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy 150
4.2.3 Capitalist Policies in Higher Education 158
4.3 *Small World: An Academic Romance* 163

4.3.1 The Idea of the Global Campus: Fashion of Academic Mobility 165

4.3.2 Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy 174

4.3.3 Criticism of Capitalist Policies in Higher Education 189

4.3.4 Conferences: Carnival in the Academic World 196

4. 4 *Nice Work* 204

4.4.1 The Changing Conception of Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy 206

4.4.2 Capitalist Policies in Higher Education: Collaboration of University and the Business World 213

4.5 Conclusion to the Trilogy 218

CONCLUSION 222

WORKS CITED 232

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to deal with the problem of hegemony and the class-based dynamics within English academia through post-war British campus novels. In the study, the relationship between different classes is observed through the depictions of intellectuals who served in the English academia from the 1950s till the end of the 1980s, covering a period of thirty-four years from the publication of the first British post-war example of the genre, *Lucky Jim* by Kingsley Amis in 1954 to the last novel, *Nice Work* in David Lodge's trilogy in 1988. To what extent the class dynamics and post-war educational policies have influence over academic practices in English universities will be questioned through the analysis of fiction. The novels chosen for this study are *Lucky Jim* (1954) by Kingsley Amis, *Eating People is Wrong* (1959) and *History Man* (1975) by Malcolm Bradbury, The Campus Trilogy consisting of *Changing Places* (1975), *Small World* (1984) and *Nice Work* (1988) by David Lodge since they are the pioneers of the genre, and cover related problems in the English academia in successive decades. By analysing these six novels in depth, I am planning to show how social class dynamics work in the academia, and what kind of hegemonic relationships exist among academics as well as the penetration of the capitalist ideology into the English universities. With this aim in mind, the changes in the perception of hegemonic practices in higher education, and the transformation of the notion of class during the post-war period in England will be discussed. The post-war period is specifically significant for English higher education because governmental policies attempted to restructure the whole of educational practices in the country. In the analysis the term "lower class" is mainly preferred to the term "working class," since academics are not evaluated as workers in the traditional sense; that is, the academics described in the novels are rather officers who do not engage in hard physical work in difficult conditions as will be discussed in the chapter on theoretical framework in detail. In relation to the hegemony at universities, Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony along with Raymond Williams's concepts, namely the dominant, the residual, and the

emergent will be utilized. Additionally, Louis Althusser's concept of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) and Repressive State Apparatuses (RSA) will also be mentioned for he spares a good amount of his discussion on ideology and the functioning of schools as ideological state apparatuses.

The dominant ideology has been in the direction of corporatization/capitalisation for a very long time for the English academia, so the various steps of this process will be discussed in detail in the novels. While evaluating the relationship between the rise of the lower class and education, T.S Eliot's ideas on education, Pierre Bourdieu's notions of social and cultural capital, as well as Michael Young's notion of meritocracy, will also be examined, since there is a good amount of research on meritocratic system of education which Michael Young's notions inspired. Finally, the Russian critic Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of carnival will be considered within the framework of how the academics in the books challenge hegemony in their daily lives.

Definition of the Genre

There are different views with respect to the categorization of the campus novels, and it has been difficult to find a unifying name for the genre.. Different higher education systems and perceptions bring forth diverse opinions about the general qualities of the genre as well as its definition. Janice Rossen, in her book, *The University in Modern British Fiction,* asserts that "various influences – whether cultural, political, aesthetic or personal – tangle together within any given novel, and especially within the field of university fiction as a whole" (6). The cultural, political, and, to a certain extent, personal influences in campus novels are the aspects which open them to various interpretations, enabling a cultural and political study of these novels. However, the fact that the campus novel is a combination of numerous effects renders it difficult to formulate a single definition that covers all examples of the genre. Furthermore, the amount of access to campus and higher education change in each country, which directly influences the perception about the campus and the fiction based on it.

Jeffrey J. Williams makes a distinction between campus novel and academic novel: the former focuses on campus life and student affairs while the latter mainly deals with the academics and their problems. He argues:

> I would call the former "campus novels" because they tend to revolve around campus life and present young adult comedies or dramas, most frequently coming-of-age narratives. The latter I would designate academic novels because they feature those who work as academics although the action is rarely confined to a campus, and they portray adult predicaments in marriage and home as well as the workplace, most familiarly yielding mid-life crisis plot. (562)

In the light of his categorization, the novels analysed in this thesis fall into the category of "academic novels." However, this classification is not used by all reviewers and writers; instead, these terms are used interchangeably. Patricia Shaw adds another term to these discussions, "university novel," and defines it as "a novel particularly or completely set against a university background, whose plot deals with typical academic activities, and having as its protagonist a university student or teacher" (44). To avoid confusion, I will use one term, "campus novel," throughout the thesis primarily because the selected novels portray a campus life with students, the academics and their families; that is, there is a variety of characters. Furthermore, among these three categories, "campus novel" is the most widely used and cited one in the discussions of the genre.

The Rise and the Early Examples of the Genre

A brief overview of the evolution of the genre will be useful in order to understand where the post-war examples of the genre stand in this process, and why they are preferred for this study. Firstly, although there are much earlier examples of the genre, the origin and definition of "the campus novel" has been a serious discussion topic especially since the 1950s. The first post-war examples of the campus novel appeared in American universities during this period. To name a few, *Groves of Academe* (1952) by Mary McCarthy, *Pictures from an Institution* (1954) by Randall Jarrell, and Vladimir Nobokov's *Pnin* (1957) are known to include the issues related to campus life. Due to the fact that there are noticeable differences in form and content between the earlier examples and the more recent ones, the researchers feel the need to scrutinize the history of this sub-genre in two parts.

Mortimer Proctor claims that in the 18th century some characters were members of the academia in the novels, yet this criterion is not enough to categorize them as campus novels. Furthermore, the 18th century did not prepare the necessary ground for the composition of the genre because of the low literacy rate in England. The earlier examples written in the 19th century are not called campus novels either

but "novels about campus life." As Mortimer Proctor indicates, the genre was mainly concerned about the two distinguished universities of the time, and did not appeal to the Victorian reading public. He claims,

> The English university novels which appeared in such numbers in the nineteenth century offer a problem not common to better known Victorian fiction. Inasmuch as they deal with Oxford and Cambridge they are concerned with the peculiarities of life within two exclusive and inbred communities, and they constitute a narrowly specialized body of literature built around codes of behaviour and thought which at times appear artificial to the outside world. (11)

The fact that the campus novel was mainly under the influence of Oxbridge is evaluated as a disadvantage by Proctor, and he detects two additional problems in these novels. Firstly, he claims, "The societies of Oxford and Cambridge are, in fact, unique to the extent that they can be compared only with each other. One difficulty in comprehending the life of their undergraduates as novels have portrayed it lies, at least for the outsider, in official academic terminology unlike that of any other university" (11). Proctor also maintains that the weird customs and characters shaped by these universities are quite hard to understand for the outsiders, so the campus novel should be stripped of its traditional scholar-monk characters and strange vocabulary to reach a wider reading public. He briefly refers to various novels such as John Gibson Lockhart's *Reginald Dalton: A Story of English University Life* (1823), Thomas Little's *Confessions of an Oxonian* (1826), Frederick William Farrar's *Julian Home: A Tale of College Life* (1859), Charles Henry Cook's *With the Best Intentions: A Tale of Undergraduate Life at Cambridge* (1884), Mrs. Anne Edwardes' *A Girton Girl* (1885), Ivor Brown's *Years of Plenty* (1915) among many others. These lengthy novels about the two universities did not attract the attention of general reading public firstly because they talk about a closed community with a set of context-bound vocabulary.

Proctor evaluates the development of the genre through the centuries and emphasizes the gradual change, saying: "They follow a clear course of progress from initial fragmentary accounts of university life through the full-scale libels of the eighteenth century, to the earnest novels of reform, to a well-developed comic literature, and finally to a series of romantic novels glorifying college life" (150). Despite being a very general outline, it is valuable in terms of indicating the general

direction and final destination of the genre outlining its transformational journey. Proctor also emphasizes the similarities in the plot and the setting of the earlier campus novels and confirms the Oxford influence, saying, "Historically speaking, the university novel has been the Oxford novel.… Of the nineteenth century novelists listed in *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* nearly half (44 percent) of those who were university-educated went to Oxford" (4). Although Cambridge is also a very old university with a considerable amount of history, its sustained emphasis in teaching mathematics diverted most of the students who are interested in creative writing to Oxford at that time (5). Patricia Shaw also supports Proctor's finding and claims that before the 20th century "approximately 85% of English University novels are set in Oxford, almost all the rest being located in Cambridge. Only after 1945, the campus novel at last, frees itself from the Oxbridge setting, precisely because the novelists themselves are no longer necessarily Oxbridge graduates" (45). As suggested by Proctor and Shaw, in the post-war examples analyzed in this thesis, the campus life gets out of the Ivy League specifically after the Second World War, and includes the life and conditions at provincial universities in England. In other words, with the establishment of numerous local universities in England, a lot of students find the opportunity to receive higher education, and many academics find tenure as secured positions in small universities. The academia now physically dwells outside Cambridge and Oxford, so the stories based on these local universities start to originate during the second half of the 20th century.

A further criticism of the early examples of the campus novels is that campuses were presented as places for socialization and gaining skills for professional life only for men in the past. For instance, John Gibson Lockhart's *Reginald Dalton: A Story of English University Life* (1823) focuses on the story of a male Oxford student, Reginald, who fights for his inheritance stolen from him. He gets into a lot of trouble during his adventurous university life, and is finally dismissed from the university. In short, the whole story revolves around Reginald and his noble family ties, as well as his Oxford adventures. Like *Reginald Dalton*, other 19th century campus stories do not take female students or academics to their center firstly because campuses are depicted as too dangerous for females.

Secondly, ambition and rivalry are not perceived suitable for the delicate and domestic Victorian women,[1] as Proctor claims:

> Women though they have been admitted to, have clearly never been fully assimilated by, the still predominantly male societies of Oxford and Cambridge. They have enjoyed at best a doubtful welcome there.…This fact of women's being to some extent alien to university scene perhaps explains, more than anything else, why women novelists who have tried to portray the life of England's older universities stand apart as a group afflicted with peculiar and very real difficulties. (136)

This exclusion from the academic scene diminished the chances of observing and getting first-hand information about campus life for female writers. Compared to male members of the academia who have had firm places in the academia for centuries, women are still in search of acceptance and appreciation for their academic success.

Although the number of female university students and academics rose in the late 20th century, the inclination to marginalize women in the academic sphere is not totally abandoned in campus novels. The campuses have been shaped by the masculine ideology for such a long time that it is relatively challenging for women to be admitted to the universities[2]. Therefore, the representation of female characters as a nuisance to the professional course of events in academic life is frequently observed in the early examples of the campus novels. As for the recent campus novels written after the Second World War, specifically the ones chosen for this study, they include predominantly male characters, implying the partial persistence of the exclusion of females from the academia. Although, later on, they were given the right to study at the university, it took time for female writers to decipher the dynamics in the academia, and write about it. The situation of female academics is not within the scope of this study, although there are references to the difficulties that they experience, yet it can be a subject for further studies on campus novels.

[1] Anne Digby in her article "Victorian Values and Women in Public and Private" discusses the alineation of women from the public sphere, and the repressed sexuality of the Victorian society in detail.

[2] Sara Delamont coins the phrase "double conformity" to refer to women's need to ensure the educational authorities and their parents that they could be wives as well as scholars at the same time. For further discussion on the issue check Delamont's *Gender and Higher Education*.

General Features and the Style of the Genre

As discussed partly, the genre has gone through various stages and taken its recent shape as a result of the adjustments in educational and economic standards in England specifically after the Second World War. Education Act of 1944[3], and admission of people from different layers of society, including females, to universities changed the course of events in higher education, and this was directly reflected in the examples of the genre written in the same period. To be precise, with the rise of provincial universities after the war, the genre has been released from its Oxford and Cambridge ties. Additionally, the admission of great masses of scholarship students into the universities rendered the genre richer and more familiar for the majority of the literate people. As the profile of the academics entering into universities change, the content of the campus novels also change and become more colorful. Therefore, to look at the socio-political and educational dynamics of post-war England is necessary in terms of understanding the direct and indirect references in the novels discussed.

As Steven Connor argues, "The rise in the readership of fiction was brought about in post-war Britain and elsewhere by two interlocking factors: the development of mass paperback publishing and the growth of higher education" (14). Since developments in higher education and mass-publication are relatively faster in the second half of the 20th century, it is sound to relate the rise of the campus novel with the general rise in the readership of fiction. Elaine Showalter has a similar claim about the post-war campus fiction, and claims that: "The genre has risen and flourished only since about 1950, when post-war universities were growing rapidly, first to absorb returning veterans, and then to take in a larger and larger percentage of the baby-booming population" (1). She also confirms the link between the expansion of higher education and the rising popularity of campus fiction. Connor also lists parallel reasons for the popularity and expansion of the genre as follows:

[3] The Education Act of 1944 announced the inclusion of masses into higher education, and equal salary for women academics, yet it was subjected to heavy criticism from some members of the parliament. Despite oppositions, Lord Butler made it possible with his political manoeuvres. (For further debate about the act, see: Nigel Middleton's article "Lord Butler and the Education Act of 1944)

> One of the most remarkable developments in postwar British literature has been the rise of university fiction or the campus novel. The usefulness and attraction of the university campus for the novelist is in many ways easy to account for. The university is a closed world, with its own norms and values, which is thick with the possibilities of intrigue. Indeed, the very restriction of elements in the academic world, the stock characters, with their cozily familiar routines of evasion and abstraction and their conspicuous, if always insecure, hierarchical structures, and the well-established situations and plot-lines, seem to generate a sense of permutative abundance. (69)

The combinations of the elements in the genre are labelled permutative by Connor, which means it is possible to formulate different mixtures and variations in terms of character, setting and plot. The common suggestion is that the variety in the profile of students and academics created a natural diversity in the authorship and readership in campus fiction. Furthermore, unlike the earlier examples of the genre, the recent ones receive relatively positive criticism in the sense that they are not perceived as limited in plot and setting.

Although the provincial universities also became the subject matter of campus novels with their growing number of students and academics, their acceptance as serious literary work took some time. Educational reforms supporting the expansion of higher education and cultural changes that accompanies the reforms rendered the genre only a popular one; however, initially the popularity of the genre was not accompanied by positive interest on the part of the critics studying contemporary British fiction. Elaine Showalter declares that the genre has not been studied thoroughly by critics, and there is still a lot to discover: "The academic novel is by now a small but recognizable sub-genre of contemporary fiction and has a small body of criticism devoted to it" (2). The genre needs further examining and elaboration to have substantial knowledge about its form, content, and socio-political positioning. Apart from a few articles, written on the famous examples of the genre, there is not much wider-scale research about the post-war campus novels.

While there is no mention of a clear plotline or stylistic standards for the earlier examples of the campus novel, the recent ones, the ones written in the 20th century, are claimed to display some similarities. Sally Dalton Brown believes that "survival" within the academia is the key term in campus novels, and she outlines the general thematic pattern in campus novels as:

> (1) the (usually male) academic protagonist is satirized, and secondary academic figures caricatured, in order to indicate his naiveté, (2) his department/university is shown to be a place of politicking, an environment that requires considerable cunningness if it is to be survived, and (3) the tale hinges on the academic's decision whether to opt for the life of the mind or the life of desires, whether sexual, status-oriented, or commercial lust, and this moral dilemma is often developed in the context of a fight to gain tenure, status, or to keep his position… Finally, (4) the academic wins the battle to stay in the academe, or escapes and here conventionality ends as the protagonist rediscovers a creative originality once freed from generic confines. (592)

This pattern is well-matched with the outstanding post-war examples of the genre, yet it is not a single formula or recipe to cover all the thematic and structural elements in campus novels. There are exceptions and diversions from the pattern considering the wide range of novels produced under this title. *Lucky Jim*, the first representative of the English post-war campus novels, includes much of the qualities specified by Dalton, yet later books do not strictly follow this pattern. In fact, what brings attraction and sophistication to the genre are those diversions from the cliché pattern which is specified by Dalton.

In his article, Robert F. Scott argues that the academic novel is a genre constantly evolving and developing itself contrary to the views of the critics who regard them depleted. He mentions a series of articles published in the 1990s in which there are severe criticisms towards campus novels because of their repetitive content and lack of diversity. He summarizes his main objection to these arguments as follows: "the academic novel is a vital and aesthetically rich literary genre that has continually evolved in order to meet the demands of its large and ever-expanding readership" (82). Unlike other critics, he does not believe that the genre is "depleted" or has reached "an artistic dead-end." He refuses the claims of those critics by giving statistical data about a large number of campus novels that have been produced and read for the last 60 years. The public attention according to the numbers he gives is an indicator of the success and popularity of the genre. Under the subtitle of *Salient Features of the Campus Novel*, Robert F. Scott summarizes the common areas of focus for these novels: "the absurdity and despair of university life; the colorful, often neurotic personalities who inhabit academia; and the ideological rivalries which thrive in campus communities … and sexual adventures of all types" (82). He suggests that issues dealt in these books do not only appeal to

academics because people outside the academia have similar anxieties, fears, hesitations or challenges in their daily lives. It is also noteworthy that he finds the characters in the campus novels colorful. Post-war campus novels do not repeat the same stock characters as they get their material from a very heterogeneous society. From his perspective, the admission of people from different layers of society into the universities brings along diversity, since prototypes at universities have been gradually replaced by new characters.

The fact that authors of campus novels are academics at the same time, that is, they are members of faculty and have an insider's perspective, creates the feeling that they talk about an esoteric group and do not appeal to the general reading public. This perspective is a remnant of old body of criticism which attacks the genre on the basis of its Oxbridge origins. As is suggested before, the main criticism is that the campus is a closed society which consists of its officially registered members, so the campus novel cannot be appreciated by the general reading public due to its limited perspective. In the introduction part of *Faculty Towers*, Elaine Showalter states: "like all other closed societies, campus can function as a microcosm" (4) in which people act out their roles according to the given set of rules under that institution. This is not to say that the genre cannot include anxieties and issues of life outside the campus, and contemporary writers of campus fiction do not confine the genre in a campus, and enlarge the geographical space in the later examples as in David Lodge's campus trilogy. Thus the simile of microcosm can be interpreted that these novels do not only talk about campus life, and have the potential to represent the large society in a compact form. It attracts the attention of various types of people, both academic and nonacademic, and implications of campus novel should not be restricted to the campus-dwellers only. In the later examples of the genre, a lot of non-academic characters are described in close relation with the academics, which means campus is in constant interaction with the outside world, and campuses are not inaccessible places or its members do not constitute an impenetrable society.

David Lodge, both a critic and the author of the genre, opposes all criticism about the genre regarding the limited perspective, setting and character. In his article, "The Campus Novel," Lodge claims that campus novels are attractive for

the readers outside the academia, saying: "academic conflicts are relatively harmless, safely insulated from the real world and its somber concerns – or capable of transforming those concerns into a form of stylized play... it belongs to the literature of escape" (33). From his point of view, campus novels provide a kind of psychological escape for the reader from the troubles of daily life; thus are quite attractive for both the academic and non-academic readers. According to Jeffrey J. Williams, through such comic depictions academics are portrayed as ordinary human beings: "The university is no longer an alien world, but a familiar setting, and professors no longer a strange species like other beleaguered white-collar workers and denizens of the middle class" (561). That is why the later examples of the genre such as David Lodge's Trilogy intensely deal with diverse issues from work ethics to family affairs.

The amount of negative criticism inevitably diminished in the 20th century as the writers of campus novels utilized the elements of comedy more to strip the campus from its prim and formal atmosphere. Sally Dalton Brown elaborates on the issue of what kind of comedy the campus novels include, and concludes that "the campus novel as a satiric and comic genre, arguably belongs to that type of comedy called the comedy of degradation, which stresses the discovery of the base behind the lofty, on the paltry behind the great, of the ugly behind the beautiful, and of the absurd behind the obvious" (597). To mock the lofty and unapproachable portrayal of academics, campus novels depicted some professors as evil and unsympathetic characters with a satirical perspective. In *Lucky Jim* as well as in other selected novels, the mistakes and follies of senior academics are exaggerated to underline their bossy and pretentious attitudes. Together with the inclusion of satirical elements, subtle but funny elements, these novels have gradually been treated as serious pieces of literature including a considerable amount of social criticism.

On the one hand, the campus fiction writers focused on the funny and ostentatious manners of academic people to entertain their readers, but on the other they maintained their critical stance in the face of social and educational problems that they encountered or observed in their academic lives. Bill Ott goes through a large number of campus novels, and supports Lodge's ideas about the attractiveness of the genre. He argues in one of his reviews, "Why are the academic satires so

deeply satisfying? Perhaps it is the inherent irony of those supposedly dedicated to the life of the mind engaging in vicious political infighting and petty rule-mongering. Or maybe it is the fantasy element of seeing pompous people cut off at the knee- something that rarely happens in real life" (22). In campus novels, the professors, who cannot be mocked or criticized easily in real life, are presented with their mistakes and follies. Robert Scott calls campus novels "comedy of manners[4]". He argues "because these works tend to dwell upon the frustrations that accompany academic existence, they often call attention to the antagonistic relationships that exist between mind and flesh, private and public needs, and duty and desire" (83). The dualities that Scott mentions are frequently observed in the novels analyzed in this study; thus, his detections for the pattern of campus novels are valid to a certain extent. The part of the comedy results from the manners of the characters who are seen repeatedly in academic novels such as "much-maligned figure of the college professor" (83). The professors in the selected novels will be analyzed from this perspective to understand from whose perspective they are depicted as maligned. To create an exalted image of such academics and then to destroy that image is a successful tool both for laughter and for serious criticism, which challenges the tendency to read the campus novels as light comedies. Moreover, together with the inclusion of such issues as class conflict, race, religion, political abuse, campus novels started to be perceived more seriously. Thanks to novelists such as Zadie Smith with her *On Beauty* and J.M Coetzee with *Disgrace* among many others, the genre started to be accepted as serious social criticism. The laughter effect found in the early post-war examples of the genre such as Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim,* Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong* are thought to shadow the more austere side of the novels. In her article, Sally Dalton Brown claims:

> Rather, the characters are deliberately placed within an environment that is cognitively limited, fated to follow the predictable path toward the moral dilemma that the campus novel presents, in order to demonstrate the limitations placed on the intellect. This is not to say that the campus novel cannot be a highly thoughtful genre; however, in achieving such a status, it must struggle against its own template. (592)

[4] David L. Hirst, in his book *Comedy of Manners*, defines the genre as: "the subject of comedy of manners is the way people behave, the manners they employ in a social context; the chief concerns of the characters are sex and money; the style is distinguished by the refinement of raw social expression and action in the subtlety of wit and intrigue" (1).

Precisely, the consideration of early examples as light comedies is misleading because even in *Lucky Jim*, the first post-war British example of the genre, it is possible to see the spirit and the rebelliousness of "The Movement" of the 1950s. At this point, the examples analyzed in this dissertation show that inserted in this comic template, there is a satirical approach to the malpractices within academia, and it is possible to make serious social criticism through campus novels. Furthermore, the campus novel is a highly class-conscious genre as Dominic Head argues by referring to *Lucky Jim*: "The novel's contradictions are systematically laid bare in the conclusion, where Dixon, the champion of ordinary provincialism, is rewarded by being stripped of his middlebrow credentials: his relationship with Christine, and his new job as private secretary to her aristocratic London-based uncle" (51). As Head implies, Amis is well-aware of the social and cultural dynamics of his time, and places his main character just in the middle of the conflicts of the Angry Young Men Movement. The same social criticisms and references to social problems will also be tracked in the other novels selected for this study. It will be argued that it is possible to interpret the genre as a serious social criticism which foregrounds issues such as hegemony, class conflict, and corporatization at universities.

Corporatization of English Universities and Campus Novel

Starting from the 19th century, instead of being autonomous and independent institutions, universities have gradually become the agent of capitalist economies by training new labourers for the capitalist system. The new regulations on the way to capitalist system of education come one after another. Eustace claims:

> In 1964 the State stepped in directly and academic salaries were referred to the National Incomes Commission. Since then salaries have substantially been determined in the same sorts of ways as those of other State-funded professions, such as medicine, with a significant role left to the UGC. Salaries are not linked directly to civil service rates (and have fallen behind them) and teachers were not involved in the civil service strike of 1981. (285)

The decline in the salaries of the academic staff may have directly influenced the life standards of these people as it is observed in the novels. The new policy makers of England restructured the status of the academics, and limited their autonomy as well as their welfare. These new regulations also meant extra work and low-wages

for all types of academic staff, but extra workload did not provide a fruitful atmosphere in the academia.

In this context, the trend towards capitalism in English universities after the Second World War will be analysed in detail with respect to the theories of Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams, T.S Eliot and Michael Young. There is great amount of research focusing on the corporatization of English universities especially after the 1950s which intersects with the rise of the campus novels. To exemplify a few, John D. Dennison, in his article, "Higher Education Policy in the United Kingdom – Reformation or Dissolution?" states "Prior to WWII, education in the United Kingdom was simply unattainable. The Education Act of 1944 provided a major impetus for change" (88). He explains that by means of the Act some local businessmen and entrepreneurs found the chance to sponsor the education of poor students. To provide higher education for a larger number of people is supposed to increase the literacy level, and encourage the formation of intellectuals in the long run. According to the governmental estimations, more and more young people would be at the university first as a student and as a junior academic. However, increasing the number of universities and students did not raise the standards of higher education in England because of financial concerns. Jonathan Rutherford, in his article "The Market Comes to Higher Education," argues: "Universities are transforming themselves from an ideological arm of the state into relatively autonomous, consumer-oriented, corporate networks" (6). The original aim of making higher education widespread which was settled by the Education Act of 1944 gradually lost its significance because of a more profit-oriented perception that took the universities under its control. Dennison mainly argues that government policy and commercial forces try to integrate bodies of higher education into a global-knowledge economy in which the information is sold quickly and at a higher price (89). Since later research indicates that England gradually adapted very similar policies to the ones in American universities in higher education, Dennison touches upon the corporatization process in American universities, too. By comparing pre-war and post-war periods in England, he underlines the tendency that the universities are evolving into profit-driven businesses in the last quarter of the 20th century.

In the campus novels selected, the academics' reactions to the political and economic strategies of their universities change slightly on the individual level, that is, the academics who are aware of the politicking in their universities develop individual strategies to cope with the situation, yet there is not an active and full-scale resistance to the course of events, except for a few protests on an institutional level initiated by a few academics. Within the scope of hegemony and Gramsci's ideas, the underlying reasons of this passivity in each book will be questioned with respect to the financial and class-based matters. In that sense, English campus novels analysed in this thesis are highly suggestive since they include academics with different levels of dissatisfaction, passivity and hesitation due to the dominant ideology. Starting from *Lucky Jim* (1954) to *Nice Work* (1988), academics feel different types of discontent about their working conditions, as well as their relationships with their colleagues. They are often exposed to inequality, severe criticism, mobbing, and rumour, in addition to working for very low wages.

The researchers publishing on sociology of education such as R.D Anderson, point out the fact that there are three stages of long-term development in British higher education, saying:

> The early, high and late industrial phases. In the first phase, universities continued their traditional task of serving the older landed and professional elite. In the second, starting around 1860, they began to adapt to the needs of industrial society, particularly by training the growing professions. Between the 1860s and the 1930s, there was a seismic shift by which a small, homogeneous, elite and pre-professional university turned into a large, diversified, middle-class and professional system of higher learning. (1)

Anderson outlines the historical evolution of English higher education before the Second World War, and is highly critical of the Victorian period since he believes that the period only helped the expansion of elite education, it became "inclusive but not progressive," (2) excluding students from lower classes. From his perspective, education was still serving the aristocratic ideals in the Victorian era. The implications of his study; that is, whether the English universities still have the residues of old aristocratic tendencies, will be questioned in the analysis of each novel.

The Transformation of British Higher Education: Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy at Universities

In the novels, the influence of the dominant ideology, and the link between the state and universities will also be studied. To what extent the academics are under pressure of state-bound policies, and how the political ideology inserts into academia will be taken under scrutiny. The connection between the state and universities has a long history in England, and it has its roots even in the Middle Ages. As stated by Rowland Eustace in his article, "The relations between university and the State in Great Britain have been heavily conditioned by their history, perhaps more so than in most countries" (283). Eustace underlines that state intervention in higher education policies has a very long history, and there are residues of this in the 20th century, referring to the formation of intermediary institutions which settled the rules and acted as a "buffer" between the government and the universities. "The 'buffer' was made permanent by the creation of the University Grants Committee (UGC) in 1919" (Eustace 283). After the foundation of UGC, government interference and involvement of local authorities into the university affairs intensified. Eustace sees the foundation of UGC[5] as a turning point in English higher education and he claims,

> The university, as elsewhere in Europe, was to be neither syndicalist nor self-validating. Thus, starting with the setting up of the University of London in 1836, the new institutions were governed by laymen, including generally a strong element of local government authority. These institutions hired their teachers as servants, and required them to teach for the examinations of external bodies whose function was to set the curriculum and award the degrees; these limited bodies were called universities. (283)

Although the respect for the status of the universities is quite an old tradition in England, it has gradually lost some of its traditional perspective; that is, the tendency to preserve some of the humanitarian methods such as supporting the departments of humanities and letters which mainly provide theoretical knowledge,

[5] "Since its creation in 1919 the University Grants Committee (UGC) has been seen in Britain and many other countries as a model piece of machinery for channelling funds from Government to universities" (For further detail on its function and historical development see Michael Shattock and Robert Berdahl's article "The British University Grants Committee 1919-83: Changing Relationships with Government and the Universities")

is seen as a hindrance on the way to capitalization by different policy makers in time. It is a perception that needed to be updated in order to meet the changing demands for the economic market. Therefore, following post-war governments have made regulations supporting corporatization, but the process of corporatization adopted by capitalist governments did not mean being in the service of pure science and knowledge with modern techniques and equipment. The schools started to view teachers as 'labourers' which points out a radical change in the perception of the academia. The ancient perception about the 'immunity' of the academic world against the socio-political fluctuations in the country have gradually become obsolete. Unlike the old English universities, the modern institutions of higher education quit giving privileges to their staff, and they do not attach importance to the rights of the academic staff because their priority is standardized success and government appraisal. The examinations given by the external bodies prove the existence of a surveillance system in which all the institutions of higher education need to display their quality standards and give success record of their schools to the government authorities. This feeling of being observed and checked all the time is disturbing for the academics in the novels studied, and is the very source of hegemonic power struggles within the academia.

In his article, "British Higher Education and the State," Rowland Eustace analyses the transformation of English higher education chronologically, and states, "One strong element in the Oxbridge tradition by the 19th century was the independence of the property-owning corporation of scholars from the State" (283). It is implied that the power, prestige, and independence of scholars come from their land-owning[6] status and wealth, which are directly linked to their class. Together with the Industrial Revolution, the land owning aristocracy lost their dominance, yet the customs and traditions they settled in higher education maintained their existence for a very long time. The fact that class-based privileges provided the academics with a certain degree of autonomy, and the established academics in prestigious universities generally belonged to the upper class for a very long time

[6] Harold Perkin in *The Rise of Professional Society*: *England Since 1880*, discusses how the meritocratic culture gradually replaces the class-based structure in English society although the new system does not totally eradicate the residues of old class divisions.

in the academia is illustrated in the analysis of *Lucky Jim* and *Eating People is Wrong* which were penned in the nineteen fifties. On the other hand, the following novels *History Man* and David Lodge's *Campus Trilogy*, which cover the period from the mid-seventies untill the end of the eighties, deal with the status of the academics with respect to their changing places in the social ladder. Starting from the seventies, the higher class academics gradually lose their economic power within the new capitalist system while the lower class academics gain access to higher education, and rise with their talents, though partially and gradually.

The change in the ideological perspective of the rulers directly influenced the post-war dynamics in the academia; that is, the hierarchical structure that was based on class privileges has gradually been replaced by a new system, namely, meritocracy. Harold Perkin summarizes the gradual dissolution of class-bound segregations in English academia. He claims, "hierarchy has almost overwhelmed class: trade unions have been marginalized….working class Labour Party has been replaced by New Labour, a self-styled pragmatic party without the class roots of Old Labour" (xiv). His main argument is that "broad class divisions are gradually replaced by professional hierarchies," again a point which will be discussed in relation to Malcolm Bradbury's *History Man* and David Lodge's *Campus Trilogy* in the following chapters. However, there is also a counter argument that meritocratic ideal was still a very unattainable goal under utilitarian policies exerted by governments like Margaret Thatcher's, since such a system totally ignores and excludes the least affluent from the system of education by focusing only on the talented or skilled graduates who were given high quality education early in life.

The next chapter deals with the theoretical background of this dissertation by dwelling on the meaning of hegemony, dominant ideology, and class as well as their functioning in the academia. The theories of Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams, Pierre Bourdieu, T.S Eliot, and Michael Young will be broadly discussed before the analysis of the six campus novels. The following four main chapters will include the analysis of the selected novels separately. The sequencing will be chronological. Since *Lucky Jim* (1954) is accepted as a pioneer in many aspects, the first chapter will include it as the first prominent example of the post-war English campus novels and will touch upon the workings of hegemony

within the academia, as well as the class dynamics in higher education. The following chapter consists of Malcolm Bradbury's two novels, *Eating People is Wrong* (1959) and *History Man* (1975) which were written in different decades, so they are evaluated against two different socio-political backgrounds. The reflection of the changing policies in higher education will be tracked in these two novels, too. Furthermore, *History Man,* being in the middle of a revolutionary period in education, will reflect a lot of new educational regulations in the English academia. The final body chapter will deal with David Lodge's *Campus Trilogy* consisting of *Changing Places: A Tale of Two Campuses* (1975), *Small World* (1984), *and Nice Work* (1988). The aim is to discuss the penetration of the dominant capitalist ideology into the universities, as well as the persistence of class antagonism in higher education, as they are reflected in campus novels. During the post-war period, there were crucial changes in the policy of higher education and also in the perception of class, so the novels will be scrutinized to understand the reflections of all these socio-political and educational developments in higher education.

CHAPTER ONE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Marxist criticism will set the framework of this study to discuss how hegemony penetrates into the universities and under what conditions it disseminates into different layers of the academia in campus novels. Fredric Jameson prioritizes the political interpretation of literary texts over other forms of analysis on the very first page of his book *The Political Unconscious*. He asserts that his book "conceives of the political perspective not as some supplementary method, not as an optional auxiliary to other interpretive methods current today - the psychoanalytic or the mythcritical, the stylistic, the ethical, the structural - but rather as the absolute horizon of all reading and all interpretation" (2002: 1). Likewise, Marxist critics focus more on the relationship of external factors, which contribute to the understanding of its internal dynamics. This kind of interaction between the text and the social context is also utilized during the analysis of the selected campus novels.

The methodology of the analysis does not consist of aligning the campus novels with their historical backgrounds and simply looking at basic correspondences; rather the evolution of the class dynamics in the novels will be discussed in relation to hegemony in academia. In his *Marxism and Literary Criticism*, Terry Eagleton by analysing Marx and Engels' ideas, draws attention to the relationship between literature and history, and warns against the danger of simply matching the historical background and the content of the art work, saying:

> Given such a limited view of the form-content relationship, it is not surprising that English Marxist critics of the 1930s fall often enough into the 'vulgar Marxist' mistake of raiding literary works for their ideological content and relating this directly to the class struggle or the economy. It is against this danger that Lukács's comment is meant to warn: the true bearers of ideology in art are the very forms, rather than abstractable content, of the work itself. We find the impress of history in the literary work precisely *as literary*, not as some superior form of social documentation. (11-12)

Regarding this criticism, the novels in this study will be evaluated within their fictional dimension, and only the explicit and implicit references to the social problems of their period will be the focus. The aim is to get help from Marxist and

post-Marxist theory in order to be more aware of the content-wise clues in the books that lead and shape the hidden meanings of the works. A healthy analysis of a literary work requires an adjacent study of its content and the external forces that already exist during its formulation, since they are indispensable to the understanding of the ideology intertwined in the work. Eagleton asserts that "All art springs from an ideological conception of the world," (8) so there is no way to understand a literary work devoid of its ideological substructure. Only after decoding the ideological formation of the work itself by looking at the external forces surrounding its creation process could it be possible to understand whether a literary work supports the dominant ideology of its time or totally challenges it. Studying the socio-cultural environment that gives way to the work of art does not necessarily mean that there should be one to one correspondence between the literary work and its historical background. The author is free to choose any style, approach, or type of representation in his/her work, yet even to understand the method the writer uses the big social picture with which the art work is in constant interaction should not be disregarded. Eagleton summarizes the requirements of a good Marxist literary criticism with the following words:

> To understand *King Lear*, *The Dunciad* or *Ulysses* is to do more than interpret their symbolism, study their literary history and add footnotes about sociological facts which enter into them. It is first of all to understand the complex, indirect relations between those works and the ideological worlds they inhabit—relations which emerge not just in 'themes' and 'preoccupations', but in style, rhythm, image, quality and (as we shall see later) *form*. But we do not understand ideology either unless we grasp the part it plays in the society as a whole how it consists of a definite, historically relative structure of perception which underpins the power of a particular social class. This is not an easy task, since 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; and to do that means grasping where those classes stand in relation to the mode of production. (3)

As he points out, the capitalist dominant ideology that surrounds England after the Second World War, and the traditionally elitist structure of the academia are firstly laid bare in its transformational stages in the campus novels selected. The class dynamics within English academia as well as the force of dominant ideology, will be studied first in each chapter and the novels will be scrutinized based on the findings.

The issues of class conflict and hegemony in academia, which will be the focus of this thesis in the analysis of campus novels, require Marxist criticism firstly because the formation of intellectuals in a society is directly linked to the formation of classes. Antonio Gramsci believes "the notion of the intellectuals as a distinct social category independent of class is a myth" (3). Class conflict is an issue that is observable in the academia just like in the other social groups. Secondly, Marxist critics are intensely interested in the socio-economic determinants in the formation of powerful institutions in societies, and school, or in the case of campus novels, the university is one of these institutions.

From the perspective of Hegelian-Marxist dialectic, the rise of one class needs to be at the expense of the other, which creates a fight for survival for all classes. There are different views on the contribution of each class to the total development of society. For instance, Matthew Arnold in his *Culture and Anarchy* focuses on the attainment of personal growth to rise above one's own class, and foregrounds the individual sophistication and refinement in order to rise in the social ladder (1869). He believes that middle-class moves functionally between two distinctive classes, namely the aristocratic and the working-class. He also criticizes the labelling of middle-class people as philistines since they constitute the dynamic and down-to-earth segment of society. For him, unlike the aristocracy, middle-class people do not live in the fantasy world of chivalry, but contribute to the development of the society by their dynamism and diligence. Arnold believes aristocratic people are the continuation of the barbaric tribes due to the preservation of many illogical, ritualistic features of those people, such as giving importance to physical beauty, and decoration. As a reaction to the term philistine, he calls the whole aristocracy "barbarians" (102).

However, T.S Eliot believes in the necessity of a "graded" society, and accepts family as the vehicle for transmission of culture. He claims that "there must be groups of families persisting, from generation to generation, each in the same way of life" for a civilized society (48). Therefore, he regards the preservation of a higher-class necessary for the creation of an intelligentsia that can preserve and pass down the high culture to new generations. In his controversial, Nobel prize winning work, *Notes Toward the Definition of Culture*, Eliot uses the term culture in three

different senses: the development of an individual, a class, and a whole society. For him, these three senses cannot be evaluated separately and need to be dealt with in relation to each other (23). Just like Eliot's privileging the higher-class, Arnold praises the middle-class with these words: "middle-class has done all the great things that have been done in all departments" (100). Although there are nearly eighty years between the publication of Arnold's and Eliot's works on culture and class, the discussion of class-conflict keeps its rigour, and Eliot's work corresponds to the post-war period discussion on the accessibility of higher education opportunities for the lower-class. In both essays, the key terms, development and growth summarize the underlying logic, the desire to reach perfection, in the creation of a new culture for Eliot and a cultured individual for Arnold. To put it differently, what underlies the class-based rivalry is, to a certain extent, this search for perfection both on the individual and cultural levels.

Considering that the focus of this thesis is hegemony and corporatization of higher education in post-war campus novels, the Marxist paradigm will provide insight into the class-conflict and power dynamics in the English academia. Class and hegemony are the strongly linked concepts in Marxism as hegemony is applied by the dominant class to control the less powerful classes. Such power struggle in campus novels will be analysed from a Marxist perspective with respect to the theories of Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Raymond Williams, T.S Eliot, and Pierre Bourdieu. In addition to these theorists, the concept of meritocracy, coined originally by Michael Young, will be used to analyse the place of talent in academia. Additionally, Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of carnival will be utilized in understanding how academics challenge hegemony in their daily lives.

1.1 Basic Marxist Notions and The Concept of Class

Karl Marx's philosophy needs to be briefly discussed, as his ideas constitute the foundation of the concepts used in the discussion of hegemony and corporatization in English academia. One of the most crucial notions in the analysis of campus novels is the class system in Marxism. Class antagonism is at the root of all social formations in history for Marx, so in *Communist Manifesto* he states:

> The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Free man and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition

> to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes. (209)

If examined more closely, class conflict either ends in a positive way, contributing to the development of a society, or in a negative way, causing the dissolution of existing social groups. In the same definition, it is suggested that one group is disadvantaged and less powerful so the other can exert full control over it. If class inequality is taken for granted, the only discussion left is the nature of this inequality and the effects of it on the individual, as well as the social level. In the novels, the situation of individual academics will be dealt in the general socio-political composition of their time with respect to the hegemonic practices and class issues.

In his *Capital*, Marx groups the society into three: "The owners of mere labour-power, the owners of capital and the landowners, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit and ground-rent – in other words wage-labourers, capitalists and landowners – form the three great classes of modern society based on the capitalist mode of production" (Vol.3: 870). Additionally, in his analysis of the classes, Marx realizes that these basic classes also have some sub-divisions. It is not even possible to talk about a unified working class or proletariat because of the different working conditions of these workers and the type of work that they engage in. Some of the workers do heavy physical work with very low wages, while the others physically work less but earn more. What is meant by the working class is only clear by the criterion that the members of this class have to sell their work in order to sustain their lives. However, Marx also agrees that to specify the type and the amount of work sold by the worker is not an easy job due to the diversity of professions and working conditions. Another problem is that the social ladder has many levels whose membership criteria have not been set clearly. Before reaching the position of the capitalist, a social class goes through different phases of development, so it is not possible to say where one class finishes and where the other starts. There are "transition classes" which could be defined as groups who try to rise from the lower social class to the higher one. That is why, Marx talks about middle classes instead of the one single middle class, or he mentions different types of "bourgeoisie" in his *Capital*.

Marx believes that England experienced class division intensely and constituted the chief example of a classified society in history. In *Capital*, he asserts, "It is undeniably in England that this modern society and its economic articulation is most widely and most classically developed. Even here, though, this class articulation does not emerge in pure form. Here, too, middle and transitional levels always conceal the boundaries (although incomparably less so in the countryside than in the towns)" (Vol.3: 870). In a way, Marx believes that it is not easier to identify the boundaries of classes because of the constant movement and changing places of groups in the social ladder in parallel to their changing situations in the cycle of production. Additionally, for Marx, each social group has its own divisions in itself merely resulting from the nature of the professions. He gives the example of doctors and government officials as the workers of modern societies, and he asserts that even though they are regarded as workers, "they form two classes, as they belong to two distinct social groups, the revenue of each group's members flowing from its own source" (Vol.3:871). The other two classes which are the capitalists and landowners are in the same situation as they subsume different types of members whose source of income changes. Marx confirms it saying that, "the same would hold true for the infinite fragmentation of interests and positions into which the division of social labour splits not only workers but also capitalists and landowners – the latter, for instance, into vineyard-owners, field-owners, forest-owners, mine-owners, fishery-owners, etc." (Vol.3: 871). In the case of academics, to divide them into certain classes is also challenging as their source of income changes according to the prestige of their universities, as well as their own title, success, and familial origins. Many academics in the novels start their career as part of a lower class, but they move up the social ladder during their career by obtaining title and money. Another case is that they are already members of higher classes, and their academic career provides only fame and self-satisfaction for them.

According to Marx, capitalist mode of production controls modern societies, and it eventually forces all the institutions to adapt to this mode in order to survive. Therefore, the capitalist education system imposed by the capitalist policies is adapted by the universities to follow the workings of capitalism. Some

ideas in Marx's *Capital* in the first volume are related to capitalism such as "the alienation of man under capitalism," "the voracious appetite for surplus labour," (344) "the degree of exploitation of labour-power (320)" will be included in the analysis of the working conditions of the academics from different classes. In the interpretation of the working conditions of academics under capitalist educational system, Marx's analysis of the process of work is helpful. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, he explains the nature of work:

> The worker becomes all the poorer the more wealth he produces, the more his production increases in power and range.…The worker puts his life into the object; but now his life no longer belongs to him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the greater is the worker's lack of objects. Whatever the product of his labour is, he is not. Therefore the greater this product, the less is he himself. The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labour becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power of its own confronting him; it means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien. (Marx and Engels 71-72)

Even though Marx uses these terms for factory workers, the demand for surplus labour is also related to the type of academic work that will be discussed in line with the novels. Thus, these ideas will help to explain the process of corporatization in institutions of higher education. The notion that labour and the production become alien to its producer is demotivating for the worker as he loses control over his own product. Marx also argues that this devotion to the work and to the product damages the worker mentally. The process even causes the destruction of his individual integrity and health. In this context, the mental and physical conditions of academics portrayed in the novels will be analysed to understand their perceptions about their work, and how this perception influences their motivation at work.

In relation to the objectification and estrangement of the labourer, Marx discusses forced labour in the context of alienation as he believes that to work is not a natural process. It is something enforced upon the worker, causing misery and dissatisfaction. This is directly applicable to the situation of the academics in the selected novels since they perceive teaching as only a way of sustaining their lives. It is no more than a financial necessity especially for the academics who are from lower-class origins. In some of the novels analysed, their need for money gets far

ahead of their professional idealism, and it eventually forces them to lose their enthusiasm about their jobs. Marx's argument that the capitalist economy alienates the workers from the work that they do is repeatedly observed in the life of some academics in the novels. The academics in the novels produce books, articles, reviews, speeches, but they do all of these activities most of the time just for the sake of keeping their status and getting promotion. At this point, Marx's concept of alienation, besides several others, proves quite helpful in understanding the working conditions of the academics in the novels, who try to survive in the academia. It also needs to be questioned whether academic work is a kind of "forced labour" in Marx's terms. If the academics perceive their jobs as forced labour, the concept of "dedication" within the academia changes its meaning considerably. It becomes dedication to money and prestige instead of professional ideals. Although this situation is true for other professions, it attracts more attention when it happens in academia since traditionally the university is regarded as a place which puts learning and science before the capitalist concerns. Academia is supposed to provide freedom to scholars and enable them to conduct their duties without political and financial restrictions.

Another noteworthy Marxist discussion is on the wages of labour. Marx spares a whole chapter to the issue in his *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. The living standards of the working-class employees are directly determined by the capitalist employers, as they determine the working hours as well as the wages. Despite some protests from the workers, the capitalist system gives priority to the employer and puts the worker at a constant level of disadvantage in order to guarantee that there is always a group of people who can be used as labour power. As Marx asserts, "wages are determined through the antagonistic struggle between capitalist and worker. Victory goes necessarily to the capitalist" (19). In this respect, there is a certain conflict between the academic tendencies, which include pure love of knowledge and science, and the profit oriented capitalist policies. If the amount of money an academic or any kind of worker earns is under the limit of meeting basic needs such as nutrition, shelter, and health-care, the concentration spared to intellectual activities may decrease. In Marx's own terms, "Political economy knows the worker only as a working animal

- as a beast reduced to the strictest bodily needs" (1988: 29). However, to produce science and philosophy, an intellectual needs to go beyond the basic daily necessities.

As Marx states, "By an unlimited extension of the working day, you may in one day use up a quantity of labour-power greater than I can restore in three" (343). What is demanded from the worker in one day cannot be restored in three days, which exhausts him physically. As observed in the novels, raising working hours or teaching load for the academics does not add to the productivity of these people. On the contrary, it affects their creativity adversely. However, in Marx's own terms, "Wherever a part of society possesses the monopoly of the means of production, the worker, free or unfree, must add to the labour time necessary for his own maintenance an extra quantity in order to produce the means of subsistence for the owner of the means of production" (1976: 344). Hence, the increase in the workload and working hours serve the "owners of the means of production," who are the government authorities as well as the elite supported by these authorities, rather than the workers themselves. Within the discussion on corporatization of universities, the capitalist demand for constant production, namely the academic rule of "publish or perish" in academia will also be discussed in the analysis of the novels.

1.2 Gramsci's Theory

1.2.1 Hegemony

Hegemony, which is the central concept in the analysis of campus novels, is discussed by Antonio Gramsci in his *Prison Notebooks* as "The spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is historically caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production" (Gramsci 12). For Gramsci, hegemony primarily works through consent. Dominant social group formulates its own values and standards, and the rest of the society needs to conform to those standards because of the dominant group's privileged status in production. In other words, the group that controls the world of production is economically more advantageous in expanding its own class influence and imposing its own

values on social life. In this hegemonic relationship getting the consent of the masses instead of forcing them to accept those values is crucial.

Terry Eagleton finds Gramsci's definition of hegemony confusing, since Gramsci believes hegemony includes the voluntary submission to the dominant class. Eagleton believes that the confusion in Gramsci's use of the term derives from the fact that he uses the terms hegemony and ideology interchangeably. Eagleton suggests that ideologies may be forced upon people while Gramsci's definition of hegemony requires a certain level of persuasion and consent from the dominated groups (1991: 112). The belief that the less powerful social groups voluntarily yield to the governance of the dominant group is not acceptable mainly because it is difficult to mention free will in the case of less powerful social classes. The option that the disadvantaged classes do not have an alternative is ignored, and their passivity is confused with willingness. Therefore, Lears and Bates, who interpret Gramsci's theory of hegemony in detail, question the underlying reasons of this consent as well as the consciousness of the working class. Lears claims that for Gramsci, "consent and force nearly coexist, though one or the other predominates" (568), and parliamentary regimes do not rely on the direct coercion, but instead they implicitly point at the existence of such enforcement. Ruling groups do not directly impose their ideas on the dominated ones since such an approach is always open to resistance. Therefore, what Gramsci means by consent is not the full confirmation of the dominated groups about the actions and intentions of the ruling classes. It is rather about creating the most appropriate conditions that will minimize the protests and oppositions. For Bates, Gramsci's main argument is that "man is not ruled by force alone, but also by ideas… Not that ideas were powerful enough to eliminate class struggle, but they were obviously capable of muting it sufficiently to allow class societies to function" (351). Hence, controlling the masses on the ideological level enables the ruling class to maintain its existence without disruption.

A further Gramscian concept, related to hegemony and the conditions of intellectuals is "contradictory consciousness". This concept is also as controversial as the concept of consent. Gramsci analyzes an individual as a philosophical being, and he believes in "the intellectual progress of the masses" through "the contact

between intellectuals and simples" (332). The conscious thoughts of an individual and the implicit values embedded in his actions might sometimes be in conflict, which carries the individual to yield in to one or the other. This divided state of consciousness creates moments of hesitations and insecurity especially for the working class. For Gramsci, "Consciousness of being part of a particular hegemonic force is the first stage towards a further progressive self-consciousness in which theory and practice will finally be one" (333). From his point of view, if people consciously become part of certain hegemonic spheres, and have an awareness of their own stance, they can develop individually. By means of this self-consciousness, an individual can adjust himself to the social forces, so he/she can get rid of such contradictions and hesitations. Although Gramsci does not use the term specifically for the working-class, his concept of consciousness is applicable to their situation. For this class man, Gramsci claims:

> One might also say that he has two theoretical consciousness (or one contradictory consciousness): one which is implicit in his activity and which in reality unites him with all his fellow-workers in the practical transformation of the real world; and one, superficially explicit or verbal which he has inherited from the past and uncritically absorbed. But this verbal conception is not without consequences. It holds together a specific social group, it influences moral conduct and the direction of will, with varying efficacity but often powerfully enough to produce a situation in which the contradictory state of consciousness does not permit of any action, any decision or any choice, and produces a condition of moral and political passivity. (333)

This state of contradictory consciousness is frequently experienced by the lower-class academics in the novels. In certain situations, they feel stuck in between their lower-class origins and aristocratic surroundings, unable to position themselves in one sphere or in the other. They are brought up by lower middle-class or working class values; however, they find themselves in a very aristocratic or elite sphere when they get tenure from a university. To illustrate, professor Treece in Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong* experiences such a state of "passivity" both within the academia and in his private life, the reasons of which will be discussed in the analysis of the novel. He observes his colleagues for a very long time, detects their follies, yet strangely cannot utter a word to criticize them. He feels detached because his consciousness is divided into two, and he is not sure

which class he belongs to. This dilemma causes a state of passivity in his academic and private lives which will be exemplified in the novel.

1.2.2 Model of Society

Gramsci accepts the existence of a dominant group or a ruling class in society and the submission of the less dominant ones to that group, and yet he believes in the existence of a "regulated" society which applies certain regulatory rules for the general order and welfare of the people. He maintains: "Every State is ethical in as much as one of its most important functions is to raise the great mass of the population to a particular cultural and moral level, a level (or type) which corresponds to the needs of the productive forces for development, and hence to the interest of the ruling classes" (258). In his argument, Gramsci sees the cultural and moral level of the ruling classes as the ultimate level to which the other layers of society aim to reach. What is hidden in his suggestion is that the other classes need to abandon their own values, interests, standards and adopt new ones to unite with the ruling classes.

Gramsci believes that a class-state is not the same thing as a regulated society that reached a certain level of welfare. He even claims that "as long as the class-State exists the regulated society cannot exist" (257). Therefore, all the segments of the society should find a common ground that will unite them both in theory and in practice. He also admits that "complete and perfect political equality cannot exist without economic equality" (258). From Gramsci's perspective, in the past, especially in England the land-owning aristocracy was a firm and strict group which was not willing to embrace the middle classes, let alone the lower class. Their rigid rules and way of life did not let them merge with the other layers of the society. However, with the appearance of the new bourgeoisie, the course of events changed, since Gramsci considers bourgeoisie as dynamic group because of its potential to allow lower classes to move up the social scale. Bourgeoisie for Gramsci, has the capacity to update itself and embrace sociological changes, so he maintains the idea that it is a changing class:

> The previous ruling classes were essentially conservative in the sense that they did not tend to construct an organic passage from the other classes into their own, i.e. to enlarge their class sphere "technically" and ideologically: their conception was that of a closed caste. The bourgeois class poses itself as an organism in continuous

> movement, capable of absorbing the entire society, assimilating it to its own cultural and economic level. (260)

Thus the bourgeois class has the capacity to transform the civil society and make its rigid limits more flexible. The change in civil society will eventually disseminate in the state, so the role of the state as "pure force" will disappear. Gramsci defines state as "hegemony protected by the armour of coercion" (263). Yet, he believes that this role of the state will change in time as "regulated society" will appear.

At this point, what is meant by the state and civil society needs to be discussed for further understanding of Gramsci's categorizations. Gramsci specifies two major superstructural 'levels': the one that can be called 'civil society', that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private', and the other is 'political society' or 'the State'(Gramsci 12). Thomas R. Bates elaborates on Gramsci's groupings, and he specifies the divisions in the structure of the society:

> Civil society is composed of all those "private organisms"- schools, churches, clubs, journals, and parties - which contribute in molecular fashion to the formation of social and political consciousness. Political society, on the other hand, is composed of those public institutions - the government, courts, police, and army - which exercise "direct dominion". It is synonymous with the "state". The ruling class exerts its power over society on both of these "floors" of action, but by very different methods. (353)

Civil society is a large entity encompassing great numbers of civic organizations and is the place of encounter for various types of ideologies. To what extent a ruling class has a command of the dynamics of civil society determines the degree of its influence on these dynamics. This is possible by establishing a massive circle of hegemonic relationships within the civil society, which will enable the rulers getting the consent of the masses without open resistance. Direct exertion of power through the agents of political society is the last resort for the rulers in case of encountering collective resistance. Vasilis Maglaras interprets Gramscian civil society, saying:

> As a place of formation and reproduction of bourgeois values, the particular identity of the bourgeois class, it is a first stage in the competition of the social classes, a first phase in the struggle for ideological hegemony. Civil society thus appears as a place in which the relations of state and economy, private and public sphere are redefined, under the terms of an ideological competition that is expressed through hegemony. (1)

So the struggle of dominance initially takes place in civil society which is the place of struggle for ideological hegemony. In that sense, class struggles and thus the

conflict between intellectuals all appear on the level of civil society, but under the monitoring of political society. The university, as a part of a civil society, then, reflects the ideological struggles. Furthermore, the link between the state and the universities will be a central discussion in the novels, since state intervention in universities increases after the Second World War.

1.2.3 Formation of Intellectuals

Gramsci dwells on the definition of the term intellectual, saying that "all men are intellectuals" but "not all men have in society the function of intellectuals" (9). Everybody is an intellectual in the sense that they engage in quite many intellectual activities like reading, listening, and calculating in their daily lives. Therefore, according to Gramsci, "there is no human activity from which every form of intellectual participation can be excluded" (9). We use our intellect in every action we perform either consciously or automatically, so Gramsci believes that there is no such thing as non-intellectual. However, to name someone an intellectual means referring to his use of intellect while performing his professional duties. For instance, a parent can teach his children the alphabet or the numbers, but this does not mean that he is a linguist or a math professor. He also argues that trying to find a unitary criterion that will explain the different qualifications and services of intellectuals is an erroneous approach. In other words, it is not functional to make reductions in the analysis of diverse groups of intellectuals for the sake of placing them into the same pattern since both their specializations and functions change in different societies. Even within the same group of intellectuals springing from the same socio-political structure, there are individual differences.

Gramsci's positioning of the intellectuals in society is directly linked to his perception of the state and the civil society as well as to his understanding of the concept of class. According to Gramsci, every class has its own group of intellectuals. He maintains,

> Every social group, coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, organically, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields. (5)

The intellectuals in each social group are the ones who develop themselves either technically or theoretically and act as the organisers of that specific group. The needs of the social group determine the types of skills that will be developed by the intellectuals, that is, they both shape their group and are shaped by it. Each group determines the type of "specialists" that they need to expand their group. Gramsci also believes that intellectuals serve to organize the group around the same interests and values so that they will help to create a sense of sharing and belonging among the members of that social group. With regard to this, the intellectuals depicted in selected campus novels display different attitudes towards their own social classes; that is, some of them defend the values of their own social class while the others yield to the dominant ideology, and adapt the values of the dominant class for different reasons.

As briefly discussed, for Gramsci it is not possible to think of the formation of intellectuals independent of the formation of classes. The conflict between different types of intellectuals is actually a conflict between an already existing and newly emerging classes. He sums up his ideas about the encounter of old and new type of intellectuals as follows:

> Every essential social group which emerges into the history out of the preceding economic structure, and as an expression of a development of this structure, has found (at least in all of history up to the present) categories of intellectuals already in existence and which seemed indeed to represent an historical continuity uninterrupted even by the most complicated and radical changes in political and social forms. (6-7)

As suggested above by Gramsci, intellectuals as a group have sustained their existence consistently in all phases of history surviving even the most drastic changes in the social structure. The fact that intellectuals act like the preserver of established values throughout history despite changes in political and social forms suggests their central role in transferring those values from one phase of history to another or from one generation to the next. While doing this they can refuse to embrace the newly emerging types of academics as they perceive them as a threat to the maintenance of old values and teachings. That is why, they try to hinder their insertion into the academia by using their already existing prestige and authority as is the case in *Lucky Jim*. However, there is a difference between the roles of intellectuals in a "class state" and a "regulated society". In "regulated society" the

intellectuals are supposed to serve as an intermediary between the dominant group and the masses so that they can be beneficial in raising the ordinary citizens to the level of the dominant group. In a class state, to rise as an intellectual requires rising economically in the first stage, and it is relatively harder for the lower-class intellectuals to come into existence. Post-war period in England is evaluated as a transitional phase from being a class state to a regulated society. There was considerable effort by the labour governments to support the lower-classes on the path to success and upward social mobility. Despite the attempts to purify the society from its rooted class conflicts, and replace class division with an egalitarian society, successive governments could only partially do it during the post-war period. The novels will touch upon the pains of this transitional period with specific reference to the encounter of upper class and lower class academics at provincial universities.

As for the categories of intellectuals, Gramsci believes that "ecclesiastics" were the representatives of religious ideology, and conducted significant services in constructing science and philosophy in the Middle Ages. For centuries, they played an active role in the issues related to morality, so they were expected to set an example for the rest of the society in good conduct. This category is somehow privileged since they were "organically bound to the landed aristocracy" (7). They benefitted from all the luxuries connected to ownership of land due to their equal status with the aristocracy. In that sense, these intellectuals were perceived as the agents of aristocracy that helped to maintain aristocratic values and interests. Being favoured by the powerful political leaders of their time and serving for their interests provided these intellectuals with extra financial welfare and strategic importance in the decision making processes related to the problems of society. Alongside the ecclesiastics there developed another "stratum of administrators," (7) the non-ecclesiastical philosophers who were equally influential in society. However, ecclesiastics and non-ecclesiastical intellectuals did not follow the same tradition in their teachings, as the former were bound to the rulers and religion in all their conducts while the latter type of philosophers could question anything including the teachings of the Church.

Gramsci also elaborates on two types of intellectuals as the urban and rural types of intellectuals. "Intellectuals of the urban type have grown up along with industry and are linked to its fortunes" while intellectuals of the rural type are for the most part traditional that is "they are linked to the social mass of country people and the town (particularly small town) petite bourgeoisie, not as yet elaborated and set in motion by the capitalist system" (14). Rural intellectuals are highly respected and envied by the local peasants as they dream of becoming part of the gentry. In the eyes of the peasants, to educate their children and to prepare them to become priests or teachers means rising up the social ladder because the living standards of intellectuals are relatively higher than those of the peasantry. Therefore, a considerable number of them take rural intellectual as role models, which verify Gramscian claim that the dominance of the ruling group mainly results from their prestige in the eyes of the less advantageous groups. There is a close link between the rural intellectuals and the peasantry stemming from the fact that villagers perceive rural intellectuals as ideal models, so they follow their example and keep their advice. Interestingly, Gramsci claims that the interaction between the urban intellectuals and the masses do not follow the same pattern as the one between rural type of intellectuals and peasantry (14). Indeed, it develops in the opposite direction, that is, the masses have influence over and control over the urban intellectuals. From this, one can infer that there is a mutual interaction between the intellectuals and the masses.

Gramsci already accepts that there is a conflict between the settled old type of intellectuals and the ones who are newly developing out of the new social and economic needs. He asserts,

> One of the most important characteristics of any group that is developing towards dominance is its struggle to assimilate and to conquer ideologically the traditional intellectuals, but this assimilation and conquest is made quicker and effective the more the group in question succeeds in simultaneously elaborating its own organic intellectuals. (10)

In other words, every new social formation requires the emergence of its own organic intellectuals to conquer ideologically the established intellectuals. If a group fails to formulate or raise its own organic intellectuals, the group members cannot compete with the traditional intellectuals who are described as the protector

of existing values. Correspondingly, the role of organic and traditional type of intellectuals will be questioned in the novels with the aim of understanding the nature of this struggle and the influence of intellectuals in shaping the social formations of their time. Furthermore, how the intellectuals are depicted in post-war English society in campus novels and whether their depictions include close associations with Gramsci's definitions and groupings will be studied.

Gramsci also elaborates on the development of intellectuals in England. He actually claims that the new group of industrialists rose up economically, but they did not show the same success in the intellectual field. Although the social group formulated with the industrial revolution developed considerably, they still could not form their own organic intellectuals. Gramsci asserts, "The old land owning class preserves its position of monopoly," (18) which hinders the establishment of a new group of intellectuals. Even though aristocracy lost its economic power, the aristocrats went on dominating the politico-intellectual field for a very long time. Gramsci looks at the issue of traditional intellectuals in the context of different countries, and only the case of United States is exceptional, for they do not have traditional intellectuals as in Europe. Organic and traditional intellectuals are merged while the country builds its superstructure upon a huge industrial base. As the sole focus is the development of the country for all types of social groups for a long period of time, clear-cut divisions of intellectuals do not have any place in the social formation of American culture. Since America does not have large layers of old-rooted type of intellectuals, it was easier for the new ones to merge with the already existing ones. This situation has implications for the campus novels in this study while comparing the English and American intellectuals in the last chapter on David Lodge's *Campus Trilogy*.

When looked into the group dynamics of intellectuals, like every social group they have the sense of belonging to a society. However, Gramsci feels that intellectuals have a feeling of high level of pride and mutual loyalty, "esprit de corps", which unites them as a group, but also causes the illusion that they are independent of the dominant social group (13). He discusses that if the intellectuals are really as independent as they assume, they need not be bound to the rulers of their time. Their main attachment should be with each other or with the more

experienced and knowledgeable senior members of their own intellectual society. Although they feel that they are autonomous, traditional intellectuals are closely attached to the rulers or to the dominant social group. This sense of detachment is a utopia for Gramsci, as he believes that intellectuals are in the service of the dominant ideology in one way or another. It needs to be questioned that even the Church is linked to the powerful leaders, so ecclesiastics cannot completely isolate themselves from the ruling ideology. Gramsci dwells on the enlargement of the functions of intellectuals by the democratic system. He believes that "the political necessities of the dominant fundamental group" adds new functions to the intellectuals (13).

The composition of the new industrialist intellectuals is not without problems as they need to fight with financial problems in order to get a place in the academia or within the accepted circle of intellectuals. Bearing in mind that England is one of the leading countries that maintained its strict class divisions for centuries, it is possible to understand the difficulties of the lower-class academics. Their economic disadvantage started from the first stages of their formation in the 19th century and persisted for a very long time in the British academy, and it peaked with the market-based policies of higher education in the 20th century. This division is also observable in the selected campus novels. The academics in the novels have mainly lower-class origins, and they feel that they need to obey the authorities because of financial and occupational concerns. Instead of challenging the unjust policies at their universities, they tend to swim with the current for fear of losing their academic positions. However, those who are afraid of losing their jobs are the ones who have to earn their living. This disadvantaged group should be separated from the academics who feel quite secure about their positions because of their financial strength and class origins. Although Gramsci believed, hegemony is not about coercion or enforcement, and it works through getting the consent of the masses on the "ideological level", the situation of many academics in the novels points toward the contrary. In other words, they do not conform to the general regulations as an act of free will, they just remain silent to protect their positions and income.

As outlined above, Gramsci's key concepts such as consent, contradictory consciousness as well as his ideas about intellectuals are all structured around the term hegemony, and they shed light on the power dynamics in the campus novels chosen for this thesis. As defined by Gramsci, hegemony is a process not a product, and hegemonic practices can change in time and in different societies. The transformation of the dominant ideology paves the way for the transformation of the hegemonic practices, and this situation finds direct reflections in institutions of higher education. Therefore, the campus as a highly compact and isolated society is one of the most suitable places to closely examine the nature and dimensions of hegemony. Campus is a compact society since the people within it gather around more or less the same target: to give or to receive education. Furthermore, the students, academics, and the administration are all linked to one another through hierarchal connections.

Gramscian concept of hegemony is later reinterpreted by many succeeding researchers and its application to the situation of the universities has been done on a local scale. For instance, Boone W. Shear argues in his article "Gramsci, Intellectuals, and Academic Practice Today" that "academic intellectuals and academic practices are produced within a highly politicized institution in which hegemony is exercised, and he considers the possibilities of and limitations on resistance" (55). Shear agrees with Gramsci on the point that academics or intellectuals are influential figures, they have the capacity to affect the masses. However, there are limitations on academic practices in Shear's terms:

> Academics, and social scientists in particular, inhabit a privileged space in which critical inquiry concerning social hegemony and political-economic domination is one possibility. The size and quality of this space, however, are delimited by the constraining and productive political, economic and cultural forces in which academia is positioned. (56)

The constraints on the academics and the academic practices are not limited to the economic difficulties, yet the economic position is highly determinant in having a broad range of power and authorization. Corporatization and the pressures from the dominant political groups are the two factors limiting the free practice of academics for Shear. He thinks the academics within the grasp of these two factors need to develop some strategies to fight with it. The changing world alters the status of the

academics in higher education institutions and the only type of academic is not the one coming from the elite. There are different academics from different layers of society, which provides academic variety in terms of both teaching and learning styles.

1.2.4 Education and Educational Practices

Gramsci believes that the categorizations of schools becomes more chaotic each day due to the rising number of different professions and capitalist needs of the new industrial societies. He argues that in the past, it was logical to divide schools into two as classical schools and vocational ones. He maintains: "the vocational school for the instrumental classes, the classical school for the dominant classes and intellectuals" (26). Gramsci uses the term "instrumental classes" for the subaltern or subordinate classes (26), so he suggests that less powerful classes need technical education to sustain their lives. In his definition, the type of education that an individual will receive is directly linked to his/her class, and interestingly only the dominant class is given the chance to engage in classical studies or humanities including arts, philosophy, literature, history and so on. In addition, Gramsci specifies that "The traditional school was oligarchic because it was intended for the new generation of the ruling class, destined to rule in its turn" (40). When it is reviewed in this manner, the dominant class is quite privileged in the field of education, as they intellectually have abundant fields of study that they can enjoy freely. They do not feel the pressure to develop new skills that can be transformed into capital as soon as possible. Dedication and academic success is not a matter of earning their lives for the members of the dominant class rather it becomes the expression of their personal choices and ideals. As for the subordinate classes, their only goal in education is to get a profession that will both help them survive financially and meet the demands of new capitalist mode of production. They regard education, especially higher education, as a way to guarantee their income, so even if they do not want to study the subjects at the vocational schools, they are reminded of the fact that there is no possibility of rising in the social ladder without earning money. However, for Gramcsi this clear-cut division blurs in time as members of the instrumental classes begin to rise in the social ladder.

Moreover, Gramsci evaluates the situation of education in his own time and concludes: "The tendency today is to abolish every type of schooling that is disinterested (not serving immediate interests) or formative - keeping at most only a small-scale version to serve a tiny elite of ladies and gentlemen who do not have to worry about assuring themselves of a future career" (27). In other words, to find a solution to this divisive approach to education, Gramsci implies the necessity of a system that will integrate all layers of society, meet collective demands of every social group. At the beginning of their education life, individuals need "common schooling" to develop basic life skills, so specializing in a field need not take place before higher education. If a division needs to be done in the type of education given to the citizens, it should come after the phase of "common schooling". And this stage equips the students with the necessary awareness about the type of schooling that they are suitable for in their future education life. The phase of common schooling needs to include sufficient amount of experiments and tests that will measure the students' capacity and interest so that the "pupils would pass on to one of the specialised schools or to productive work" (27).

1.3 Althusser's Theory Related to Education

Louis Althusser's model of class society is quite similar to Gramsci's, yet Althusser emphasizes how the means of production requires a strict caste system for its survival. Like the division Gramsci makes between the civil society and the state, Althusser believes that there are apparatuses through which a state or a ruling body exerts control over the masses. He mainly divides these apparatuses into two as the repressive state apparatuses (RSA) and ideological state apparatuses (ISA). He groups school as ideological state apparatus, and maintains that it plays a crucial role in the dissemination of the ideology of the ruling class. He asserts that the school shapes children ideologically from the very beginning of their education lives. It is highly efficient in creating "obedient" citizens who are in full harmony with the interests and philosophy of the ruling class. He suggests:

> School takes children from every class at infant-school age, and then for years, the years in which the child is most vulnerable, squeezed between the family state apparatus and the educational state apparatus, it drums into them, whether it uses new or old methods, a certain amount of know-how wrapped in the ruling ideology (French, arithmetic, natural history, the sciences, literature) or simply the ruling ideology in its pure state (ethics, civic instruction, philosophy). (251)

Implied in this definition is that schools are never apolitical places in which the sole concern is science and art. The fact that they start to impose the ruling ideology on children at a very young age makes the school a determining factor in an individuals' life. The children's basic notions about religion, state, family and social life are shaped through this subjective education system which is under the control of ruling classes.

What is more important is that schools determine the place of the individual in the cycle of production. It creates individuals who are oriented into the class system in societies. In other words, school tailors students to adapt to their prefixed roles in the cycle of production. Through education a student learns to which category he/she belongs to even before he becomes an active part of the capitalist process. Althusser points:

> Somewhere around the age of sixteen, a huge mass of children are ejected 'into production': these are the workers or small peasants. Another portion of scholastically adapted youth carries on: and, for better or worse, it goes somewhat further, until it falls by the wayside and fills the posts of small and middle technicians, white-collar workers, small and middle civil servants, petty bourgeois of all kinds. A last portion reaches the summit, either to fall into intellectual semi-employment, or to provide, as well as the 'intellectuals of the collective labourer', the agents of exploitation (capitalists, managers) the agents of repression (soldiers, policemen, politicians, administrators, etc.), and the professional ideologists (priests of all sorts, most of whom are convinced 'laymen'). (251)

In his groupings, the first group that quits formal education is the workers. This derives from the capitalist idea that peasants and workers just need to use physical labour, so they need not receive large sums of theoretical information for a very long time. The second group continues their education life for a little while to gain the essential skills to perform their technical jobs. Here the focus is that they get sufficient information just to meet the demands of their profession and they are not expected to receive extra skills or knowledge. The third group is the one who has the longest education life, and they serve as the agents of "repression or exploitation". This last group gets far ahead of the other two both financially and politically as they are the most adapted group to the workings of the capitalist system. By looking at Althusser's division, it is understood that the more time one spends in the formal education system the more important his/her position is in the capitalist system.

Gramsci's evaluation of class-based education system has certain similarities with Althusser's groupings of students in formal education. Both thinkers start their analysis from the level of primary education and go on with high school education. In the analysis of the campus novels in this thesis, we will deal with academics as the end products of such educational systems, but we will focus on the same issues at the level of higher education. Nothing much changes at the university in terms of being class based and being oriented to meet the demands of the ruling class. The capitalist system continues to control the institutions of higher education just like the primary or secondary schools.

1.4 Raymond Williams's Theory

1.4.1 Hegemony

In his book *Marxism and Literature*, Williams makes a short summary of the use of the term "ideology" in Marxist theory:

(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. (55)

The very first definition is closer to the definition of class consciousness by Gramsci, yet Williams argues that class-consciousness is a concept which is not "tainted" by ideology (66). Ideology is the more systematic shaping of this consciousness and creating a fixed set of criteria to be accepted as the "ideal" for the mentioned social class. If what appeals to the interests of a specific social group is reflected as a notion serving to the general welfare of all people, then it takes the form of the dominant ideology. Therefore, while class-consciousness remains an understanding and internalizing of one's own social group dynamics and practices, ideology becomes a more systematized adaptation and distribution of these practices to the whole society under the disguise of general social welfare.

When it comes to hegemony, in the same book, Williams broadens Gramsci's initial definition:

> 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 body 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. (1977:110)

Unlike Gramsci, Williams attracts the attention to the effect of hegemony on private life, and he argues that the social influence of hegemony is only one aspect of the issue. He, in a sense, rejects the idea that hegemony is only a matter of dominance and submission. People live hegemony, internalize it, shape it or are shaped by it for Williams. In that case, to understand the dynamics of hegemony, one needs to look at the "whole body of living". As for the members of academia, studying them only as a professional group means ignoring the effect of hegemony in their private lives and personal relationships. However, most of the time, to separate personal and professional life is quite challenging for academics, and their private lives are partially under the pressure of hegemonic practices which are present in their professional lives. Therefore, to understand the hegemonic practices in the life of an academic both as a professional and an individual, Williams' integrative approach is quite helpful.

This approach is also more objective in understanding that academics do not always yield to submission and hegemony. They have their personal ways of resistance and criticism against the dominant ideology, so expecting a certain mode of reaction from all academics is misleading. In this respect Williams asserts, "The major theoretical problem with immediate effect on methods of analysis is to distinguish between alternative and oppositional initiatives and contributions which are made within or against a specific hegemony" (1977:114). When there is a hegemonic system at an institution, one should not expect absolute submission to the hegemon, for this means ignoring the individualistic differences in the perception of the "hegemonic" and the "hegemon". It also means overlooking the fact that each individual has his own way of internalizing or rejecting the dominant ideology.

Williams' does not define hegemony as a cultural activity which is experienced on a larger scale of society, but he proposes to look at individual levels of the process. He also suggests studying the concurrent existence of alternative and counter hegemonies which could be interpreted as deviations from the dominant ideology. He posits,

> A lived hegemony is always a process. It is not, except analytically, a system or a structure. It is a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities, with specific and changing pressures and limits. In practice, that is, hegemony can never be singular. Its eternal structures are highly complex, as can readily be seen in any concrete analysis. Moreover, it does not just passively exist as a form of dominance. It has continually to be renewed, recreated, defended and modified. It is also continually resisted, limited, altered, and challenged by pressures not at all its own. We have then to add to the concept of hegemony the concepts of counter-hegemony and alternative hegemony, which are real and persistent elements of practice. (1977: 112-113)

As indicated in Williams' definition, the pressures and limits of hegemony change within societies in relation to its political and economic structure. In this respect, the intellectuals as a social group experience hegemony on different levels and intensities according to their institutional positions. The emphasis is that hegemony is created continuously within each social group with different dynamics formed by the group itself, which means one needs to moderate the definition of the term with respect to the structure of the social group in question. Hence, intellectuals create their own type of hegemony which is peculiar to their own social group.

This broad definition of hegemony also shows the complexity of the analysis of hegemonic practices within academia. In English campus novels, the workings of the dominant ideology and its reflections in the institutions of higher education can be observed at different layers. However, the intensity of the pressure changes according to the position of the academic or the political stance of the institution. It is also possible to observe differences among different departments. While professors of applied sciences focus generally on the technical side of many problems and the practical implementation of their findings, experiments, and theories, humanities professors try to find the social, psychological, political or historical outcomes that result from these technical details. In other words, they touch the human aspect of all the technical and mechanical developments, so they are much more focused on the reflections of the technical findings in the life of individuals. The protagonists in the selected campus novels are all humanities professors who are highly aware of the politicking in their universities. Their depictions in the novels contain diverse material related to hegemonic practices in the academia with an emphasis that they are working under the pressure of the dominant ideology.

As for education, Williams accepts that educational institutions are not totally neutral or purified from the dominant ideology. While teaching the necessary skills and knowledge, institutions have their inherent attitudes both to learning and social relations. They organize their practices according to these beliefs or principles. However, Williams does not approve of reducing these practices to one organic hegemony, so he does not accept the educational institutions as ideological state apparatuses as Althusser does. Williams maintains:

> Yet it can still not be supposed that the sum of all these institutions is an organic hegemony. On the contrary, just because it is not 'socialization' but a specific and complex hegemonic process, it is in practice full of contradictions and of unresolved conflicts. This is why it must not be reduced to the activities of an 'ideological state apparatus'. (118)

Instead of relating all the methods of hegemonic dominance to schools, he questions the contribution of all formations in society to the creation of a certain dominant ideology. Williams also believes that "no mere training or pressure is truly hegemonic. The true condition of hegemony is effective self-identification with the hegemonic forms: a specific and internalized 'socialization' which is expected to be positive" (118). Thus, for Williams, self-identification with the dominant ideology is a precondition of hegemony.

In his *Marxism and Literature*, Williams also discusses the role of tradition, especially "selective tradition" (115) in shaping the values to be protected and transmitted to new generations. The power of tradition comes from the fact that it strongly defines what is acceptable and what is not. He believes "Tradition is in practice, the most evident expression of the dominant and hegemonic pressures and limits." (115). Selective tradition keeps the values and ideas that will protect a certain privileged class, while it erases the ones which could be threatening for the existence of the dominant class. Therefore, tradition is not a passive element of the past, rather it lives and updates itself in time, especially in accordance with the interests of the dominant class. Some features of tradition have long survived and continued to shape the general trends in society, while some other features disappeared. Williams' discussion on the selective tradition is also noteworthy in understanding the English academic tradition and its level of selectiveness. Williams claims that Marxist theory ignores the workings of tradition in the

discussion of dominant ideology. He declares that selective tradition is both powerful and vulnerable with following words:

> Powerful because it is so skilled in making selective connections, dismissing those it does not want as 'out of date' or 'nostalgic', attacking those it cannot incorporate as 'unprecedented' or 'alien.' Vulnerable because, the real record is effectively recoverable, and many of the alternative or opposing practical continuities are still available". (116)

In this sense, it can be interpreted that the Oxford and Cambridge traditions have long survived and shaped the hegemonic pressures and limits at English universities. The strong elements of this tradition, such as putting pressure upon junior academics to force them to adapt into the existing system, survived and maintained their existence in the modern universities in England despite attempts to modernize the system.

Williams rejects the definition of tradition as the absolute continuity of the established culture and suggests the existence of "formations" which cannot be explained by the established tradition. Formations are "conscious movements and tendencies (literary, artistic, philosophical, or scientific) which can by no means be wholly identified with formal institutions, or their formal meanings and values, and which can sometimes even be positively contrasted with them." (119) Since formations are quite distinct from institutions, their analysis requires a methodology quite different from the ones used for institutions. He argues "Within an apparent hegemony, which can be readily described in generalizing ways, there are not only alternative and oppositional formations but, within what can be recognized as the dominant, effectively varying formations which resist any reduction to some generalized hegemonic function" (119). Unlike Louis Althusser, Williams leaves room for alternative and contrasting ideas within a system controlled by the dominant ideology. From this perspective academia can also include alternative formations rather than fully adapting the ideology of the dominant class; that is, there might be diversions from the dominant ideology among the members of the academia. And in the novels analysed, whether there are people who question the dominant ideology is questioned by comparing the attitudes of different academics in their institutions.

1.4.2 The Dominant, the Residual and the Emergent

As mentioned, Raymond Williams brings a new perspective to the functioning of hegemony, and frees the term from its official ties by attributing it to all the formations within a society ranging from family to religion. Unlike Althusser, he believes "hegemony is in practice full of contradictions and unresolved conflicts. This is why it must not be reduced to the activities of an ideological state apparatus" (118). According to Williams, cultural systems have determining dominant features which are passed down to the future generations, and formulate the dominant in these cultures. The idea of the dominant is present in all cultural activities from music to the visual arts. The dominant controls, shapes and gives structure to the newly emerging values on the cultural level. However, within the construction of the dominant, there are several stages and variations. The dominant is not an isolated and intact concept that controls all the areas of life from a certain distance. It is not something that is passed on to the following generations in its pure state. In this respect, Williams believes in the existence of "the residual" and "the emergent" values within the dominant. He maintains: "By residual I mean something different from the archaic though in practice these are often very difficult to distinguish. Any culture includes available elements of the past, but their place in the contemporary cultural process is profoundly variable" (122). He also underlines the sustenance of active residual meanings and values against the pressures of incorporation. The academia resists incorporation to a dominant value system to a certain extent, so the universities can be scrutinized whether they contain residual and emergent elements in their structures.

The emergent is the newly created cultural value and relationship which is oppositional and alternative to the dominant one. In Marxist theory, Williams believes that the emergence of a new class like the working class brings forward the appearance of different modes of perception and value judgment. He also underlines the fact that in a newly arising culture, it is very difficult to distinguish which values are the residue of the dominant, and which are the emergent ones. The emergent can easily be confused with the residual as they both have their roles in the new cultural formations. It requires a special method to distinguish those elements of a culture which resist incorporation to the new dynamics of the modern

culture from the elements which are totally new and oppositional to the dominant in that culture. Williams also argues advanced capitalism paves the way for the penetration of dominant culture into "hitherto reserved and resigned areas of experience and meaning" (126). The existence of the "emergent" becomes quite difficult and problematic under capitalism, as it strongly represses all the alternative elements for fear of facing opposition and resistance. By its very nature, capitalism eliminates the obstacles on its way by using pressure, so the areas which are convenient for the emergent to arise become restricted. Williams also personally experiences the pressure upon the emergent when he enters Cambridge. In his writing, *Culture is Ordinary*, he confesses that he is not intimidated by the campus or big historical buildings, but intimidated by the teashop (93). He claims such places are the places that remind the existence of a high culture which immediately excludes the individual that does not comply with its requirements like taste of fine arts.

1.5 Mikhail Bakhtin and the Carnival

Since campus novels are evaluated as comic and satirical pieces of writing, the element of laughter gives clues about the social criticism in the selected books. Each book deals with the element of laughter from a different perspective, but especially *Lucky Jim*, *History Man* and *Small World* display some features which can be explained by Bakhtin's concept of the Carnival. *In Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin proposes the concept of carnival as opposed to the official feasts of the Middle Ages. He claims that there is a difference between the medieval carnival and the official feasts of the time, arguing:

> The official feasts of the Middle Ages, whether ecclesiastic, feudal, or sponsored by the state, did not lead the people out of the existing world order and created no second life. On the contrary, they sanctioned the existing pattern of things and reinforced it… the official feast asserted all that was stable, unchanging, perennial: the existing hierarchy, the existing religious, political and moral values, norms and prohibitions. (9)

He differentiates between the free spirit experienced during the carnival and official atmosphere present in the medieval feasts. While the tone of medieval feasts is quite serious, carnival is a more liberating moment of entertainment which prepares the ground for great renewal and rebirth for Bakhtin. He asserts "As opposed to the official feast, one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the

prevailing truth and from established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms, and prohibitions" (10). In other words, carnival is a special moment in which the participants find freedom from the oppression of social norms, though temporarily. Bakhtin also proposes that the abandoning of the official ranks helps to create a special type of communication through which people express themselves without constraint. Carnival makes it easier for people from different classes to create a common language. Therefore, the analysis of the language used by the academics within and outside the carnival may also give clues about the hegemonic control over these people within the academia. Considering the university as an established place upon strict hierarchical relationships and ranks, a detailed analysis of carnivalesque elements in campus fiction will bring new perspectives to the understanding of the workings of hegemony and class in the academia.

As mentioned in the introduction, campus novels are also classified as comedy of degradation, so in that sense Bakhtin's analysis of parody and its inherent feature, grotesque realism, will be utilized. The use of the images of the human body with their biological functioning and the materiality of the body are characteristics of grotesque realism as is discussed by Bakhtin. He asserts "not only parody in its narrow sense but all the other forms of grotesque realism degrade, bring down to earth, turn their subjects into flesh" (20). In that sense, the dignified stance of the academics in the novels are turned upside down through the use of parody and grotesque realism. The divisive nature of the academic ranks and positions are in a sense neutralized through the use of these exaggerated bodily images in carnival. In grotesque realism, the body is accepted as "universal and representing all people… all that is bodily becomes grandiose, exaggerated, immeasurable" (19). For this reason, the description of the bodily images in campus novels needs to be analysed to understand the meaning of the body in and out of a hegemonic system. The idea that the body is universal, and it represents all people renders it a common ground for all academics in the novels. Grotesque realism is a method which is intertwined in parody, so its more serious connotations can be overlooked under the effect of laughter, but it will prove useful in understanding

the nature of the hegemony in academia as is partially discussed in *Lucky Jim*, *History Man* and *Small World*.

1.6 Education and Advancement of the Working Class

The discussion of culture and liberal education, one of the central debates in the novels analysed, dates back to the mid-Victorian period when Matthew Arnold penned *Culture and Anarchy* (1869), and edited it later in 1875. From his perspective, through culture people can pursue "light and perfection," (90) and anarchy arises in the absence of culture. The editor of the book, J. Dover Wilson, fellow of the British academy, points out that for Arnold culture is related to "liberal education" (xiii). Arnold is a keen observer of social life, specifically poverty of the lower classes and wasteful lives of the higher classes. For him, education is the medicine to this agonizing gap between the rich and the poor. Wilson argues that "Arnold's two recipes for the rawness and provinciality of his countrymen were the organisation of higher education under state control" (xviii). Thus, schools are the mediums through which individuals can have access to culture, perfection and refinement from Arnold's perspective. Although he divides the society into three categories namely "barbarians, philistines, and populace," (105) representing the aristocracy, middle-classes, and working class successively, he believes in a common search for perfection for all classes. Working-class riots and protests seem vulgar to the rest of the society, since members of populace do not know how to express their long-neglected situation. And according to Arnold, only through education and culture can they find a way of expression (81).

Raymond Williams, a century later, reminds Arnold's legacy in his book *Culture and Materialism*, entitling the first chapter "A Hundred Years of Culture and Anarchy". He asserts that "In our own late sixties the spirit of Arnold is often invoked, especially in the universities.… He was a hardworking inspector of education and the most effective exponent of the need for a new secondary schooling" (3). However, the necessity for a change in education and class perception detected by Arnold in the middle of the nineteenth century did not take place for a very long time. It takes more than a hundred years to discuss the transformation of the working class into a "general class of wage-earners" thanks to the dissolution of the old distinction between "manual and mental labour" (271).

Hence, the connection between education and improvement of lower-classes is a long-debated issue.

In parallel to Arnold's discussions, T.S Eliot also brought the issue into question once again right after the Second World War. In his *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948), he dwells on the concept of class and the rise of the elite. Eliot believes that class divisions of the past would change in time depending on the dynamics of developing societies. For him, clear-cut class distinctions and rigid definitions of the concept would have to be broadened so as to contain the newly rising groups in societies. He argues that "In the present state of society there is found the voluntary association of like-minded individuals, and association based upon material interest, or common occupation or profession, the elites of the future will differ in one important respect from any that we know: they will replace the classes of the past (36). What is interesting in his suggestion is that Eliot indeed does not talk about a classless society; instead, he implies a society whose layers will be specified according to the skills that its members possess. Within his formulation there appears to have again a group of elite or leaders that direct the rest of the group by making the managerial and critical decisions on behalf of the group. He believes in the existence of group leaders rather than a dominant group that represses the subordinates. This transformation of the class system is mainly based on the educational power of the individuals, since education renders an individual a qualified one in any social group. By centralizing education, Eliot suggests that talented people from all layers of society merge and create an alternative order whose unifying criterion is the educational and professional quality of its members. Eliot's ideas are invaluable in terms of understanding the post-war class dynamics in England, especially the seventies and eighties during which individual talent started to replace class-bound ties in becoming successful financially and socially.

On the other hand, Bourdieu and Passeron claim that education serves the reproduction of the dominant class. Higher and elite academic qualifications support obtaining positions of power. The network and economic capital of the ruling classes provide benefit in gaining entrance to the most distinguished schools

which consecutively ensure access to leading labour market positions. They summarize the function of the education system as follows:

> Every institutionalized educational system (ES) owes the specific characteristics of its structure and functioning to the fact that, by the means proper to the institution, it has to produce and reproduce the institutional conditions whose existence and persistence (self-reproduction of the system) are necessary both to the exercise of its essential function of inculcation and to the fulfilment of its function of reproducing a cultural arbitrary which it does not produce (cultural reproduction), the reproduction of which contributes to the reproduction of the relations between the pups or classes (social reproduction). (1977: 54)

From Bourdieu and Passeron's perspective, formal education serves to the preservation of ruling class ideology, since the very nature of education practices require the maintenance of the set of rules and traditions that give way to its existence. Although Bourdieu takes his examples from the French education system, his detections have implications for English higher education since it has also been under the influence of this class-based hierarchy for a very long time.

Bourdieu's claim also finds support from the English researchers who devote their studies to the relationship between education and social justice. Furlong and Cartmel in their *Higher Education and Social Justice* sketch the structuring of the British education system with claims not much different from Bourdieu's, arguing:

> In the UK in the 1950s and 1960s, children were largely educated alongside peers from similar socio-economic backgrounds. In the main, those from the working classes were educated in secondary modern schools and channelled towards early labour market entry and jobs in the semiskilled and unskilled sectors of manufacturing industry. In contrast, those from the middle classes tended to be educated in grammar schools where they were prepared for university or for white-collar careers in the expanding service sector. These stratified modes of delivery were reflected in expectations. For many working-class children, a grammar school education was neither desired nor anticipated, just as today university education remains off the radar in many poor neighbourhoods. (2)

The influence of this stratified mode of education will also be reflected in the novels whose lower class protagonists are graduates of different local grammar schools, instead of private, big prestigious ones, so do not have necessary knowledge and skill to pursue academic life.

During the 1980s, the government made radical changes in the funds allocated to universities, and demanded them to be part of the 'enterprise culture' initiated by

the Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher. In his article on Thatcherism and British higher education, Michael Shallock asserts:

> Universities, of course, suffered immediately from the cuts in public expenditure. Within three days of Mrs. Thatcher's taking office in 1979, 100 million pounds were cut overnight from the universities' budgets, and, between 1980 and 1984, 17 percent was removed from the grants made by government to the UGC. (34)

Such monetary constraints aligned with the new governments' demand for productivity and profit from the universities put the administration of universities into trouble. After these new regulations what was expected from all British universities was to be extremely careful with their expenditures, and make quick contributions to the industrial world through collaboration with the companies. The general public opinion was that this move would deteriorate the reputation of British universities around the world, so there were immediate protests from the university staff as well as the students' parents because the regulations would influence their children's career opportunities. Shallock interprets the situation as "a deepening crisis surrounding the breakdown of the post-war consensus about the place of universities in British society" (33). Before the war, the consensus was that British universities would get 90 percent of their income from the state through University Grants Committee, which guaranteed an atmosphere of financial security for the university staff. From Shallock's perspective, British universities used to be "an elite group" and "research oriented" (33) since finding funds for their research was not a serious problem thanks to the grants given by UGC. Consequently, the academic staff used to feel that their positions and salaries were under the guarantee of the state. In this respect, the governments' economic intervention created discontent especially at the faculties of humanities and letters as Shallock confirms: "The consequences of lost funding are painfully apparent. The humanities in particular have suffered in the last decade. Philosophy, for example, has lost over 30 % of its posts in British universities" (37). One reason that makes the humanities vulnerable in the face of these monetary restrictions is that these faculties do not have direct contact with the industrial world, and the education at these departments is not profit-based.

1.7 The Rise of Meritocracy and British Higher Education

In addition to the discussions by Arnold and Eliot on education, there arose the concept of meritocracy whose meaning evolved over time. When it was first coined by Michael Young in his dystopia *The Rise of Meritocracy 1870-2033*, the term used to have a negative connotation as it implied a harsh Darwinist perspective for the selection of skilful people both for institutions of education and corporations. In fact, Young himself calls the term "unpleasant" and adds that the origin of the term is "obscure" (21). Despite being a fictional work, there are serious historical references to specific dates, events, and regulations like Butler Act of Education, Education Act of 1944 together with many others. It is also rare for a book, which has no claim to fact, to be sufficiently firm in documentation and research. As he indicates by the subtitle of his book, Young ignites the discussion on the relationship between education and equality, yet through fiction. Therefore, the fact that the work is treated as a reference book by the following researchers is no surprise. Subsequent educationalists and sociologists frequently refer to Young's work in their articles before introducing their own research, so his ideas have kept their popularity until today. Since such articles will be utilized in the analysis of later campus novels, specifically the ones in the fifth chapter, a brief look at Young's perspective will be useful.

Michael Young creates a "civil service modal" in which the destinies of individuals coming from different classes have already been fixed, so the Education Act of 1944 or similar enterprises to expand higher education will not be enough to equalize opportunities for lower and higher classes. He states:

> It is remarkable that by 1944 the most brilliant young men from Cambridge and Oxford were already going into the administrative class, there to guide the destinies of nation; outstanding young men from the provincial universities into the hardly less important scientific and technical grades; worthy young men and women from the grammar schools into the executive grades; the less outstanding joined the junior clerical grades; and the fine body of men and women who were the backbone of the service entered the manual and manipulative grades straight from the elementary schools. Here was a modal to any sensible organizer to emulate. It was copied a thousand times in commerce and industry, at first mainly by large companies like Imperial Chemicals and Unilever, and later by the ever-proliferating public corporations. (20)

Briefly, his claim is that since there is already a rooted segregation in British society, education in its own right cannot abolish class divisions. On the contrary,

it fosters the tradition of classification, this time making it more painful for the lower class to get chances of intellectual development. He believes that the higher-class administrators already assigned to their positions before these educational reforms, would determine the destiny of new participants, and would not give them a chance to integrate into their elite zones. Furthermore, Young believes meritocracy is a system that is also created by the elite, and it is another form of suppressing the lower classes. The individual who does not have the necessary funds and opportunities to receive high-quality education, is forced to survive in a system whose sole criterion is being highly-qualified.

Young's main aim in publishing the book is to raise awareness about the English caste system which had been created ages before he started his work, and will continue ages after the completion of it. For him, the segregation is so rooted in English society that it maintains its existence by changing its name in every century. Such changes are only the attempts to disguise the discriminative perception embedded in English culture. In other words, the English nation is so accustomed to divide its members into social classes whose qualities and customs have long been defined, therefore, no new arrangement can save itself from transforming into an alternative cast system. Hence, meritocracy is the trendy term of the last era, but nothing more than another implementation of the same, old, divisive mind-set. Young also interprets the after-effects of post-war educational regulations like placing students into grammar schools regardless of their origins. He states, "It was one thing for able children from the lower classes to enter grammar schools, another for them to stay there" (58). In this way, he emphasizes the difficulty of staying in the education system for lower-class students, which will comprise much of the discussion in campus novels selected for this thesis.

As mentioned, many years later, Young's fictional work ignited many non-fictional publications and scientific research on the issue of meritocracy. It started a very long and comprehensive debate on the subject not only in England but also in other European countries and America. One of the reviewers of the book, Barbara Celarent from the University of Atlantis comments:

> *The Rise of the Meritocracy* is a very particular book then, a book of its place and time. Yet the issues in it are timeless. In a way, this prescience is shown by the list of predictions that—whether he liked them or not and whether he intended them

> or not—Young got right. He foresaw the emergence of China as a world power. He foresaw women having equal rights in university and workplace. He foresaw the re-emergence of domestic service. He foresaw the abolition of the House of Lords. He foresaw the renaming and upgrading of many occupations. He foresaw the metric system, IQ crammers, and obsession with economic growth. It is an impressive list. (324)

It is confirmed that Young estimated many of the educational and social reformations of the future, and his suggestions sometimes serve as a warning for the dysfunctional features of these new regulations. Specifically in the chapter discussing the origins of modern education, he touches upon critical problems ranging from the salaries of teachers to the progress of intelligence testing. Hence, he reveals the certain defective areas of in the system of education whose reflections will also be felt in the campus novels analysed in this thesis.

The contemporary aspects of meritocracy will also be discussed in this study, because the term has evolved since Young's time. Kim and Choi publishing collaboratively touches upon the modern perception of the term, and they scanned 280 publications upon the meaning of meritocracy for their analysis. They conclude that today the term gradually gains a constructively positive meaning, and represents a system of equality (115). However, they also emphasize that researchers publishing on meritocracy regard "impartial competition" and "equality of opportunity" as the indispensable requirements of the meritocratic system. Without these features the system turns into a vicious cycle of capitalist rivalry as in the case of academics who do not belong to the same social segment in the selected campus novels.

As meritocracy is a very broad discussion, some researchers like Reynolds and Xian tend to examine the concept by dividing it into some sub-categories, and they suggest:

> There are two hidden categories in a meritocratic society: meritocratic elements (hard work, ambition, having a good education) and non-meritocratic elements (family wealth, family background, knowing the right people) for the purpose of getting ahead in life. (121)

The categories they place under non-meritocratic elements corresponds to Pierre Bourdieu's social capital which will be referred in the analysis of the situation of lower class academics. Their study is mainly based on American society's perception of meritocracy, or specifically the American belief in the meritocratic

system. Their categorization will be utilized in the chapter on David Lodge's trilogy since he is an American professor who obtained a certain level of prestige within the meritocratic system.

On the other hand the controversy about the functionality of the meritocratic system in societies which are geared towards capitalism, and already have a segmented social structure goes on in the 21st century. There is a huge body of research that focuses on the dysfunctional and inapplicable aspects of the system. Among these researchers, Ross J. Corbett claims that the promise of equality in meritocratic system fades away in time due to the interference of non-meritocratic elements into the system. His main claim is that "Elite universities admit students who we know can succeed: Upward mobility occurred because other schools took chances on students whose background suggested that might or might not succeed (212). From this perspective, prestigious universities in England already receive high-qualified students and guarantee the continuation of their prestige. The students who have the non-meritocratic advantages from the earlier levels of their educational lives goes on to rise in the social ladder specifically due to not their skills but their familial network and wealth. In short, the discussion whether a meritocratic higher education system guarantee for an individual upward social mobility goes on in recent studies as well. There are still doubts about the implementation of the system both in social and educational arena without purifying it from outer influences categorized by the mentioned researchers. The discussion of meritocracy will specifically be used in David Lodge's trilogy in which there are depictions of academics who attempt to gain a prestigious place both in academia and in society through education and their professional skills.

CHAPTER TWO: KINGSLEY AMIS'S *LUCKY JIM*

2.1 Introduction and Background

Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim* (1954), one of the first examples of post-war English campus novels, narrates the struggles of a lower-class history instructor, James Dixon, within the academia. He manages to get a position at a provincial university, but he makes many mistakes throughout his short academic career, and goes through a series of conflicts with his seniors. After a scandalous conference speech, he loses his academic position, finds a well-paid job as a secretary, marries the woman he loves, yet he needs to pursue his dreams outside the academia not within it. His frustration at the university is related to his class origins as he starts his career with a lot of disadvantages, such as lacking money and intellectual insight. At this point, his story provides clues on how class dynamics work in the academia and to what extent the dominant ideology influences university life.

Despite his rejection of the categorization of his works, Amis is considered one of the eminent members of the Angry Young Men Movement. This literary community whose members are writers, poets, and playwrights, reflected the general restlessness in the country stemming from the changing political and economic conditions. As Singleton asserts, "During this decade, the literary community saw a vast increase in works of literature that addressed displacement and uneasiness within British society, ranging from social class structure to issues in the education system" (50). The main characters in the works of the writers of this movement were not portrayed as total victims or role models. Instead, they were depicted as ordinary men with whom the working-class men identified themselves. William van O'Connor describes the type of the protagonist created in post-war English fiction, arguing:

> English fiction in the years since World War II has produced a new kind of protagonist. He is a rather seedy young man and suspicious of all pretensions. He spends a lot of time in pubs, has any number of half-hearted love affairs. He gets into trouble with his landlady, his boss, and his family. There is nothing heroic about him, unless it is his refusal to be taken in by humbug. He is a comic figure, with an aura of pathos about him. *Lucky Jim* was one of the first, and is probably still the best, of these novels. (168)

The features summarized by O'Connor are exemplified by Jim, who has no educational formation to make him succeed in academic life apart from organizing tricks to get his colleagues into trouble. He tries to satisfy himself and cover-up his ignorance with such mockery. On one level, *Lucky Jim* epitomizes the first English example of the angry man who rejects, criticizes or reacts against the established order and its rules without the required social capital, in Bourdieu's terms. From R.B Parker's perspective, *Lucky Jim*'s pattern *"centered on an anti-intellectual, 'intellectual' sniping at society*" (27). In other words, Jim's intellectuality is already in question from one perspective, but the so-called intellectuals that he is surrounded by are not different from Jim in terms of knowledge or academic capacity.

Since the novel was written after the Education Act of 1944, it displays the changes in the education system, allowing university scholarship to a large number of students regardless of their social backgrounds[7]. Jim's situation and feeling of isolation proves that the regulation was initially an act of goodwill on the part of the government, but it ignored the social implications of such a move. The Act meant that the academic society would not be homogenous anymore, and class-conflict would arise among the academics. That is why, from the very beginning of Amis's novel, the two academics, the head of the history department, Ned Welch and his junior Jim are described as quite different from each other. In the first chapter, they walk in the aisle of the faculty building side by side, "To look at, but not to look at, they resembled some kind of variety act: Welch tall and weedy, with limp whitening hair, Dixon on the short side, fair and round-faced, with an unusual breath of shoulder that had never been accompanied by any special physical strength or skill" (8). Initially, the contrast is implied to be physical in the first scene, but as the plot develops, it is understood that this physical difference is only a foreshadowing for other contrasts in manners and social background. As a university staff and an insider, Amis emphasizes the ambiguous position of working class academics both in social life and in academia. He is quite critical of the

[7] Amis is one of the writers of lower class origins who benefited from the opportunities provided by the law as he funded his university education through scholarship just like his protagonist.

intellectuals in the sense that their theoretical knowledge is far from contributing to the plans of the Labour Party. In one of the pamphlets published in his own life-time, Amis openly declares:

> In actual relationships within party politics, the intellectual will be distrusted for the middle-class habits he is likely to have, particularly his middle-class or public school accent…. I am sure here we have a tremendously important badge of class difference…. In the field of political theory your intellectual is likely to be a pure theorist, much too indifferent to changing conditions, not nearly empirical enough, without a quarter of the tactical sense that your trade union official will have picked up without noticing. (12)

The writer implies that the formal education and university circle moderate the life standard, manners, and even the language of lower-class academics, so these people are not perceived as "workers" by the active supporters of the labour movement anymore. They are regarded as middle-class or bourgeois rather than working-class because they adapt to the bourgeoisie life-style, and they start to lose their connections with their backgrounds. For this very reason, Amis believes that these academics are not trusted within the party politics. Their situation is ambiguous; that is, such academics face exclusion not only in labour unions but also in the academia since they do not fit in the established elitist traditions of the academic circle. They cope with the same suspicious attitude within the academia, so it is difficult for them to identify themselves both with the established academic traditions and the working-class values, which are quite different from each other. This struggle of the lower-class academics in order to establish themselves within one group without losing the ties with the other is portrayed in *Lucky Jim*.

To have a broader understanding of the class dynamics in England, the variables of the post-war period need to be understood. Although England was among the winner states of the Second World War, it did not experience a full spirit of victory due to the fact that in the background it still carries the traces of the fall of a colonial kingdom. Considering that the novel was written in this atmosphere, it reflects the traces of the Welfare State's failure of providing an atmosphere of prosperity and educational quality. In one of the reviews published in BBC news, it is argued that "Britain's imperial past has brought with it a series of questions about national identity," and the former US Secretary of the State confirmed this with these words "Great Britain has lost an empire and not yet found a role"

(Acheson 1962). The Labour party won the elections in 1945 which led to the rise of working class consciousness. The political leaders of the time decided to create a welfare state in which every citizen would have financial security. However, the demands of the global economy, and the after-effects of war prevented the party from carrying out some of its economic plans. For a few decades or more, England struggled to create a steadily developing national economy and educational policy which was in harmony with the general policies of the government. There was an uncertainty and unrest in the post-war atmosphere of England as a result of these socio-political changes.

The class dynamics in the novel will also be analysed within the light of Gramsci's study of the formation of intellectuals. As is discussed in the previous chapter, Gramsci emphasizes the fact that the long and arduous process of the creation of intellectuals requires systematization and continuity. An individual should be put into an educational mechanism that will shape him as a scholar at the very beginning of his education; otherwise, he cannot adapt to the discipline and hard work required by academia. He questions:

> Would a scholar at the age of forty be able to sit for sixteen hours on end at his work-table if he had not, as a child, compulsorily, through mechanical coercion, acquired the appropriate psycho-physical habits? If one wishes to produce great scholars, one still has to start at this point and apply pressure throughout the educational system in order to succeed in creating those thousands or hundreds or even only dozens of scholars of the highest quality which are necessary to every civilization. (37)

In this case to what extent a working-class individual can stay in the system to meet the requirements of academic life should be considered in detail to grasp Jim's situation in the academic sphere because there are differing perspectives on the issue. For instance, Constance G. Anthony does not believe in the success of working-class individuals in the academic world, and argues:

> In a certain respect, being working-class and becoming an academic is an oxymoron. Academics aspire to genteel, professional success; working-class life rejects the genteel for the overt—at times even rude—acknowledgment that life is difficult. Academics revel in a world of carefully chosen words and phrases; subtlety and indirection are prized. A well-delivered, witty repartee at a party is always rewarded. At a working-class party, it would be much safer to say exactly what you mean in a direct way. (300)

In the novel, the lower-class protagonist, Jim Dixon, will frequently experience the difficulty of closing this gap of class values. And the factors that make Jim Dixon's academic development an "oxymoron" for scholars like Anthony will be detailed. In parallel to this, Raymond Williams points to the difficulty in the case of the 'emergent' values since they are under the constant pressure of established tradition. In other words, because the emergent is regarded as a threat to the tradition, Jim Dixon will be under scrutiny of the representatives of the dominant ideology. He is seen as an outsider who needs to be incorporated into the system. Incorporation into an already established system is a painful process for Jim Dixon, since he already lacks the necessary "social capital" in Pierre Bourdieu's terms. In his *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1984), Pierre Bourdieu dwells upon the various forms of capital namely social, cultural and economic[8] whose ownership specifies the rank and position of the individual in his society. The possession of these capitals are highly deterministic in positioning each individual in relation to others, yet the reconstructed universities of New England fails in providing the masses with this capital.

2.2 Class Conflict and Hegemony in *Lucky Jim*

Class antagonism and the hegemony of the upper class over the lower one at the university is felt by Jim in the opening chapters of the novel. He believes that his destiny is in the hands of his senior, Professor Welch. He also believes that he is of slight importance in the academic world. For example, at the party organized by the Welch family, Jim introduces himself as an "underling" of Professor Welch (41) which connotes to subordination and insignificance, especially in terms of position and rank. He signals that he is aware of the hierarchical relationships within the academia and positions himself accordingly. On the one hand, Jim is conscious of how the other academics perceive him in the academic circle but on the other hand he detects their follies and intellectual inabilities. He notices that the people who have control over his professional life do not have the necessary intellectual qualifications to deserve their positions at the faculty. Hence, this observation leads

[8] Social capital is directly about relationships and organization that are within one's social network (acceptance to a very prestigious firm via one's classmates' families). Cultural capital is the outcome of one's stored knowledge of culture -ballet, theatre, classical arts, music, literature, and this type of capital is more connected to education and intelligence.

Jim to see the discrepancy between appearance and reality, between how academics reveal themselves at the university and who they really are.

As discussed in the previous chapter on theoretical framework, there is a conflict between traditional and organic intellectuals from Gramsci's perspective. In the novel, Professor Welch is a traditional intellectual while Jim Dixon is an organic intellectual trying to move up the social ladder. When analysed in detail, Jim's fear of hegemonic wars among the academics gives clues about the failure of the lower class to create their own "organic intellectuals" in Gramsci's terms. According to Gramsci, it is difficult for lower classes to have their own intellectuals because of the financial hardships. In this sense, upper classes are always one step ahead at the beginning of their education lives, and this advantage continues up to the level of higher education. Althusser claims that they are the first group to fall out of the formal education process in order to meet the immediate labour need in the capitalist system, so there is limited chance for a lower-class person to become a great scholar. They get these positions at universities simply because of the government policy that welcomes the veterans to academic positions in parallel to the establishment of different provincial universities. Such lower-class academics are employed in less prestigious schools to meet the immediate demands of the newly established universities after the Second World War. Jim is a graduate of "Local Grammar School" (215) which is a state-funded school in the tripartite system of England, the others being technical and modern schools[9]. Although this system divided the students according to their merits instead of their classes, and was free of charge, the families opposed the idea and claimed that a system based on selection was again a type of discrimination. They knew that only prestigious schools in London could prepare pupils for higher education while many of them, especially local ones, would still have limited curricula. As Jim graduated from one of those local schools, his fears and insecurities about his academic merits are not groundless.

[9] "The 1943 White Paper, Educational Reconstruction, determined that secondary education would be organised into a tripartite system of secondary grammar, secondary technical and secondary modern schools with each following a discrete curriculum" (Galvani 79).

The relationship between Professor Welch and Jim displays that hegemony operates in the form of the abuse of the less experienced academic by his senior. For instance, Jim hates the petty works such as filling in the departmental time table (85), assigned to him as a routine of the department's paperwork. Each semester, academics write short feedbacks about the departmental policies, the curriculum and the staff on the timetable and hang them to the places that everyone can see, yet Jim personally sees it as an academic drudgery imposed upon them. Or he deep down believes that his ideas on any of the topics given will not be valued and respected by the seniors of the faculty, so he does not want to spare time for something which will not be taken seriously. For Jim, it is one of those unnecessary tasks that is invented to keep people busy, and it has no real use for the functioning of the academic system. Welch, once, wants Jim to check some information from the library for his own personal use, and as an excuse he implies that he is too busy to do the task himself: "I shan't be able to spend any time pottering about looking things in the library… It's good of you to do this for me, Dixon" (173). Although Jim has an appointment with his girlfriend on that day, he feels obliged to run the errands assigned by Welch because of the hierarchical pressure he feels upon himself.

The abuse of power that appears in the form of assigning unimportant errands to Jim, has a psychological purpose. In one instance, Jim gathers the courage to ask Professor Welch about his position at the university, saying, "I have been worrying rather about my position here… I am afraid I got off on the wrong foot here rather, when I first came. I did some rather silly things. Well, now that my first year is nearly over, naturally I can't help feeling a bit anxious" (83). Welch is quite unsympathetic about Jim's concerns. Instead, he talks about some other problems at the university, such as the situation of the chemistry labs. Upon such indifference, Jim feels that he is not worthy of attention, and thinks Welch is a selfish, incompetent man who does not deserve his status. Jim believes such incapable people as Welch become employers at universities because of the privileges that are provided by their upper-class position. He dreams of beating the professor and disclosing his real feelings about him: "Look here, you old cockchafer, what makes you think you can run a history department, even at a place

like this, eh, you old cockchafer? (85). The phrase "even at a place like this" is repeated in different contexts whenever Jim evaluates the institution he works in, so it connotes that a provincial university need not be very conventionally hierarchical. He has a low opinion of the institution, and a lower opinion of the administration.

The enforcement of the upper-class values upon Jim is observed in the term party scene at Welch's residence. Before the party, Jim meets Margaret, who is another young, upper class academic in the same department, in a bar, and openly declares that he lacks the required knowledge and discipline expected of an intellectual, which Gramsci also points out in his theory. He tells her in a state of panic and anger:

> Look Margaret, you know as well as I do that I can't sing, I can't act, I can hardly read, and thank God I can't read music... He [Welch] wants to test my reaction to culture, see whether I am a fit person to teach in a university, see? Nobody who can't tell a flute from a recorder can be worth hearing on the price of bloody cows under Edward the Third." (24)

He is also angry due to his self-realization that he lacks the qualifications needed from an academic, so he calls the cows "bloody". At this point, Raymond Williams' argument concerning the workings of tradition in institutions is explanatory of Jim's situation since Williams claims: "specific communities and specific places of work, exerting powerful and immediate pressures on the conditions of living and of making a living, teach, confirm, and in most cases, finally enforce selected meanings, values and activities" (118). The academic tradition tries to incorporate Jim into the system by imposing the established values of the academia which are highly class-oriented such as having a taste for music, art, and literature, yet he finds himself insufficient to meet those demands.

The second use of "see", at the end of his complaint, shows that Jim needs empathy and understanding from his listener. He also needs confirmation about his discomfort in front of such annoying tests. However, Margaret shows no interest in Jim's complaints and ignores his anger and anxiety. She responds: "Don't let's talk about it anymore. Can't we talk about ourselves?" (24). Her reaction implies that Margaret also does not understand what Jim is going through as she is one of the academics who is accepted by that microcosm. Hence, she feels secure about her

position both socially and financially. For instance, she does not feel well enough to teach for a whole semester, but the faculty keeps paying her salary. What is more, the same professor Welch, who threatens Jim at every opportunity, welcomes Margaret to his house to provide her with special care during the treatment of her illness. Such discrimination of Welch indicates class has a determining factor in academic relationships. As Williams claims, the "selective force" of tradition excludes the newly emerging values which cannot be incorporated into the established system, or which pose threat to it, while preserving the old and approved ones (116). Then, Jim does not belong to the academic community which has been monopolized by the upper-class for centuries. He feels that he belongs to a totally different community. Therefore, in the same scene, when they have this conversation in the bar, Jim associates himself with the barmaid: "He thought how much he liked her and had in common with her, and how much she'd like and have in common with him if she only knew him" (25). He involuntarily feels that someone from his class, like the barmaid, would understand him better instead of the upper-class academics surrounding him. . Raymond Williams himself experiences a very similar feeling when he first comes to Cambridge and understands that there are basically two different meanings attached to the term 'culture', one is equivalent of 'high culture'. This meaning is the one that scares Raymond Williams himself, since he believes that the other meaning of culture which is related to learning is ordinary and easy to learn. In his writing *Culture is Ordinary*, he summarizes his feelings and observations about this two different perceptions of culture as follows:

> I am not oppressed by the university, but the teashop, acting as if it were one of the older and respectable departments, was a different matter. Here was culture, not in any sense I knew, but in a special sense: the outward and emphatically visible sign of a special kind of people, cultivated people. (93)

As a scholarship student at Cambridge, learning and gathering information is quite ordinary for Raymond Williams. However, he feels that there is a special community filling those teashops, and he is not one of them. Just like Jim Dixon, he feels uncomfortable in such places whose code of conduct is totally unknown to him. Moreover, Raymond Williams's observations about the qualities of people that inhabit those teashops are also similar to Jim Dixon's observations of his upper

class colleagues. Williams claims: "They were not, the great majority of them, particularly learned; they practised few arts; but they had it, and they showed you they had it" (93). He implies that practising art and having art are two different things, and the people of teashops are the ones who only possess art without any real insight about it. Similarly, Jim Dixon, from the very beginning, feels that his superiors are actually his inferior; that is, they do not deserve to be in the position of criticizing him. Therefore, he rejects obeying the rules that are set by those people since he believes that he deserves better than being monopolized by these pompous academics. Rachel Singleton evaluates Jim's situation with these words:

> Although Amis' novel reads as a comedy, the underlying implications of *Lucky Jim* is that Jim is one angry man: his superior is actually inferior, he can see straight through the falsities of social interaction, and yet he wants so desperately to fit into the social paradigm that he deplores. Jim is constantly mocking his peers, making funny gestures and actively involving himself in shenanigans, simply for his own spiteful amusement. (54)

As a reaction to the hegemony which is forced upon him, Jim develops quite a negative or even a spiteful attitude towards the professors of his faculty. The more rules they impose on him, and try to control him, the more rebellious he becomes. He mocks or criticizes the upper-class academics at every opportunity, and sets little traps to ridicule them. He steals their taxis after balls, changes his voice on the phone to trick them, writes fake letters using pseudonyms to make them afraid, and finally sets fire to valuable documents of colleagues. After a while all his tricks go out of control and they are discovered by the victims of the jokes, so he puts himself into real trouble with his co-workers. In his Merrie England speech, he ruins the occasion by getting drunk and imitating Welch's and the Principal's voices. In the meantime, he keeps thinking whether he is losing his position at the department and feels anxious. All these reactions signal that Jim wants to be part of the circle, yet he cannot find a proper place appropriate for his class and background.

The ambivalence of Jim's social position within academia puts him into a constant attempt to assert himself and create good public opinion partly to subvert the negative views of his colleagues. In the bathroom scene in Welch's house, the day after the party, he looks at the mirror after cleaning it, and he thinks "As always, though, he looked healthy, he hoped, honest and kindly" (65). The adjectives he

uses to describe himself are not randomly chosen. In spite of all the lies and tricks he devises he looks "honest". Despite all the crudity that he displays by swearing and using offensive words, he looks "kindly". Although he gets drunk and sick at parties, he looks "healthy". There is also the expression 'he hoped' which connotes that he desires to be regarded positively by the upper-class. Nevertheless, they all approach him with suspicion and bias at the university, which makes Jim's mission more difficult. As Gramsci states, "Consciousness of being part of a particular hegemonic force is the first stage towards a further progressive self-consciousness in which theory and practice will finally be one" (333). In other words, one needs to adjust his self-perception according to the social forces that surround him to handle the contradictory state of consciousness. Coping with this divided state of consciousness is necessary for the lower-class to realize his goal of becoming a member of higher class, or getting equal chances with them. At this point, Jim's inner rejection to adapt the perspective of the upper-class prevents him from being a part of the hegemonic system. On the surface, he hopes to become one of them, yet inwardly he is aware of their follies and defects which prevent him from identifying himself with their ideology. However, the same inconsistent state, the contradiction between his beliefs and practices, causes Jim's passivity. For Gramsci, the contradictory state of consciousness does not permit any action, any decision or any choice, and produces a condition of moral and political passivity (333). Therefore, the only choice for Jim is to position himself among the academics surrounding him, to be one of them. Jim inwardly knows that as social force, class is very powerful in separating him and causing his exclusion. This social force is tradition for Williams while it is mainly the class dynamics for Gramsci and Althusser. From Gramsci's point of view, Jim is unarmed as he did not undergo a proper education, so his chance of fitting in an academic system, whose basic requirement is knowledge, is low. What fundamentally causes Jim's insecurity is not having been educated properly to survive within academia. From Bourdieu's perspective, Jim is unarmed, or lacks the necessary "cultural and social capital", as he did not undergo a proper education.

The gap between the classes is not only an inner pressure felt by Jim without any external factors. He is frequently reminded of his poor background and

vulgarity by the upper-class members of academia like, Welch's son, Bertrand. Bertrand actually is one of those superficial members of the upper class, exemplified by Raymond Williams, since he does not really appreciate or practise art, but likes to show off at art galleries and social gatherings. He is not a good painter, and does not have any real talent in painting. Yet, he goes on painting and attends social gatherings which include art discussions to find rich sponsors for his work. In the discussion of arts, he places the rich people at the heart of culture and art, so he disregards the possibility that poor people can also contribute to those areas. He says: "The point is that the rich play an essential role in modern society…. More than ever in days like these…. And I happen to like arts" (51). In this quote "days like these" refers to the post-war state of the country. The pre-war and post-war period in England are evaluated as stagnant in terms of arts and literature as the war's anxiety and horror prevented people from engaging in creative works. During such periods of despair, Bertrand believes that the rich keep the arts going, which means that he assigns a very significant mission to rich people in the maintenance of artistic traditions. The class conflict between Jim and Bertrand mainly stems from this contemptuous attitude which lacks empathy and understanding towards people who do not belong to the upper class. The immediate link that Bertrand establishes between welfare and art sounds quite elitist to Jim, as Bertrand directly excludes lower-class people from the discussion of art and culture. They are a bunch of tasteless and vulgar people for Bertrand.

If Bertrand's criticism of the lower-class is an implicit one, Margaret openly humiliates Jim when she understands that he is interested in Bertrand's girlfriend, Christine, instead of herself: "You don't think she'd have you, do you? A shabby, little provincial bore like you" (158). Her humiliation includes references to Jim's social position as provincial[10] which connotes vulgarity and being uncultured. In that sense, she is not much different from Bertrand who calls Jim a philistine[11] to remind him of his poor background and class (184). Originally the word is used to

[10] 1755 Countrified, lacking refinement or polish (See: *The Barnhart Concise Dictionary of Etymology)*

[11] 1827 translation of German Philister, enemy of God's word, applied by German university students to townsmen and outsiders; hence, any uncultured person. See: *The Barnhart Concise Dictionary of Etymology.*

criticize the uncultured outsiders by German university students in the 1820s. Therefore, its usage firstly implies that Jim is an 'outsider' although he is an academic serving at a university. Secondly, the modern usage of the adjective[12] puts more emphasis on ignorance and vulgarity, and suggests that Jim is a person who cannot appreciate art or culture. Bertrand, Welch, and Margaret display the same elitist attitude towards Jim at every opportunity because they inwardly feel that Jim is not one of them, or does not belong to their class. In that sense, the choice of such words as provincial and philistine is not coincidental, on the contrary, they are carefully selected to emphasize the class antagonism between Jim and other academics.

Language is also a tool which underlines class antagonism in the novel in different ways. It is used to undermine the hegemony exercised by the upper-class academics and to ridicule their false intellectuality. While listening to one of his speeches, Jim thinks about Welch; "How had he become Professor of History, even at a place like this? By published work? No. By extra good teaching? No in italics. Then how?" (8). Despite being the most influential faculty member at the department of history, Welch's linguistic capacity is very weak. He leaves nearly all his sentences unfinished as if he could not find the right words to develop his ideas. The frequent use of ellipses in the closing sentence of all his speeches are noteworthy; "It would help to take her mind off… off…," "And the train was… well, it…," (9) "Not too academic, and not too… not too…," (17) "the hymn, which is a typical … typical …," (36) "Well, this … this …," (79) and "You will just have to use your own …your own …" (173). The fact that Welch utters these unfinished sentences during his conversations with his colleagues, juniors or family members show that this is his genuine speech defect. However, as a humanities professor, Welch needs mastery over language to teach in class and to give public speeches in conferences. He plays the ideal scholar and controls junior academics while paradoxically he has his own imperfections. In that sense, Jim never looks up to him, or finds him inspirational.

[12] A person who refuses to see the beauty or the value of art or culture. (See: Cambridge Online Dictionary)

Amis believes that "trying to catch someone's tones, hearing them in your head and then trying to put them on paper is very useful to the reader…. the way people talk tells an awful lot about what kind of person they are, if you think you can hear the character talking, it's much easier to identify with that person" (qtd in Eastman 43). John K. Eastman's research analyses the lexico-grammatical structure of the novel to display the interference of paralinguistic features like class and hierarchy into the speech styles of characters in the novel. Amis's belief that there is a close connection between personality and the way one uses language implies that he does not make his characters speak randomly. After the analysis of the different speeches by academics in the novel, Eastman detects important linguistic features like ellipsis[13] which are transferred from spoken discourse. Therefore, they claim that Amis consciously creates an effect of "hearing the character talking" in his systematic transference of features of spoken discourse to writing. At this point, the vocabulary the characters use, their accents, their speech defects are notable details to be studied in terms of understanding the contribution of sociological factors like the status, education and class to the individual's use of language. However, as mentioned in Eastman's article, class is not the only determinant as the characters pick up certain styles according to the addressee of their talk and the context. For instance, Jim's use of language differs considerably from the other academics, especially outside the campus and according to the recipient of his words. Throughout the novel he is the only academic who swears and uses offensive remarks. While staying at Welch's house on the party night, Jim enters into the bathroom after the professor left it and starts to observe the traces of the professor: "Welch had left grime round the bath and steam on the mirror. After a little thought, Jim stretched out a finger and wrote 'Ned Welch is a Soppy Fool with a Fase like A Pigs Bum' in the steam; then he rubbed the glass with a towel and looked at himself" (64). The use of slang in his writing, the incorrect capitalization of some

[13] For further discussion and examples, check John K. Eastman "Dissimilar discourses: the realism of Amis's conversations in Lucky Jim."

words like Soppy, Fool, Bum, Pig or the misspelling of the word "face" indicate that the natural language Jim uses when he is not under surveillance at school is considerably different. Jim is not as ignorant as a semi-illiterate person, who does not have the faintest clue about spelling or capitalization, but he prefers to use them incorrectly with the purpose of plotting against those upper-class academics.

The bathroom scene is not the only instance in which Jim violates the rules of written English. In another example, he writes a letter from the mouth of an ignorant villager, to threaten a colleague, who sold out Jim about his tricks. In the letter which he pens using a pseudonym, the systematic distortion of the spelling is more obvious: "DEAR MR JOHNS, Dixon wrote, gripping his pencil like a breadknife. *This is just to let you no that I no what you are up to with yuong Marleen Richards, yuong Marleen is a desent girl and has got no tim for your sort, I no your sort*" (153). He believes that it is his right to take revenge as the other academics establish an alliance to disclose his tricks. The misspelling of the word 'know' as 'no' implies the duality between knowing and not knowing, which means every time Jim says I know, he actually means he does not know anything. Arthur Quinn believes misspelling is an effective tool, and serves many purposes, and explains these figures as metaplasmus. He says: "You have used a metaplasmic figure when you have purposely misspelled… If we wish to emphasize the sounds of a dialect, we might misspell God as Gawd" (19). However, here the aim is not only to mimic an ignorant villager, but to violate the rules set by the upper class as the feeling of exclusion puts Jim in a reactionary mood. He "grips his pencil like a breadknife" since he wants to show his protest through language. By negating the rules of language which is set by the intellectuals who claim mastery over the correct use of language, Jim in a way, reacts against the jargon and the official language used by the representatives of hegemony. Therefore, all these mistakes in spelling and capitalization, which have an initial humorous effect, are done to indicate Jim's protest of the rules of written English, and his reaction to the hegemony in the academia.

Jim's last conference speech at the faculty during which he mimics different administrators and faculty workers' accents displays his mockery of class and his so-called intellectual associates. He adopts a totally different accent to finish his

speech. “Almost unconsciously, he began to adopt an unnameable foreign accent, and to read faster and faster.… He began punctuating his discourse with smothered snorts of derision. He read on, spitting out syllables like curses, leaving mispronunciations, omissions, spoonerisms uncorrected…” (226). Although Jim seems to lose the command of language in the scene, in fact it is the expression of his protest against the rules used in academic speeches. He violates each and every one of them on purpose to show the uselessness and artificiality of such a jargon since he never internalizes those rules as a part of his natural discourse. He “spits out syllables like curses” to show his opposition to the written and oral rules that govern academic speeches.

The language is problematized in the narration of the novel as well. To be confined in a standard discourse is quite challenging for Jim as a lower-class academic, for he does not have a sufficient command of the rules of formal language. There is a difference, however, between the accounts of the third-person narrator and Jim’s remarks in their degree of formality to underline the dichotomy between serious academic discourse and Jim’s basic and sometimes offensive vocabulary. For instance, in the first chapter, Jim kicks a stone, and it accidently hits a professor’s leg in the garden of the college building. This event is described as “he was the only visible entity capable of stone-propulsion” (16). The words “entity” or “stone-propulsion” are not the kinds of words Jim would use, but these serious words are employed to create a certain contrast between daily speech and academic jargon. When Jim’s basic vocabulary is placed within such a serious narration, it sounds much simpler than it really is. Just like the effective misspelling technique used in Jim’s writings on the mirror, or in the letter, the narrator’s elevated language emphasizes the artificiality of academic jargon, and implies the pretentious behaviour of the academics, resulting from class consciousness.

Jim’s overtly incompatible attitude in the academia is corroborative of Raymond Williams’ idea that all the activities in institutions of higher education cannot be “reduced to be activities of an ideological state apparatus” (118). Jim remains in the system of formal education until he becomes an expert, so the expectation is that he should be supportive of the dominant ideology. However, his attitude towards hegemony in the academia shows that there are always deviations

from the imposed dominant ideology both on institutional and individual levels. Williams also sets forward a very important precondition for a pressure to be hegemonic. He believes that the training or pressure becomes only hegemonic when it is voluntarily internalized, which is similar to Gramsci's concept of 'consent'. If a teaching is not fully and voluntarily internalized, then it cannot be truly hegemonic. Jim's case is full of pressures on the institutional level, but he does not yield to those pressures. Every service Jim engages in is forced upon him in one way or another. As discussed earlier, there is no "self-identification with the hegemonic forms" (118). On the contrary, he always mocks those teachings, and tries to find ways to protest them through the little tricks he devises for his colleagues.

Jim's lack of a strong academic background points to the fact that class remains a determining variable in the measurements of academic success in England, and it maintains its influence for a very long time in English higher education. Vikki Boliver claims that "educational inequalities tend to persist despite expansion because those from more advantaged social class backgrounds are better placed to take up the new educational opportunities that expansion affords" (229). She clarifies that expansion in English education does not exactly mean having equal chances in making use of the opportunities provided by that expansion. The results of her study indicate that "quantitative inequalities between social classes in the odds of higher education enrolment proved remarkably persistent for much of the period between 1960 and 1995" (229). Although the novel was written during the 1950s, it displays such inequalities through Jim's failure in the academia. She claims even if the educational opportunities are given to larger groups of people, the higher classes controlled the enrolment and admission processes to the prestigious schools, and left the lower classes without alternatives other than their own type of less prestigious schools, as in Jim's case.

2.3 Irony and Pretension in *Lucky Jim*

Considering the fact that academia consists of strictly defined hierarchical relationships, to survive in it, one needs to develop certain strategies. Pretension is one of those strategies, and it takes a lot of forms in case of Jim. Especially in the description of the attitudes of the academics, the word "pretend" as well as its

different formations and synonyms appear so frequently in the text that it attracts attention to the widespread practice of the manner in the academic world. The implication is that the majority of the academics depicted in the book put on a mask and adopt an artificial attitude within the academic circle. As soon as Jim steps into the world of academia, he discovers what matters is seeming to know rather than knowing, and he tries to act in the same way to survive in this environment. However, his pretence does not have the same function and effect as that of the upper-class academics in the novel; that is, he is so conscious of his own pretentiousness that he performs it only as a technique to stay among them. Unlike the other academics, he does not believe in the self-image he made up, or he is not carried away by his own pretentiousness.

The first pretence Jim observes is about the manners one adopts in the academic circle. He finds out that he needs to look kind and friendly towards the other members of the faculty to be welcomed, and that he must hide his sincere ideas and feelings especially if they are not positive. In the first chapter, while Welch is talking about a confusion in a concert, Jim gets quite bored with the details of the event, yet he pretends to smile. "Mentally, however, he was making a different face and promising himself he'd make it actually when next alone" (8). Secondly, as a medievalist, he pretends to know everything about his field when somebody questions him. For instance, Welch inquiries Jim about a book written by a local academic, and says; "I expect you know his book on Medieval Cwmrhydyceirw". Although Jim immediately says "Oh yes" (80), he does not have the faintest clue about the place or the book mentioned. What is more, he even confuses the classical writers and philosophers like Aristotle and Plato with the modern ones frequently: "Plato or Rilke," (72) "Aristotle or I. A. Richards" (107). He never remembers the writers of texts or names of the poets, or essential information about his alleged field of research. In fact, his policy is "to read as little as possible of any given book." (17) To have such a policy is quite ironic for a man who has a claim to academic success. According to Grice, "to be ironical is among other things, is to pretend and while one wants the pretence to be recognized as such, to announce it as a pretence would spoil the effect" (125). At this point, Jim's meticulously tuned and organized pretence embodies a subtle criticism of academic

manners and practices. On the one hand, Jim is portrayed to be ignorant in academic matters, but on the other his ignorance highlights the insufficiency of the intellectual and academic capacities of other members of academia in the novel. The relationship between irony and pretence is also studied by Fowler (1965). In *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, Fowler defines:

> Irony is a form of utterance that postulates a double audience, consisting of one party that hearing shall hear and shall not understand, and another party that, when more is meant than meets the ear, is aware both of that more and of the outsider's incomprehension. It may be defined as the use of words intended to convey one meaning to the uninitiated part of the audience and another to the initiated, the delight of it lying in the secret intimacy set up between the latter and the speaker. (305-306)

In the light of Fowler's definition, Jim's irony targets an "initiated" audience who will decipher the real meanings of his tricks and pretensions, and an uninitiated audience who will not understand the original aim of his ironic or pretentious attitude. As mentioned before, Jim is portrayed as insufficient in academic matters, yet he feels self-confident when he is not under the surveillance of his seniors. He does not refrain from devising tricks and making fool of his colleagues. Therefore, the other members of his faculty constitute the uninitiated audience while the reader who deciphers the real function and meaning of his attitude becomes the initiated one. The narrator enjoys sharing a secret with the reader by contrasting Jim's conscious and organized pretence with the wilful and unaware pretence of the other characters in the novel. In this case, Jim's pretension is not unconscious; on the contrary, it is a tool to highlight the total insincerity practiced in academia.

Jim's pretension is not limited to playing the knowledgeable academic. He quickly changes identity, and steps into other people's shoes. Once he introduces himself as a journalist to the Welch family on the phone, and changes his voice not to be recognized. Just like a journalist he asks questions about Bertrand's latest studies, comments on his drawings and demands for an interview. However, all he wants to learn is whether Bertrand is planning to participate in the summer party or not. Although Jim knows that such tricks are like playing with fire, he cannot help going on them as he genuinely takes great pleasure in these jokes. After the telephone joke, he has an, "anarchistic laughter" (105) since Jim believes he gives those upper-class people a taste of their own medicine, that is, he pretends as a

response to their pretension. His laughter is defined as "anarchistic" because he feels that he is destroying or sabotaging the established set of manners in academia by means of his little tricks. In another scene, when the faculty secretary wants Jim to take a phone call in the absence of Welch, he assumes a fake identity and talks as if he is the sole authority there adopting Welch's all-knowing attitude. For Grice, ironic tone of voice is a frequently observed technique in pretence, and people generally leave their own voices behind for new ones. As Grice himself puts forward, "If speaking ironically has to be, or at least to appear to be, the expression of a certain sort of feeling or attitude, then a tone suitable to such a feeling or attitude seems to be mandatory (125). That is exactly what Jim does when he assumes fake identities; that is, he changes his attitude and uses an ironic tone of voice.

As is told, Jim is not the only pretender since all the staff mentioned in the book study topics which are trendy in academia in order to seem knowledgeable to the others. During one of the discussions Jim states, "Haven't you noticed how we all specialized in what we hate most?" (33), and nobody objects to him. What is more interesting is that none of these people are more knowledgeable than Jim, but they pretend to be elite intellectuals. For instance, they throw parties during which they talk about art and literature, listen to classical music, and invite art sponsors to get financial support from them. In the same way, Bertrand desires to look "cultured" and get financial support for his artistic enterprises, so he invites Christine's uncle, Gore Urquhart, a very rich art connoisseur, to the party, and tries to build a close relationship with him. At the very beginning of the book, Welch mentions that a local newspaper's reporter has confused the flute and the recorder, explaining the difference between the two in such detail that Jim gets panicked as he is forced to believe that a cultured person should definitely know the difference. As mentioned in the class discussion, Jim strongly desires to have such talent and knowledge in arts and literature to be appreciated and to have a word within discussions of art. "Dixon himself had sometimes wished he wrote poetry or something as a claim to developed character" (140). He once dreams about becoming a real art critic just to criticize Bertrand's paintings and publicize the low quality of his work. In his *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*, Alexander Kojeve explains the steps of becoming a unified human self, and claims man is made of

desire that needs to be satisfied by destroying the desired object, yet he does not become fully human by satisfying his id or his desire, since he consists of self-consciousness which needs to be confirmed by another self. Kojeve states,

> Man's humanity comes to light only in risking his life to satisfy his human Desire - that is, his Desire directed towards another Desire. Now, to desire a Desire is to want to substitute oneself for the value desired by this Desire.…Therefore, to desire the Desire of another is in the final analysis to desire that the value that I am or that I represent be the value desired by the other: I want him to recognize my value as his value. I want him to recognize me as an autonomous value. In other words, all human, anthropogenetic Desire - the Desire that generates self-consciousness, the human reality is, finally, a function of the desire for recognition. (7)

As in Kojeve's analysis, Jim's struggle is basically the fight for recognition, for he cannot fully realize himself and become a unified human-self without getting the recognition of the Other. Jim frequently feels the insufficiency of his literary knowledge and artistic talent. However, his desire to be a good critic of art is not only a desire to become a cultured person. What Jim desires is simply the recognition by the Other. He knows that there is no real artist or humanities expert who can be a role model for him at the faculty, so what he pursues is not an ideal academic to copy, but to be "recognized as an autonomous value". Therefore, he keeps playing little tricks to show them he is there as an individual identity, waiting for them to notice his existence.

While Professor Welch and his family imitate elite traditions in their speech, clothing and life style, Jim tries to understand these traditions with great difficulty. For example, he questions why Welch gives French names to his children although he is not French (85). Or, he even does not understand the way they dress up. Seeing Bertrand wearing a blue beret, and Welch a fishing-hat, Jim thinks: "If such headgear was a protection, what was it a protection against? If it wasn't a protection, what was it? What was it for? What was it for?" (188). It is strange for Jim to wear a fishing hat if a person never goes fishing. As he does not even have a spare pair of trousers, it is not easy for Jim to understand such decorative pieces in clothing. Moreover, the repetition of "what was it for" does not only serve to explain his surprise in front of such luxury, it also highlights the pompousness of those upper-class people as they attach inaccurate social status to their clothing. The blue beret that Bertrand wears all the time is originally "a round, cap worn by the Basque

peasants"[14]. Those hats were probably a fashion of the time among the artists. While he wants to look fashionable and noble, he wears something which originally belongs to peasantry.

Concisely, Jim is conscious about the pretention and insincerity in the relationship of all these upper-class academics. He knows that no one exists in the academia with his natural manners and feelings. They all pretend to "know" things, while they are as ignorant as Jim. Academically, the upper-class are as unproductive and talentless as Jim. Although they put him to test, inquire him about culture and arts, none of them show a real talent in any of the fields that they test Jim about. Therefore, in every little trick he devises, he feels that he puts these upper-class academics in their deserved places. Within this hegemonic struggle between classes, Jim's pretension is a weapon against other members of academia.

2.4 Criticism of Capitalist Policies in Higher Education

There are several references to the capitalist ideology and its practices in the universities in the novel. For instance, the application of the standard exams by an external examination committee points out to the presence of a state policy, which tries to put universities under surveillance. Louis Althusser touches upon this state surveillance over the schools with special emphasis on their function of imposing the dominant ideology on students. The state has always had direct relationship with the institutions of education in England, since it guarantees the dissemination of ideology through these bodies. Like Gramsci and Althusser, Rowland Eustace points to the onset of such a policy of intervention through the UGC [University Grants Committee] which settles the financial rules for universities and acts as an intermediary between the universities and the government (283). Through such committees, institutions of higher education are subjected to a series of quality control tests. However, the enforcement of a national policy is not immediately welcomed and adopted by some academics such as Fred Karno, who does not yield to this pressure. His colleague, Beesley, comments on Karno's attitude saying: "One thing I like about Fred Karno is he will never try to push anyone through that he doesn't really think's worth it…. Fred's about the only prof. in the place who's resisting all this outside pressure to chuck firsts around like teaching diplomas and

[14] *The Barnhart Concise Dictionary of Etymology* (origin and definition of Beret)

push every bugger who can write his name through the Pass courses" (169). He personally gives low grades to the students who have not acquired sufficient knowledge to meet the requirements of his course, and does not refrain from receiving criticism from his seniors. The government spares a huge amount of money to finance such provincial universities, and it expects a certain success rate from them. Therefore, local universities need to prove their achievement through the students who can benefit from their education. Good exam grades are thought to be the first indicators of such success, so the academics feel the pressure of passing their unqualified students otherwise the failing students will be evaluated as waste of money by the government. Fred Karno's resistance to the interference of the capitalist ideology into his teaching style indicates that Jim is not the only person resisting to the dominant capitalist ideology. There are exceptional figures from the established academia who can also see the falsities in the current capitalist system.

Moreover, the main criterion for academic success, namely publish or perish ideology, is also problematized in the novel. Once Welch inquiries about the title of Jim's article, which needs to be published soon, he thinks of the title "it was a perfect title, in that it crystallized the article's niggling mindlessness, its funereal parade of yawn-enforcing facts, and the pseudo-light it threw upon non-problems" (14). Here again the word choice immediately attracts attention firstly because it summarizes Jim's perspective about the academic affairs: they are boring, useless and artificial. Jim is quite critical of his own research as all the facts are "yawn-enforcing", or not interesting for the reader. The article does not provide any solutions to serious questions, the light it bears is fake. It is one of the moments in the book when Jim engages in genuine self-criticism, so he knows that his adaptation strategy also includes imposture. Instead of making valuable contributions to his area of study, he chooses a topic which supposedly looks serious, and gathers appreciation from his seniors and publishers. He writes the article just because he needs to keep his position in the university. All the adjectives used to evaluate the title of the article have negative meanings. The narrator chooses such vocabulary to underline the difficulties of academic publication under the pressure of capitalist educational system, whose basic aim is profitable production.

Since, the fifties is the time of the rise of provincial universities in England, the members of academia are in some kind of a race to prove themselves as competent scholars. The only way to prove their qualification and knowledge is publication for the academics, which again corresponds to Marx's idea of demand for surplus labour.

Additionally, Welch's using Jim Dixon for his personal errands, which has been evaluated under class-based hegemony, can also be discussed from the perspective of capitalism. Although it is not included in his job description, he takes care of nearly all the paperwork in the department; that is, his labour-power is exploited in Marxist terms. The "exploitation of labour power" (320) is among the chief problems of workers in *Capital*, since the workers suffer from excessive demand from the producers. Similarly, Jim Dixon is openly exploited by his seniors, and spends all his time doing the petty errands at the Department. In other words, the time which he needs to spare for his academic studies is usurped by his colleagues because they do not want to be bothered with such small tasks themselves.

2.5 Carnivalesque Elements in *Lucky Jim*

Throughout the novel, the professional lives of all these academics are juxtaposed with their private lives at parties. The academic relationships are highly class conscious and follow a strict hierarchical pattern, and this formal atmosphere creates tension which is released at social gatherings when they stop pretending. They abandon their masks temporarily during the parties organized by the faculty members as they are drunk and are outside the campus. Since they are stripped of all their hierarchical concerns and boundaries, they do not feel under the pressure of their professional lives. Bakhtin defines such moments as carnival and specifies: "The suspension of all hierarchical precedence during carnival time was of particular significance" (10). Carnival is defined as a counter or alternative culture in Bakhtin's theory, it is an "unofficial culture" which allows the merging of the higher and the lower which is impossible in a class-based society. Therefore, all the members of academia show their true feelings and ideas during these carnivalesque moments.

Chapter six which includes the comic hangover scene of Jim after the party at Welch's residence is full of carnivalesque features. Excessive eating and drinking, fire, grotesque images of the body as well as the play with the concepts of time and space are some of those aspects. To start with, Jim drinks so much during the party that he loses consciousness for a while in Welch's guest room. The chapter immediately starts with this description: "Dixon was alive again. Consciousness was upon him before he could get out of the way; not for him the slow, gracious wandering from the halls of sleep, but a summary, forcible ejection" (61). The word choice "alive" instead of "awake" to describe Jim's waking up connotes that Jim went through a temporary state of unconsciousness or even death. It is closely linked to Bakhtin's description of the transformation one goes through during the feasts. Bakhtin says, "Feasts were linked to moments of crisis, of breaking of points in the cycle of nature or in the life of society and man. Moments of death and revival, of change and renewal always led to a festive perception of the world" (9). As his reaction to culture is tested, the party at Welch's house is a breaking point in Jim's life. He feels under great pressure because of his class inferiority and academic insufficiency. To deal with this crisis, he drinks excessively and loses himself at night. Getting drunk is, in a sense, crossing the boundaries of consciousness and losing contact with real space and time. The moment he starts to gain his consciousness is described as resurrection or revival. Bakhtin's belief that such moments eventually lead to a festive perception of the world suggests that Jim's perception of his surrounding will slightly change after his heavy hangover state.

Additionally, his "forced ejection" just at the moment of waking up underline the grotesque imagery related to the genitals and sex, which in Bakhtin's theory imply production and rebirth. Jim's erection, is, then, a release of his repressed sexual desires. Throughout the novel, he has a problematic relationship with the opposite sex. He does not know how to deal with Margaret's whimsical attitude, or her self-pity. When he sees Margaret with red lipstick, he feels quite puzzled in front of such feminine attitude and style. He also feels speechless when he encounters Bertrand's girlfriend, Christine, at the party since she is impressively beautiful, but he admits that he cannot attain or be friends with her. He needs to

hide his sincere desire to be with those women, so his repressed sexual desire is released during the hangover scene. It is another liberation or getting rid of a pressure for him.

In grotesque realism, the body is accepted "universal and representing all people…all that is bodily become grandiose, exaggerated, immeasurable" (Bakhtin 19). In this context both Jim's and Welch's detailed hyperbolic physical descriptions emphasize their repulsiveness as a part of the material bodily principle, which encourages neutral depiction of such physical conditions. In one scene Professor Welch has food stains on his tie which disgusts Jim, and in another scene, he is described as blowing his nose. "This was usually horrible, if only because it drew unwilling attention to Welch's nose itself, a large, open-pored tetrahedron" (86). To call Welch's nose a tetrahedron[15] attracts attention to the sharp triangular shape of his nose, which is not aesthetic for the onlookers. Its being open-pored is also a reference to the deformation of Welch's aging body. From Jim's point of view, Welch's bodily qualities and physical condition are unpleasant. However, in the hangover scene, Jim is also described in a similar repellent physical state: "He lay sprawled, too wicked to move, spewed up like a broken spider-crab on the tarry shingle of the morning…. His mouth had been used as a latrine by some small creature of the night, and then as its mausoleum" (61). The depiction of his condition as "spewing up like a broken spider crab" creates the mental image of a giant marine spider stretching its extremely long legs. This simile connotes that Jim is too weak to stand up, as it is scientifically known that legs of spider crabs are weak despite their length[16]. His vomiting is also resembled to the spewing up of the sea crab throwing up the excesses of the dead material and carrion he feeds on. The choice of the sea crab is not coincidental since the animal's typical behaviour pattern is specified as placid and solitary[17] which underlines Jim's lonely and socially-excluded state. Moreover, his mouth's being used subsequently as a

[15] A tetrahedron is a polyhedron with four faces. Each face is a triangle. In other words, a tetrahedron is pyramid with triangular base. A regular tetrahedron has all four faces congruent. (*Barron's Dictionary of Mathematics Terms*)

[16] It is a species of large, and scavenger marine crab. Although long, the legs are often weak. Nearly three quarters of these crabs are missing at least one limb, most often one of the first walking legs. (*Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, 2011)

[17] For further details: See Riebel William's entry on macrocheira kaempferi on animaldiversity.org.

"latrine" and "mausoleum", of a small creature of the night firstly refers to losing the taste of food temporarily after excessive drinking, and the bitterness the alcohol leaves in the mouth. All the details of their bodily conditions are laid bare to unify Jim and Welch, or in other words the lower-class with the upper-class. Bakhtin claims, in grotesque realism, "bodily element is deeply positive. It is presented not in a private, egotistic form, severed from the other spheres of life, but as something universal, representing all the people" (19). In another saying, Jim's and Welch's bodily features are described to show that they are not quite different from each other within the carnival sphere in which all the hierarchical boundaries are abolished. Bakhtin asserts "not only parody in its narrow sense but all the other forms of grotesque realism degrade, bring down to earth, turn their subjects into flesh" (20). Instead of their mental capabilities, their bodily descriptions turn both of them into flesh. In this way, all the distinctions between classes disappear, and all the hierarchical connections are dissolved temporarily through carnival.

Another element of the carnival observed in the book is fire. In his study of *The Spirit of the Carnival*, David Danow states "Fire is designed to swallow the old in preparing the way for the new" (30). Fire is the messenger of a new life and new possibilities, and from the ashes there appears a revived form of life. In the hangover scene, Jim realizes that he has fallen asleep and let his cigarette burn the bed sheets and the blanket as well as the coffee table. Afterwards, he cuts out the ruined parts of the sheet and reorganizes the room to make it look as if nothing happened. By the new design that he creates in Welch's guest room, Jim actually creates an alternative order for the Welch family since he has serious problems with their present way of life and tastes. When Christine questions; "What are you going to do with the table? He answers, "There is a little junk-room at the end of the passage, full of broken furniture and rotting books and things; they sent me up there to fetch a music-stand or whatever they call the things. That room's the place for this table" (73). His hatred towards the tastes and life-style of the Welch family as well as his desire to get rid of them becomes quite clear in this scene. His attitude, in a sense, can be interpreted as a desire to create an alternative to the established order by destroying it.

2.6 Conclusion

The campus described in *Lucky Jim*, is full of diverse members of the academia who have different class origins and world views. Despite the existence of a dominant ideology which has considerable influence over the whole teaching and learning atmosphere, the reactions of individual academics to the dominant ideology differ from each other to a large extent. Within the context of the novel, not all the academics serve to one dominant ideology. Firstly, the protagonist of the novel, Jim, questions every established rule in the university from academic jargon to manners, and academic competence. He secretly searches for ways in order not to conform to those established traditions in the academia. Secondly, Professor Fred Karno's reaction against the enforcement of rules of standardization, and his resistance to passing the unsuccessful students also exemplifies the existence of the academics who do not yield to pressure and do not immediately consent to the sanctions of hegemonic powers. The fact that there is only one professor who acts ethically in the evaluation of the students accounts for Jim's disdain for the rest of the academics in the novel. At this point, the absence of an ideal intellectual in Amis's novel implies that post-war England failed to produce those intellectuals at least on the provincial level. Although Welch gets the title of a professor, he does not fit into the image of a true intellectual with his abuse of his juniors, academic incompetency, and pretentiousness. That is why, when Jim dreams about having a developed and sophisticated character, he never means being like Ned Welch. The novel is a quest for the existence of an intellectual who fits to the ideal meaning of the term, which was created long ago and preserves its residue in the collective unconscious of these characters.

Bearing in mind the existence of such nonconformists as Jim and Fred in the academia, it is not possible to evaluate the academia as a society that unquestioningly adopts the dominant ideology. Rather, academia can be evaluated as an "alternative formation", to use Williams' exact words. The alternative formations help understand the dynamics of the dominant by challenging and questioning it. The place of the academia in the contemporary cultural process is gradually updated when compared to its traditional place, so academia holds a "residual" aspect evaluated from William's perspective. The institutions of higher

education and their values were formed in the past, but those institutions are still active in the cultural process as an effective element of the present. However, the capitalist system makes the survival of characters like Jim and Fred Karno, who are "emergent" in Williams terminology, very difficult because they challenge the system and its rules, and react against the illogical residual functions in the modern education system. The dominant capitalist culture puts pressure upon every emergent that does not serve its function, but as Williams claims "no dominant culture ever in reality includes or exhausts all human practice, human energy, and human intention" (125). Therefore, even the dominant capitalist ideology contains in itself individuals whose intention comes as a surprise to the system, so they cannot be incorporated according Williams. At this point, Jim is one of those figures who resists incorporation despite the limited chances he catches considering his educational and financial restrictions.

Actually the whole novel can be read as the fight between the traditional, and the emergent, or the fight between the upper class and the lower class. As the academia blends the traditional, residual, and emergent elements of a given culture, one reads the mixture of these forces in *Lucky Jim*. While characters like Welch represent the traditional established values, Jim is the emergent within academia as he is the product of the new post-war policies of England's Welfare State. Throughout his struggle in academia, Jim's certain attitudes like trying to become part of the academic circle or adopting their manners can be confused with a willing submission to hegemony and tradition; however, he defies the system in every possible way through his precarious social attitudes and financial status. Williams also warns against the confusion of the concepts of "locally residual and the generally emergent" with these words: "the process of emergence … move beyond a phase of practical incorporation … much incorporation looks like recognition, acknowledgement, and thus a form of acceptance (125). The provincial university that employs Jim, includes locally residual values and the representative of those values while Jim is part of a bigger general emergence in the context of England. He is the inevitable outcome of post-war education policies in England, and he is just a representative of a newly emerging class and a culture. On the other hand, Welch is the preserver of the traditional formation of academic values. Williams's

argument concerning the selective nature of tradition emphasizes that hegemony works through tradition's selective force since tradition excludes every new formation that threatens its foundation and maintenance. The fact that Jim Dixon could not survive in the academia finally suggests that the lower-class individuals need to decipher the workings of high culture, in Raymond Williams's word, to be part of the established academic community at English universities.

CHAPTER THREE: MALCOLM BRADBURY'S CAMPUS FICTION

3.1 Introduction and Background

Within the light of his own evaluation of post-war British fiction, Malcolm Bradbury's novel *Eating People is Wrong* (1959), to use his own terminology, can be evaluated as a novel of "coming out of the fifties", for being the product of the late fifties and responding subtly to the immediate social problems with a satirical tone, while his next campus novel *The History Man* (1975) belongs to the decade which he finds more revolutionary by voicing such problems openly. To be precise, the protagonist of the former novel, professor Treece, is the representative of the passive lower-class academic who is drawn into the higher education system by the policies of the welfare state, yet he is surrounded by people who metaphorically consume him, as the title suggests. The main character of the latter, Dr. Howard Kirk, on the other hand, partially saves himself from the pressure of the upper class, and becomes a fashionable and radical academic figure in his field of study. Unlike Treece, Kirk is not a submissive observer of the political, economic, and scholarly changes of his time.

Both books will be analysed from the perspective of class antagonism, with respect to Gramsci's concepts of hegemony, contradictory consciousness, and consent as well as Raymond Williams's cultural theory with specific reference to his concepts of the dominant, the residual, and the emergent. Since the protagonists of both novels are successful academics with lower-class origins, there is the implication that the status of the emergent is developing in terms of academic achievement. However, there are still dominant capitalist powers and their residues that surround these people and complicate the process of becoming a successful academic. There will be references to Michel Foucault's ideas on madness and civilization with respect to the university building as well as positioning of its intellectuals in *Eating People is Wrong*. Marx's adaptation of Hegel's thesis and anti-thesis dialectic, which will lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat will also be used in the analysis of second novel. When read successively, a lot of class-based

educational problems that are only partly hinted in the first book are detailed within the discussion of *History Man.* The aim of this chapter is to analyse the changing capitalist and class-based dynamics in higher education through Bradbury's two novels written in different decades, and to discuss the modifications in higher education policies as reflected in the novels.

As a literary critic and a novelist, Malcolm Bradbury published several works on the development of the modern English novel by analysing the books of various novelists. In his *The Modern British Novel* (1993) in the chapter "The Novel No Longer Novel," he talks about the drastic changes in the genre due to the destructive effects of the Second World War when human beings developed a sense of "self-annihilation", so the pursuit of aesthetics was perceived as pointless in the face of such atrocity and mass-killings. He states: "everywhere you look there is a tragic irony, pathetic irony, even the irony of black comedy and farce; and there is the irony that is simply violent. The mushroom cloud over Hiroshima was a beautiful spectacle, even though it owed its colour to a kiloton of human blood" (266). By emphasizing the post-war atmosphere, Bradbury draws attention to the destructive effects of the world wars on the literature of the time. As he exemplified by the Hiroshima event, a search for aesthetics is always necessary even during war time. Knowing that a lot of patriotic, nationalistic and humanistic feelings were lost after the wars, and this pessimistic state pacified people, he argues, thematically, the literature of the period, including campus novels, carries the traces of this loss of sensibility and enthusiasm to a certain extent. Bradbury suggests, "The post-war world knew it was post many things. It was post-Holocaust, post-atomic, post-ideological, post-humanist, post-political" (268). The protagonist of his first novel, *Eating People is Wrong*, professor Stuart Treece, will be interpreted as the product of such an atmosphere due to his passivity and detachment from the political problems of his time. In the face of such atrocity and renunciation in the fifties, the novel genre also changed for him. According to Bradbury, there was an immediate need to reach the reading public, and revive the enthusiasm about literature and writing after the gloom and boredom of the war atmosphere (1993: 273). In the same book, he asserts:

> Fifties was in fact passing through a significant revival…. And, far from moving in one single direction, the novel was moving in many - towards realism, but also

> new forms of experiment; towards provincialism and regionalism, but a changed internationalism; towards social representation, but moral allegory, fantasy, gothic, metafiction. (1993: 281)

Campus novels showed up as a part of this observed diversity in the novel genre. In one sense, their satirical and comic tone meets such a demand of revival. Bradbury details each quality of the newly rising post-war fiction in his book, yet two of them are highly relevant for the discussion of post-war campus novels: provincialism and social representation.

With respect to the discussion of regionalism, Bradbury believes that red-brick or provincial universities prepared the ground for new types of fiction and criticism different from the body of canonical ones. In his article "The Rise of the Provincials", he discusses how the provinces create their own type of literature and author. He claims, "At any rate, the welfare state, the world of Subtopia[18], and the atomic age is producing, it seems, its kind of writer" (477). In that sense, such kind of writers are do not ignore the suburban dynamics of the immediate society that surround them; therefore, post-war novelists belong to a separate category for Bradbury. The welfare state's policy of broadening the chances of higher education in the ways that would include the lower-class people, and that would give them a chance to rise up the social ladder through education, paved the way for the formation of a totally new regional community. He dwells upon similar ideas in another article "Coming out of the Fifties", in which he mentions the trends in novel writing in this decade and onwards and repeats his idea that the fifties are fundamental to the understanding of post-war fiction and the decade creates a new generation of writers: "A new generation of young writers seemed then, too, to emerge very rapidly, a generation who were responding to the disturbing new maps of society and history…. In Britain the sense of large social changes and the need to reassert, in new forms, liberal and democratic values had generated a quite new literary atmosphere" (182). He implies the writers of the fifties react to the pessimist post-war atmosphere and portray in their works the social problems of their era. Another implication by Bradbury is that novel writing in the fifties, despite having

[18] *Oxford Online Dictionary*: "blend of suburb and utopia. Unsightly, sprawling suburban development".

a sparkle of renewal, lacked the radical stance of the seventies and the eighties in terms of integrating wide-scale social problems into fiction. However, it is a transitional period, and is crucial to an understanding of the following decades. In this sense, his second novel *The History Man* will display a more radical stance in comparison to the previous one written at the end of the fifties.

As for social representation in campus novels, one of the main problems of the period is that the welfare state's economic plan to give equal chances to people from different classes and backgrounds especially in the field of education, fell into the trap of capitalist dynamics by forcing the returning veterans to find positions in regional universities and by following the criteria set by the established academics, or external boards of examination. They were also exposed to the capitalist standard of publish or perish policy, which intensified the feeling of insecurity among those junior academics as discussed in *Lucky Jim*. By means of such logic, maintenance of their academic positions became very challenging for the lower-class academics who, most of the time, did not have the necessary network to publish their articles. The fact that they were given the opportunity to have positions at provincial universities via the Education Act of 1944 did not guarantee success in getting promotions or titles in the academia, since they had to compete with a lot of upper-class academics who have monopolized higher education for many years. The same capitalist mentality that pushes Jim to look for publishers for his article, motivates professor Treece in *Eating People is Wrong*, to get scholarships for his early education, and adopt the philosophy of hard work to attain success. Bradbury's novels also touch upon rather critical issues of their time including such references to the problems in English higher education.

The economic regulations that deprived the universities of their financial resources left their mark on the educational policy of the following decades too. Being one of the most voluminous study of British higher education, the famous Robbins Report (1963), addresses the economic as well as academic dimension of these regulations in detail. It also supports the Education Act of 1944, the initiator of the expansion in higher education system, since the report continued to gear education towards including the masses into the system. The essential objectives of the report are summarized in the conclusion part as follows:

> Our Report began with a statement of guiding principles. It postulated the need for a co-ordinated system of higher education; and it laid down the requirements that the system should provide for those who had the qualifications and the willingness to pursue higher education; that it should ensure equal academic awards for equal performance; that it should eliminate artificial differences of status and recognise hierarchy only in so far as it was based on function and attainment; that it should ensure ease of transfer for students, as well as freedom of development and flexibility of organisation for institutions; and finally, that it should encourage the cultivation of high excellence. (265)

As is understood, equality became the key word, so providing equal opportunities for the gifted and enthusiastic candidates in higher education was highlighted in the report. However, specifically the goal of providing autonomy and flexibility for the institutions of higher education proved contradictory with the search of standardization which was regarded as a way of unifying England's tripartite education system.

The report dealt with various problems in higher education, ranging from the necessity of training the educators to the insufficient number of universities capable of granting degrees to students. Not only the quality of the educators but also that of the students was among the discussed topics, so the need to develop comprehensive curriculums was underlined (5). The students who had the capacity to improve themselves had to be integrated into the system and they had to be guided properly to guarantee a mass of skilful graduates. "The recognition of individual achievement" (7) was specified under the guiding principles of the report, yet the criteria against which this achievement would be evaluated was a matter of controversy. Many of the initial aims could not be achieved in the short run, since they require a large-scale needs analysis and expertise. It also takes a longer time than expected to train liberal educators who are open to the idea of equality in education.

After its publication, researchers and critics of the time paid attention to the report and evaluated the feasibility of its requirements. For instance, The London School of Economics published *Shaping Higher Education: 50 Years after Robbins*, a book consisting of a collection of reviews on the report, in which various critics argue that the report became a road to mass education, yet it did not elaborate on through which criteria these masses would be evaluated, or what the unifying principle in practical teaching conditions would be. One of the reviewers of the

report, David Watson, a professor of higher education management, is very interested in the ethics and psychological conditions of the university as a workplace. He claims that education in England has become a mass education, but not a universal one, and argues that there are four main lenses through which the reasons of this failure should be inspected: "rates and types of participation, paying for it, legislative attempts at control, institutional dynamics" (33). In the first criterion, he refers to the profile of the higher education participants and questions whether the expansion includes individuals who have modest backgrounds and limited financial resources. In his second principle, he raises the issue of affordability of higher education for people of limited income. As for the legislations at control, he believes that general economic and social policies should be in harmony with the trends in education to create a universally appreciated system that is based on the philosophy of equal opportunity. He believes that there is a clash between the sociological dynamics of the English society and the educational policies that are recommended by the authorities, stating the existence of "the quality-wars and a discourse about world-classness that flatly contradicts most of the social and economic goals being set for higher education by regional and national strategies" (43). In other words, the competition created by the demand of high-quality in education forces the candidates and institutions to be in constant rivalry with each other. Therefore, in the last principle he deals with the demands of students as well as academics from different institutions, which complicates the situation for new participants. In such rush and turmoil, to create a fruitful teaching and learning atmosphere, or to provide equal opportunities for everyone is not possible, since the ultimate aim becomes creating appreciated, profitable, and renowned institutions rather than innovative or inspirational ones. The individuals trying to get degrees become victims of capitalism because the chief goal is to obtain profit out of the system.

Rowland Eustace also discusses the after-effects of this detailed report on the institutions of higher education, and points to the general restlessness resulting from the regulations brought by the report. He claims that the controversy arises due to the government's decision to transfer the responsibility of funding universities from the ministry of finance (the Treasury) to the ministry of Education

in 1964, so "the grant had to be extracted from a ministry concerned with the whole of education, and there was fear that universities would cease to receive special treatment" (Eustace 285). Indeed, the fears upon the issue are not groundless, since the facilities in local universities in providing students with good degrees was problematic in the sixties and the seventies. In this respect, Robbins report touched upon crucial defective points in higher education including the tripartite system (categorization of schools as grammar schools, technical schools and modern schools) mentioned in the analysis of *Lucky Jim*. By means of such a divided system, it became quite difficult for the inspection mechanisms, such as the external examination boards, to standardize the quality of education, and to formulate a national standard for higher education. After the sixties, the aim has been specifically to create common criteria against which all the universities are measured so that this standardization process would lessen the responsibility of the government and the ministry.

The studies in education policies gained momentum right before the publication of Bradbury's second campus novel, *The History Man*, and similar reports came one after another. James Report (1972), prepared by a committee appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, specifically focused on the area of teacher-training. It drew attention to "the difficulty of devising an acceptable national scheme for administering the education and training of teachers" (50). The idea was that the educators who were trained with a standard curriculum faced some adaptation problems when they needed to follow specific aims at their workplace. Before any other problems, the tripartite system prevented unity in terms of the various skills gained at these different types of schools, so to devise a common training scheme that would answer the needs of diverse institutions was far from being feasible in the short run. Therefore, the suggestion that England should have a unified teacher training system was not found attainable firstly because of the categorization in English higher education system. Although the report cannot find exact solutions to the problem of teacher-training, it opens up horizons in terms of pointing out the existence of such a problem. It also outlines a three-year teacher-training schedule that starts from the college years and gains intensity after graduation. William Taylor, in his article analysing the report,

emphasizes England's pioneer position in such teacher-training programs, and states "there wasn't any systematic study of teacher education in other countries" (299). Not having a reference point for their study complicates the plan for the committee, but the general outline presented by the report proved to be inspiring. Hence, the James Report is noteworthy in terms of shifting the focus from the problems of students to the condition of educators, which is a long-neglected perspective.

3.2 *Eating People is Wrong*

Bradbury's first campus novel *Eating People is Wrong* recounts the story of Professor Stuart Treece and a group of students who are as discordant and remote as himself to the academic environment. The whole book, except for his private affair with one of the post-graduate students, revolves around his static academic life, and his careful observation about the dysfunctional aspects of the English higher education system. Different from Amis's junior academic, Jim Dixon, this time the protagonist is a professor of English, who has achieved academic success at least in getting one of the highest academic degrees possible despite his humble background. The book opens with his "mannerism and seriousness," (9) the two qualities that attract the attention of both his students and colleagues.

The title of the book is also didactic and instructional - one should not eat his fellow men and women - the kind of warning that can be given by Treece who is, ironically, eaten up by academic power struggles and the momentum of the 1950s, mainly because of his reserved and inactive nature. In fact, the title alludes to the comic and ironic song "The Reluctant Cannibal" by Michael Flanders and Donald Swann. This song is in the form of a dialogue between two singers upon the necessity of eating people to survive. It implies that people cannot go on living without hurting each other and causing misery for the others. Furthermore, it suggests the futility of fighting with the system and trying to change it, so it foreshadows Treece's partial passivity in the face of cruelties in the academic circle. Gramscian concept "contradictory consciousness" is heavily observed in Treece's passive stance. Despite his title and success in academia, he does not voice many of his ideas and mostly prefers to be a silent observer due to his lower-class origins.

3.2.1 Post-War Academic Disillusionment

Professor Treece's solemnity in *Eating People is Wrong* is tied to the fact that his generation is the one "between the wars" (9). He is a socialist, but not an active one, since he is trapped in the routine life of an academic. His inability to act and his loss of academic inspiration are told in what follows: "His sense of identification with the advancing movement of the world had run short. Living in the provinces intensified the feeling. New terms and new students did not depress or excite him. A routine was now established" (10). From the very beginning, Treece is described as an academic who has lost his enthusiasm and ambition about his profession because of an unchallenging academic life and unpromising student profile in the provinces. Many students he encounters are in search of a satisfying job rather than intellectual achievement, so they do not even buy the textbooks. Such a disinterested bunch of students creates the feeling that he is wasting his time and energy. His undergraduates do not have the life experience to understand the debates in literature, so they cannot appreciate the instructor's attempts to create an atmosphere of fruitful discussion (11). At this point, he does not think of motivating his students. He merely chooses to be a keen observer of his academic surrounding as is implied in the epigraph from Epictetus[19] at the beginning of the novel. Epictetus asserts:

> Do I say man is not made for an active life? Far from it. But there is great difference between other men's occupations and ours. A glance at theirs will make it clear to you. All day long they do nothing but calculate, contrive, consult how to wring profit out of foodstuffs, farms, and the like. But I entreat you to understand what the administration and nature of the world is, and what a place being endowed with reason holds in it; to consider what you are as a person, and in what your good and evil consists. (*Eating People is Wrong* 7)

For Epictetus, instead of simply engaging in worldly profits, mankind needs to think about his actions and his place in the world by using his reason. In this respect, the novel problematizes the situation of an academic and his pursuit of materialistic goals, so the epigraph is another foreshadowing of Treece's observations as to the disinterestedness among academics and students.

[19] Epictetus is a Greek stoic philosopher who was born as a poor slave, and the quotation from him includes his stoic philosophy of giving up certain privileges in life to reach an understanding of the self.

For Treece, homo-academicus[20], the academic man, cannot bridge knowledge and experience in the current academic system. He inwardly despises the groundless theories of his fellow academics and questions the value of their alleged intellectual discussions. For instance, he silently watches Jenkins, a sociologist, talk about group dynamics, which he claims to be a new field of study. Jenkins gives examples from the experiments they design, "You know how you feel uncomfortable at parties if you have forgotten to fasten your flies," (23) and he talks about the necessity of using U or circular shape seating plans at conferences. Treece listens to him with boredom, and even asks a question to seem interested, yet he does not make any sense of his recommendations. After listening to Jenkins' theoretical explanations,

> He turned and looked around the room, with a mystified and oddly tired eye; if all the chairs had been filled with horses, instead of lecturers and professors taking coffee in their matitudinal quiet, it would have seemed no odder to him than the conversation from which he had just emerged, as from some long black tunnel…. Are there then people who do *that* and call it thought? (24)

The italicisation of *that* refers to Treece's reducing such academic discussions into an absurd conversation - also suggested with horses replacing lecturers - in which no one understands the other party, but keeps sharing his highly abstract ideas at the expense of the listener. The sharing of such theoretical and abstract ideas without any proper explanation by the speaker is not a brainstorming for Treece. It is unbelievable for him to call such absurd dialogues as "thought", since what they perform is simply verbosity rather than engaging in a thought-provoking discussion. The more he listens, the more he gets disillusioned, so his eyes are "mystified". As a matter of fact, what happens between Jenkins and Treece is hardly a conversation. Treece utters only a question out of politeness, and says in the end "I see," (24) which is quite ironic since he does not have the faintest clue about Jenkins's argument. He does this to dismiss all this nonsense, because unlike his colleagues, Treece is not a lover of circumlocution and remains silent when he does not have an interesting point. The discussion of the academics' impracticality in the face of real-life problems is also stated by Kingsley Amis, and the intellectuals in *Lucky*

[20] The title of Pierre Bourdieu's book (1988) in which he analyzes the forms of capital and power that shapes the system of French higher education, and creates a map of intellectual power dynamics.

Jim are portrayed as quite incompetent academics of their time. In this respect, Jenkins's nonsense theorizing is as useless as Jim Dixon's pseudo-scientific article, which he tries to publish because both of them include highly abstract and theoretical information which does not have any practical value even from their writers' or utterers' perspectives. As specified by the two famous reports of the time, these academics are products of an educational system that lacks unity and equal opportunities, which means not all of them have received proper education to be successful in their fields.

A further disillusionment for Treece is the snobbish attitude of the English academics towards international students, which he firstly observes during the departmental reception that brings the faculty staff and the international students together. As the advisor in charge of the international students, Treece feels that it is his mission to ease their process of cultural adaptation, so he organizes a reception to welcome the students and to create a friendly atmosphere in which students of different nationalities interact with one another. Nonetheless, as one of the English graduate students, Emma Fielding perceives, foreign students appear awkward to the English. Emma appreciates Treece's intention of guiding those foreigners, but shows her pity and contempt with these words:

> Poor man, he has tried to show us all that foreigners aren't funny; but they are. After all, there was one thing that every Englishman knew from his very soul, and that was that, for all experiences and all manners, in England lay the norm; England was the country that God had got to first, *properly*, and here life was taken to the point of purity, to its Platonic source, so that all ways elsewhere were underdeveloped, or impure, or overripe. (37)

In her evaluation of the foreigners, Emma directly reflects an ideology that claims a nationalistic superiority over other nations. She believes that England sets the standard for a lot of cultural practices, referring to it as the Platonic ideal. In other words, if other nations do not adjust themselves to the English criteria, they will remain flawed and ridiculous. When aligned with Emma's perspective, it seems Treece is the only believer of the richness of such cross-cultural interaction. For upper-class academics, those foreigners are an absurd and incapable bunch of people who cannot be taken seriously. This attitude of Emma is overtly prejudiced for Treece, so he takes charge of those students to refute the negative perception of his colleagues. The English perception of supremacy over other nations or the idea

that “The English lay the norm for all sorts of experiences” is a powerful dominant representation in English academia in Williams’s terms, because this old ideology of superiority is passed down to future generations and maintains its residue in a post-war provincial university. In his discussion of dominant, residual and emergent, Williams emphasizes this aspect of the residual, and specifies that residual cultural elements are formed in the past and maintain their existence in the present culture, though with proper adaptations and changes. By means of these adaptations, residual aspects become “an effective element of the present” (122). From one perspective, Emma, voices a centuries-old pride with Englishness that keeps its existence in a twentieth century English university.

The same disdaining perception has implications not only for foreign students, but also lower-class English students too. Since the upper-class is the defender of such aristocratic and elitist values, they display the same discriminatory attitude towards lower-class students and academics as well. For instance, the 26-year-old lower-class student, Louis Bates’ situation is another source of disappointment for Treece as he knows that the graduates of provincial universities have limited career opportunities. Bates used to be a girl’s school teacher and a librarian at a mental hospital, but could not become a permanent employee, so he decides to study in Treece’s department. Obviously, Bates is one of those unemployed young people perceiving education as a last resort before reaching his thirties. Treece believes that each year he sends out to the world “a group of discontented men…. and he foresaw the profound depression of spirit that would overcome such people when, with too few vacancies in the faculties of universities, … they would find themselves working in the advertisement departments of soap factories” (12). Unfortunately, the graduates of English departments are confined to what the capitalist system offers them instead of becoming specialists in their own fields. Bates defines himself after Treece’s introductory first class with these words: “I believe in application and self-training, I am self-made…. I am a poor man; I have no money to spend on amusements; it all goes on books, what there is of it” (17). Bates, in this quote, clarifies that his belief in hard work as a form of existence differentiates him from other students in Treece’s class. However, unlike Treece, he is not aware of the fact that university education or hard-work does not

necessarily mean permanent employment for many desperate young people of the 1950s.

3.2.2 Class and Hegemony

As partially discussed in the background of *Lucky Jim*, the formation of a new academic community is an inevitable outcome of the combination of the socio-economic forces of the fifties. The inclusion of people from different classes into higher education and the community that rises out of this policy suggest the creation of an amalgam in which the dominant and the emergent come together. A hybrid academic society is controversial firstly due to a rooted class-antagonism. The transformation of the lower class through education is only functional via economic policies which are parallel to the educational ones. As mentioned in the theoretical chapter, academia is built upon a very hierarchical structure, and the promotion from one title to the other seems to depend on not only individual attainment, but also a social network that supports and appreciates this achievement. Janice Rossen, in her book *The University in Modern Fiction: When Power is Academic*, evaluates these power-dynamics and gives a list of the negative aspects of universities with specific references to campus novels. She asserts, "the university can be a place of exclusion and marginalization, rife with class consciousness, misogyny, competition, and xenophobia" (7). Within this atmosphere, the lower-class academic lacks the required social network and status at the beginning of his career, so all he can do is to maintain and cherish the established system to find a place for himself in it. In this respect, Treece questions his own situation and what it means to be a lower-class humanities professor in the 1950s, and comes up with an evaluation which is quite class-conscious: "To be a professor, of the humanities, at a provincial university, in England, in the nineteen-fifties, was a fate whose rewards were all internal, for in the matter of social status he was small enough beer" (45). Education in its own right is not enough to provide respect for the lower-class academic, he needs a rich family, an Oxford or Cambridge degree to mean more than a "small beer" in the social class system. Mathew Arnold, Althusser and Gramsci discuss the vitality of systematic education starting in early childhood to specialize in one's field and become an expert, and expertise is supposed to advance the social status of a person, especially after the Second World War. Ken Hirschkop

refers to T.S Eliot's ideas on this point stating: "Education replaced the idea of inherited power and prestige with the concept of the trained expert and the elite, who ruled by virtue of superior talent, honed and proven by formal educational achievement" (457). However, Treece is not depicted as a powerful academic ruling by the prestige of his talent. The fact that he gains a highly prestigious academic title does not alleviate his feeling of insecurity. He feels under constant pressure since the opportunity of systematic education for the masses is a threat to the class-system from the perspective of the higher-class academics, and the antagonism between the academic who traditionally holds the power, and the one who tries to rise economically and socially through higher education is generally at the background.

Unlike his inexperienced and young students, Treece knows that only talent is not enough to climb the social ladder. In other words, the traditional intellectuals, or the elites will always render the process more difficult for the organic intellectuals like Treece from Gramsci's perspective. The professor with his lower-class origins and his academic title is a threat to the traditional intellectuals in his institution. Indeed, every organic intellectual who has a claim on moving up the social ladder is perceived as dangerous by the established members of the academia. His lower-class student Bates is a proper example of the insufficiency of talent on its own terms. Despite being a talented poet, whose poems are published in a leading literary magazine with the help of an author of campus fiction, Carey Willoughby (224), Bates is never appreciated by his peers and instructors. During class discussions, Bates challenges Treece and asks controversial questions, which makes Treece think that he just tries to attract attention and assert himself rather than stimulating genuine intellectual discussion. From Treece's viewpoint Bates is another ambitious young man who does not know how to channel his ambition, and all his struggles of self-assertion is an expectation of help from Treece. Though Treece is conscious of Bates's disadvantaged situation as a lower-class student, he does not attempt to raise his student's awareness of the situation. At this point, it is questionable whether Treece is the ideal person to be consulted due to his passivity resulting from his sense of disillusionment. In that sense, the author Carey Willoughby who also comes from lower-class, takes more initiative than Treece by

helping Bates publish his poems. The fact that Treece does not take any action despite his observations of Bates's misery reminds Gramcsi's contradictory consciousness, which leads the lower-class into a dichotomy specifically when he needs to choose between the values of his own class and the one he wants to integrate in. In other words, by remaining silent about the problems of a lower-class student, he, in one sense, prefers the comfort of being in agreement with his superiors and colleagues rather than risking his own position and image in his academic circle. Unlike the outspoken Willoughby, he is generally not a man of hot debates and conflicts, but rather a peacekeeper. To use Williams' terminology, Bates is the representative of emergent values within academia, a figure who is subjected to the attempts of incorporation into the dominant at every opportunity. Treece is conscious of the difficulty of the acceptance of emergent values in academia, and, from his perspective, Bates is not fully aware of the precariousness of his situation. As a result of the long years spent in academia, Treece is mature and experienced enough to know that only hard work will not solve Bates's problems.

Due to his serious attitude and diligence, people reckon that Treece is a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge, but actually he is from the University of London, which is another prestigious university, though not as famous as "Oxbridge". Graduation from such a prestigious university together with his diligence is enough to provide him with a career path that reaches to professorship. As the narrator recounts: "He had gone to university not to make good contacts, or to train his palate, or refine his accent, but rather to get a good degree" (46). From the very beginning, Treece is focused on being academically successful and completing his degree with the highest possible score rather than seeking network and socialization. His morality and self-discipline makes his colleagues assume that he also comes from an upper-class family. However, his background and social class is summarized as follows: "In fact, his father had had a wallpaper shop, and when, once, he had told his father that it was wrong that people's relationships should be those of buyers and sellers, his father had gazed at him blankly. What else could they be?" (47). As a man of trade his father's evaluation of all human relationships in terms of commercial ties is surprising for the young Treece, yet the bitterness of

his father's logic becomes clearer for him as he becomes a middle-aged man. In the face of capitalism, some of his idealism is lost, and he becomes a liberal man, with no rigorous political affiliations. When evaluated in terms of its outcomes, Treece's apolitical and compromising attitude provide him with a respectable academic title, unlike Jim Dixon whose incompatible and pretentious attitude causes him to lose his position. Therefore, it can be suggested that class-antagonism at the university is only resolved by the submission of the lower class to the hegemony of the upper class.

Treece positions himself as a lover of all kinds of people with a peaceful attitude with such words: "It is well I am a liberal, and can love all men, for if I were not, I doubt if I could (29). He maintains this flexible attitude in his professional relationships with his colleagues and students, yet he is still sensitive to his upper-class colleagues' injustice against Louis Bates. His confrontation with the eccentric Louis Bates reminds him of his own unpopularity and poverty "with holes in his underpants and not a change of socks to call his own" (47) during his school years. Since he remembers the difficulties that is caused by his poor background, Treece genuinely believes that students like Bates need to be looked after, and runs the risk of receiving heavy criticism by defending Bates while the others humiliate him. During a gathering in his colleagues, Viola and Tanya's house, Dr. Adrian Carfax, an academic with a military background, implies the eccentricity of some of Bates' behaviour saying: "Louis Bates is a wild, untutored genius. In my humble opinion, he should stay untutored…. We cannot carry everyone else" (95). Carfax believes that people like Bates are a burden with their oddities, and it is not their duty to guide those students. Carfax's attitude is also an example of "xenophobia[21]" emphasized by Janice Rossen in the introductory chapter. The same hateful and discriminatory attitude has also been observed in Jim Dixon's case since he is perceived as an outsider and excluded from academia. Upon his colleagues' insensitive remarks, Treece shouts aggressively, "I think that's a shameful plea! Truly, what do we live for? ... Caring is our role (95). Treece clarifies that he does not share the same indifferent attitude with his colleagues and states his willingness to help Bates with these words: "I don't mean to let him go….

[21] *Cambridge Dictionary*: "extreme dislike or fear of foreigners, their customs, their religions, etc".

He needs looking after" (95). None of the upper-class academics expects such an outburst from a restrained man like Treece, because they are nearly sure that Treece will take their side and shun Bates for being what he is, and help them get rid of the student. Nonetheless, Treece opposes them with the intuition of remaining loyal to his own kind. In this respect, he goes through Gramsci's contradictory consciousness, and cannot hide his attachment to his lower-class background despite having a respectable reputation among upper-class academics. However, it is the only reaction from Treece throughout the whole novel, since the rest of his academic life is spent in silence and obedience. This one-time cathartic sensation does not change his following passive attitude, as he refrains from putting his ideas into practice and watches Bates' exclusion and misery.

As it is indicated in the analysis of the title, the academic community literally "eats" people who do not conform to its established values. Treece knows that remaining in the university is a battle of survival for people like Bates, it is a way to get job opportunities and earn a living. The upper-class academics know that an argument that is simply based on Bates's eccentricity and class will again be opposed by Treece, so they accuse Bates of neglecting his assignments as a student. Bates faces a great deal of peer pressure too; after his invitation is rejected by Emma, he has to go to the Christmas Ball alone. A student, knowing Bates is alone at the party, publicly humiliates him when Bates says, "I am looking for my partner". He responds: "Try the river," (148) suggesting Bates to commit suicide. This is also a foreshadowing of Bates' committing suicide at the end of the novel although he is saved. Through such severe forms of alienation, both the academics and his peers eat him up and destroy his chance to exist in the academia. From Gramci's perspective, the possibility of his becoming an organic intellectual is destroyed due to class antagonism, and his chances of serving his own class and community are usurped. As for the emergent values he represents, they are not embraced by the dominant ideology and its representatives since the existence of such values means questioning the practices of the dominant ideology. This discussion brings into mind T.S Eliot's ideas in *Notes Toward the Definition of Culture* upon the role of education in shaping culture and his implication that education is a threat to the social class system. From his perspective, if the power

of education replaces the idea of inherited power, the whole class system will suffer incurably (104). In other words, if one's professional degree comes to mean more than his class, there will be no need for a revolution for the lower-class because they will gradually replace the bourgeoisie or even the aristocracy. Nevertheless, victory will not come as easily as it is implied by Eliot, for the upper-class academics are quite aware of the threat and fight for the maintenance of the system as is seen in Bradbury's novels.

As mentioned earlier, from Gramsci's perspective, the ambiguity of the lower class academic's social status is a disturbing situation for the academic, and causes him to falter in his choice of attitude towards other members of the academia. The tension of being constantly under the gaze of those upper-class people who watch for an opportunity to marginalize Treece damages his physical and mental stability. As a successful and hardworking professor, he has already proven his adequacy within the academia, yet he ends up in a hospital and is diagnosed with a serious form of ulceration, a highly stress-related illness. During his long stay in the hospital, Emma comes to apologize for her cruel way of rejecting Treece's marriage offer. Nevertheless, Emma believes Treece emotionally exploits people, expects sympathy, but he does not have any success in human relationships, and does not have deep feelings towards them. He literally lacks the capacity to form emotional attachment with people. He does many things just to gain sympathy and appreciation, which appears to be a parasitical behaviour from an external perspective. His excessive form of self-denial is summarized as follows: "All his life, Treece had been doing things that he did not exactly want to do, journeying off on holidays he had no intention of taking, watching plays he did not wish to see, playing sports he detested, simply because someone had gone the trouble to persuade him, simply because he felt they *cared*, simply…well, simply because he could not say *no*" (129). In this respect, coming from a class which has long been neglected, being cared for plays a central role in Treece's relationships. Upon Emma's criticism, Treece becomes aware of his emotional dryness, and accepts he is "simply parasitic on other people" (219). He also confesses his "inability to form proper relationships" despite his tendency to ponder about these relationships for all his life. He tries to compensate for his class-based disadvantage by assuming a

humble and flexible attitude. In other words, he believes that the only way to be in harmony with these upper-class people is to conform to their rules and regulations. Creating conflict is not a proper way of building academic relationships for Treece, especially in his socially disadvantaged position.

As mentioned earlier, "contradictory consciousness" hinders Treece to form healthy relationships with his colleagues because being appreciated by his colleagues and friends precludes him from expressing his own wishes and ideas. To a certain extent he is not that much different from Amis's Jim Dixon, who cannot tell his ideas about upper-class academics, and applies to petty tricks to mock them. Though Treece is not as conniving and tricky as Jim, he also keeps his opinion to himself in his professional life resulting from the same class-based apprehension. Unfortunately, Treece's subservient attitude renders him unsympathetic in the eyes of his upper class colleagues, so he is rejected or avoided by them. In that sense, he is not different from his student Louis Bates despite academic talents and position. The reason of this class-based inferiority is that both Treece and Bates lack a lot of opportunities and network which upper-class people have as their birth right. As discussed in the *Lucky Jim* chapter, being conscious of this class-based disadvantage, they feel incomplete in their human relationships, and find it hard to express their own ideas and exist as self-sufficient individuals. This feeling of incompleteness directly corresponds to Raymond Williams's detection about the painful process that the emergent goes through. This process is not only socially and economically challenging, it is also psychologically a difficult one, and *Eating People is Wrong* brings this aspect to light with the vulnerable psychologies of a lower-class academic, and his lower-class student.

3.2.3 Criticism of Capitalist Policies in Higher Education

The financial difficulties that a lower-class academic goes through is obvious as in the example of professor Treece's poverty, which he confesses is also also the reason for his unpopularity among women. As Marx specifies in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, "Political economy knows the worker only as a working animal - as a beast reduced to the strictest bodily needs" (29). The fact that a professor who works at a provincial university in England suffers from serious budget problems confirms this Marxist criticism. Louis

Althusser also suggests it is difficult for lower-class to maintain their existence in the education system, and argues "somewhere around the age of sixteen, a huge mass of children are ejected into production" (251) without completing their education or even passing to the next level which is higher education. And the first social group that falls out of the education system is the lower class. From this perspective, individuals like professor Treece are exceptional members of their social class in that they somehow managed to stay in the system for a long time.

The first chapter of *Eating People is Wrong* includes the Vice-Chancellor's heavily capitalist attitude towards academic practices. He does not believe in the contribution of universities in the practical solution of social and economic problems. As a businessman, he thinks that academics, whom he calls "woolly-minded," (25) have no understanding of business unlike him. The choice of the adjective indicates that academics are not quick-minded in terms of business. It can also refer to the academic's confused state of mind, reminding once again the Gramscian concept of "contradictory consciousness which does not permit of any action, any decision or any choice, and produces a condition of moral and political passivity" (333). This inertia is directly linked to the mental state of the lower-class academics like Treece as he does not know what his principles of action should be. The struggle to find a middle course ends in misery and failure for Treece. The Vice-chancellor, as the representative of the dominant capitalist ideology, is not aware of the nature of academic studies such as search for knowledge or aesthetics, so he puts all the academics in the same pot. From this capitalist point of view, those, especially in the humanities, are a body of people that cannot be utilized as a workforce. Most of the time, what the academics produce, such as articles, reviews, and books do not have any exchange value in the capitalist system. Therefore, they are viewed as the unnecessary rings in the capitalist chain even from the perspective of a senior academic.

For Raymond Williams, in an advanced form of capitalism, the dominant culture can reach even "reserved areas of experience," (126) so universities, being such areas, are also under the pressure of the dominant capitalist ideology. The existence of such capitalist academics as the Vice-Chancellor is an example of the penetration of the ruling ideology into the universities. Williams also believes,

"much incorporation looks like recognition, acknowledgement, and thus a form of acceptance;" (125) therefore the unresponsiveness of the lower-class academics, as in Treece's case, can be confused with acceptance of the dominant culture and its ideology. At this point, whether it is possible to talk about willingness in Treece's academic stance needs to be questioned. Is he a liberal by choice, or is it something he adopts as a survival strategy?

In this respect, Treece's attitude towards the foreign students at his university is explanatory of his stance. The novel has references to international students' being a form of income for provincial universities, and those students' satisfaction means gaining a profit out of them. Treece is assigned to be the advisor of a group of international students, for he is thought to have the common sense to understand such students' problems, which connotes that his neutral stance is recognized as a positive skill by the capitalist administration of his university. The West-African student, Eborebelosa assumes that he is the owner of the student lodging and calls it "my house" (28) because of the money he pays. As the son of a tribal chief, he also expects the same respect and obedience that is shown by the more inferior members of his tribe from his classmates and acts insolently towards them. He even demands his classmates to bring gifts to him. As his advisor, Treece patiently explains the differences in code of conduct to the student, and clarifies that in England people gain respect through their kind behaviour (29). If indeed the student wants to be loved and accepted, according to Treece, he should be kind to people. He finds many of Eborebolesa's inclinations, like having four wives in his country, unbearable and anti-humanistic, yet, paradoxically, he tries to convince the student to understand another culture's dynamics and values. He is, in a sense, well aware of the fact that being liberal provides him a chance of survival within the academia and since the administration uses his stance for their own capitalist interest of making the international students happy.

Another reason that motivates Treece to undertake such a responsibility lies in his tendency to identify himself with those foreign students. Being not familiar with the university's system, those students, especially during their first year, look for people who can sympathize with them, and guide them. They feel lost in the face of an unknown culture and educational system. After Treece learns that his

favourite graduate student, Emma, has rejected Eborebolesa's marriage offer, he feels resentment on the student's behalf. He ponders, "Why had he been feeling so offended? As if it was he who had been rejected? ... His motives were far from pure; it was his protest on behalf of the international spirit, his cry for foreign races, that he felt had been turned down" (58). Internally, Treece accepts himself as the defender of the international and liberal spirit that embraces different types of people and ideas, so Emma's rejection of the international student seems to be the denial of Treece's liberal mode of thinking.

This humanistic stance of Treece, in fact, is a suggestion of what Williams argues: "self-identification with a dominant ideology" (118) which serves the purpose of hegemony. Treece persuades himself that his motives are internal and humanistic, yet he tutors those foreign students as the administration gives importance to the money that those students pay for their education. Though indirectly, he serves to the purpose of the capitalist administration and their ideology. Due to the partial internalization of this ideology, Treece initially fails to understand that Emma rejects Eborebolesa's marriage offer simply because she does not want an intimate relationship with a person who does not meet her expectations from a relationship. As Emma is the defender of dominant ideology, and British superiority over other nations, her rejection must result from racist reasons for Treece. Nonetheless, it is a matter of personal choice rather than a political one. After a bit of thinking, he becomes aware of the hypocrisy of his viewpoint: "Like so many liberals, he had conceived of actions in terms of ideas, when there was nothing in the action but pure action. As soon as he observed the treacherous nature of the moral stance he had taken, he bathed in apology" (58). In other words, he understands that a young woman can reject a man simply on the basis of her individual taste. As a former scholarship student, Treece has remained in the education system long enough to be exposed to the dominant ideology, but did not totally lose the consciousness to question the incorrectness of his expectation from Emma. In a sense, he is stuck in between a humanitarian stance and a capitalist one, and his passivity results from "contradictory consciousness" in Gramsci's terms. Practically, he needs the money provided by the university to

sustain his life, so he cannot challenge their system and reject the expectations of the university administration.

The capitalist policies are also evaluated from the perspective of a writer, Mr Carey Willoughby, whom Treece invites to his university as a speaker, and introduces as "one of the so-called novelists of the movement," (193) referring to the Angry Young Men movement. During the dinner at the Vice Chancellor's residence, some academics imply that they may appear in Willoughby's next campus novel, so the writer reacts vehemently by stating that he is a full-time teacher, and there is no possibility of writing another novel unless intellectuals buy original copies of his work, and he demands payment for his train-tickets (204). The emphasis upon his being a full time teacher corresponds to Marx's suggestions on "voracious appetite for surplus labour" (344). In his *Capital*, he emphasizes that all the employers target making use of the labourer at his/her maximum capacity, forcing the worker's physical and mental limits, yet providing insufficient income in return for this toil. At this point, the author underlines that he works a lot, but is not provided with enough money to survive. The writer's attitude is also an open criticism of the academics who only want to be the focus of attention, and do not empathise with the financial difficulties that a writer goes through. He reacts: "You don't know what it is to have money matter to you, because you have it. I used to go into cafes, once, and have a meal and then walk out without paying, because if I hadn't done that I would have starved" (204). His complaint corresponds to the government policy of the fifties when the control of academic grants and funds was given to the University Grants Committee (Eustace 285), and serious budget cuts forced universities to demand a heavy teaching load from the academics. Since many authors needed to teach full-time to sustain their lives, the amount of time they spared for their academic research or publications decreased. Such capitalist policies influence not only their financial well-being but also their prolificacy. Willoughby assumes that those people do not have the faintest clue about such hardships due to their advantageous social status.

3.2.4 The Duality of Normality and Abnormality

The question of normality or how one looks normal and compatible in the academic circle is problematized in the novel. The duality between madness and sanity is firstly mentioned with reference to the university building's being a former asylum. As the narrator states,

> The town lunatic asylum was proving too small to accommodate those unable to stand up to the rigours of the new world, and a larger building was planned. It was not big enough for an asylum, then; but it was big enough for a university college. So, as Treece frankly admitted, it became an asylum of another kind; great wits are thus to madness near allied. There were still bars over the windows; there was nowhere you can hang yourself. (20)

The implication here is that the university building was once used to cure mentally unstable people, who could not cope with the changes brought by the developing world, in the town, and it started to become physically too small for the rising number of such people. However, in its use as a faculty building, it has not gone under much restoration and keeps some of its physical features like bars in the windows, which connotes that just like the mad people, academics are also isolated from the daily city life. And the phrase "great wits are thus to madness near allied" [22]implies that intellectuals of the university are in a sense equated with mad people. It may also connote that intellectuals are dangerous, and need to be kept in a closed area due to their tendency to raise the consciousness of the society with their though-provoking theories and ideas, which may be perceived as a threat to the dominant ideology, specifically when these academics reject the traditional hierarchical structure at the universities.

The epithet from Keats's "Ode on A Grecian Urn", on the very first page of the book, foreshadows this implication of madness in the academic circle with these lines: "What mad pursuit? What struggle to escape?" (1). The mad pursuit can also be interpreted as the struggle of the lower-class academic to find a place for himself in the established academic circle. During the process, he constantly feels under the intense pressure of the upper-class practices and customs, and the struggle becomes much harder, for the upper-class academics metaphorically hunt the lower-class to maintain their own existence. Essentially, the desire to stay in the academic circle

[22] The phrase is originally found in the satirical poem, "Absalom and Achitophel", by the 17th century poet John Dryden.

is a mad pursuit for the upper-class academics in the novel, too, since they give up much of the comforts and amusements in daily life to realize their goals of becoming a distinguished academic at least in their immediate community.

Treece's perception of his institution as an asylum draws attention to the historical continuity of the idea of locking dysfunctional people in a closed area with the aim of healing them, which Michel Foucault studies in his book *Madness and Civilization.* From his perspective, societies gather people who are out of work, unemployed, and use their physical power for the welfare of the rest of the nation. He asserts "It was no longer merely a question of confining those out of work, but of giving work to those who had been confined and thus making them contribute to the prosperity of all" (51). Therefore, the aim of the asylum, which is transforming all these potentially useless people into a workforce, turns out to be a very capitalist motive. From Foucault's perspective, labour is supposed to abolish poverty (53), nevertheless, the work produced in the asylums does not contribute to the welfare of those confined people. The Marxist argument that the isolation of the workers from their work can be directly observed for the labourers in the asylums. Although these people are expected to contribute to the general welfare of the society, they cannot benefit from the outcomes of their own work. Within this context, to regard the university as another asylum, as is implied in the novel, is to suggest that the whole institution is full of mentally-unstable people from whose labour the society will benefit. The Vice-Chancellor's evaluation of his own colleagues as a lazy and confused bunch of people is a suggestion that these people have no use-value in the society. This assumption also requires that the members of the academia need to prove their normality periodically, if not, they are put out of the system.

Apart from the building, there are also implications that Treece and a bunch of his students are misfits in the academic circle which is repeated throughout the book through subtle references to their strange and unnatural tendencies and qualities such as Eborebolesa's hiding in the toilet cabinets, Bates's refusal to take regular baths and giving off a disturbing odour, and Treece's clumsiness during conversations with the opposite sex. Metaphorically, though, the body of people that the building hosts now display the same strange and incompatible tendencies as those in the asylum. Such abnormality is also reinforced by the fact that both

Treece and Bates end up in a hospital. His hospitalization connotes that he is one of those people who cannot actually adapt into the capitalist dynamics of the new educational system, which requires taking a political stance that supports the maintenance of the status quo.

Among all these misfits, Louis Bates is the one whose normality is under close inspection due to his strange behaviours such as offering his own cough syrup to the lecturer in the middle of the session, or cutting his hair in an academic's living room, and the disturbing odour he gives off. Bates is quite desperate due to being shunned and excluded by the upper-class academics and his classmates. After his unsuccessful educational life and being rejected by Emma, Bates attempts to commit suicide, so he is put in a mental hospital for rehabilitation. Emma has an interesting explanation about Bates' exclusion from the society, and shares it first with Bates and then with Treece since she believes that what leads Bates to suicide is partially her harsh criticism: "I told him what he was, how people saw him…. He was other people's scapegoat, you know, a whipping boy, the one they spanked when the prince was naughty so that wrong shouldn't go unpunished (247). Emma, in a way, summarizes the humiliating and discriminatory attitude of the upper-class academics towards Bates with the prince metaphor. She actually implies that upper-class people use all the weaknesses of the lower-class to wear down those people mentally, to worsen their adaptation process. In fact, the information that Bates once served in a mental hospital before his university education coincides with his state and foreshadows his ending up in a mental hospital after the suffering he endures at the university. The fact that he is avoided by other academics because of his eccentricities highlights the criterion of normality to exist in the academia.

Treece discovers that abnormality is used by the upper-class as a weapon against the lower-class, especially in Louis Bates' case. Professor Treece openly questions the relative meaning of normal and abnormal, and claims that people label those that do not fit into their upper-class norms as abnormal. Therefore, the only moment he gets angry and out of control in the novel is the time when he defends Bates's rights as was discussed before. An academic at the university, Viola, claims, Bates has the potential of doing someone harm. Upon this Treece responds:

> Nonsense, Viola; he's not psychopathic. It isn't that kind of derangement at all, as far as I see it. Madness, genius, and originality - it's all the same thing; it is a

> breaking of our normal value structure and the substitution of another one. In a sense, we all do this. He's simply an original; he is no wilder than that. His delusions don't prevent him from living in the ordinary, everyday world; he isn't that severely impaired. (93)

His explanation about Bates's mental state is full of words (psychopathic, derangement, madness, wild, delusion, impaired) that are related to madness, so Treece's mastery over the terminology of madness is also noteworthy. Sounding like a psychiatrist, he analyses Bates' situation and even provides a partial diagnosis of it. Nonetheless, he defends Bates not because he loves him, but because he strongly empathizes with his exclusion by the academic society, and is also aware of the fact that upper-class academics have also their own oddities: Viola and Tanya have a circle of friends who have naturalist tendencies and support an organic way of life, so they make their own bread, prefer home-produced honey or even use "organic curtains". Such tendencies are interpreted as originality when it is performed by the upper-class.

Trecee knows, as a man of literature, there are a lot of geniuses who are expelled from traditional schools of thought on the basis of their oddities, which intensifies his resentment to being eaten up by the upper-classes. Even his own field, literature, has the example of "Shelley's indictment of Oxford" (140). During one of his lectures, Treece recounts Percy Bysshe Shelley's story[23] to his students by quoting his exact words, "Oxonian society was too insipid to me, uncongenial with my habits of thinking. I could not descend to common life; the sublime interest of poetry, lofty and exalted achievements, the proselytism of the world, the equalization of its inhabitants were to be the soul of my soul" (140). He shares Shelley's story intentionally to stir awareness and empathy in Bates, and to awaken him about the dilemma of his own situation. Bates feels quite motivated by the story because he sees right through the parallelism between his own situation and Shelley's: "Shelley had been an oddity, just like Bates; and at school and university they had called him what Carfax, what they all had called Bates - mad" (140). The same academia keeps labelling the nonconformists as mad because diagnosis of this

[23] "Shelley was expelled from Oxford (1810) along with his friend Thomas Jefferson Hogg for refusing to deny authorship of a pamphlet entitled *The Necessity of Atheism*, which includes atheism, vegetarianism, free love, and political radicalism". (victorianweb.org)

mental state in a person means questioning his intellectual capacity, which is a primary tool to rise academically. The border between normality and abnormality, sanity and insanity should be carefully defined especially for the lower-class academics as their situation is a lot more precarious within the established academic system. One does not have to be a great mind like Shelley to be dismissed; even ordinary people like Bates face exclusion on the basis of their oddities or originality.

Additionally, Treece's reticence is also interpreted as "abnormality" by the people in the "Literary Society", which is a group of fanciful people who meet monthly to discuss the prosecution of good literature. Treece specifically chooses to socialize in literary societies in which fancifulness or eccentricity are more welcome than not. However, because of his passivity and shyness, in such gatherings he prefers to be the person who introduces the speakers rather than being the speaker. He gets on the stage for a very short while, gives the necessary biographical information about the speaker, and then retires to his corner without further involvement in the debates. Such shyness and fear of public speech is also not accepted as normal by the other members of the academia, since they expect him to be more outspoken as a person of literature and as a lecturer. A woman from the Literary Society sits next to him after the speech, and asks him: "It is terrible to be abnormal. Did you have an unhappy childhood?" and he answers, "I had an unhappy maturity," (39) meaning the period that corresponds to his higher education and academic life. Treece feels quite over-exposed and disturbed upon the woman's comments on personal issues like marriage, but explains that he keeps asking women to marry him, but somehow, they reject him on the basis of his poverty: "I don't seem to have the attributes women like in a man - a car, a television set, you know" (42). He underlines the fact that even the chances of getting married is strictly tied to one's financial well-being, which he lacks from the very beginning because of his poor familial background. Therefore, he clarifies that his loneliness is not a matter of preference but an inevitability to prove his normality to his society. The professor also knows that as a man over his forties, the declaration of unwillingness about marriage will not sound normal to the people around him. As discussed, the notion of normality and class go hand in hand since upper class uses abnormality to exclude people who are not compatible with their norms and values.

Finally, Treece declares that his type of "intellectual purity and liberalism" (173) is bound to die under the crushing power of capitalism. His declaration of his own end comes with these words:

> But those who live by liberalism shall perish by the liberalism. Their own lack of intransigence, their inevitable effeteness, betrayed them. Already liberal intellects like his own found themselves on the periphery. The end was coming, as people like him had less and less of a social function, and were driven out into an effete and separate world of their own, to the far edge of alienation. (173)

Treece brings a very heavy criticism to his liberalism and passivity and points to the advent of a new type of academic who can take initiative. He feels that his pure search for knowledge and aesthetics or his discipline and hard-work are self-motivating aspects that only serve his own personal satisfaction. However, he is not the type of academic calculating the wider-scale effects of his ideas and beliefs; he hardly shares his principles let alone motivating his students to follow them. From the very beginning till the end, he remains a passive observer of his university, his students and his colleagues. Although he has the necessary knowledge and insight, he simply does not take any action for the survival of his own kind. Therefore, the type of intellectual of which he is the representative becomes gradually obsolete or eaten up to use Bradbury's terms. Treece not only fails to save himself but also Bates from a miserable exclusion. Desperation and loneliness draw Bates to the verge of nervous breakdown, so commits suicide. Although he survives from the suicide attempt, he does not have the strength to remain in higher education. In this respect, Bates is obviously a good example of the arduous process that "the emergent" goes through in academia, his vulnerable situation in front of the dominant ideology and its norms is laid bare thanks to his final discouragement and withdrawal.

3.3 *The History Man*

Bradbury's second campus novel, *History Man* includes references to the problems of higher education including external examiners, insufficient physical conditions of provincial universities, a problematic student-teacher profile, and unfair competition created by means of capitalist ideology. The references to the financial hardships that the academics go through, and to the limited opportunities of employment for new graduates in *Lucky Jim* and *Eating People is Wrong* can

also be found in *History Man*, this time the emphasis being on the rivalry among the academics to achieve fame and prestige. The novel mainly recounts the story of a lower-class sociology instructor, Howard Kirk, who teaches at a fictitious provincial university, University of Watermouth, and highlights his radical Marxist stance in the face of the social problems of his time, such as high inflation, traffic, women's repression, abortion or social injustice of any kind. The Kirks are both scholarship-students, and local grammar school[24] graduates and face many of these problems starting from their school years. Despite being young, and at the beginning of his career, Howard is quite famous in his community due to his rigorous efforts and active participation in the problems of his immediate surroundings. The narrator describes Howard Kirk as:

> A radical sociologist, a small, bright, intense, active man, of whom you are likely to have heard, for he is much heard of. He is on television a good deal, and has written two well-known and disturbing books, urging new mores, a new deal for man; he has had a busy, literary summer, and a third book is on its way. He also writes articles in the papers, and he lectures at the local new university… (3)

Howard's interest in the social problems of his area, his academic prolificacy, his inspirational ideas and lifestyle are in stark contrast to Treece's detachment, political neutrality, loneliness and passivity. The protagonist of *Eating People is Wrong* has already announced Howard's advent by declaring the immediate non-progressiveness of his own neutral and apolitical stance.

History Man, as Bradbury himself evaluates in his interview with Istvan D. Racz, carries the traces of the general restlessness and discontent of the mid-seventies in England. In his evaluation of the decade, he declares: "In the mid-1970s Britain was in the middle of a mess; the oil crisis, a balance of payment crisis, a government that seems to have lost control over social problems, and then in 1978 there was a winter of discontent. The trade unions began to break with the labour government" (100). As it is understood from Bradbury's evaluation, people started to voice their distrust of the labour government, which failed to carry its economic plan of creating welfare for all classes, specifically by expanding the number of

[24] There are also prestigious grammar schools, but the local ones are generally short of finance and professional teaching staff. For further information about the state and student profile of these schools, see: Professor David Jesson's article "The Creation, Development and Present State of Grammar Schools in England" published by University of York.

trained people. This discontent and distrust urged the lower class to look for alternative ways of representation, preferably more radical ones as they gave up their hopes about the Welfare State's policies. In the political arena, rather than distancing themselves from the bigger political and social problems, the lower class preferred to be at the centre of them through strikes and public protests. This atmosphere is also represented in Bradbury's second campus novel.

To be concise, in the novel, Howard's popularity and the insincerity of his alleged working-class philosophy are problematized through the abuse of his academic position. As a lower-class academic, Howard voices his so-called Marxist stance at every possibility, but there are serious deficiencies in the practical application of his socialist ideas both in his academic and private life mainly due to the popularization of the counter culture that he represents. In other words, Kirk confuses counter-culture with the obsession of being different, and lives in an illusion. The whole novel ironically describes the transformation of a lower-class academic into a bourgeois one despite the socialist image he desires to maintain. Therefore, the transformation of the counter-culture into a popular or a capitalist one will also be discussed in detail. Finally, Howard Kirk's case as an 'emergent' will be evaluated in comparison to the previously analysed lower-class protagonists.

3.3.1 Hegelian Dialectic: Class and Hegemony

When analysed from Gramsci's perspective, Howard Kirk is a successful organic intellectual who really achieves moving up the social ladder by fighting against the traditional intellectuals in his institution. From the beginning of the novel, the lower-class origin of "The Kirks" is highlighted with an emphasis that both Howard and his wife Barbara need to work very hard to obtain a prestigious position in society. Their humble background is summarized as follows:

> The Kirks, both of them, grew up, in a grimmer, tighter north, in respectable upper working-class cum lower middle-class backgrounds. […] Howard was that conventional product of his circumstances and his time, the fifties: the scholarship boy, serious and severe, well-read in the grammar school library, bad at games and humanity, who had got into Leeds University, in 1957, by pure academic effort. (18)

By virtue of the hardships that he went through as a lower-class individual, Howard is quite aware of social inequalities as in his observation of the shopping assistant in the supermarket. When he looks at the sulky face of the assistant, "Howard sees

with gratification the indignation of the employed and oppressed, the token resistance" (13). As to understanding the power dynamics between classes, like professor Treece of the former novel, Howard also knows that what separates himself from the shopping assistant is just the early educational opportunities they were given in school. In this respect, he is aware of the fact that the rise of his own class is only possible through knowledge and skill as was detected by Matthew Arnold nearly a century ago. For him, the lack of educational opportunities push such people as the shopping assistant to work under heavy and tiring conditions for very low wages.

Long before he turns into a vehement defender of Marxist values, equality, and working-class life style, Howard was a reticent and timid boy, nothing of the distinguished sort. However, once he settles down in his new position as a lecturer at University of Watermouth with publications and a good reputation, he starts to publicize his working-class life style and socialist principles during the term parties he organizes with his wife. They bring together leftists, bohemians, academics, students, writers, and critics that support their experimental life style. Similar to the party scene in *Lucky Jim*, which includes only the academics that have the potential to appreciate classical art and music as indicators of high-culture, Howard also creates another category, a group of radicals that conform to his own egalitarian worldview. By agreeing to come to the party, guests yield to Howard's revolutionary philosophy in which differences are welcome.

The transformation of Howard from "a timid, apolitical university student who had nothing to say" (19) into an activist and spokesperson of social justice is worthy of attention as the same transformation points out the rise of his kind, the proletariat in Marx's terminology. It is a gradual and laborious rise from many perspectives. For instance, knowing publication means power and prestige, Howard writes a book called *The Defeat of Privacy* during his summer vacation to discuss his ideas about cancelling all private forms of experience, since from his perspective, the era calls for collectivism and popularity. As he perceives himself as a representative of the working-class ideology, he believes in the power of cooperation to achieve his goal of organizing lower-class people against the workings of the capitalist ideology. Therefore, he publicly displays his political

stance both in faculty gatherings, in his class, and in his social life. Howard's influence at the faculty supports T.S Eliot's finding that education will eventually take the place of inherited power, since Howard Kirk owes his reputation to his educational radicalism and intellectual discipline. The more he defends his socialist political ideas, the stronger his position at the faculty becomes. That is why his wife praises him, saying, "Howard Kirk is what we have instead of faith" (8). He commits himself to this socialist worldview, and shuns people who do not follow his non-conformity.

In this respect, *History Man* questions the conflicting status of the emerging intellectual through the Kirks; "they are indeed, new people" (18) representing the emergent values such as equality, reform and renovation in a lot of social areas, and they constitute a serious menace to the established customs. From Raymond Williams's perspective, the academic with emergent values needs to fight against a long-preserved set of values and practices. As discussed in the analysis of *Lucky Jim*, the case of the emergent is a painful one, since he defies a lot of the established values and is a threat to the "dominant". To what aim or ideology this new type of man serves within the context of class-struggle is always at the background of *History Man* as well. Howard, as another representative of emergent values, has to fight against the established tradition, which eliminates those values threatening its existence. As the narrator recounts, "Kirks do nothing just because it has been done before; indeed they are widely understood not to have such things as customs and traditions," (2) underlying their unconventional and critical stance against tradition. Williams argues that "Tradition is in practice the most evident expression of the dominant and hegemonic pressures and limits. It is always more than an inert historicized segment; indeed it is the most powerful practical means of incorporation" (115). From this perspective, with their unconventional stance, the Kirks resist being part of the dominant capitalist ideology.

However, in the novel, the sincerity of their socialist and egalitarian stance is subtly questioned. The novel opens with a dialogue from Günter Grass's *From the Diary of a Snail* (1973): "'Who's Hegel?' 'Someone who sentenced mankind to history.' 'Did he know a lot?' 'Did he know everything?'" And the same question is frequently asked by different characters in different contexts in the novel, yet it

is left partially unanswered, drawing attention to the role of the emergent in questioning traditional values through Howard's story. Initially, in Howard's office, a freshman student asks Howard who Hegel is, and he advises the student to study sociology to learn the answer (67), since the student is insistent on getting a proper answer (84). Howard hears the question during his opening of term party several times, one of them being drowned out by the sound of a toilet flush (90), implying the triviality of the question. In the last party to close the term, the same student is depicted as explaining "the philosophy of Hegel in detail" (223) to her classmates. Finally, in a semester spent at the University of Watermouth, she discovers the answer to her question. However, Howard himself never attempts to answer the question personally, which means that he does not have an exact answer or he wants the student to discover it herself. At first sight, placing Hegel's philosophy at the background of the novel, and emphasizing "the Kirks are true citizens of the present" (2) connote that Howard is another man who is sentenced to the present moment, playing his assigned role. Moreover, with Hegel in the background, there is also the implication that the philosophy of seize the day, which the Kirks adopt, is also restrictive and unproductive for the advancement of the lower class. Instead of being authentic, these people also fall into the trap of imitating the very people that they dislike: the bourgeoisie. In that sense, they are confirming Stuart Hall's suggestion of lower classes' being deceived by temporary comforts of bourgeois life style.

Howard Kirk in the first chapter is depicted as a zealous defender of the rights of the lower-class with deeply-rooted Marxist principles: "For Howard is a well-known activist, a thorn in the flesh of the council, a terror to the selfish bourgeoisie" (3). They do not refrain from organizing their local community to protest the decisions of city council, and take them to the streets to shout their objections. Therefore, at first sight, Howard seems to carry out the original plan that is meant for his class, and achieving the aim specified by Marx and Hegel; determining the course of history, instead of being determined by it. However, the irony, the difficulty of achieving such an aim, starts very early in the book with these words: "When you visit the Kirks, there is always a new kind of Viennese coffee-cake to eat and a petition to sign" (3). The petitions on serious social

problems, such as abortion, homelessness, rights of street animals, are juxtaposed with their indulgence in luxurious bourgeois habits, having a special type of cake with coffee. Such discrepancy suggests the fact that the Kirks do not live in complete alliance with the working-class norms they defend. At this point, Stuart Hall underlines that capitalist ideology foregrounds certain tendencies such as "individualism, privacy, the spirit of healthy competition, cultivating one's own garden, a property-owning democracy" (29) in the process of climbing up the social ladder aiming at blurring the group dynamics for lower classes, and severing the ties of the lower-class individual from his group. The lower-class people who have bourgeois tendencies need to work a lot to attain such comfortable standards, and they also run the risk of being excluded from their original societies.

Howard transforms from a humble lower-class student into an individual who challenges the authority and hierarchy. Nevertheless, the moment he gains power, he does not refrain from victimizing people of dissenting opinion or lower rank. The most evident sign of Howard's becoming a hegemon is his treatment of his student, George Carmody, who cannot cope with the content of Howard's transformational and innovative classes. Carmody wants to interpret the assigned texts by merely quoting critics and not talking about his own views, yet Howard publicly reprimands the student after his formally-written presentation. Such a structured, and uncreative presentation is an unacceptable form of scholarly activity for Howard, so he gives very low grades to the student, and intentionally causes his failure. When Carmody asks for a chance to exist the way he is, Howard expresses his indignation and does not let him choose another instructor for the same course (132). Though punishing the student for being old-fashioned can be an acceptable form of evaluation from his teaching perspective, preventing the student from being transferred to some other instructor's class is an abuse of his own authority. In a system that lets the students choose the instructors that they want to work with, Howard's usurping of this right is a quite prejudiced act. He literally blocks all the ways the student can exist, and even causes his dismissal from the school. He turns this disagreement into a personal conflict, and uses all his power to cause Carmody's misery. As Le Mahieu suggests theirs is an "existential struggle" (132) since Howard is the emergent while Carmody is a "historically residual figure

within Marxist dialectic" (132). In the novel, Carmody is described from Howard's perspective with these words: "From this standpoint, Carmody looks like a creature at the end of a long historical corridor, back in dark time; Howard stands, in the brightness of the emancipating present, at the other" (146). Hence, for emergent to exist, he needs to fight against the residual aspects that threatens his existence. Consciousness of such antagonism motivates Howard to be determined and self-confident about his domineering stance.

Regarding the ambivalent and precarious situation of the emergent from Williams's perspective, Howard Kirk, in fact, risks his existence in academia with his unrestrainted attitude towards his colleagues and students. In this fight for survival, unlike Jim Dixon and Professor Treece, he takes a risk to defend his own interests and benefits. The contradictory consciousness, which is strongly felt in their case, has no trace in Howard's behaviours since he does not hesitate in his choices. Despite the pressure from the administration of his department to reconsider Carmody's grades, and help the student, Howard does not step back. His resolution and courage is suggestive of the gradual disappearance of contradictory consciousness in lower-class academics' professional life. At this point, he displays quite a different attitude from professor Treece who defends his lower-class student, Louis Bates when his upper-class colleagues try to conspire against him, and expel him from the school. On the surface, Howard annihilates someone of lower rank on the basis of difference of opinion on academic matters, yet the real motivation behind his reaction is that he sees Carmody as a threat to his own position. Nevertheless, his reputation as a lower-class intellectual, who supposedly fights for the rights of the lower class, and his defence of the acceptance of different forms of experience, conflicts with the fact that he destroys Carmody by using his power and prestige at the university. In that sense, he falls into the vicious cycle of substituting the hegemon during the fight against it.

Although William Van O'Connor claims that "there is nothing heroic about the new kind of protagonist that the British fiction created after the World War II" (168), Howard Kirk is a fighter, and an inspirational leader for a lot of young students and academics at his university. Connor's detection is partially applicable to the situation of both Jim Dixon and Professor Stuart Treece analysed so far in

this thesis, since their tendency to avoid conflict with the upper-class academics pacifies them, and makes them appear unheroic. Howard, on the contrary, appears as a relatively rebellious and assertive character, and refutes O'Connor's argument about the ordinariness of the new type of a protagonist in post-war fiction. Howard's versatile character enables him to have close contact with people in and outside the academia. It also helps him to influence, guide, or even manipulate these people in his community, as in the example of Carmody.

Howard's attitude is indicative of the thesis and anti-thesis theory in Marxist philosophy. James Acheson summarizes Marx's adaptation of Hegel's thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis dialectic to his discussion of class struggle as follows:

> Hegel believed that each historical epoch, characterized by a central ethos, or thesis, would eventually give way to its ideological opposite, or antithesis, and that the best features of the two would finally be united in a synthesis. This process would repeat itself, he held, until there was an ultimate synthesis, in which we would be freed of historical restrictions and empowered to rationally determine the course of our history, instead of being determined by it. Marx adapted the Hegelian dialectic to his theory of the class struggle, believing that the thesis of a bourgeois-dominated society would lead to its antithesis, the dictatorship of the proletariat. (41-42)

According to the Marxist ideology, the bourgeois dynamics will eventually lead to the dominance of the working-class, as in Howard Kirk's case, who turns into an oppressive instructor and manipulative academic. By being graduates of local grammar schools with restricted financial opportunities, the Kirks share the same background with Amis's Jim Dixon. Nonetheless, a close scrutiny of Howard's career path gives evidence to his fast advancement contrary to the final failure of Jim. Unlike Jim, who does not even cope with the pressure of talking in front of his colleagues, and gets drunk in his first conference speech, Howard is self-assured about his manners and principles.

Howard's bossy and abusive attitudes towards his students and his wife is suggestive of Marx's cycle which leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. For instance, Howard keeps one of his undergraduate students as their baby-sitter, and assigns extra domestic chores to her without any payment (9). When the female student displays some unwillingness about the extra chores, the Kirks notice that they exploit her by their excessively demanding attitude, yet they prefer to go out

and look busy while the student takes care of their children. Barbara, being the one who voices their hypocritical attitude more often than Howard, mocks him saying: "Oh, God, how his heart bleeds for victims. And he finds them all over. The only ones he can't see are the people he victimizes himself (10). Howard indeed victimizes his female students and his wife specifically concerning the domestic chores as he finds an excuse to escape from them. Barbara is always the one who clears up the leftovers after the house-parties. What he does is obviously labour exploitation, a concept he allegedly opposes, but only in theory. His unjust attitude towards his wife and his student suggests that he turns into a hegemon who abuses individuals of lesser power at every chance. In that sense, he is a hypocrite whose actions and ideas contradict with each other.

A further example of Howard's manipulative and domineering manner is his criticism of Henry Beamish, both an old friend and a social psychologist at the faculty, for distancing himself from his own class by engaging in the conformist aspects of a bourgeoisie life style. The Beamishes are their old friends from their former university in Leeds, and they are also poor citizens just like the Kirks. However, they completely change their lives when they move to Watermouth as is described in what follows: "These people [Beamishes] who in Leeds had no money, and used to borrow kettles from their friends because they could not afford to buy one of their own, were now settled outside Watermouth, in an architect-converted farmhouse, where they were deep into a world of Tolstoyan pastoral" (37). The Beamishes move from rags to riches, from poverty to living in a comfortable farmhouse designed by an architect. Henry claims that there is no harm in engaging in the comforts of bourgeois lifestyle, and this does not prevent them from criticizing class-based inequalities. Knowing Howard published his second book, *The Death of the Bourgeoisie* (52), Henry feels hesitant about defending his luxurious life style. Howard's perception of Henry can be explained by Gramsci's concept of "subversive" which is "a negative rather than a positive class position, the 'people' is aware that it has enemies, but only identifies them empirically as the so-called *signori*[25]" (272). For him, such gentlemen as Henry epitomize everything

[25] "Gentleman" would be the nearest English equivalent of signore, but since this note is directly on the concept itself, the word has been left in the Italian (*Prison Notebooks*).

he rejects because Howard wants to gain respect without losing his organic ties with his own class. Gramsci explains this as follows: "contained in the concept of *signore* there is much of the old dislike of country for town; dress is a fundamental element of distinction. There is also dislike of officialdom, the only form in which the State is perceived" (272). Although he does not see Henry as an enemy, he finds him rather middle class with his new "naval type of beard" and air of dignity (38). He rejects Henry's offer to live in this idyllic region, since he prefers to be right in the middle of the city and its problems rather than in relative seclusion.

The inconsistency between the public image the Kirks create and their genuine tendencies is subtly repeated through different incidents. On one hand, they intentionally do not dwell in a bourgeois property, and prefer to live in a slum-clearance area. On the other hand, Barbara does not refrain from having shopping weekends in London. The emphasis on their love of fashion indicates that they are the type of people who go with the flow instead of being the radicals that question fashion. It is indirectly the result of the welfare state's economic policy, which has been partially discussed in the previous chapter, in that it steers the lower class towards having bourgeois tendencies based on material goods, and causes the illusion of a "classless" society, which is addressed by Stuart Hall in his review published in 1958. He summarizes the social implications of such an economic policy with reference to its class-based effects. Hall claims "Here the very nature of work itself, the rhythm and skills involved, have changed out of all recognition (26). By the advent of the new industrial techniques, working conditions and distribution of income changed; thus, the lower class obtained alternative ways of making money such as becoming technicians, officers, secretaries, and teachers. These moderate-income individuals lived up to the spending habits of the higher classes.

Although Howard is disturbed by Henry's polished appearance, specifically his navy style beard, the Kirks' description implies similar adaptation of fashion: "They look the new people do look, this autumn. Howard, small, dark, and compact, has long hair, and a Zapata moustache[26]; he wears neat white sweatshirts, with

[26] "A thick moustache that curves down around the edges of the mouth, like that worn by the Mexican revolutionary Emiliano" (oxfordreference.com)

rousing symbols on the front, like clenched fists, and hairy loose waistcoats, and pyjama-style blue jeans" (5). The fact that he wears a Mexican revolutionist's moustache, which was very popular among the leftists in the seventies, suggests that he wants to be perceived as a reactionary socialist, a supporter of heated protests, and another angry man against the social injustices, symbolized by the "clenched fists" on his sweatshirts. Nonetheless, this obsession with the fashion might be considered a contradiction with his egalitarian values. Besides, Barbara criticizes Howard for changing with the fashion, yet, for him, there is nothing wrong with choosing the intellectual fashion that suits his way of life while ignoring the others. For instance, upon hearing the suicide of a lower-class hippie boy, Howard immediately attempts to explain it with the loneliness and misery of the modern man by using the widely known terminology regarding the issue. He summarizes the boy's action as "This is his existential choice," (16) and refuses to empathize with him. Barbara reacts against her husband's craze for fashion, saying: "Howard, you have always turned everything into a metaphor for the times. You've always said that the times are where we are; there is no other place. You have lived off the flavours and fashions of the mind" (16). Then, she argues the boy is real and the incident is also real (17), although her husband does not care about the reasons behind such realities. Even death becomes a "fashion" for him rather than an actual miserable occurrence. In that sense, Howard is already quite distanced from the philosophy that he supposedly defends. On the one hand, he claims to understand the problems and miseries of disadvantaged people, and fight for their rights, but on the other, he does not care about real miseries. Barbara implies that Howard actually is not interested in any social problem with such words: "Take a Valium[27]. Have a party. Go on a demo. Shoot a soldier. Make a bang. Bed a friend. That's your problem solving-system" (17). From Barbara's perspective he is an escapist; instead of finding a solution to social matters, he prefers to have parties. Furthermore, none of the attendees of their parties are actually their friends, they

[27] Valium is the brand name for a drug called diazepam. Valium is a type of medicine called a benzodiazepine, which enhances the effects of a neurotransmitter called gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) in the brain. The more GABA in the synopses of nerve cells, the less active the brain, which is why Valium is mainly used as a sedative or tranquilizer. Valium (diazepam) is also considered a hypnotic, anti-epileptic, and anxiolytic (anti-anxiety) drug which affects the central nervous system as a general depressant. (addiction.blog.org)

are just acquaintances or associates that will be used up for their popularity. Barbara openly admits it, and criticizes Howard for this attitude saying: "You've had all the people you can eat", but Howard answers, "We need some fresh ones" (5). Here, the verb eat is a reference to Bradbury's former novel *Eating People is Wrong*, but this time the roles have been changed, because unlike Professor Treece's case, a lower-class academic becomes the eater or the exploiter of others.

3.3.2 Capitalism and the Fashion of Nonconformity

As discussed in the theoretical chapter, the connection between education and improvement of lower-classes is a long-debated issue dating back to the mid-Victorian period when Matthew Arnold penned *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) advising all classes to pursue light and perfection through culture and education. Later on, Raymond Williams reminds Arnold's legacy in his *Culture and Materialism* (1980) highlighting once again the role of education for the advancement of the lower classes. Likewise, T.S Eliot supports the idea that education substituted hereditary power and the newly rising elite is being formed through education rather than familial or class-bound ties. The expansion of higher education coupled with the rise in working-class consciousness paved the way for a lot of demonstrations and protests of the lower-classes to claim equality. The form of these protests which were found "vulgar" in Arnold's time, was regarded fashionable during the 1970s. Being an active participant of these protests, Howard aims to rise together with his class.

The first paragraph of the novel opens with a reference to George McGovern's campaign against the 37th president of the United States, Richard Nixon, who served from 1969 to 1974, to attract attention to the general reactionary mood in the world[28]. For the election the two rival candidates carried out carefully-planned campaigns. It was claimed by the American press that McGovern attempted to be the voice of a lot of rebels, hippies, and the people who felt ignored, yet Nixon by handling the Vietnam War cunningly manipulated the public opinion to get a clear victory, so he got the chance to serve one more term after the election

[28] "Bradbury's deep familiarity with the United States in the 1950s and 1960s provided him not only a subject for his comic fiction and a new field of study in Britain, but an appreciation of a comprehensive educational system that, for all its limitations, offered a future that might work" (for further information see: D.L. Le Mahieu's article on *The History Man*)

in 1972. The division in American public, the final defeat of the representative of the hippies and peace supporters might be a foreshadowing for the ineffectuality of Howard's intention to solve every social issue through hot protests, quarrels or fighting, since the fashion of revolution fades away very quickly.

At this point, *History Man* problematizes such populism and questions whether it actually serves the betterment of the working class by highlighting the link between capitalist ideology and populism/fashion. For instance, Howard does not resist when the publishers change the name of his book from *Defeat of Privacy* to *The Coming of the New Sex*, "which they thought would sell widely; and it was clear that the book would be a commercial success" (37). From the perspective of Gramsci's manufactured consent, Howard does not interfere with the publishers' modification of the title of his work since he internalizes such attempts of popularization, and sees nothing wrong with writing in a fashion that is highly marketable. In this respect, Stuart Hall emphasizes that the fake satisfaction that the working class gets from consumption and production shows how they become "factors in their own alienation" (29) as the capitalist policies integrate them into the cycle of production, give them a temporary taste of financial well-being so that they will serve more eagerly to the capitalist ideology. From Hall's perspective, through their jobs and salaries lower-class people feel that they realize themselves, but in fact they fall into the trap of capitalism by means of class confusion. Populism or craze for fashion only leads to alienation from his own values and community for the lower-class.

In parallel to Howard's inconsistent attitude, Joseph Heath and Andrew Potter, in their book *Nation of Rebels* (2005), discuss the pointless protests of anti-capitalist social groups, and question how counterculture transforms into consumer culture. By the counterculture, what is generally meant is a culture which conflicts with the prevailing social norms. However, this opposing culture falls into the vicious cycle of capitalism by popularizing their own lifestyle. Heath and Potter explain this cycle with the example of hippies by their rejection of consumerism, yet their Birkenstocks and VW Beetles become one of the mostly sold and advertised products in American history. Therefore, they claim that "The hippies became yuppies," (3) suggesting their fall into the trap of capitalist marketing

strategies. At this point, Howard's tendency to popularize his own working class life style and Marxist ideas shares the same destiny with many counter-cultural formations and protests exemplified by Heath and Potter. To be specific, for example, Howard's book is said to be "weak on fact and documentation" (37) since he doesn't do enough research on the issue. In effect, his aim in writing on such a hot topic is to be widely acclaimed rather than being a real expert on the issue. That he targets getting fame through a book which is not well-researched gives clues about the insincerity of his ideology and lack of dedication. He simply tries to be fashionable rather than well-esteemed or scientific. Writing is just a part of the fashion for Howard, and his wife, Barbara, reminds him that he just keeps changing the terminology according to the latest fashion without internalizing any of the concepts he discusses in his books. She comments on Howard's book with the following words: "It says you are a radical poseur. It tells how you've substituted trends for morals and commitments" (32). From Barbara's perspective, Howard's book has no "character," (32) since he does not commit himself to the work, or does not believe any of the concepts he discusses. He simply theorizes on such issues as "maturity, liberation, emancipation," (32) but refrains from practising them in real life. His sole motivation in preparing a book on such a popular topic is to get a position at a better university, and earn a high salary, and become popular in his community. In this respect, the book becomes a means of advertisement for Howard, and provides him with prestige and money.

Accordingly, starting from the opening remarks and the title of the novel, there is the connotation that Howard Kirk, is a man of his time. He is, in a sense, a product of the inevitable reactionary mood of the sixties and seventies. Although Howard perceives anarchism as the fashion of the time, many people genuinely protest injustices on the streets, in their publications, or through gatherings. Howard, on the contrary, simply follows the fashion without much dedication and tries to persuade the others to do so as in the example of Barbara. The narrator's frequent use of the present tense when he addresses the reader both to give descriptive information about the Kirks and to talk about their past, firstly implies that the Kirks, specifically Howard, are people that exist with the fashion and serve the fashion. "They are very busy people, with full diaries; the days may lie

contingently ahead of them, but the Kirks always have a plot of many events, an inferior plot to the one they have come to desire, but one that gives them much to do" (52). They keep themselves busy with the present, the moment, rather than looking for the long-term effects of the fashions they follow. This is also related to the capitalist tendency of seize the day, which urges individuals to engage in the present, take pleasure in the moment and forget about the rest. By means of this carpe diem philosophy, which directly supports the psychology of consumption, not only material goods but also human relationships become disposable.

The process of industrialization is felt in the new design of the university buildings which foregrounds simplicity and practicality rather than aesthetics. The new Kaakinen[29] style buildings obscure and replace the old Victorian style ones on the campus, and become the harbingers of change in the physical conditions of the university. Even in architecture, the trend is to appeal to a consumer society that utilizes the qualities of such practical and simple buildings rather than adorning them with luxuries. As discussed in the chapter on *Lucky Jim*, the university building becomes "a modern workhouse" as is understood from their design. The architectural change of the university in ten years is described as follows:

> The university gets bigger, year by year.… It enacted the entire industrializing process of the modern world.… Ten years ago this stretch of land was a peaceful, pastoral Eden.… The Watermouth Hall, the turreted Elizabethan mansion now screened from sight by the massive constructions that have grown on the pasture and stubble.… The feudal era was ending; a year later it was gone for good, when teaching was shifted from Watermouth Hall, which became an office block, devoted to administration, into the bright new buildings, some high, some long, some square, some round, that began to spring up here and there all over the estate. (63-64)

This new style in architecture urges its dwellers to focus on their jobs rather than indulging in the luxury and comfort of the place. In that sense, it is not different from a factory with its cold and grey walls, but it serves its purpose, which is production at a maximum level. On the one hand, the simplicity and practicality of the Kaakinen design saves the academics from the trouble of creating their individual arrangements; it thus saves more time to study and produce. On the other,

[29] A Finnish architect designing modern, simple, convenient but modest buildings aiming at meeting the immediate needs of the dwellers rather than having aesthetic concerns. (Explained in Elaine Shoewalter's *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel and its Discontents* p.61).

it promotes the capitalist idea of standardization and uniformity for the sake of maximizing production. The transformation is depicted as: "And now the campus is massive, one of those dominant modern environments of multifunctionality that modern man creates. […] and you could open it again as a factory, a prison, a shopping precinct" (65). Therefore, the design focuses on the convertibility, which is commercially a profitable approach, since there may arise a need to use the building for other purposes. The building is one of the signs that universities are also geared towards capitalist aims of productivity, and multifunctionality in the 1970s. The suggestion that the building can be converted into a 'prison' is evocative of the university building's being a former asylum in *Eating People is Wrong*. In other words, in both novels there is the connotation that the university building served or might serve as a place to confine mentally unstable people or criminals; it is a place for rehabilitation of one kind or another. Nevertheless, as discussed before, from Foucault's perspective prisons and asylums also serve the capitalist ideology by exploiting their dwellers' labour. Therefore the allusion to 'prison' again fosters the idea that the transformation in the architectural design is a capitalist alteration.

A further dimension about the building is that different blocks of the university building symbolically carries traces of the worldview of its inhabitants. Specifically, the sociology department has modern glass blocks and a standardized cold design, while the literature department is in one of the old Victorian style buildings. This contrast is suggestive of the variance between the values that both departments represent. In the novel, it is implied by the dialogues between the sociologist Howard, and literature instructor, Miss Callendar that sociology questions the very dynamics of the society, and supports the abandonment of old values, customs, and styles with the purpose of investigating new ones. It is a discipline that embraces innovation in social structure and behavioural patterns. On the other hand, literature, from the perspective of the classicists, is implied to appreciate the classical values, supports their preservation in the present to a certain extent. In a recent article, Felix Nicolau, evaluates the function of Kaakinen's architecture in *The History Man*, from a semiotics perspective, arguing:

> Jop Kaakinen's geometrical vision functions as a two-way intersemiotic translation: sociological postulates are reflected in the simplified and corporatist

> architecture of the new university. Accordingly, the sociologists get intimidated by and show aggression towards the intimate and embellished genre of architecture specific to the Faculty of Humanities. (122)

The antagonism between the two departments, which is also fostered by the conflict between Howard and Miss Callendar, is even embedded in the architectural design of both departments. In that sense, the architecture of the Faculty of Humanities in Watermouth resists industrialization, preserves its historical structure while the block of sociology department yields to the industrial urges. Miss Callendar, as her name suggests, is exactly aware of both past and the present social and educational values, yet she willingly opts for the past with her Victorian style hair and clothing, or with her rejection of modern technology such as not having a telephone at her apartment. She chooses to remain inaccessible and secluded, resists the transparent life-style that Howard advises to his admirers in his immediate circle. When she confesses that she is an old-fashioned person, Howard reacts saying "We must modernize you," (88) but Miss Callendar being conscious of Howard's hypocritical stance declares that she prefers to stay away from "the new man with the old techniques" (89). In her reaction, there is the implication that Howard represents the new man with all his claim to modernity and revolution, yet he uses the well-known capitalist and pragmatist techniques for his own interests. She does not believe in Howard's sincerity about equality, revolution, egalitarianism, or embracing all types of people with humane motivations.

Classroom setting and the content of the lectures at University of Watermouth also reflect capitalist populism disguised in the form of revolution. Once he settles down in Watermouth, Howard observes the atmosphere there, and notices there is a trend towards organizing innovative classrooms: "Classes at Watermouth are not simply occasions for the one-directional transmission of knowledge; no, they are events, moments of communal interaction, or, like Howard's party, happenings" (127). As opposed to the formal lecturing style of the traditional classroom, alternative forms of behaviour are permitted in these classes, and divergent reactions to the discussion topics are welcome. Different from the distanced and serious professors of previously discussed novels, the professors may burst into tears with the intensity of the topic, or shout at their students. Since this university challenges the classical space and power perceptions in the classroom

and displays a non-conformist style, it becomes a place of case study for a lot of researchers studying educational sciences. They visit the place, and record the seminars to understand the teaching methodology in the classrooms (127). Howard, being well-aware of the requirements of such an ambiance, organizes his classroom quite creatively. He once changes the arrangement of the tables saying: "I'm afraid this is what Goffman[30] would call a bad eye-to-eye ecological huddle. We don't want these tables here like this, do we?" (128). The classical plan of seating in rows is not approved since it does not give students the chance to see each speaker. Therefore, he advises the students to sit in a circular, U shape form to increase eye contact.

Not only Howard's seating plan, but also his interactive classroom discussions are well-known among the students. The unconventional style of the classrooms, which is also adopted by Howard, is narrated with these words:

> There are classes where you have, on arrival, to eat something, or touch each other, to recount last night's dreams, or undress, in order to induce that strange secular community that is, in Watermouth terms, the essence of a good class, a class that is interesting. (128)

Whether such a reformative classroom atmosphere helps students develop themselves in their fields of study is another controversial topic since students are from time to time disturbed as is stated: "Watermouth makes students nervous; you never know quite what to expect" (128). Howard's classroom design is a part of his attempt to appear revolutionary and fashionable, but apparently it does not create the desired effect as Heath and Potter suggests: "There is no single, overreaching system that integrates it all" (8). Their argument, though not specifically about the classroom, may be applied to the situation of such anxious students in Watermouth who are intimidated with the fear of being shunned by their friends or instructors in the classroom. In other words, the system Howard adapts in his classroom excludes some of the students as it does not comply with their individual learning styles. For this very reason, when Howard asks the rhetorical question about classroom arrangement, "We don't want these tables here like this,

[30] Refers to the famous Canadian sociologist, Erving Goffman's theory of "encounters" in which he discusses the role of physical position in "maximizing each participant's opportunity to perceive the other participants' monitoring of him" (*Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction* 17).

do we?" "'No, Dr Kirk', says one of the students standing in the room… in a nervous way" (128). Such classroom design excludes introverted students who find it very difficult to adapt to group activities. Just like the traditional teaching methods, experimental methods also fail to integrate all the students, so it inevitably singles out some. Furthermore, there is no reference to the positive academic outcomes of such an air in the classroom; on the contrary, students participate in such practices to follow the fashion at the university. Or in other words, they do it to avoid being labelled as traditional or old-fashioned. In this respect, Harvey Lee and Peter Night in their book *Transforming Higher Education,* draw attention to the necessity of professional development before the instructors engage in such transformative/alternative teaching styles, for they require a high level of expertise on the issue (61;71;122). Their main claim is that "curriculum change is about changing people" (156), so by changing the way one teaches, the instructor also changes the message he gives to students. Since using this method is a matter of expertise, one can guide students in transformational teaching only if s/he has a solid grasp of the theory behind it and the educational outcomes of it. In Howard's case, though, there is no reference to such proficiency; instead the irritation that his teaching style creates is emphasized by the shyness and reluctance of some students to participate in his classes. Nevertheless, from Howard's point of view his unusual curriculum is something that sells, and adds to his popularity. Peter Case from the University of Exeter and Glauco De Vita from Oxford University oppose such approach to educational programming, saying: "It is inappropriate to treat curricula as though they were merely commodities reducible solely to exchange value", and criticizes the "student-as-customer approach" (383). From their perspective, what Howard does is to commodify his syllabus regardless of its educative value.

The impression that Howard follows transformative methods just to keep up with the fashion is reinforced by the short popularity of experimental schools in England during the seventies. In 2014, BBC news released an article on such schools of the 1970s, claiming that there were "no compulsory lessons, no timetables, no rules. So what happened to the kids who attended these free-for-alls?" (Tom De Castella from BBC News). These students graduated and looked for opportunities in higher education, yet they needed to adapt into the formal

system of higher education leaving behind their love of free style. The article also includes a discussion on how such schools adopted the working class ideology, and avoided imposing bourgeois values on the students. Howard may find this style convenient for his alleged Marxist philosophy, yet his aim in implementing such a style is quite different from goals of practitioners in Castella's article. Although the schools mentioned in the BBC article were high schools rather than universities, Bradbury's novel applies the same philosophy to university classrooms, since many of the experimental styles that were peculiar to these high schools of the seventies are exactly the same as the ones Howard uses in his classroom. As stated in the article, in these schools, unconventional type of teaching such as motivating the students to go on strikes with the workers, strengthening their ties with nature, and designing the courses freely according to the desires of the students or the requirements of the moment were followed. However, their appeal quickly decreased and only a small number of people preferred to send their children to such schools. Experimental schools were not profit-oriented; on the contrary, they emphasized the process of learning and teaching rather than the end product. Their non-profit philosophy was against the workings of capitalism. By the end of the decade, standardization and the spirit of competition dominated all the educational institutions, so what was done in the name of revolution in education was not able to cope with the dynamics of the dominant capitalist ideology.

Howard's pleasure-seeking approach to life and his engagement in such revolutionary activities for their amusement and excitement is another aspect of his non-conformity. Heath and Potter analyse the situation as follows: "In the countercultural analysis, simply having fun comes to be seen as the ultimate subversive act. Hedonism is transformed into a revolutionary doctrine" (9). In that case, Howard simply follows his desire to have fun in the classroom and get rid of the boredom of lecturing. He is after pleasure rather than the pursuit of creativity or productivity. His wife Barbara criticizes the unproductivity and repetitiveness of this tendency when Howard advises her to get rid of this depressive mood by using the same hedonist attitude. She reacts: "Revolt as therapy. But haven't we tried all that? And don't you find a certain gloom in that?" (17). In that sense, Barbara is more conscious of the paradox of following the fashion of non-conformity and

reacting against things simply for the sake of pleasure. Barbara suspects that they are falling into a vicious cycle by using rebellion as if it were a cure for all types of real life problems. In fact everything is part of a temporary fashion for Howard, since he interprets his wife's pessimism on the issue as a "fashion for failure and negation" (17) and cautions his wife not to follow this fashion. For Howard, what matters is to be part of the right fashion so that they can mingle with the right community and have more fun.

On the surface, Howard's main aim seems to be stirring action about social problems, one of them exemplified as racism, and organizing large groups of people to protest aganist those issues that are ignored by the authorities. With this aim in mind, he tries to campaign against the invitation of a biologist, Professor Mangel[31], who is thought to have fascist ideas, to the university, and secretly plots against him. He creates the rumour that he is invited to the university, but later during the faculty meeting, he learns that Mangel was not invited at all. Nevertheless, he still organizes his colleagues to oppose the idea in every possible way. Dr Zackary, another academic who is familiar with Mangel, criticizes Howard, and informs him about the reality behind Mangel's situation: "Professor Mangel and myself have a background in common; we are both Jewish, and both grew up in Nazi Germany, and fled here from the rise of facism. I think we know the meaning of this term," (158) implying the impossibility of Mangel's fascistic tendencies. In this respect, Howard reacts aganist something without getting enough information about the issue, he just reacts for the sake of reacting, which renders his attitude insincere and pointless. All he wants to desire is to stir action and manipulate the crowds to get what he wants, yet he does not have the habit of looking for truth. Even after Dr. Zackary's explanation about Mangel's worldview, Howard does not stop campaigning against his invitation defending his ideas blindly. The discrepancy between his Marxist, egalitarian philosophy and his unjust, populist actions becomes clear with this biased attitude.

[31] The name 'Mangel' might be an allusion to German physician Josef Mengele, who served in Auschwitz concentration camp, and conducted deadly experiments on captives for racist purposes. (For further details see: www.auschwitz.dk/mengele.htm)

From Louis Althusser's perspective Howard Kirk is a success story for his class, and he belong to the last group[32] who gets far ahead of the others by adapting themselves to the functioning of dominant ideology. From his perspective the more an individual spends time in the system of education the more adapted he becomes to it, and has a relatively more important position in the capitalist system. In the final chapter of *The History Man*, Howard is depicted as quite a satisfied and happy man despite the serious conflicts he went through with his seniors, colleagues and wife. His marriage does not end with divorce in spite of his numerous disloyalties. When it comes to his professional life, after the Carmody incident, he wins even his opponents' favour as in the example of literature instructor, Miss Callendar, who questions Howard's abusive attitude towards his students. The female instructor is depicted as a lover of nostalgia and tradition. With her refusal of modern technology and fashion both in her lifestyle and professional life, she is the exact anti-thesis of what Howard represents. Even her name is suggestive of the word *calendar*, which keeps track of time, and reminds us the date we are living in. Nonetheless, she is charmed by Howard's charismatic attitude in the end, and has an affair with him. In that sense, she is also under the spell of fashion, and gives up her criticism of Howard.

3.4 Conclusion

When analysed from the perspective of hegemony and class-conflict, Bradbury's two campus novels, covering a period of more than a decade, include references to the educational and social problems of their periods and present a broad perspective on these issues. Firstly, written at the end of the fifties, *Eating People is Wrong* portrays the ambiguous situation of a lower-class academic, professor Treece with all his inner sufferings in the face of hegemonic pressures and academic politicking in his university. Both Treece and his lower-class student Louis Bates's ending up at the same mental hospital at the end of the novel connotes that they are both literally eaten up by the academic community due to their lower-class backgrounds; that class-based inequalities persist despite the legislative attempts to include lower-

[32] Althusser divides students from different classes into separate categories according to the amount of time they spend in the education system. (for further detail see his discussion on schools as ISA in *On the Reproduction of Capitalism*)

income individuals into higher education. Bates is the most obvious example of the failure of the policy of expansion in higher education that started with the Education Act of 1944.

The second novel, *History Man* portrays a very different academic from the first one, since Dr. Howard Kirk, a Marxist sociologist who shares the same lower-class background with Professor Treece of the former novel, never refrains from voicing his ideas publicly, and defying the authorities in case of any professional conflict. He is quite a popular figure in his own community, publishes two fashionable books, works in the editorial board of a sociology series, and becomes a favourite instructor at one of the progressive universities. As is understood, he is a multi-dimensional character, and D.L Le Mahieu refers to Bradbury's ideas saying: "It was difficult to write a novel that described external behaviour without revealing its internal motivations, though he [Bradbury] later maintained that Howard Kirk came closest to becoming a three-dimensional character" (129). Therefore, throughout the novel, Howard is read from many perspectives, and is depicted as full of surprises. Moreover, under this fame and popularity lies a despotic tendency, which is understood from his abuse of his wife and his students in similar ways. In order not to become a victim of the hegemonic wars, he himself victimizes people whenever he has the chance as in the example of Mangel and Carmody. The different endings of the two novels, one with the failure and misery of the lower-class, the other with the victory and happiness of it, bring to mind that education in its own right is not sufficient to improve the status of the lower classes. The dynamics of the capitalist ideology needs to be decoded by the lower-class individual in order to develop a survival strategy. Unlike Treece, Howard is quite conscious of these capitalist dynamics, so lets the publishers change the title of his book to a more commercially attractive one. With the same consciousness, he follows only the fashions that will contribute to his survival, and do not internalize many of the principles that he pretends to defend.

Briefly, the capitalist dynamics at the background of the two novels, subsequently covering the end of the fifties and the beginning of the seventies, maintain their influence in the provincial universities. These capitalist policies which have been broadly discussed in relation to the novels are the actual

determinants of the destiny of the lower-classes who have been deprived of financial support until the forties. Even thirty years later, the policies of expansion and providing equal opportunities do not give the desired results in higher education. Despite three decades of planning and implementation, lower-class academics still need to create their own resources and network in order to maintain their existence in the academia. There is a close relationship between one's financial welfare and his educational opportunities, so the lower class academics that gain title and fame in academic society obtains them at the expense of giving up leisure in case of Treece, his own pleasures, desires, and youth, while for Howard, his principles and work ethic. As is observed from the relationships among the academics in both novels, the arbiters of the rules and regulations in universities are still from the upper-class. They determine the principles of academic practices, and expect the newcomers or outsiders to follow these, proving once again the residual aspect of the dominancy of upper-classes in higher education.

CHAPTER 4:DAVID LODGES' CAMPUS TRILOGY

4.1 Introduction and Background

David Lodge as a critic and a fiction writer has keen observations on how the problems in English higher education evolved in time. His campus trilogy, consisting of *Changing Places*: *A Tale of Two Campuses* (1975), *Small World* (1984), and *Nice Work* (1988) covering more than a decade, deals with issues ranging from the cooperation between the academic and the industrial world to resolve the financial problems at the universities to hegemonic power struggles among academics. Lodge is considered to be an author who has freed the campus novel from the boundaries of the university and its fixed pattern[33]. Siegfried Mews confirms Lodge's "departure from the conventional campus novel with its geographically limited setting", and his contribution to "internationalization of the genre," (714) suggesting that Lodge has a substantial role in bringing in worldwide publicity to the genre. Much of the discussion on class, hegemony and capitalist policies at institutions of higher education in the previous chapters appears in the trilogy too, yet these concepts evolve in time and are manifested in different ways and contexts. Despite the transformation in hegemonic, class-based and capitalist practices, their residual values of the academia were still traceable in the eighties. Compared to the previous chapters, the discussion on meritocracy will occupy more space in the analysis of Lodge's novels since starting from the eighties, promotions based on individual merit has been on the rise at the universities.

The publication of all three novels in Lodge's trilogy coincides with Margaret Thatcher's period of service, and there are explicit and implicit references to her decisions on English higher education in the books. Therefore, taking a brief glance at the government's educational policies at the time will clarify those references and further related criticism in the novels. Margaret Thatcher, the first

[33] Sally Dalton Brown outlines this pattern as is discussed in the introduction of this thesis. She argues that the whole genre is built upon a male academic's struggle for survival within the academia.

female Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1979 to 1990, left her mark on British higher education with her budget cuts on the university funds, and she is also claimed to start the privatisation process at the universities. Her higher education policies will also be discussed under the title of the criticism of higher education policies in England.

Thatcher's decisions about the privatization of universities, and their integration into the industrial world was conceived as a violation of a long-term agreement on the welfare of universities since her moves were considered to be the opposite of what had been targeted after the Second World War in the name of expansion of higher education. Different from the two former prime ministers, Harold Wilson (1974-1976) and James Callaghan (1976-1979) of the labour party, Thatcher, having been elected from the conservative wing, believed in the power of marketization, and disapproved of too much state support in many fields. Those who were happy with the policies of the two successive labour governments resisted such a drastic change of perspective in Britain's political arena. Instead of providing students with regular scholarships, the government made two new proposals to the fiscal problems in education. Reginald Edward summarizes these proposals in his published commentary as follows: "The first proposal has suggested that universities increase their tuition fees... The second proposal would freeze maintenance grants at their present level, and offer government backed loans, repayable during a set period of years after graduation" (213). Specifically the female students who were not sure that they could find permanent employment right after graduation, and the ones who paid the available tuitions with difficulty opposed the governments' regulation. As Edward points out "16.000 students marched on Whitehall in protest" (213), yet the government did not step back.

Accordingly, Thatcher's move received considerable criticism from the academics, since they believed such regulations meant that financially disadvantaged people would be stripped of pursuing university education. Shallock asserts that "universities are not, in the view of the government, embarking whole-heartedly on the enterprise culture" (35). The prime minister believed that university staff misguided the students about the policies of privatisation, and caused the students to be biased against the new regulations. She criticized the

attitudes of academics in an interview in *The Sunday Times*, saying: "Some academics and intellectuals do not understand and are putting out what I call poison" (qtd in Shallock, 35). In other words, the attitude of the academics were hostile to the policies of the prime minister, and she wanted them to collaborate to strengthen the system. Therefore, she put more pressure upon the universities, and as Shallock suggests, "Under pressure from the government, the universities set up a committee to look at the efficiency of universities, and we now submit annually an efficiency return intended to demonstrate efficiency gains from improved decision-making processes" (35). So the role of the government transformed from being a financial guarantor to that of a central inspector who demands reports of profitability from all universities. It was without doubt a shock for many universities and their administrative staff, since they did not know how a university could obtain profit out of educational practices. Budget cuts might mean not hiring any new staff, or even losing the ones they had. Furthermore, there might be some forced retirements for the senior staff members. As Edwards also argues, "Under the new University Funding Council's contracts with universities, more university departments would be in danger of closure" (213). He summarizes the process which is accepted as the initiator of competition and rivalry among universities as follows: "So far eleven departments of philosophy have disappeared. An annual assessment will be made of the members of each department of each university in terms of teaching duties performed and research conducted. A 'league table' will be prepared to show the standings of departments within and between universities" (212).

The problems that the universities went through during Thatcher's service has its reflections in Lodge's campus trilogy, so the process of capitalization of universities as well as the evolution of hegemonic practices in academia will be discussed with specific references to Raymond Williams and Gramsci's theories as well as T.S Eliot and Pierre Bourdieu's ideas. In addition, research on the rise of 'meritocracy' will also be utilized to track the transformation of the concept and its place in academia since the time of T.S. Eliot. As mentioned in the previous chapters, Eliot points out the rise of a new social group thanks to the educational qualities they are given. For him, this newly rising class can climb the social ladder

by polishing their talents through education. His ideas are quite relevant for the analysis of Lodge's campus trilogy as Lodge portrays academics that gain prestige and money purely on the basis of their academic success. Moreover, the evolution of the concept of "class consciousness", firstly pointed out by Marx and then expanded by such post-Marxist critics as George Lukacs, will be discussed to see how the perception of class changes over time. Whether the concept of class and class-antagonism has disappeared from the universities will be the principal question. In relation to this discussion, what kinds of values and concepts replace the concept of class will also be at the centre of this discussion.

With the advent of meritocratic culture in England, there comes the question whether the formation of such a culture is a positive transformation or not. Although Young used the term in an unfavourable fashion, the following researchers pointed out the fact that the term changed in time and did not have the same meaning in the following decades. Ansgar Allen suggests, "Today, however, meritocracy represents a positive ideal against which we measure the justice of our institutions" (367). In Allen's terms the whole concept turns into a highly constructive assessment criterion which guarantees fairness in academic evaluations. In other words, it helps create the feeling that academics serve in the positions and with the titles they deserve. Nonetheless, Allen also reviews a very recent book by Jo Littler, *Against Meritocracy: Culture, Power and Myths of Mobility* (2017), and admits that there are still very strong oppositions to the application of meritocratic criteria to higher education. For him, Littler's argument against meritocracy has sound roots and explanations, and touches upon its dysfunctional aspects. He refers to Littler's argument and points out,

> Hence, we might attempt to reclaim from it a 'language of opportunity' that speaks to a 'desire for human lives and potential not to be constrained and to find occupations and/or outlets in forms of activity that match the abilities they have developed so far and enable them to flourish in a way which is not delimited by the precise context they were born into. (1)

What Littler points out is that before talking about a measurement upon intelligence or skill, there is a need to create equal opportunities for individuals to develop and demonstrate those skills. If the meritocratic system disregards the social and economic advantages and disadvantages that shape an individual's background

starting from his/her childhood, it only serves the creation of another hegemonic system based on the exclusion of less fortunate people. As mentioned, Lodge's treatment of the concept in his trilogy will be under scrutiny to evaluate how the meritocratic culture affects the academics in the seventies and eighties.

In this chapter, the second book of the Trilogy, *Small World*, will be analysed in detail with specific references to the others when necessary. As suggested, the first book of the trilogy, *Changing Places*, is not chosen for detailed analysis since Bradbury's *History Man,* studied in the previous chapter, was published in the same year, and against the same background, so the problems in the universities at the end of the sixties and beginning of the seventies have already been dealt with. The second book is in the focus since it displays the mood of the mid-eighties, during which the economic crisis in England peaked, and rigid budget-cuts swept the academia. The last book, *Nice Work* will be briefly analyzed in the last section to finalize the discussion on the problems of higher education and hegemony in the trilogy. The central argument will again be on the immediate effects of the dominant capitalist ideology in academia and hegemonic power relationships among the academics. Although the issues discussed in the previous chapters under similar sub-headings persist in Lodge's novel, they gain new dimensions in time, and this chapter will be mainly on the nature of this transformation under the light of Michael Young's concept of "Meritocracy" (1958), Pierre Bourdieu's discussion on "academic ethics" in his *Homo Academicus* (1984), T.S Eliot's ideas about class in addition to Raymond Williams and Gramsci's ideas used in the previous chapters.

4.2 *Changing Places: Tale of Two Campuses*

In the introduction he wrote for *Changing Places*, Lodge admits that his aim was to write a comic novel based on his sixth-month experience in the United States as visiting associate professor at the University of California. He confesses that this opportunity provided him with the chance of comparing the educational and cultural atmosphere of England to that of America. He admits that "I was intrigued and amused by the contrasts between American and British academic life – the competitiveness and professionalism of the former making the latter seem by comparison humane but amateurish" (viii). In fact, the subtitle of the novel; *A Tale*

of Two Campuses, gives a clue about the nature of this comparison. Ramona Sava compares Lodge's handling of the two universities in her dissertation, and concludes: "As its symbolic name suggests, Euphoria, with its wonderful landscape and warm climate, is not only a utopian space for tourists in search of fun and relaxation, but also a dream for its inhabitants whose lives are turned into permanent holidays" (182). Thus, starting from the first novel in the trilogy, the American campus is depicted as more attractive than its British counterpart. Sava claims: "Rummidge appears to be the opposite of Euphoria, namely the absolute dystopian place whose main features are work, noise and pollution; in reality, it stands for Birmingham, Lodge's home city," (182) emphasizing the ugliness of the British scene for the visitors. By contrasting the two campuses in terms of their physical, geographical, and climatic conditions, David Lodge foreshadows the upcoming differences in principles and practices inside these institutions, too.

Having witnessed the ideological climate on both campuses, Lodge believes that the influence of the student riots at the end of the sixties was felt strongly at the American universities with a lot of injuries and arrests while they had a milder effect on the British campuses with fewer protests (vii), and he spares a whole chapter on this disparity in the novel. Briefly, this book recounts a long travel adventure for two academics through which they explore different academic traditions as well as their inner-selves, hidden desires, and neglected emotional needs. The academics are no longer in their claustrophobic settings in which they repeatedly see the same type of individuals - other academics and students - and engage in the same type of social relationships as a part of their day to day responsibilities. Enclosed on a campus, whose physical and social boundaries were clearly specified by the very rules and regulations set by their former colleagues centuries ago, the academics seldom challenge those limits and routines. In that sense, Lodge portrays what happens if those boundaries are crossed and in what ways the campus and the world that surrounds it interact.

Two humanities instructors, Philip Swallow from an English provincial university, Rummidge, and Morris Zapp from Euphoric State University in the United States become participants in an exchange program, and take each other's place at their host universities. However, this repositioning refers to not only

substituting for their institutional positions, but also engaging in sexual affairs with each other's wives. Morris's wife Desiree and Philip's wife Hillary are also influenced by the relocation of their husbands as they need to handle the domestic chores and children alone during their absence. Thus, the interaction of divergent academic traditions start very early in the first novel through the story of two academics who were trained in different educational systems. Lodge meticulously introduces a new academic problem in each chapter, and titles them to introduce the stages these two academics go through during their exchange program. The first chapter, "Flying", recounts the flight experiences of the two academics and Swallow's nervousness to change his place after years-long immobility, drawing attention to the stagnation of British academic life. In the second chapter, "Settling", the period when the two academics explore each other's worlds with references to how the capitalist ideology works differently in these two universities is illustrated. The third one, "Corresponding", consists of letter exchanges between both Philip Swallow and his wife Hilary as well as Morris Zapp and his wife Desiree, since their already static and problematic marriages start to fall apart with the influence of physical distance. "Reading", which is the shortest chapter, consists of newspaper and brochure clippings about student demonstrations and upheavals of the sixties in both campuses, resulting in the arrest and injury of the staff as well as the students. The fifth one "Changing" includes Philip Swallow's confession about the transformative effects of his American experience, and Morris Zapp's becoming more sensitive to the opposite sex thanks to Hillary's tenderness and domesticity. All these stages portray what happens when two different academic customs are blended, so, in that sense, the novel initiates the discussion on academic mobility.

4.2.1. Academic Mobility

The origins of academic mobility dates back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries when "Germany developed research centres of excellence," (Kim, 2009: 390) which allured a lot of researchers from all over the world. However, like a lot of European countries, England also got its share of this movement increasingly after the World Wars because there was a partial stagnation in scholarly and aesthetic studies during the inter-war period. Therefore, the academics in the fifties and sixties, in Amis and Bradbury's novels, served in their own countries, and

engaged in only national studies rather than looking for alternatives in other countries. For example, in Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong*, Professor Treece represents the generation of inter-war period, who spends his whole life in one institution, and does not even dream of leaving his country. One reason of this domesticity is that it took time for England to distance itself from the immediate effects of the war and catch up with the pace of science and technology. To underline the issue of mobility, the opening chapter of *Changing Places*, which is about Philip Swallow and Morris Zapp up in the sky crossing each other's paths, contains a set of aviation terminology, such as "Boeing 707, cabin, corridor, risk of collision, altitude, criss-crossing, soaring, looping" (6). Thus, before going into detail about the experiences of these professors in their host countries, the technology that makes such a fast exchange of place possible is underlined with.the two jet planes meeting in the air.

Another implication of mobility in the novel is that British academics are not as enthusiastic as their American colleagues about changing their places, at least within the framework of Lodge's observations. Early in the novel it is declared that Philip Swallow applied to a fellowship in America during his master's studies, and got accepted. However, he did not take the chance due to his romantic attachment to his future wife, Hilary (14). He ignored the opportunity and stayed in Rummidge as an assistant lecturer. On the other hand, when his marriage with Desiree starts to fall apart, Morris Zapp calls the dean of his faculty and declares: "Look, I want to go to Europe for six months, as soon after Christmas as possible. I need some kind of deal. What have you got?" (33). He purposefully wants to escape from his domestic problems by using his career, and presents the administration with a fait accompli, and the dean lists what he has got at hand though he believes the agreement with Rummidge is way below Morris Zapp's academic standards. Since the exchange programme takes a longer time than other short-term studies, Zapp accepts it as an exit strategy.

Although Lodge's novel frequently includes the implication that England is not a favourable country for an American academic with references to lower salaries, unfavourable weather and the like, the researchers studying academic mobility picture England as a very hospitable and popular country for scholars from

all over the world. When the dean of the faculty asks Morris Zapp about where in Europe he would like to go, Zapp replies: "Even England," (33) revealing his negative attitude about the country with the word "even". His dislike of the country, later on, is supported with the information that Morris has never been in England before this exchange program despite his mobile lifestyle. His former disinterest in the country, and later on regarding it as the last resort for a long-term stay creates a negative image of the country from an American's perspective, yet England, in reality, has long been hosting significant scholars. For instance, Terri Kim suggests that "Many of the great names of 'British scholarship' were from elsewhere, whether voluntary migrants or enforced exiles" (587). By quoting a long list of names and biographies of distinguished scholars whose career paths urged them to set foot in England, or settle down there, Kim emphasizes the fact that England has been hosting eminent scholars, and is among the highly preferred countries in Europe. The socio-economic reasons of academic mobility in England, which change in the course of time under the influence of changing policies of higher education, will be discussed in *Small World* in relation to the capitalist policies in Margaret Thatcher's term of service. During the post-war period, there is also a reverse version of this mobility, that is, British scholars also opted for other countries for their academic studies, including the United States. In this respect, Morris Zapp represents the American perspective, but Philip Swallow also has his own observations about America, though he is not as outspoken and critical as Morris Zapp.

4.2.2 Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy

The first noticeable difference on the issue of class in Lodge's trilogy is how subtly he deals with the concept in the academia. Particularly in the first book, there is no explicit reference to the class conflict because of the transformation of class dynamics in the decades he wrote his novels. The boundaries between classes gradually become more fluid and variable, and the differences became less noticeable especially in the academia. Having been distanced from the immediate effects of the World Wars, the policies of higher education was no longer occupied with finding positions for the returning veterans, instead the focus shifted to gaining profit through education not only on an individual level but also on the national

level. Within this context, both protagonists in *Changing Places* have moderate class origins, though not depicted as lower-class, and they do not experience social exclusion unlike the previous lower-class academics analysed so far in this thesis. Different from Jim Dixon, Professor Treece, Louis Bates or Howard Kirk's cases, the two academics in Lodge's first campus novel, Swallow and Zapp, are described through their academic talents rather than the financial hardships that hinder them in the way of becoming successful in the academic world. The rise and fall in their academic careers are rather associated with their individual merits and discipline. Regarding Gramsci's discussion on organic versus traditional intellectuals, the 1980s witness the rise of organic intellectuals who are highly flexible according the changing needs and trends both in the economic and intellectual arenas. Academics in David Lodge's novels are more geared towards the needs of modern society and science unlike the traditional academics who are only interested in preserving the established customs and practices as in the example of Professor Welch in Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim*. Thus, in Lodge's trilogy, the concept of class does not appear as a distinctive powerful determinant of social and academic status.

Since David Lodge penned his trilogy during a period when the immediate effects of the Second World War withered away, and the educational policies required individuals to prove their talents regardless of their social class, the problems Lodge foregrounds changed in this direction. Due to the rise of meritocracy, individuals, in and out of academia, have been evaluated on the basis of their personal capabilities rather than their class-based privileges. The first noticeable trace of this criterion is the description of Morris Zapp in the opening chapter:

> Zapp was the man who had published articles in PMLA while still in graduate school; who enviably was offered his first job by Euphoric State, had stuck out for twice the going salary, and got it; who had published fiendishly clever books (four of them on Jane Austen) by the time he was thirty and achieved the rank of full professor at the same precocious age. (11)

In this and in many other depictions of the protagonist, there is no reference to the familial or class-based ties unlike Amis and Bradbury's novels in which the protagonists' poor backgrounds and social classes are underlined with specific references to their past. This time, the emphasis is on the protagonist's academic

prolificacy and the money gained by this success. Philip Swallow, on the other hand, fails to grasp the "enterprise culture" that is desired by the prime minister of the period, and falls behind the requirements of the same system. He is described as follows: "Swallow was a man scarcely known outside his own department, who had published nothing except a handful of essays and reviews, who had risen slowly up the salary scale of Lecturer by standard annual increments and was now halted at the top with slender prospects of promotion" (11). Philip Swallow's unambitious nature, which is connoted by his unproductivity and leisureliness in the professional arena, is in stark contrast with Morris Zapp's prolific and industrious character. This situation firstly is reminiscent of Gramsci's ideas about the differences between the formation of American and British intellectuals. As is specified in the chapter on theoretical framework, Gramsci believes there does not exist clear-cut divisions between organic and traditional intellectuals in America as they merged while the country builds its superstructure upon a huge industrial base (20). Thus, figures like Morris Zapp do not have to fight with a group of traditional intellectuals who support the maintenance of present customs and applications in academia. Furthermore, through the success level of these two academics, the difference in the functioning and perception of meritocracy in England and in the United States manifests itself. From the American perspective, the destiny of the academics depends on their personal effort and ambition, while the British academia is relatively slow to integrate this into their system.

In line with this, there are differing opinions on how meritocracy functions in society, and whether it is beneficial to implement it into the system of higher education. While some researchers interpret it as an indispensable step of creating equal opportunities, both in education and in business, for individuals from different social classes, the others perceive it as another system of division and inequality. Barbara Celarent specifies what the term actually means in its time in her comprehensive review of Michael Young's book:

> In its time, *Meritocracy* was part of an intense polemic about British education. The 1944 Education Act had brought the eleven-plus exam, whose results dictated a tripartite division of students into academic, technical, and vocational tracks. Chief among Young's targets was a great apostle of that system—Eric James, headmaster of the famous Manchester Grammar School, which restricted nearly all its places to those who obtained high scores on the eleven-plus. (323)

For Celarent, the book consists of the mockery of this divisive system and "raised all the issues of stratification by means of its unforgettable fantasy" (322). Later on, a group of 21st century scholars, mentioned in the chapter on theoretical framework, who were supportive of Young's perspective, perceived meritocracy as another "stratification" system, and believed that it would be a very simplistic approach to regard that every talented individual could change his destiny only with his/her education. At this point, a deeper look at both protagonists' backgrounds in the novel is more explanatory of their present status and success; that is, Morris Zapp is the product of the progressive American education system while Philip Swallow is an expected result of the relatively classical system of higher education in England. Skills such as assertiveness, spirit of competition, inventiveness, resourcefulness, self-reliance that are culturally valued in American higher education have not found their proper places in English higher education for a very long time. Emergence of such values within British academia fall on relatively later decades in their recent history. Hence, personal effort combined with inherent skills is not a formula applicable to Swallow's situation. In this respect, Miriam David compares the education reform movements in Britain and the USA starting from 1960s till the end of 1980s, and finds fundamental similarities as well as differences between their educational policies. By juxtaposing the two higher education systems step by step and chronologically, he specifies "In the USA, the same objectives of education reform were pursued as in Britain. Indeed, it could be argued that Britain followed rather than led the USA," (98) which is explanatory of Morris Zapp's being more acquainted with the newest regulations and trends in his field than Philip Swallow is. David also draws attention to the complexity of the American higher education system resulting from the fact that they start very early to specialize in their field of studies, and focus on more specific areas of study rather than following a general curricula and teaching a bit from everything in a chosen field. On the other hand, David suggests that both Britain and America went through analogous stages in their educational reforms in terms of targeting expansion and equality and being partially ineffective in realizing this goal in the long run as a result of changing governments and political perspectives. From Brown and Tannock's perspective, the United States discovered the global war for talent earlier

than England, or any other nation states, it had a leading role in the knowledge market for a long time in comparison to the European countries. In relation to the position of England in the global knowledge market, they assert: "Large and wealthy countries, too, are losing some of their highly skilled – Britain, for example, has lost a greater number of its college-educated citizens overseas than any other country in the world" (382). Thus, it can be suggested that Philip Swallow's American experience provides him with an insight into a more complicated and up-to-date system of education in the seventies.

David Lodge himself also fosters the idea that his protagonists are in fact products of two different socio-economic and educational systems, and were gradually shaped by the requirements of these divergent systems. Therefore, the perception about the meritocratic system and its admission into higher education went through different processes in England and America. Martin Trow from the University of California at Berkeley, has studied forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since the Second World War, and specifies three chronological phases, namely, "elite, mass and universal" (244). Statistically, he demonstrates that in modern societies, there is a shift from an elite tendency towards adding the masses into education, and later on combining it with universal standards to catch up with the rest of the world. However, the initial stages of expansion meant widening and spreading the available elitist system in England, and the transformation to a mass system was not a smooth process. He argues, "In Britain, as on the European Continent, growth in the early years of expansion was achieved mainly by expanding the elite university system. But the old institutions could not expand indefinitely; they were limited by their traditions, organizations, functions, and finance" (248). The traditionalism of English universities becomes apparent when the administration of Euphoric State University tries to assign Philip Swallow the courses he needs to teach that semester. The Chairman of the faculty calls Morris Zapp and states: "Goddammit, Morris, what are we gonna do with this guy Swallow? He claims he ain't got a field" (47). Upon this, Morris advises to assign something related to his PhD, but is bewildered when the Chairman of the faculty informs that they have a different system in England, and Philip Swallow does not even have a PhD. Morris reacts incredulously, "You mean the jobs are hereditary?"

(47). From Morris's reaction, it is understood that such a system sounds very old fashioned and impractical from an American's perspective, since they do not have an equivalent practice at their universities. Despite finding it weird, the American university accepts Swallow, and lets him teach classes due to the contract between the two universities, the acceptance of an instructor without a PhD is also an indicator of progressive and innovative structure of American universities, which is ready to embrace such differences in practice.

The residues of the old elitist system has also been discussed in the chapter on *Lucky Jim*, in which the protagonist is unhappy with the elitist tendencies in the academia though he is admitted to the system as a result of the expansion schemes that aims equal opportunity in education. Therefore, Swallow's situation indicates that there are still minor traces of the established tradition in English academia, while the whole system is based on revolution, change, and renovation from the very beginning in the United States. One study that confirms this difference in educational arena of these two countries is by Donald J. Treiman and Kermit Terrell, in which they discuss the process of status attainment in these two countries, suggesting: "We show that the British stratification system is somewhat more closed than that of the United States: there is less intergenerational occupational mobility in Britain, and the correlations among status variables are generally stronger" (563). They mainly argue that British societal values controlled the higher education strongly; that is, the stratification in the social structure is reflected in education for a very long time, and the status attainment is linked to "the kind of schooling one receives" (569). Therefore, occupational privileges and disadvantages have long been passed down from one generation to the other in the same family, which is closely linked to Morris Zapp's evaluating the English system as 'hereditary'.

As for the hegemony in academia, it starts to be felt in Philips Swallow's involuntary assignment for the exchange program. Academic rivalry which has been discussed in the analysis of Amis and Bradbury's novels, is introduced, in the first chapter, with a petty trick behind Swallow's dispatch because the university administration wants to promote a junior staff as the head of the department instead of Swallow during his absence. Swallow is not a proper candidate from the

perspective of the administration. It is stated, "Philip Swallow had never actually applied for Rummidge-Euphoric exchange scheme" (18), and learns later on "the year's nominee for the exchange scheme had withdrawn at the last moment" (18); therefore, the administration does not intend to do Swallow a favour, rather, they are looking for someone to fill in the vacancy. Furthermore, his absence will give the administration the opportunity to rob him of his long-desired promotion without hurting his feelings. This hegemonic power-struggle is only a beginning for the upcoming series of competitions and ego-satisfaction of academics.

In the novel there is the suggestion that meritocratic ideals create another system based on hegemony, rather than a humanitarian alternative to the old class-based hegemony in the academia. Academics who gain titles and respect with their personal effort and talents control the system, create the trends, and become dominant figures in their own fields, and they leave no space for the less prestigious or junior academics who have a claim on academic attainment. For instance, being aware of his success and power in the academic world, Morris Zapp generally has a critical eye for the other academics, and their studies. His disdain of British academics, specifically the ones he observes in Rummidge is explained with such remarks: "Their publications are vapid and amateurish, inadequately researched, slackly argued, and riddled with so many errors, misquotations, misattributions and incorrect dates that it was amazing they managed to get their own names right on the title page (37). He cannot understand how these incapable English academics sometimes dare to criticise American academics in their "lousy" journals. From his perspective, the English academics cannot even be rivals to the Americans with their clumsiness. Due to this disdaining perspective, Swallow experiences difficult times during the exchange program. To exemplify, upon his arrival at the host university, Philip Swallow is assigned to teach a course for a whole semester, *English 305*, yet he is shocked when he learns that the title of his course is Novel Writing, from a student who intends to register. He states, "I must stop this at once," (52) meaning to call the administration and change it. Despite his intention and effort to share his rejection with the authorities, he cannot even bring up the subject during the phone call. All his sentences are interrupted by the chairman of the department, Professor Hogan, and his remarks are left unfinished: "I…, but what

I…, about my courses…., I mean, no that is….," (52) Hogan automatically keeps the conversation going, and repeats the same word, "fine" to dismiss any argument and negotiation, and rings off (52). He does not give Philip Swallow the chance to open up his problem, instead he has a cliché and superficial conversation with him to circumvent the real issue. In fact, the administration of the Euphoric State University never asks Philip Swallow's opinion about the issue in advance, since they are not interested in his preferences. As a visiting professor, Swallow is expected to fill in Morris Zapp's place, compensate for his absence, and maintain Zapp's already established order rather than proposing his own syllabus. The American higher education which embraces an instructor without a PhD does not let him teach a course of his own design, so the innovative steps are welcome only when they are offered by skilled members of the academic community. Zapp is a popular professor at his home university, and the courses he offers draw considerable interest. Therefore, no one questions the content of the courses, and the administration considers their maintenance as a natural process. In one sense, the more "talented" and dominant academic becomes a hegemonic force upon the less powerful one. Philip Swallow's situation can also be evaluated within Gramsci's concept of consent, which defines the voluntary consent to the dominant ideology; however, Philip Swallow's consent is not because of free will but for practical reasons of getting his high salary and position in an American university. He inevitably complies with the requirement of the American system, which has long ago adapted the capitalist and meritocratic values.

This new form of hegemony created by the meritocratic culture is, in a sense, a follow-up to the old hegemonic system based on class distinctions for some critics. For instance, despite being a supporter of the meritocratic system, T.S. Eliot carefully underlines the precariousness of such a system, and cautions that there is a fine line between being carefully selective and being discriminatory in this system. He argues,

> But the ideal of an educational system which would automatically sort out everyone according to his native capacities is unattainable in practice; and if we made it our chief aim, would disorganize society, and debase education. It would disorganize society by substituting for classes, elites of brains, or perhaps only of sharp wits. (101)

Eliot emphasizes the difficulties of putting the meritocratic scheme into practice, and is aware that if not carefully dealt with, the system will only be a substitution of the old class system. Therefore, as discussed briefly, putting Morris Zapp and Philip Swallow into the same position in the academia, and testing them against the same criteria might not give clear results about their inherent merits, since they do not go through the same educational processes. Therefore, juxtaposing their status and posts by means of the exchange program makes Philip Swallow look less capable in academic studies compared to Morris Zapp. Nevertheless, as suggested, this is a very simplistic approach, which ignores the discrete educational practices that they have been subjected to for their whole educational lives.

4.2.3 Capitalist Policies in Higher Education

As briefly discussed in the introduction of the chapter, Thatcher's educational policies caused fundamental changes in the system of higher education, and the process of privatization started for the universities as well. In *Changing Places*, the first noticeable example of this corporatization of universities is the course bulletin that is prepared and published by the administration of Euphoric State University. When Philip Swallow inquires the content and function of the bulletin, a student, Wily Smith, gives him a copy of the last issue. He informs Swallow that Kroop, one of the Assistant Professors in the English Department, has been refused tenure because the other professors accused him of not publishing enough. The student also adds that the real reason behind this refusal is jealousy because Kroop always gets highly positive comments in the course bulletin, and he is quite a popular instructor (53). When the students learn that Kroop has been refused tenure, they start a campaign to keep their favourite instructor, and wear badges carrying the label "Kroop" to protest the decision. After reading the commentaries on the course bulletin, Swallow ponders "It was apparently a kind of consumers' guide to teachers and courses based on questionnaires handed out to students in previous quarters" (53). The more he examines the bulletin the more he comes to believe that the appreciation of the students is central for an academic to be accepted at a university permanently. Therefore, as university staff, it is their responsibility to please their "customers" in order to be appreciated by the

administration. Although not stated openly in the novel, this is one of the initial steps for the upcoming series of changes in the nature of the student-teacher relationship since a new criterion, namely customer satisfaction, gains importance in higher education. This means, lecturers need to advertise their courses, and create interesting syllabuses that draw the attention of the students to be able to get tenure.

Such insecurity urged British academics to look for alternatives such as leaving their posts in England to go to other countries. Michael Shallock, commenting on the immense influence of Thatcher's educational policies on academics, argues, "Due to the atmosphere of change and insecurity, 200 British academics abandoned tenured positions at British universities for posts in the US" (32) at the end of the eighties. It sounds like a small number, yet it is the harbinger of the upcoming necessity for academic mobility for the English academics. As partially explained in the mobility discussion above, England lost some of its intellectuals to other European countries because of financial difficulties. Upon this, Terri Kim suggests: "The term 'brain drain' was coined by the British Royal Society in its report published in February 1963, entitled 'Emigration of Scientists from the United Kingdom' (Royal Society 1963), to highlight the outflow of scientists and technologists from the UK to the United States and Canada" (2009:394). Thus, even before Thatcher's intervention, British academics, though on a small scale, opted for other countries for their academic studies. Such forced departures of academics could be evaluated within the framework of capitalist policies in English higher education because this type of migration is a reaction to the lack of job security during economic turmoil in the seventies and eighties.

The financial difficulties experienced in English universities, as mentioned, is a central topic in the novel which is depicted from different aspects such as low salaries and uncomfortable physical conditions at English universities. In the opening pages of the first chapter, Rummidge and Euphoric State are compared through underlying physical or procedural differences. For instance, the fact that monetary restrictions render British universities undesirable for foreign professors is emphasized at the very beginning in *Changing Places*. While explaining the terms and conditions of the exchange program between Rummidge and Euphoric

State, the comparison between the salaries given in English and American universities is described as follows:

> Under the original agreement, each visitor drew the salary to which he was entitled by rank and seniority on the scale of the host institution, but as no American could survive more than a few days on the monthly stipend paid by Rummidge, Euphoric State made up the difference for its own faculty, while paying its British visitors a salary beyond their wildest dreams and bestowing upon them indiscriminately the title of Visiting Professor. (10)

Two points raise concern about the conditions of English academics; the first one is that they need to live on a very limited income, and the second implication is that British academia is highly discriminative compared to American academia. For the former point, the welfare of academics was not a noticeable issue before the Second World War in England, since the majority of the individuals who opted for academic careers already came from rich families. From Raymond Williams's perspective, this tendency to disregard the financial status of the academics could be interpreted as the "residue" of the old, aristocratic profile of English academia who did not rely on their incomes from a university to survive. Such intellectuals already had their family properties or assets, which made them perceive the academia as the pursuit of their personal satisfactions rather than a way to earn a living. They also created very rooted customs in English academia that have been followed for many years. In relation to this, Noel Annan, in his book, *The Dons: Mentors, Eccentrics, and Geniuses* (1999), gives a long list of the Oxford and Cambridge based scholars, and describes their legacy in British academia. He points out the dons at Oxford and Cambridge shaped the British higher education for two hundred years, creating rooted traditions that are preserved in the long run, since these universities serve to create true intellectuals who are loyal to the tradition. He argues,

> Universities have endured hard times since government decided to move to mass higher education, none more so than the elite institutions I knew so well in London – University College, Imperial College and the London School of Economics – and the leading civic universities. It is these places, with Oxford and Cambridge that are the guardians of intellectual life. They exist to cultivate the intellect. Everything else is secondary. Equality of opportunity to come to the university is secondary….The need to mix classes, nationalities and races together is secondary. The agonies and gaieties of student life are secondary. So are the rules, customs, pay and promotion of the academic staff and their debates on changing the

> curricula or procuring facilities for research– all these are secondary to the cultivation, training and exercise of the intellect. (3)

As is understood, Annan, a researcher of the twentieth century, strongly opposes the violation of the old elitist system as it harbours everything desirable for educating great scholars in England. Annan is not the only researcher pointing out the residues of the old tradition in the English academia. A number of researchers, like Martin Trow, suggest that the elite university system in England maintained its existence till the mid-twentieth century (248). With such an elitist mind-set in the background British academia falls behind the requirements of newly developing educational systems, and fails to understand the problems of academics.

Different from the British scene, in the novel, there is the implication that the American academia is aware of the newly constructed dynamics of the capitalist world, so provides university staff with ample opportunities as well as satisfying salaries. There is an inverse proportion between the monetary policies of British and American universities; that is, the former increases the budget cuts and restricts tenure options while the latter looks for ways to make university staff comfortable. American professor Zapp is surprised to see the horrid conditions of Rummidge and the superficiality of its academic staff in terms of their limited world views and publications in the second chapter. In this respect, the chapter signals the contrast between the academic customs of British and American universities; America is the more progressive, standardized, and revolutionary at the expense of humanistic values, and England is implied to have relatively humanitarian, but old fashioned academic standards. In that sense, it is the starting point of a series of comparative analysis of different academic settings and customs.

Parallel to this, the perception about the nature of academic studies is quite different in these two countries. Philip Swallow teaches literature to earn his living, yet treats literature as an integral part of his life, and uses a sort of artistic design even to write his exam papers, which impresses the examinees and other members of the staff. There is also the implication that if his exam papers were published, it would be treated like art work, and inspire huge interest in the reading public. As a professor of literature, Morris Zapp has quite a different perception of life and literature from Philip Swallow's. His point of view is summarized in what follows:

"In Morris Zapp's view, the root of all critical error was a naïve confusion of literature with life. Life was transparent, literature was opaque. Life was an open, literature was a closed system. Life was composed of things, literature of words" (37). He also teaches literature to earn his living, yet he manages to make a division between literature, as a field of study, and life. He perceives the teaching of literature as something he performs to earn money just like doctors, physicians, or engineers. It is not a life-style for him, but a job. On the other hand, Philip is fully absorbed in his classical readings, getting lost in them; thus, cannot perceive teaching literature as merely a job till the last years of his service. This difference in their perception is also related to the fact that England was one step behind the United States in adapting capitalist regulations into higher education. As discussed in relation to Annan's ideas about the mission of British universities which consist of cultivation of the mind and pursuit of aesthetics, the British Philip Swallow remains interested in the aesthetic side of his job until the last phases of his career when he discovers the materialist tendencies in his workplace.

In the novel, the disdainful attitude of American Morris Zapp towards all British academia and its practices is frequently exemplified. From his perspective, the English academia is full of unskilful scholars. His perspective is summarized in what follows:

> He had neither affection nor respect for the British. The ones he had met - expatriates and visiting professors – mostly acted like fags and then turned out not to be, which he found unsettling. At parties they wolfed your canapés and gulped your gin as if they had just been released from prison, and talked all the time in high twittering voices about the differences between English and American university systems, making it clear that they regarded the latter as a huge, rather amusing racket from which they were personally determined to take the biggest possible cut in the shortest possible time. (37)

From Morris Zapp's perspective, the British look unpleasant and repulsive, and British academics admire the American system. While they want to get their share of the system, and engage in the American experience, Morris Zapp is quite reluctant to socialize with them. The reference to prison is also an implication about the tediousness of English Universities, for him, the English professors desire to travel to America in order to get rid of boring, official, and ceremonious manners in the English academia. He also mocks the British professors' delusions of

grandeur, and imitation of delicacy which makes them look like homosexuals – "fags" – though they really are not. Since in the trilogy the British academia is recounted from the perspective of Morris Zapp as the focalizer, such disgust on the part of Morris Zapp makes one question the validity and impartiality of his criticism.

The implication that England is behind America in catching the ideological changes in the world is also fostered in the fourth chapter of the novel with the short paper clippings from the brochures and newspapers of both countries. The clippings indicate that American students resist the police force more vigorously to get what they demand from the government and school administration while British students organize smaller and less fierce demonstrations with less injuries and strife. The suggestion that the effect of the student revolutions was not equally felt in these two campuses points to the difference of the ideological climates of the British and American campuses. From Lodge's perspective, American universities are one step further in catching the spirit of revolution while English universities still have some hesitations about resisting the old system and demanding new regulations. In Bradbury's *History Man*, such upheavals and protests on campus were partially reflected only within the British context, yet Lodge's depictions are noteworthy in terms of drawing a comparative and; therefore, a more global look at the scene.

4.3 *Small World: An Academic Romance*

Written right in the middle of the eighties, *Small World* reflects a lot of socio-cultural and economic changes of the decade in Britain. The same couples of the first novel appear in the second novel together with other academics from different countries who compete with one another, this time, on a universal scale. Moreover, the comparison between the English and American higher education systems subtly continues in the background. Lodge must have decided that even two campuses would be limited to picture the academia, and enlarges the geographical space both to free the campus from its physical ties and to reinforce the notion of mobility. Morris Zapp, in what follows, emphasizes the inevitability of movement for academics at the beginning of this novel: "Even two campuses wouldn't be enough. Scholars these days are like the errant knights of old, wandering the ways of the world in search of adventure and glory" (273). The

academic mobility from Lodge's perspective is a form of modern pilgrimage whose ancient versions existed in the Middle Ages, in which the pilgrims were all in search of pastime activities, enjoying one another with interesting stories on the way to their destination. In the prologue of the second novel, Lodge draws attention to the similarity of modern academic mobility to the pilgrimages of the past, saying: "As the poet Geoffrey Chaucer observed many years ago, folk long to go on pilgrimages. Only, these days, professional people call them conferences" (213). Thus, conferences are no more than pastime activities, which lead to academic mobility. Jelena Borojevic, in her article on literary space in Lodge's novel, confirms Lodge's attempt to make an analogy between academic mobility and the archaic notion of a pilgrimage, and suggests that "Lodge forms a connection between the tales of literary conferences and the quests of older stories. Such is the case with the *Canterbury Tales*, where there are recurring instances of religion, betrayal, righteousness and conspiracies" (45).

From the beginning, Lodge implies that these travels are done for reputation and prestige rather than for pursuit of pure scientific knowledge. The search for glory connotes hegemonic wars among academics whose interests clash occasionally when they set eyes on the same rank and position. To depict the variety in academic styles, customs and trends, the reader is taken on a world-tour, and provided with vivid profiles of numerous academics in competition with one another. By means of seminars and international conferences, which occupy nearly two-thirds of the second novel, the academics are observed in contact with their colleagues, not in their institutions but away from the mundane realities of daily life, and they take great pleasure in exploring new tastes, meeting new people, and having sex with strangers. In *Small World*, the carnivalesque atmosphere of the conferences is relatively more emphasized in comparison to Amis and Bradbury's novels with elements of excessive drinking, disguise, deception, and sexual affairs. Briefly, the central themes of the trilogy; hegemonic power-struggles, the inevitability of mobility and the entrance of capitalist ideology into universities are hinted at early in the book.

4.3.1 The Idea of the Global Campus: Fashion of Academic Mobility

The idea that the whole world is turning into one global campus, hinted partially in the first book of the trilogy, is articulated in many contexts in *Small World*. Starting from the title, it is implied that the world, which is already confined and small for academics, is getting even smaller with the invention of the internet and communicative devices. Since the whole pace of information gains a dazzling acceleration, the academia needs to adapt itself to the new speed of communication. From Raymond Williams's perspective, the dominant changes in the academia; that is, mobility and adaptation to information technologies are the new dominants in the educational arena. Therefore, one of the opening discussions of the first chapter is the interest in information technologies among the academics. Mainly reflected from the perspective of Morris Zapp, mobility becomes an inevitable part of academic life. Zapp declares: "information is much more portable in the modern world than it used to be. So are people. *Ergo*, it is no longer necessary to hoard your information in one building, or keep your top scholars correlated in one campus" (255). Scholars need to change their places and search for academic knowledge anywhere in the world through travel or online research. His detection also means that immobility is an old-fashioned style, and the modern world does not appreciate stable academics any more. Now that the world is getting smaller by means of technological advancement and developed transportation systems such as planes, high speed trains, and even private jets, the academia is pushed to get some insight about their fields on a global scale. In short, all the academics in *Small World* adapt travelling for their studies as a lifestyle, and keep expressing the need of mobility.

The increasing tendency towards academic mobility suggested by Lodge is also supported by the scientific studies that focus on the place of mobility in academic promotion and development. For instance, Terri Kim, from Brunel University in west London, studies the historical development of mobility in United Kingdom starting from the middle ages till the 21st century. He argues: "The notion of the cosmopolitan 'wandering scholar' links with the origins of universities, but the patterns of academic mobility in the history of universities have been framed by the international politics of particular time periods" (2009: 387). To exemplify, he draws attention to the influence of "enlarged European union" (2009:394),

specifically at the end of the 20th century, on the rising popularity of academic mobility, since during this period both academics and students found the chance to travel across Europe more easily. Kim, in a sense, confirms the influence of politics upon education, and argues that socio-economic dynamics of a particular period partially controls the trends in education as in the case of mobility. Thus, Morris Zapp's simile that scholars today are like "the errant knights of old" (273) corresponds to Kim's notion of "the wandering scholar". Policy makers started to realize the contribution of cross-cultural interaction to academic studies, and initiated collaborative projects with different universities. Lodge starts the first novel in the trilogy with such a project between Rummidge University and Euphoric State, then develops it into a more complicated network among many universities from various countries. For instance, the relatively immobile academic of *Changing Places*, Philip Swallow, goes through a transformation in the second novel, and is described by one of his colleagues, Rupert Sutcliffe, as: "Lately he seems to be absent more often than he's present" (233). In Sutcliffe's complaint about Philip Swallow's absenteeism from the faculty lies a jealousy firstly because he also wants to have the same opportunity to travel freely, secondly he desires to be in Swallow's position as the head of the department. He declares: "If they'd appointed me, they'd have had a Head of the Department who stuck to his post, and wasn't flying off here there and everywhere all the time" (233). His claim does not sound believable since academic mobility was perceived as a privilege for a lot of academics in England in the eighties; that is, the academics who got such an opportunity despite all the financial and administrative restrictions in the country were regarded as exceptionally lucky. Therefore, Sutcliffe might use the opportunity frequently if he were in Swallow's shoes.

As is implied frequently in the novel, what centralizes mobility and makes it a dominant value in the academic circle is the recognition that it would bring to the academics. For instance, Ronald Frobisher, a novelist in *Small World*, is one of the figures that is sensitive about his fame more than anything else, and he knows that he can stay in the circle through mobility. Like Morris Zapp who supports

catching the *Zeitgeist*[34], he is highly aware of the fashion of academic mobility, and tries to adapt himself to the requirements of the system. Therefore, he gets quite angry with his wife when she implies that she does not understand why even people from far-eastern countries are interested in reading his books, referring to the translation of her husband's novel by a Japanese academic. Feeling that his wife does not have the faintest clue about the necessity of being universally acclaimed, he explains: "Because I am an important figure in post-war British fiction, that's why. You never grasp that fact, do you?" (313). Right after this reaction he opens the conference invitation from Heidelberg, which is full of praise about his contribution to the field, and reads it to his wife to illustrate the essentiality and significance of being famous in the academic world. Discussed briefly in the chapter on *Lucky Jim*, without being praised and honoured by their peers, academics cannot experience job satisfaction; and one way to guarantee this is to increase their popularity by circulating their work worldwide, and building a network through travel. The necessity of networking in academia is directly related to Bourdieu's notion of social capital, which enables a person to gain higher status through his/her network.

Academic fame and prestige has also been one of the central discussions in Bradbury's second novel *History Man (1975),* whose protagonist guarantees his position in the university through his Marxist stance and radical course design. Although there is no mention of academic mobility in Bradbury's books, the necessity of following the trends and fashions is at the heart of obtaining academic prestige in the seventies. Therefore, if the fashion of the sixties and early seventies was having a radical political stance as well as an experimental teaching style in one's institution, the fashion of the eighties was following the latest technological developments and attending seminars and conferences all over the world. In other words, there is always a fashion to follow in academia to be appreciated and recognized by one's peers. In this respect, Lodge implies that in the eighties

[34] "The defining spirit or mood of a particular period of history as shown by the ideas and beliefs of the time. Origin: 19th century: from German Zeitgeist, from *Zeit* 'time'+ *Geist* 'spirit'" (Concise Oxford English Dictionary).

mobility is a prerequisite of this recognition, and a fast adaptation to the trend facilitates receiving academic appraisal as in Ronald Frobisher's case.

One way the novel deals with academic diversity is by including professors from different countries, and picturing different conferences around the world. There are German, Japanese, South-African, English, American, Italian, Irish academics who are in contact with each other through international conferences or exchange programs. They review each other's books and articles to create close relationships and strengthen their network. For instance, Akira Sakazaki, an academic from Tokyo, translates *Could Try Harder* by the British Ronald Frobisher. Because of the difficulties caused by the linguistic differences of English and Japanese, he consults the writer to clarify the terms and phrases he does not understand. The idea of mobility is, thus, reinforced by the contact of two academics who are geographically and culturally quite far away from each other. In addition to this, the second novel immediately starts with the preparations of a conference at Rummidge University, the same redbrick British university of the first novel, implying that even the smallest universities feel the need to engage in international interaction, and host distinguished foreign academics at their campuses. The university is depicted ten years later with its urge to become part of the international movement, so it is suggested that the local universities start to get their share of globalization and mobility at the end of the seventies.

The profile of mobile academics also needs attention in the novel. As is mentioned above, the academics who get invitations to such events are the happy, privileged minority, since not every academic has the necessary network and funding to be part of this mobile circle. Inspired by the Arthurian Legend and the Holy Grail, David Lodge, in an interview with Raymond H. Thompson in 1989, labels this group as "the Round Table of professors: the elite group who get invited to conferences, who go around the world in pursuit of glory"[35]. In line with this, for

[35] He explains further in the interview, "It gradually grew on me that there was an analogy between my story and the Arthurian story, particularly the Grail quest in which a group of knights wander around the world, having adventures, pursuing ladies, love, and glory, jousting with each other, meeting rather coincidentally or unexpectedly, facing constant challenges and crises, and so on. Later I thought that the heroes of romance had an almost magical mobility that enabled them somehow to travel around the whole known world on winged horses, or by no particularly rational means. They do seem to be extraordinarily mobile. This all corresponded to the modern world with its Round Table of professors" (Interview by Thompson).

instance, in the novel there is the implication that the guest speakers of local universities are generally from other local or new universities, it is hardly possible to host somebody famous for such local events (217). The only distinguished speaker is Morris Zapp, but he accepts the invitation for the sake of his old friendship with Philip Swallow rather than personal interest or willingness. The fact that there is a select group of academics who benefit from mobility opportunities, and they prefer more prestigious conferences rather than the local ones in order not to waste their time and energy, fosters the idea that conferences are the paths to prestige and networking. They are, in a sense, very valuable professional investments for the academics, so they need be selected with great care. Thus, popular conferences always bring together the stars of the academic profession, while the local ones are generally pushed aside as trivial events, having no professional value. Lodge confesses in the same interview that he has built his story both structurally and thematically on the framework of the Grail legend for such reasons directly related with mobility during his direct transfer from one conference to another almost in a magical pace. He discovers that the supernaturally fast journeys of mythological heroes directly matches up with the unprecedented pace of academic mobility. Therefore his mobile protagonist Morris Zapp states frequently: "The world is a global campus…. The American Express card has replaced the library pass" (275). Zapp admires the small magical card which enables him to go all around the world with great speed, and perform his duties as a scholar on different campuses[36]. Nevertheless, whether he admits it or not, he becomes one of the professors of "the round table" with all these opportunities of travel and networking.

Furthermore, in the novel, mobility is perceived as an academic's being open to changes from Morris Zapp's perspective. While looking at a panoramic view of Rummidge University and its library, he confesses:

> The day of the individual campus has passed. It belongs to an obsolete technology – railways and printing press…. Look at the library – built like a huge warehouse. The whole place says, '*We have learning stored here; if you want it, you have got to come inside and get it'*. Well, that doesn't apply anymore." (255)

[36] The capitalist connotations of the American Express card will be dealt with under the subtitle of capitalist policies in higher education.

He resembles the library to a warehouse, a place in which the unused items are packed and stored for a long time, which connotes squeezing knowledge into such desolate places prevent people from reaching it, and slows down the flow of information. Knowledge is not something to be locked, rather, it needs to be easily accessible by everyone in such a technological era. The fact that Morris Zapp makes this criticism by looking at the library building of an English provincial university might also connote that English universities are more static and old-fashioned. Unlike Philip Swallow, Morris Zapp follows the fashion and supports the idea of updating oneself in the face of such fast changes in the academia, so he confesses that "There comes a moment when the individual has to yield to the *Zeitgeist* or drop out of the ball game" (274). Nevertheless, what urges him to explore the world is, at the background, the fear of being excluded from his academic cycle for being old-fashioned. In a sense, Zapp does not embrace the situation willingly; rather, he reluctantly obeys the latest mania. For example, he is known to criticize the mania of mobility at the beginning of his career, yet his critique moderates in time since he gradually becomes conscious of the fact that to update one's field of knowledge and enlarge his network through conferences is a serious requirement in academia. Like Howard Kirk in Bradbury's second novel, who is a man of fashion and revolutionary trends, Morris Zapp is neither disinterested nor unresponsive to the latest changes in his profession, since he knows that the modern era requires following all the social and professional trends that shape social sciences, and mobility via conferences is an efficient way of realizing this goal.

The academics who follow the latest trends in their fields are more likely to be invited to conferences. In *Small World*, for instance, the magical word in criticism is claimed to be "deconstruction", and Fulvia Morgana, an Italian Marxist professor with radical views and a wide public recognition, criticises the intense usage of the term by the American academia, and reacts to the tendency, saying: "Everybody in Chicago - I'ave just been to Chicago - was reading Derrida. America is crazy about deconstruction" (323). She confesses that she cannot understand this mania of Americans. From her example, it is understood that academic mobility gives the scholars the chance to learn about what is in fashion in other parts of the

world. By visiting Chicago, an academic from Italy gets insight about the latest academic trends there. A.H. Halsey concludes: "After the acceptance of the Robbins Report in the 1960s the social sciences began to flourish in the expanding British universities," (658) which coincides with the fact that all the academics in *Small World*, and also in the previously analysed novels, study social sciences. Nevertheless, the ones that serve during the fifties, before the publication of the Robbins report, as in the examples in *Lucky Jim* and *Eating People is Wrong*, are not mobile academics.

In the novel, the first academic that comes to mind in terms of his unusually mobile career is Arthur Kingfisher, whose name is allusion to the Fisher King[37] in the Arthurian Legend. Like the Fisher King, Arthur also suffers from impotency for a very long time and relates it to his academic unproductivity through the end of his career. He is an exceptional academic who guarantees worldwide fame not only through his studies, but also his success in spreading these studies through publications, conferences and seminars all around the world. For instance, in the novel, the conference on "The Crisis of the Sign", inspires interest from all famous academics and literary critics, because of Arthur Kingfisher's keynote address. Since he is depicted as the indisputable connoisseur of literary criticism, his participation in such seminars is perceived as gratification of the event. To host the most important name in literature is an honour for the conference organizers, and they start to flatter him long before the conference to persuade him to attend it. His biography is given in minute detail in the novel to display how he obtained such reputation:

> This is Arthur Kingfisher, doyen of international community of literary theorists, Emeritus professor of Columbia and Zürich universities, the only man in academic history to have occupied two chairs simultaneously in different continents (commuting by jet twice a week to spend Mondays to Wednesdays in Switzerland and Thursdays to Sundays in New York), now retired but still active in the world of scholarship, as attender of conferences, advisory editor to academic journals, consultant to university presses. (299)

[37] "In the Arthurian legend the Fisher King, or the Wounded King, is the last in a long line charged with keeping the Holy Grail. Versions of his story vary widely, but he is always wounded in the legs or groin and incapable of moving on his own. In the Fisher King legends, he becomes impotent and unable to perform his task himself, and he also becomes unable to father or support a next generation to carry on after his death. His kingdom suffers as he does, his impotence affecting the fertility of the land and reducing it to a barren wasteland." (see the website*: Story Archaeology: Uncovering the Layers of Irish Mythology)*

From his memoir, it is clear that one thing that guarantees his reputation is his extreme mobility. His studies in two different continents makes him a unique academic in his own field. He also does not give up attending conferences even after his retirement and keeps travelling the world in his old age. It can be inferred from his example that mobility through conferences give senior academics the chance to remain in the field, and keep their fame long after they retire from the university, which is previously implied by Morris Zapp, too.

Besides its scientific and scholarly results, academic mobility also has a cultural aspect; through exchange of places, academics get to know about new cultures and even adapt to them, gradually becoming world citizens. This type of exploration of the host culture, and the transformation of the academics through this experience has been observed for Philip Swallow and Morrris Zapp in the first book of the trilogy. Both protagonists have broadened their horizons about the customs and traditions of their host countries. In the second book, Rudyard Parkinson, a famous critic and scholar, is described as "a South African who came to Oxford at the age of twenty-one and perfected an impersonation of Englishness that is now indistinguishable from authentic specimens" (305). It is implied that by means of long years of foreign education, the individual adapts into the host culture, and in some cases as in the example of Parkinson, he is mistaken for the natives of that culture.

On the other hand, Lodge problematizes the issue of mobility in the novel from the very beginning. *Small World* opens with a Latin epigraph from Horace, "*Caelum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt"* meaning "Those who hurry across the sea change the sky upon them, not their souls, or state of mind" (211). The hurry across the sea refers to the academics who change their locations constantly, and join cross-continental travels, supposedly in search of knowledge, yet, in the background there is the question of whether they really attend conferences for the sake of developing themselves or for following the fashion. The quote might be a foreshadowing for the individual journeys of certain academics in the novel at the end of which very few of them gain any insight about life or their studies, since professors in the novel attend the conferences not to learn or cultivate

their minds but to socialize. Similarly, in *Eating People is Wrong*, Malcolm Bradbury also refers to the madness and futility of pursuing academic fame without having the necessary wisdom and maturity with the epithet from Keats's *Ode on A Grecian Urn*. Therefore, the constant motion and vitality among academics in *Small World* can be read as challenging whether knowledge of new cultures and encounters with academics all over the world provide academics with self-improvement, and contribute to the cultivation of both their mind and their soul.

Furthermore, there is a frequent emphasis on the fact that the conference papers are extremely boring, so attendees skip the majority of the sessions. Even the popular conferences in the book are described as wonderful occasions except the papers. What gives pleasure to the attendees are the informal gatherings that they organize during these conferences as is described:

> Let's have a drink, let's have dinner, let's have breakfast together. It is this kind of informal contact, of course, that's the real *raison d'etre* of a conference, not the programme of papers and lectures which has ostensibly brought participants together, but which most of them find intolerably tedious. (429)

The implication is that what is searched for is not wisdom or knowledge but an entertaining kind of sociability. It is also implied that many middle-aged or old academics perceive conferences as a compensation for the time they wasted for their academic studies when they were much younger. They make sacrifices to get those titles and tenures; that is, they lock themselves into libraries while their peers have fun at the parties, so now they want to make up for their lost youth. Consequently, seminars cease to be intellectually fruitful occasions, and turn into parties during which they lose themselves, and engage in heavy drinking, partner-hunting, and sex.

A further issue that fosters the idea that the world is one global campus is the number of coincidences in the novel. The chain of coincidences starts in the first conference when Morris Zapp discovers that his former landlord is a relative of Percy McGarrigle, a junior Irish academic, who attends the same conference, and gains Zapp's favour with his romantic and sincere style. They learn about the truth while they both pay a visit to the same person after the conference, and they are quite surprized to be related in this way (244). It continues with the hat incident. Since Percy admires his hat during the conference, Zapp wants to give it to him as

gift, but at the airport, he notices that he forgot it. Therefore, Zapp gives the hat to an officer at the airport to be sent to Percy, to Ireland. On the same day, Percy comes to the same airport for his return, and during his chat with the officer, he discovers that the officer has the hat, so he gets it in person without cargo. Another coincidence is Philip Swallow's encounter with Joy, an Italian woman with whom he has had a one-night stand in Genoa after a conference. Although it is only a night's affair, Philip cannot get the woman out of his mind for a long time, and assumes that she is dead after reading about a disastrous plane crash in which her husband's name is included. Since he supposes that Joy also dies during the accident, he goes pale with shock when he sees her in Turkey (412). Briefly, academics keep coming across with one another during very unlikely situations and places, and, finally the last conference is like a grand reunion during which everybody discovers unexpected relations. For instance, Arthur Kingfisher, learns that he has twins from one of his extra-marital sex adventures in his youth, and that one of his daughters is a successful researcher and academic (523). The novel opens with a conference in a small town in England, and finishes with a grand conference in America, and in-between are pictures from nearly all over the world, yet it is as though one reads about the same place and the same community, whose members know each other very well and live in one location, the campus. The campus is such a unifying force that it gathers academics from different continents, nations, classes, and puts them into the same melting-pot. They all engage in similar activities, go through similar procedural problems, and find one another at the other end of the world to talk about these common problems.

4.3.2 Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy

The intense class-antagonism of the 1950s and 60s that has been analysed in Amis and Bradbury's novels in the previous chapters give its way to a more liberal atmosphere in David Lodge's trilogy, which he started to pen in the mid-seventies and ended towards the end of the eighties. Sociologists and researchers suggest that the nineteenth century conception of social class has lost its applicability in the modern world for a lot of reasons. For instance, Stanislaw Ossowski claims that traditional class structure has been transformed into a "bureaucratic hierarchy," (184) so the political authorities determine the essentials

of these hierarchical structures rather than an individual's familial ties or their relations to the means of production. For him, bureaucratic hierarchy is completely different from the traditional hereditary structuring of the old English academia. Besides suggesting moderations in time, he also accepts that there are still antagonisms in the society though not in the classical sense, that is, it is not a conflict directly between lower and higher classes. He argues, "The nineteenth century concept of class becomes more or less an anachronism, and class conflicts give way to other forms of social antagonism" (184). The power struggles among academics, which will be discussed in more detail under this title, provide examples for these "other forms of social antagonism," since the pursuit of prominence creates conflict among academics. From his perspective academia gradually turns into a community in which requirements for getting the titles are clearly defined by political authorities, within specific laws and regulations, and such standardization of the processes in the academia partially hinders the existence of class-based discrimination.

In the seventies, the strategy of valuing the individual's knowledge and skills in his profession, which is called meritocracy, is adapted by the universities in Europe and England as a humanitarian and positive attempt. However, regarding the outcomes of meritocracy, there exists a controversy between Michael Young, who originally coined the term in his dystopia, and the critics who evaluated his term not fictionally but scientifically in different educational and social contexts in the following decades[38]. As discussed in the chapter on theoretical framework, Young defends the idea that meritocracy is another form of fostering inequalities between classes. In fact, eliminating the long-standing effects of class division is not quite possible for him. Although it is a fictional work, Young's discussion created an overwhelming impression on researchers, and there are also scholars that support his stance; that is, the education system guarantees the rule of the elite, and fails to deal with class-based inequalities. A. H. Halsey declares: "All over the

[38] Ansgar Allan is one of those critics of Young's work, and she argues that the meritocratic criteria used in Young's time (50s), and in the following decades do not exactly match. Like other terminology, merit and meritocracy have evolved, so Young's findings might not be valid for the educational and social practices of the following decades. See: "A Philosophical Critique of Michael Young's The Rise of Meritocracy" by Allan.

world there is a search for educational reform towards equality of opportunity. With respect to gender and ethnicity these efforts have succeeded. With respect to class they have failed" (658). At the bottom of the problem lies the fact that the criteria which the meritocratic system applies falls into the trap of creating another hegemonic system that serves the dominant class. One of those criteria is testing the IQ of students on a regular basis. From Young's perspective this system is highly divisive, and gives chance to only exceptional students, based on their IQ and ability tests[39]. Moreover, these tests cannot measure intelligence holistically, so inevitably exclude some students, stripping them from their right to get proper education. Regarding the fact that certain life skills are gained at a very early age by direct exposure to proper examples, the initial concern should be creating those examples for all classes rather than progressive testing.

In the eighties, the academia became less aware of class-distinction, and more aware of the individual's academic merits. Nonetheless, being less conscious of class-antagonism does not mean that the longitudinal effects of this division have completely disappeared from the scene. In fact, for some researchers, the new system of evaluation, meritocracy gave way to the social antagonisms mentioned by Ossowski. In this respect, the publication of *Small World* coincides with numerous studies on the link between class, social mobility and higher education by notable educationalists. For instance, Spyros Themelis, a researcher interested in the relationship between higher education and class mobility, emphasizes the difficulty of climbing the social ladder through education in what follows; "'Meritocracy through education' discourse can potentially conceal inequalities and injustices in contemporary market-driven British society…. The expansion of educational provision and the increase in educational qualifications of the past 60 years has done little to eliminate social class differences and associated privileges" (427). Briefly, from his perspective, meritocracy is nothing but a preservation of the old divisive class system, mainly between the middle-class and the working-class, and cannot guarantee equal opportunities for people from different layers of society.

[39] For further discussion on the use and function of the IQ tests in the sixties and seventies, see: Young's discussion on "Progress of Intelligence Testing" in *Homo Academicus* (1988).

The discussion on the difference between American and British intellectuals goes on in *Small World*, this time with more emphasis to Gramsci's perspective about the absence of traditional intellectuals in the American intelligentsia. This is directly related to the suggestion that English higher education does not update itself quickly enough to catch up with this new meritocratic system since its structure has long been based on criteria other than merit. In England, the existence of an elite group domineering the universities for a very long time initially hindered the integration of meritocratic values into higher education. On the contrary, the whole American education system is built upon meritocratic values and supports the individual talent as a way to obtain a prestigious position in society. From Gramsci's perspective, this historical difference between the formations of intellectuals in each country influenced their higher education policies for a very long time. For instance, in *Small World*, all the distinguished American academics have the chance to get foreign education and travel opportunities thanks to their institutions and governmental funds, while their English colleagues lack the same opportunities as is seen in the difference between financial situations of Morris Zapp and Philip Swallow.

This does not necessarily mean that the academia elsewhere managed to solve the inequalities at universities thanks to adaptation of meritocratic principles. The novel gives certain clues regarding the suggestion that the meritocratic system fosters inequalities, and does not contribute to the welfare of lower-classes through education. The most obvious example of this point is the case of the Irish academic Persse McGarrigle, who comes from a lower-class family, and tries to find a place for himself in the academia through grants and teaching. Despite his implied success and enthusiasm in his field, McGarrigle is not depicted as one of those eminent names in literature. Although he gets a grant and a chance to travel by conference hopping, this limited finance does not provide him with equal opportunities with his colleagues in the long run. This is not a coincidence for some critics, and Philip Brown, one of the prominent contributors of class and social mobility studies, claims: "Existing studies of intergeneration social mobility show how difficult it is for education to equalize relative life-chances because it cannot compensate for wider social inequalities" (693). Brown's article is a key study in

the field which refers to a lot of previous studies that reflect social mobility as a means for a fairer society. He does not believe that education can stop class inequalities without a large-scale political and economic agenda that support it. In a sense, Persse McGarrigle's destiny in academia is under the control of more powerful social determinants such as having the necessary social and cultural capital in Bourdieu's terms, and higher education cannot guarantee him to climb the social ladder.

On the other hand, researchers like Trevor Noble, publishing on social mobility and class relations in Britain, believe in the alleviation of the effects of class-conflict with such claims:

> Trends in post-war Britain indicate that access to favoured occupational positions is improving for the children of both the manual and non-manual strata, and this would in turn therefore imply an incipient decline in the centrality of specifically class or status group relations in the current distribution of power." (434)

In other words, Noble declares class origin as an outdated power struggle, and disregards its long-preserved effects. If one admits that class antagonism has gradually lost its effect in English universities, then, from Noble's perspective, in Persse's case, it is not only class origin that hinders his career development, but his unawareness of the politicking in the academia. He is so naïve and oblivious to the power dynamics around his circle that he does not refrain from opposing distinguished academics in the question-answer sessions of the conferences; reveals their faulty claims, and criticizes their artificial term-bound papers. Therefore, Angelica, the junior academic with whom he is deeply in love, warns him about the issue: "You have to treat these professors carefully, Persse. You have to flatter them a bit" (242). Angelica is more aware of the hegemonic power balances in the academia, for instance, she remains silent despite believing that Morris Zapp has copied another writer's ideas in his conference speech. Instead of sharing her true ideas about the presentation, she asks Zapp some questions just to look interested, and makes Zapp feel that he is of great help (241). However, what Angelica does, in a sense, is abiding by the hegemonic structuring in academia, and letting herself be "guided" by a senior member of the community. Lacking such cunning and ability of politicking, Persse finds the situation quite puzzling and hypocritical. This

difference between Angelica and Persse's perception of hegemony can also be explained by Persse's lack of social and cultural capital in Pierre Bourdieu's terms, since he comes from a lower-class family, and grew up in a small village, while Angelica was raised in a big city by a very rich and reputable American family who cares about her education, and provides her with limitless funds for her self-development.

The hegemonic pressure of established members of academia upon the junior or lower class academics have also been observed in the campus novels analysed so far in this thesis. Characters like Jim Dixon in *Lucky Jim* and Louis Bates in *Eating People is Wrong* have experienced severe problems in the academic circle due to their inability to adapt into the power struggles and politicking. Both miss out their chances of being successful academics, because of the shunning and exclusion of the senior members of their faculty. They do not know how to handle the power dynamics there, and are victimized in the process. While Pierre Bourdieu explains this incompatibility with their lack of social and cultural capital, Gramsci relates the success and failure in education to the systematic exposure to the system starting from childhood. The common ground of these two discussions is the idea that individuals from lower class, like Louis Bates and Persse McGarrigle, need to be given the chance of personal development right from the early years of their lives. The amount of social capital and academic discipline which is partially accumulated later in adulthood is not sufficient enough for individuals from lower class to close the gap. In other words, meritocratic ideals need to be taken into consideration right from primary school in order to raise individuals who are compatible with the same system. Therefore, from Bourdieu's and Gramsci's perspective, it is clear that higher education is not the suitable phase in which to apply meritocratic criteria if the individual has not been brought up with it. It is not merit that Bates and McGarrigle do not have, but the development of those merits at a suitable age, and in an appropriate context. The persistence of such unequal opportunities suggests that there will always be a group that utilizes the advantages of their familial wealth and prestige while the ones who lack the same hereditary opportunities will be deprived of high quality education. Therefore, changing the system at the level of higher education will not contribute to the lower class in the

sense of helping them climb the social ladder through education. So, there is quite a difference between theoretical meritocratic ideals and their application in real contexts.

Fulvia Morgana, an Italian Marxist professor, is a good example from the novel that illustrates this difficulty of applying an egalitarian theoretical perspective into practice and sticking to purely socialist ideals in daily life. She leads a life of extreme luxury with a dream-like mansion, servants, jewellery, cars and clothes of leading-brands. Therefore, her socialist stance is found hypocritical by Morris Zapp, who is equally successful in academic terms, but lacks such wealth and luxury. Practically, he cannot even pay for the tuition of his children and gets in conflict with his ex-wife about monetary problems although his salary is higher than most of his colleagues. When Morris declares that he does not understand how Fulvia "reconciles living like a millionaire with being Marxist," (332) she despises him for being very American, yet accepts: "I recognize the contradictions in our way of life, but those are the very contradictions characteristic of the last phase of bourgeois capitalism, which will eventually cause it to collapse" (332). Her detection is reminiscent of Stuart Hall's *A Sense of Classlessness*, in which he mentions this changing perception of class and the gradual embourgeoisement of the working class together with the change in the "rhythm and nature of industrial work" referring to the "technological industries based on automotive processes" (26). With the advent of technological facilities, large sums of people from lower-classes find themselves with lighter workloads and higher salaries that create an artificial feeling of merging with the upper class, since they have access to some of the luxuries that the upper class have long taken pleasure in.

The paradox in Fulvia's explanation is that she, in a sense, uses the mistakes the bourgeoisie make as a pretext to justify herself. She both accepts that consumerism will bring the end of a class, yet she keeps copying the lifestyles of the people she criticizes. Fulvia's situation is also present in the discussion of Malcolm Bradbury's *History Man* (1975) as well. The sociologist Howard Kirk defends vehemently a working-class life style, and openly criticizes people that engage in bourgeois luxuries, yet he can only partially put these ideas into practice with his wife's shopping weekends, and his own exploitation of graduate students'

labour. Gramsci explains this as contradictory consciousness, while Althusser links it to the dominant capitalist ideology which is imposed via schools, family and other ISAs. And finally Raymond Williams associates it with the "selective force of tradition" which directly chooses the values and ideas that will survive, meaning the dominant, and discusses the difficult situation of "emergent" values that oppose the dominant. The contradictions between Fulvia and Howard's luxurious life styles and their Marxist stance recalls the power of the dominant which absorbs all emergent values and renders them an integral part of the tradition. From Williams' perspective, Fulvia Morgana, like Howard Kirk, only theoretically defends the emergent values, and talks about the existence of an alternative system to the capitalist ideology, yet, in application, they are under the influence of the dominant capitalist ideology.

Neither Fulvia, a rich academic, nor Persse, an extremely poor one, belongs to a class any more, since there is no clear cut boundaries between classes in the eighties in England. In this context, Themelis also mentions a "service class" (434) into which he incorporates the academics. The service class, in his own terms, requires an upward mobility for the lower-class, since they gain money, status and prestige by becoming members of the "service class" with their professional merits. Regardless of their origins, once they enter into the academia, all academics find themselves in this service class, in which they need to survive with their skills and productivity. They form a new community with different dynamics from the classes they come from, and the dynamics of this new class do not always match with the dynamics of the traditionally defined class boundaries. Their previous disadvantages or privileges, related to their classes, are neutralized in the campus, to a certain extent, but not dismissed altogether. Inge Bates and George Riseborough in *Youth and Inequality* (1993) outline how young people from different social classes do not attend the same types of educational institutions, nor do they gain similar levels of qualifications and results, nor follow equivalent post-graduation routes. Their main claim is that, at all phases of the educational development, young lower-class individuals obtain inadequate educational resources, receive less prestigious qualifications and follow lower-status trajectories. Their findings somewhat verify the case of academics like Persse

McGarrigle in *Small World*, and Louis Bates from *Eating People is Wrong* who could not get any chances of promotion in the novels.

Class status is not the only common point of McGarrigle and Bates, a further similarity is that they are both interested in poetry, a field that does not promise financial wellbeing for an individual from the lower class. Robert Dempsey warns Persse McGarrigle about this problem: "I bet you write poetry yourself…. There is no money in it, you know" (219). Louis Bates, similarly, has difficulty in finding a publisher for his poems, the contents of which have later been found aesthetical and of good quality. On the basis of their examples, there might again be the implication that poetry has long been performed under the patronage of nobility in England, and is still seen as an aristocratic preoccupation rather than a profitable job. If it is interpreted within the framework of William's idea of the dominant, and the residual, the field of poetry, in a sense, has not yet been liberated from the residues of the old tradition before the eighties, since an amateur poet from the lower class still has hesitations about performing it without a sponsor.

On the one hand there is the idea that the modern academic system should not be built upon class privileges, should not preserve the old class divisiveness, and individual merit should be valued. On the other hand, the malfunctioning of the meritocratic system or its slow entrance into higher education is questioned, specifically in the British context. For instance, there is the implication in the novel that the British academia is still partly based on the old traditional divisions rather than fostering the idea of promotion through academic productivity. The former staff of Rummidge University, Professor Dempsey, utilizes the conference at Rummidge as an opportunity to pay a visit to his children years later, and observes that the old ineffective system remains intact in the course of time. He criticizes this British tendency of sticking to the old system in academia, which does not stimulate progress in the profession with such remarks:

> Christ, what a retarded lot they were, still are by the look of it. The same old faces. Nobody ever seems to move. Old Sutcliffe, for instance, been here for forty years, man and boy. Naturally I got out as soon as I could. No place for an ambitious man. The last straw was when they gave a senior lectureship to Philip Swallow instead of me, though I had three books out by then, and he'd published practically nothing. (218)

Dempsey obviously believes that publication or academic productivity should mean the sole source of prestige and at the university, implying these are the new criteria for academic development and promotion in the rest of the world. However, the British system still carries the residue of old aristocratic networking tendency, and partly values the senior staff members because of their loyalty to the institution. In this respect, in a special report with the support and sponsorship of the Carnegie Foundation, Burton R. Clark suggests, "some national systems of higher education change more rapidly than others…. In the last half of the twentieth century the huge American array of institutions and disciplines has been unparalleled in its restless proliferation….What gives the American system a distinctively dynamic cast?" (45). The answer he provides for this question is: "extreme competitiveness in the context of institutional hierarchy" (46). It is understood that American universities foster rivalry at an institutional level, so academics have been raised with the consciousness of this criterion from the early years of their educational lives. For instance, Morris Zapp is shocked upon learning that having a PhD or having a field of interest is not valued in British academia. Zapp's stance represents a foreigner's perspective, but Dempsey as a British man also finds the English provincial system static and old-fashioned. From Robin Dempsey's perspective, what matters is being rooted in an institution, knowing the administration for a long time, rather than the academic's merits and studies in his field.

The traditionally class-based structure of hegemonic practices has gradually dissolved, and transformed into a more skill-based hegemony through which the individuals who gain those skills earlier in life can exert power upon the ones who lack them. Hence, the search for dominancy and hegemony does not completely disappear from the academia in David Lodge's trilogy. The hegemonic power-struggles and academic rivalry, which start very early in the trilogy with the pressure that is applied by Morris Zapp's department upon Philip Swallow about the content of the courses he is going to teach, goes on in *Small World*, too. Zapp, being one of the most ambitious academics in the trilogy, summarizes the spirit of rivalry in the academia to young Persse McGarrigle as follows: "You don't have to worry about your success. You are famous already". Morris replies: "It's not a question of making it, Percy, there is also keeping it. You have to remember the

young men in a hurry (253). He then quotes Cornford's *Microcosmographia Academia* to clarify his point: "From far below you will mount the roar of a ruthless multitude of young men in a hurry. You may perhaps grow to be aware of what they are in a hurry to do. They are in a hurry to get you out of the way" (254). The ruthless multitude mentioned here are the young scholars whose number rises each day by means of the expansion in higher education, and who target elimination of the old fashioned practices in their fields together with the elimination of the mind-set that favours preservation of values and practices. From Raymond Williams's perspective the academics who are conscious of the emergent values in the academia are able to survive in the academia while the others are labelled as outdated and fall from favour. As is understood, Zapp is quite conscious of the fact that a lot of young men try to enter into academia with their studies and publications, and what they need to do is to get rid of their old rivals to clear the path of promotion for themselves. From Zapp's perspective, to keep one's power and prestige in the academic world and not to become prey to young energetic academics, senior academics always need to be up-to-date or even one step further in their academic studies. He cautions Persse about the severity of this rivalry, saying: "You know Freud's idea of primitive society as a tribe in which the sons kill the father when he gets old and impotent, and take away his women? In modern academic society, they take away your research grants. And your women, too, of course" (254). For Morris Zapp, up-to-date knowledge in one's field is power. He also knows that all the success in the academic journey depends on protecting one's power since impotency means being eaten up by the rivals as it happens to Professor Treece in *Eating People is Wrong*. A successful academic should always keep his guard up firstly by being aware of the intense level of rivalry, and secondly by developing strategies to cope with this ambitious system. Persse, educated in a totally different system, Irish higher education, is not aware of the politicking and hegemonic pressure upon both the senior and junior academics mainly because of his isolated academic career in Ireland, yet Morris Zapp's remarks provide him with some insight about the power dynamics in the academia.

A further example of hegemonic power-struggle is the antagonism between a novelist and a critic. The Angry Young Man novelist, Ronald Frobisher, who is

author of five successful novels, feels sterile after being exposed to a harsh analysis of his last novel, and is unable to produce anything for years. Rudyard Parkinson is a critic who exposes Frobisher's private life in a review of one of his novels, but Frobisher believes that it is unethical to release the confidential real-life issues, in a criticism of his work. What Rudyard Parkinson does is not professional criticism of a literary work but "being a ponce for Sunday papers" (375) from the novelist's perspective. However, Ronald Frobisher is already a disappointment for his post-graduate students due to his distracted and disinterested attitudes, and is not favoured as a thesis supervisor. The feeling that he gradually loses his influence and success both in literature and in academia renders him precarious in facing harsh criticism. As a result, the author and the critic have a fierce fight during the Royal Academy of Literature's prize-giving party, which take place on a boat on the River Thames. After threatening the critic with angry words, Frobisher is dismissed from the party, but he secretly cuts the boat's rope with his knife to give the literary community a little bit of a scare. Surprisingly, he acts just like the angry protagonists that are depicted in the works of Angry Young Man novelists and playwrights. Rudyard Parkinson is also one of the snobbish English dons[40] who is notoriously anti-theory in literature. He has a disdainful attitude towards Frobisher's novels. Being one of the preservers of the old literary tradition in English literature, Rudyard Parkinson does not find the works of reactionary writers such as Ronald Frobisher's aesthetically valuable. In one sense, their antagonism can be interpreted as the opposition between the dominant and the emergent from Raymond Williams's perspective, emergent being Frobisher with his provocative and stimulating ideas and the dominant is Rudyard Parkinson with his attack on such new modes and forms of literature.

The enmity between them also points to the severity of the power-struggle in the literary community. In this respect, a critic is also counted as a member of the same community, since he is invited to an award ceremony on literature and has the right to publish about the works of academics. In other words, an academic's

[40] Noel Annan in his book *The Dons: Mentors, Eccentrics and Geniuses* dwells on what it means to a don in English aristocracy, and four different categories of dons, Oxbridge professors, who are the guardians of old teachings in Oxford and Cambridge.

path crosses with a non-academic, and they disrupt the power spaces of each other, so get into conflict. Pierre Bourdieu, in *Homo Academicus* (1988), analyses the strictly hierarchal French higher education system, in which the "holders of the positions of power" (83) in institutions are strictly defined, and "academic capital[41] is obtained and maintained by holding a position enabling domination of other positions and their holders" (84). Although his detections are on French higher education, Bourdieu introduces the idea that maintenance of academic power is only possible through domination of the other members of the academic community. Therefore, Frobisher and Parkinson's struggle is a struggle to protect their own spheres of influence. The novelist gains money and prestige by means of his book, while the critic becomes popular in literature magazines and newspapers through the popularity of his reviews. The same book, the novel, is a means to enhance their influence and recognition for both of them. The publication also becomes a part of Ronald Frobisher's academic capital if he manages to get appreciation through it. If the book sells and becomes popular the writer will gain power, but on the other hand, if the review reaches large masses and gets admiration the critic will become a prominent figure whose ideas are valued and taken into consideration while evaluating other novels, too.

Lodge carries hegemonic power struggles to the extreme with the example of Robin Dempsey, who believes that he is treated unfairly by the university administration, since Philip Swallow is promoted to the position that Dempsey longs for. His sense of rivalry and despair turns into an extreme form of obsession with Philip Swallow, so he starts to chat with a computer software called ELIZA, a senseless robot, providing automatic answers to the questions which Dempsey asks. Dempsey shares his jealousy of Swallow with the software with the expectation that the program will alleviate his misery. The fact that Dempsey has no real companion to share his frustration about the injustices and politicking in the academic circle is supportive of the suggestion that it is difficult to establish sincere and close relationships in the academia due to the rivalry among its members. Dempsey's

[41] Bourdieu classifies types of capital and forms of power in *Homo Academicus*, and academic capital is one of those three capitals required for scholarly success. It is the accumulation of field-specific knowledge and institutional experience.

search for socialization and empathy is obvious from his dialogue with the software: "Hallo, how are you feeling today?" says ELIZA. "Terrible" Robin Dempsey types (438). Dempsey spends long hours in front of the computer in search of genuine conversation and sympathy from his listener. However, the designer of the computer software, Josh Collins, notices Dempsey's unhealthy obsession, and prepares a joke for him. When Dempsey confesses that he is dying with jealousy because Philip gets all the fame and money that he himself deserves, the computer program says "Shoot yourself" (502). Dempsey discovers Collins's trick, and they get into a fierce fight during which the computer suddenly prints out a document: "The printout consists of one word, endlessly repeated: error, error, error, error, error…" (502). The message is that such extreme sense of rivalry is a mistake. Dempsey, like Treece and Bates in Bradbury's first novel *Eating People is Wrong*, is also on the verge of losing his mind due to academic rivalry. The desire to be more prestigious and famous than one's colleagues creates a kind of tension that blocks productivity for psychologically weaker members of the community. Thus, such figures like Dempsey foster the idea that the academic community is a lion's den, so the individual needs to be equipped with the necessary survival skills to exist in it.

In the novel, the people who are perceived to be of secondary importance or stay in the background in academic competitions are not always the ones lacking necessary field knowledge and discipline. They are the ones that fall behind the others in grasping the newly arising values in the academia. To use Raymond Williams' terminology, being technology-oriented or mobility-oriented are the new "emergent" values in the academia during the eighties, and academics like Morris Zapp or Arthur Kingfisher who are aware of the emergent values of their times are likely to grasp the mood of their period. For instance, the conference organized by Morris Zapp is depicted as a huge success:

> Almost everybody agrees that it is the best conference they have ever attended. Morris is smug. The secret of his success is very simple: the formal proceedings of the conference are kept to a bare minimum. There is just one paper a day actually delivered by its author, early in the morning. All the other papers are circulated in Xeroxed form, and the remainder of the day is allocated to unstructured discussion. (491)

There appears a depiction of an academic with full awareness of the dynamics of his profession, and acts accordingly. Morris Zapp observes the tedious details of such organizations, and immediately gets rid of every one of them. On the other hand, academics like Dempsey and Persse McGarrigle, who are isolated from the dynamics of their immediate surroundings are bound to be dominated or pushed aside. What the novel underlines about Morris Zapp is not the class that he originally belongs to, but his consciousness of the dynamics of his profession. As mentioned earlier, class-conflict leaves the ground for other types of social antagonisms such as fight for prestige, power and money, as illustrated in *Small World* with contrasting depictions of academics. By looking at all these hegemonic power struggles between academics, it might be concluded that the emergent values like meritocracy, innovative education, and mobility shaped the destiny of the academics during the eighties.

The most controversial point in the discussion of class and hegemony is that there are diverse approaches about how to define class, or specifically the relationship between class and academia. In this respect, Louise Archer, a senior research fellow from the London Metropolitan University, elaborates on different approaches to define class, and suggests: "Modernist/categorical approaches define social class primarily in terms of occupation, but there is no overall consensus on how to define social class categories and the occupational criteria are being constantly revised" (9).Thus, one's occupation comes to mean his/her class in modern societies, yet the criteria for professional competence are always renewed. He also mentions "the class as process" approach, and argues there are stages of social development like "individualization" that obscures the notion of class (15). Finally, he includes Bourdieu's perspective that "Social hierarchies are transformed into academic hierarchies as George Bernard Shaw suggested, universities can be viewed as shops for selling class limitations" (18). Within the framework of these multiple approaches to class in the academia, the novels, juxtaposing the British and American contexts, illustrate the contrasts and similarities in such issues of social power in different social landscapes. Hence, the meritocratic system, which works for the American academia, is not fully applicable to the English scene due to the existence of the residues of the old elitist system. Interestingly, in the trilogy,

none of the academics who are described as revolutionary and distinguished in their fields are from the English academia. Therefore, preserving the old hierarchy based on class privileges, and applying hegemonic pressure to the juniors and outsiders who do not fit into this perspective, do not bring world-wide success to the British academics.

4.3.3 Criticism of Capitalist Policies in Higher Education

Written against a background of financial crisis, the novel projects the problems of the capitalist system in the academia. The discussion of merit and meritocracy accompany the question of the mediums through which these merits will be measured and by whom they will be designated. To decide that a person is proficient or skilled in his/her own field requires the existence of a very detailed criteria to measure, categorize, and appreciate those merits appropriately. In this respect, institutions of higher education in Britain updated their policies frequently by the publications of two famous reports; Robbins' Report (1963), and the James Report (1972) which ignited the standardization of the conditions of measuring expertise, and emphasized the necessity of intense teacher training programs. William Taylor in his article, "The James Report Revisited" evaluates the restrictions on the report's committee that try to standardize conditions of teacher training:

> The committee had neither time nor resources to consider the wider range of possibilities and constraints that were soon to become apparent…. What could not have been foreseen was how during the 1980s and 1990s mass higher education would fundamentally alter many of the assumptions on which Committee's work had been based" (304).

Even the tripartite system of education has been updated and the types of schools and their distributions have changed in time. Furthermore, Taylor specifically draws attention to the financial pressure which impedes the application of such a grand training project on a national-scale. He suggests that the idea of raising meticulously trained educators is found attractive, yet the time of the report unfortunately coincides with the economic crisis in the 1970s that urges the labour government to ask for a loan from IMF[42]. Though the projects suggested by the

[42] For further information about the practices of labour government in the 1970s, see: Historic-uk.com. Under the title of "Prime Ministers of Britain".

report have not been accomplished in the short run, by means of the report the essentiality of raising experts for education and measuring their expertise with standardized criteria have become a currently debated issue.

The financial situation of England was not different in the eighties, since the economic crisis got more serious. Right before the publication of *Small World*, the government imposed a strict budget cut for the universities. On one hand, there is the project of expanding the university education to the masses; on the other hand, there are severe restrictions due to the financial crisis of the time. Therefore, the possibility of such expansion becomes a highly questioned issue for the planners of higher education. John D. Dennison, a professor of higher education, claims that the educational regulations of the seventies and the eighties in the United Kingdom should not be interpreted as revolution but dissolution. He refers to the unsupportive monetary policy of the government, and its far-reaching effects on higher education, and claims: "The Conservative administration, elected on a policy of restraint in the public sector, introduced reductions in current grants to universities in the order of 10 percent during the 1981-84 period" (89). *Small World* opens with the description of a conference with horrid conditions in a provincial university, which shows the intense influence of the budget cuts in the academia. Attendees of the conference are disillusioned when they arrive at the university's halls of residence: "They had appraised the stained and broken furniture, explored the dusty interior of cupboards in vain for coat-hangers, and tested the narrow beds whose springs sagged dejectedly in the middle" (215). The very first page of the novel not only welcomes the attendees to these unpleasant physical conditions, but also helps the reader imagine the immediate effects of such monetary cuts in the daily lives of the students and the academics. Thus, even the beginning reveals that academia receives its share of capitalist problems.

The abolition of tenure[43] from the British universities in the eighties was another capitalist move that created a tremendous impact on the academics. Tenure traditionally means job security for a senior academic, and provides the academic with the freedom he needs for his academic research. However with the Education

[43] For a more detailed discussion on the educational policies and tenure in the eighties see: Stephen Court's "Academic Tenure and Employment in the UK"

Reform Act of 1988, the destiny of academics were left in the hands of local administrations. Stephen Court describes the process as follows: "The Act said a member of academic staff was redundant if the university had ceased, or intended to cease, the activity for the purposes of which he was appointed, or if the demand for work of a particular kind had ceased or diminished or were expected to cease or diminish" (771). Hence, the act ties all the academic positions to the criterion of supply and demand; that is, if a department or discipline reaches higher registration records than the others, the staff of this department feels more secure.

There exists the implication in the novel that deprived of their support from the government, academics need to find sponsors from the private sector for their research and publications. For instance, Morris Zapp frequently declares that finding finances is crucial for academics and claims: "On the strength of that one damned good book you could get a grant to write a second book in more favourable circumstances; with two good books you got promotion, a lighter teaching load, and courses of your own devising" (353). For him the first book ignites a chain of productivity and financial support which later on aids an academic to reach the "omega point" (354). The omega point is described as becoming a professor, and doing nothing, specifically, living on grants and fellowships. From his perspective, the peak point in an academic's life is when he does not have to think about his livelihood. And it is implied that even Morris Zapp has not yet reached that point since he still needs to think of his children's tuitions, and the alimony that he needs to pay for his two ex-wives. In line with this, successful academics and writers get money prizes from the publishers, companies and other benefactors in *Small World*. For instance, Persse McGarrigle gets the chance to go abroad for the first time by means of a thousand-pound money prize which he wins at a poetry contest. His case also underlines that financial welfare is a prerequisite for mobility; that is, the academics who can get the necessary funds and support have the chance to attend conferences outside their countries.

Nevertheless, once money is included in prizes, the quality of the work becomes questionable for some critics like Ronald Frobisher. Having written many worthy books in his field, he reacts to this mania of publishing to earn a living before an award ceremony in which he will be the presenter. He shares his views

with Persse with these words: “I mean, I don’t begrudge you your money- good luck to you - but the situation is getting daft. There are people here tonight who make a living out of prizes, bursaries, and what have you. I can see the day coming when there’ll be a separate prize for every book that’s published” (371). These prize ceremonies create the feeling that writers are like salesmen exhibiting their skills on the market with the expectation to sell them at a high-price. For instance, Arthur Kingfisher is depicted to have the maximum amount of this capital as he was “born into the intellectual ferment of Vienna at the turn of the century, studied with Shklovsky in Moscow in the Revolutionary period, and with I.A Richards in Cambridge in the late twenties, and collaborated with Jakobson in Prague in the thirties” (299). From Bourdieu’s perspective, Arthur Kingfisher enjoys the “social and economic capital” with the wide chain of network he possesses. As Bourdieu suggests, all the three capitals are related to each other; thus, Arthur Kingfisher’s social capital provides him with economic capital in the long run, and he never has financial problems. He starts the profession adorned with the necessary knowledge and insight, so becomes the number one name in literary criticism in a short while. His exceptional success in academia reminds once again the influence of societal factors which cannot be neutralized in the formal education system.

Furthermore, the “merits for sale” atmosphere disturbs people, and recalls Young’s original suggestion about the meritocratic system. He believes that meritocracy is another division of individuals based on capitalist criteria, and repeats itself constantly, though in changing forms. Even the recent studies in the field confirms the existence of educational elites, and their dominancy over the labour market. In their joint-work in 2013, Tholen, Brown, Power, and Allouch conclude:

> Networks and connections are integral to an elite student experience. A distinctive feature of the modern functional elite is the cultivation towards and the development and understanding of, the elite labour market, through the educational process. Whether in the lecture hall, at university social meetings or external corporate events, the familiarisation with elite employers, gatekeepers of information or otherwise useful contacts are woven into the university experience. (152)

As is suggested, their deduction, based on the data gathered on elite universities such as Oxford, is corroborative of Young’s suggestion that the same system based

on inequality has been "copied a thousand times" in Young's words since the available social and economic dynamics support its survival. The capitalist system, which uses production and capital as its basis, only favours the individuals who are more skilled and productive than the average worker since they guarantee "profit," but personal skills need to be coupled with cultural and social capital to help an individual gain access to higher positions of power. As for the relationship between meritocratic education system and capitalism, it can be concluded that the maintenance of a meritocratic society directly corresponds to the interests of capitalist business managers by providing competent executives for the system methodically, and in the long run. Therefore, all these prize distributing publishers in *Small World* use the financial strategy of "competitive benchmarking"[44] to increase the intensity of rivalry among the academics, and guarantee the profit of their companies or publishing houses.

The discussion of publish and perish for the academics that started in the analysis of *Lucky Jim*, and goes on being repeated in the following novels discussed, persists in *Small World*, again with the emphasis that the only way for an academic to survive in the capitalist higher education system is to publish frequently in prestigious journals, and write books in their fields, which can find positive reviews from the critics. Rudyard Parkinson, an academic who believes in constant writing, defines unpublished writing like "masturbation or *coitus interruptus*[45], something shameful and unsatisfying" (304). He personally becomes depressed if he cannot write regularly, and cannot find publishers for his works, so his great fear is to become dry one day. He also believes in a hierarchy in terms of forms of writing; that is, there are valuable forms of writing in terms of academic success, his perspective is summarized as: "The highest form of writing is of course a book of one's own, something that has to be prepared with tact, subtlety, and cunning, and sustained over many months" (304). What he supports is not producing low quality works in a limited time, rather distilling one's ideas before putting them into words.

[44] "The act of measuring the quality of something by comparing it with something else of an accepted standard".
[45] The withdrawal method of contraception (see: mayoclinic.org)

In that sense, his regular writing attempts keeps him alert by providing constant exercise so that he can maintain his practicality.

Another capitalist discussion is that the academics are well aware of the fact that some fields of study like positive and natural sciences are more favoured than social sciences. As discussed before, there is, for instance, "no money in poetry" (219). Persse McGarrigle is the only person that is interested in poetry, and unsurprisingly, he is the only academic who experiences severe money problems. He has such limited income that he needs to calculate his every expenditure to survive his daily life. The image of a starving poet and the discouragement he receives from his fellow academics foster the discussion of whether there is a hierarchy of disciplines in academia. Pierre Bourdieu, in his *Homo Academicus* elaborates on the issue declaring:

> The social sciences assume a doubly subordinate position, both under the hierarchy which is tending more and more to predominate, that of the natural sciences, and under the old hierarchy, today threatened by the rise in natural sciences and scientific values on the cultural stock exchange. (121)

Studying poetry, in this context, is unprofitable and does not add to an academics financial welfare within the new capitalist hierarchy of disciplines. There are certain disciplines that can serve the immediate needs of the market economy, and humanities is not among them.

A much related discussion in the novel is that academics need to advertise their work to guarantee their existence in the knowledge-market. For instance, Morris Zapp's comments on the function of conferences. Zapp suggests the point of conferences is "to uphold the institution of academic literary studies. We maintain our position in society by publicly performing a certain ritual, just like any other group of workers in the realm of discourse – the lawyers, politicians, journalists" (239). Portrayed as a critic and a deconstructionist theoretician who believes in the work he performs, even Morris Zapp admits the necessity of meeting certain capitalist demands such as regular advertising and creating a public image that guarantees the sale of one's service. Thus the conferences, discussed under the subtitle of mobility, gain another perspective, a capitalist one: the advertisement of the academic profession.

In the novel, the most striking example of the capitalist concerns in academia is the rivalry for the UNESCO chair. Almost all distinguished academics in the book, set eyes on the chair, and flatter Arthur Kingfisher, the assessor of the candidates for the chair. What makes this position so precious for the academics is the fact that it offers not only world-wide publicity in the field but also a prize of "100,000 dollars a year" (325). The facilities of the holder of the chair is summarized as follows:

> He would have no students to teach, no papers to grade, no committees to chair. He would be paid simply to think and, if the mood took him, to write. A roomful of secretaries at the Place Fontenoy would wait patiently beside their word-processors, ready to type, duplicate, collate, staple, and distribute to every point of the compass his latest reflections on the ontology of literary text… (325)

Therefore, being elected as the chair is on the one hand, a spiritual satisfaction, flattering of the ego, but, on the other hand, it means a source of finances and betterment of working conditions for an academic. As Morris Zapp suggests frequently, an academic needs to have a proper income to focus on his personal studies. This UNESCO prize is much more than any lower-class academic can imagine, specifically when it is compared to the prize of a thousand pounds given to Persse McGarrigle. Within the capitalist dynamics, no academic without a reasonable number of publications, and necessary network can dare to see himself as a candidate for the chair. Correspondingly, Arthur Kingfisher contents himself with the idea that no one in his field can be a better candidate for this chair, and announces himself as the winner.

A further point about the discussion of capitalism in the novel is that such extreme form of rivalry, created by the capitalist ideology and based solely on the productivity of the academics, influences their academic performances negatively. The pressure put upon them restricts their productive powers as in the example of Rodney Wainwright, an academic, who cannot finish his paper for Morris's conference in spite of his countless attempts. He keeps trying till the last minute, and his desperation right before his speech is described in what follows: "Rodney Wainwright, never deeply a religious man, who has not in fact raised his mind and heart to God since he was nine, kneels in the holy city of Jerusalem, and prays, diplomatically, to Jehovah, Allah and Jesus Christ, to save him from disgrace and

ruin" (497). As his surname connotes, Wainwright, has written in vain all these years, since there is not a single mention of his success in literature. What is more, he coaxes Morris out of this invitation to speak in the conference, since Morris does not want to include him in the list of speakers on the basis of the low quality of his academic work. However, it is the capitalist competition among the academics that makes him apply to the conference despite his paper not being ready. As other academic depicted in the novel, Rodney Wainwright is also conscious of the fact that he needs to find a proper place for himself within the academia by advertising his works through conferences, or he will perish.

There is also one common point that unites Robin Dempsey and Wainwright: their envy of Philip Swallow[46], which exemplifies the detrimental effects of capitalist pressure upon the productivity of the academics. They are obsessed with Swallow's reputation among the academics as an anti-theorist and his young, Italian girlfriend, Joy. The fact that Swallow's name is also mentioned for the UNESCO chair drive both of them crazy, as they believe he is not that much prolific or creative enough to be a candidate. Like, Dempsey, who is obsessed with Swallow, Wainwright listens to Philip and Joy's room throughout the conference and believes, Philip has everything he desires while Wainwright is sterile both in his private and professional life. The more he thinks about Philip and his life, the less concentrated he becomes in his work and leaves his paper for the conference unfinished. Their envy of a colleague blocks their productivity, and harms their mental stability, which exemplifies the detrimental effects of rivalry and power struggles among academics.

4.3.4 Conferences: Carnival in the Academic World

Small World both opens and finishes with two different conferences, and spares a great amount of space for the depictions of the physical as well as intellectual atmosphere of these conferences, so the novel encloses the academia between two conferences, and places the academics in a cycle of occupational mobility. Conferences become an indispensable part of their professional lives for

[46] The names of the academics in David Lodge's trilogy are allusive in the sense that names of central academics corresponds to certain types of birds. Kingfisher is a rare bird, swallow is a very common one implying the exceptional case of Arthur Kingfisher, or Philip Swallow's being a very familiar stereotype in English academia.

most the academics in the book. At this point, the discussion in the previously analysed novels that the conferences serve as carnivals, in Bakhtinian terms, is valid for David Lodge's campus trilogy, too. Bakhtin in his *Rabelais and His World* interprets the renaissance laughter culture and the festivals which form a basis for suspension of all hierarchical privileges, liberation of all natural feelings and bodily pleasures. He is conscious of the marginalization of the members of society that threatens the central hierarchy, an insight which he gained mainly due to his banishment from the Soviet Union[47]. Academia is earlier defined by such critics as Janice Rossen as a community based on strict hierarchical relationships, politicking, and a certain degree of formality, and its members need to abide by strict rules and regulations in order to survive in it. In this respect, the conferences provide a carnivalesque atmosphere for the academics, and help them get rid of the tension of their professional lives as partly mentioned in the analysis of *Lucky Jim* and *History Man*.

The examples of excessive eating, drinking, and sex that take place among academics during the after parties of the conferences can be considered as carnivalesque features from Bakhtin's perspective. In the book, as in the novels discussed earlier, financial problems, rivalry, hegemonic power struggles, and long-term suppression of sexual desires are the primary sources of tension for the academics, which hinder their productivity and cause their dismay. Therefore, they use conferences to alleviate the tensions of their professional lives, as described in the novel:

> Academics doing amazing things under the shock of this discovery, things their spouses and colleagues back home would not believe: twist the night away in discotheques, swing themselves hoarse in beer cellars, dance on café tables with flowers gripped in their teeth, go midnight bathing in nude, patronize fairgrounds and ride the giant roller-coasters shrieking and clutching each other as they swoop down the shining rails. No wonder they quite end up in each other's beds. (433)

[47] "Bakhtin lived through the revolutionary euphoria of the 1920s, participated in a text practice and culture that not only preached, but also practiced openness, hybridization, and dehierarchization. At the same time, he was witness to the process of increasing closure, isolation, and hierarchization taking place in Soviet society" (For further detail about Bakhtin's philosophical stance that shapes his creation of the carnival, see: Bakhtin and Carnival: Culture as Counter-Culture by Renate Lachmann, Raoul Eshelman and Marc Davis)

The reason behind all this relaxation is the desire to compensate for the years they dedicated to their academic studies when they deprived themselves of the worldly pleasures for the sake of guaranteeing their positions in the academia. By means of engaging in such activities, they demonstrate that "they are not dryasdust swots after all, but living, breathing, palpitating human beings, with warm flesh and blood" (433). Although they engage in excesses, and sometimes experience minor embarrassments, the academics do not criticize one another's behaviours during the after parties of conferences. The academics who do not refrain from harshly criticizing each other in their professional lives ignore all the extremities that their colleagues engage in during conferences. They are all captivated by the relaxing mood of the parties after the conferences. It is surprising to see those who are on the verge of beating each other up for the sake of capitalist competition, act in such harmony. This is the magic of carnival in Bakhtinian terms, it equalizes all members of the academia and gives them a chance to unite, though temporarily.

Marital and extramarital sex is also constantly pictured, somewhat in minute detail with the connotation that many of the middle aged academics in the novel are in search of sexual adventure, which they postpone in their youth due to their academic studies. Sex, in a sense, is a common desire among them, and interestingly unites different academics who normally do not approve of each other's ideas, or who do prefer to come together for professional reasons. Fulvia Morgana, one of the most industrious professors of cultural studies, is happily married, and has an open relationship with her husband; that is, they both have sex with other people with the explicit approval of each other. They even ask each other whether there are any couples or individuals at the conferences who are worthy of attention, meaning who are desirable enough to have sex. Morris Zapp is Fulvia's guest during one of his visits to Italy and has sex with her despite his disapproval of Fulvia's luxurious life style, which conflicts with her alleged Marxist stance. However, a post-conference sex brings them together. Morris Zapp is also shocked when he discovers that Fulvia's husband knows her affairs, and is completely comfortable about the situation. The narrator directly goes on with the sexual extremities of another couple going to the same conference as Fulvia's, and the situation is described as: "In the same airplane, some forty metres to the rear of Fulvia

Morgana, Howard Ringbaum is trying to persuade his wife Thelma to have sexual intercourse with him there and then, in the back row of economy section" (295). One interesting point about their placement in the airplane is that Fulvia travels in business class since she does not like giving up her daily luxuries and comfort even during her flights, while Howard Ringbaum and his wife travel in the economy section "forty metres to the rear of Fulvia". It is obvious from the description that their economic status divides them physically, yet their search of sexual for adventure creates a common ground that unites them in a sense. As is the case in the carnival, the social, economic and class-based hierarchies dissolve, so all individuals are equal, and they share a sense of unity. Laughter and the spirit of the carnival adds this sense of relaxation and unity, so they try to act in harmony. It is also narrated that Howard Ringbaum tries to seduce his wife because he hears stories about unusual sexual adventures of his colleagues, and wants to be part of their 'adventurous', sex-loving community, to be part of the carnival in Bakhtin's terms.

The entertaining conference atmosphere as an alternative to the rigid academic life at the university attract academics even though they do not apply to the conference with the intention of engaging in such extremities. Some of them participate entertainments just to adapt themselves to this new order as in the example of Desiree Zapp and Ronald Frobisher. They meet at a conference at Heidelberg, and spend a lot of time together walking on the streets, visiting coffee houses and bookstores together. Their inevitable intimacy is described as: "Desire Zapp and Ronald Frobisher find adultery virtually thrust upon them by the social dynamics of the conference on *Rezeptionsästhetik*. The only two creative writers present, they find themselves constantly together" (434). Both being interested in the depictions of sexual intercourse in each other's writings, and not wanting to look "timidly afraid of sexual adventure" (434) end up in bed. Since both of them are writers, they do not trust each other for fear that their potential intercourse might be a material for their writing, so they make an agreement about not including any of the details of their affair in their writing. In other words, what happens in the conference should stay in the conference, and should not cross the borders of the carnival and penetrate into their professional life. Such an agreement on the part of

these two writers also means that both of them are conscious of the fact that the carnivalesque climate of the conference is an alternative to their official order, and they should not confuse these two separate orders.

A further carnivalesque point in the novel is that the academics' sexual potency are closely linked to their professional efficiency; that is, some academics associate sexual unproductivity with their professional dryness. The primary example of this is Arthur Kingfisher, who remains insensitive to intimate feelings after his divorce, and there are rumours that he is a great name, but has stopped creating new and original arguments long ago. The fact that he cannot think of sexual and intellectual productivity separately is described as follows : "Kingfisher had always led a very active sex life and regarded it as vitally connected, in some deep and mysterious way, with his intellectual creativity" (300). He deeply desires to gain his bodily and mental fertility; therefore, he keeps Song-Mi Lee, a former research student from Korea, as his assistant and obedient sex-partner. She dedicates her whole life to "protecting the great man against the importunities of the academic world and soothing his despair at no longer being able to achieve an erection or an original thought" (300). With her arousing massages and healing physical therapies, she provides Kingfisher with a certain amount of relaxation, and hides his impotence from the academic community.

Another person that links his academic sterility to his sexual inactivity is Philip Swallow, as he believes that he becomes more enthusiastic about everything, including his job after his affair with Joy. He recounts the story when Morris inquires as follows: "It was as if passing through the shadow of death, I had suddenly recovered an appetite for life that I thought I lost for ever. In a way, it was keener than anything I had ever known before. The food pierced me with its exquisite flavours, the tea was fragrant as ambrosia" (281). In his explanation, sex becomes a very powerful life drive which spreads to all layers of life, and provides him with an extreme level of motivation. Concisely, sexual satisfaction triggers a life energy by means of which academics revitalize both their mind and body. Even Robin Dempsey, a bachelor by choice, believing, in principle, the dignity of singleness, is not able to desist from envying Philip Swallow's sexual productivity

in his middle age. His envy results from his belief that Swallow revives himself professionally thanks to his exciting sex life.

On the other hand, conferences might sometimes be a device for the academics to get rid of their familial, day to day responsibilities or even serve as a form of disguise for their adultery plans as in case of Philip Swallow. After coming across Joy, his ex-lover, in Turkey, Philip Swallow immediately makes plans to see her again, and uses the conference in Greece as an excuse to be away from home. He deceives his wife Hilary by telling her that he needs to go to the conference despite his unwillingness, since the university administration insisted that he should go there. His real intention is to organize a very romantic trip with Joy, and have a passionate adventure in Greece.

The book draws attention to an additional function of conferences apart from their capitalist and professional functions; their rehabilitating effect upon the academics. A carnivalesque atmosphere is described by means of the conference in Lausanne in Switzerland, which is organized by the *T.S. Eliot Newsletter* in places with which the poet is associated. During his search for his lover Angelica, Persse finds himself right in the middle of a street carnival, in which the conference attendees act out *The Waste Land* on the streets of Lausanne. Understanding his amazement in the face of such frenzy on the streets, Professor Michel Tardieu, an academic interested in T.S. Eliot's work, explains the situation to Persse, saying: This year it is the turn of Lausanne. As you undoubtedly know, Eliot composed the first draft of *The Waste Land* here while he was recovering from a nervous breakdown in the winter of 1921-2" (457). The depiction of the people in masks and costumes running down the streets, and relaxing themselves by performing Eliot's poem connotes that there is a relationship between the conferences, and getting rid of the tensions of academic life. Such environments, in a sense, help academics maintain their normality and mental health under the pressure of strict hierarchical order in the academia. The inclusion of the biographic information, that Eliot visited the place during a time of depression to heal himself, also fosters that the district has a healing effect both on the poet and on conference attendees. Furthermore, the Waste Land includes references to the Fisher King, whose land becomes infertile and desolate as a result of a wound he gets in his genitals, its

reference in the novel within the context of a carnivalesque conference might connote that the academics also expect a form of healing from these carnivalesque moments. The desire to heal the fisher king might be interpreted as the desire to heal the academics from their chronic stress-bound discomfort.

As for the last conference that takes place at the end of the novel, it brings together nearly all the characters in the novel, and serve to finish the novel in a big carnival in which all academics find answers to their problems. Its significance is the literary world is described as: "The MLA is the Big Daddy of conferences. A mega conference. A three-ring circus of the literary intelligentsia" (503). It is also emphasized that this year New York hosts the conference "in two adjacent skyscraper hotels", yet still there are people who need to find hotels for themselves, since there are thousands of participants coming for the event. The magnitude of the conference is emphasized as: "There are no less than six hundred separate sessions listed in the official programme, which is as thick as the telephone directory of a small town" (504). However, the audience is a little bit perplexed in the face of such crowd and hustle. The whole canivalesque scene is quite overwhelming for a lot of them, and they are described as:

> The audience are, however, restless and migratory: people stroll in and out of the conference rooms, listen a while, ask a question, and move on to another session while speakers are still speaking; for there is always the feeling that you may be missing the best show of the day. (505)

Some of them, specifically the ones coming from small cities are speechless, so Persse Mc Garrigle expresses his surprise with these words: "Its….I cannot find a word for it" (505). Such an atmosphere brings the possibilities of engaging in a lot of unusual discussions, shows, parties and gatherings. Furthermore, being conscious of the prestige and the luxuries of the conference, numerous academics desire to be a participant either to strengthen their relationship with the academic community or to create new chances of employment. Morris Zapp, Philip Swallow, Arthur Kingfisher, Persse Mc Garrigle, Angelica, Fulvia Morgana, among many others depicted in the novel, are present at the conference with the same expectation: adventure and excitement. The conference is actually a very huge carnival for all of them, the academics who are described with all their cultural and

ethnic differences peculiar to their home countries, now act in harmony in the conference.

There are explicit features of the carnival displayed during the conference, and one of them is the trick that Angelica's twin sister designs for Persse McGarrigle. She impersonates Angelica to have sex with Persse McGarrigle, then confesses her trick, which disappoints the romantic lover. Persse sees that Angelica does not even know Persse is there, and she already has a fiancée. This play with the official identity is a common element in the carnival culture, since people attending the carnival put on a mask and hide their identity during carnival. Another mystery solved during the carnival is Arthur Kingfisher's fatherhood of Angelica and her twin sister. The woman whom he impregnated long years ago comes to the conference, and confesses the affair and the existence of the twin girls, which excites the whole audience during the final scene of the conference. Everybody cheers and applauds heatedly. They laugh together to the union of Kingfisher's family, and celebrate their coming together in a mood of carnival. Unlike the mythological figure that his name alludes to, Arthur Kingfisher is not a barren and infertile figure anymore, his sexual energy and vigour are, in a sense, restored with the information that he is capable of impregnating a woman named Sybil Maiden. It is another allusive name in the sense that maiden means a young unmarried woman or a virgin. And correspondingly, the woman confesses that she did not expect to get pregnant as a "respectable middle-aged spinster," (524) and accuses Arthur Kingfisher to take her long preserved virginity.

And very interestingly, this mystery is tied to another one, to the secret of the black leather glove, which Siegfried von Turpitz never takes off in public. There are scary stories about what is under the glove, and his acquaintances always wonder what he hides in it. However, it accidently drops while Perrse grasps Siegfried von Turpitz's hand in a mood of cheer and celebration of the news about Arthur Kingfisher's family. The German professor gets very angry upon losing his gloves, and the moment is described as:

> The black glove comes off, revealing a perfectly normal, healthy-looking hand underneath. Von Turpitz goes pale, hisses, and seems to shrivel in stature, plunges his hand in his jacket pocket, and slinks from the room, never to be seen at an international conference again. (524)

The professor is extremely embarrassed when people discover that he has been wearing the glove just to induce strange stories about himself, and create an eccentric image. However, no one in the conference is interested in his gloves, or criticizes him doing such a weird thing for years, since everybody is carried away with the happy mood of the final union. From the carnivalesque perspective, it can be interpreted that no one seems be interested in the oddities of other people; hence, Siegfried's sensitivity is groundless. Normally in its professional context, such an oddity might arouse interest in the academic community, yet within the carnival it is normalized and tolerated.

4. 4 *Nice Work*

Narrating a professional collaboration and a consequent love-affair between a businessman, Victor Wilcox, and a junior academic, Robyn Penrose, the novel brings together two different social contexts, and dwells upon the outcomes of such a cooperation between the academia and the business world. The possibility of creating a bridge between these two distinctively separate worlds is frequently questioned through the adaptation processes of these two characters into each other's circle. Lodge reveals the dissimilarity of the academic world from the industrial sector with an epigraph from Benjamin Disraeli's *Sybil; or the Two Nations* at the beginning of the novel: "Two nations; between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy; who are as ignorant of each other's habits, thoughts and feelings, as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, and fed by different food, and ordered by different manners…" (533). All the issues suggested by the epigraph such as lack of communication and sympathy between the academia and the industrial world are underlined by the repetition of the word "different". The discrepancy of these two spheres will be depicted through the problematic relationship between an academic and a non-academic in the novel.

Lodge continues to transcend the traditional patterns of setting and characterization of campus fiction with the last book of the trilogy, since *Nice Work* does not even start on a campus or with the life of an academic. On the contrary, the introductory chapter deals with a famous businessman's life, and discloses an unknown feature of the city, Rummidge, from a businessman's perspective. In the

opening pages, Victor Wilcox remembers the nineteenth-century novelists' gloomy descriptions of the city each morning during his commute from home to work. The industrial districts connected to Rummidge were so horrible that "Queen Victoria had the curtains of her train window drawn when she passed through the region so that her eyes should not be offended by its ugliness and squalor" (549). Industrialisation is an issue in the first two chapters of this dissertation only with respect to the university buildings: the university is described as a a "modern work house" in *Lucky Jim*, and the old Victorian style is replaced by the more Industrial Kaakinen arthitecture at Watermouth University in *History Man*. In these novels, and in Lodge's trilogy so far, not much detail about the city surrounding the campus is provided apart from their being small and undeveloped. Nonetheless, in *Nice Work*, Rummidge is depicted as an ugly industrial town with a lot of factories and grey clouds in the sky. Later on, the narrator reveals that the female protagonist, Robyn Penrose specializes in the nineteenth-century industrial novels. The coincidence, in a sense, serves as a foreshadowing for their future encounter. Unlike the campus novels analysed so far, in *Nice Work*, academics have connections with the social and economic life around them. Again the financial restrictions of the Thatcher government, abolition of tenure, and partially class-based conflicts can be seen in the background of the novel, yet this time the novel draws attention to how these problems are experienced both in and outside the campus.

Similar to researchers studying the educational polices of the eighties in England, Penny Welch also emphasizes the rising managerial control over the universities from 1979 until 2000s. For the mentioned period, Welch specifically claims:

> Over the whole period, successive governments established increasing central control over the higher education system and mobilised it to meet goals compatible with government interpretations of the national interest. In the process, the total number of students in U.K. higher education has trebled, the average cost of a student place has almost halved and the proportion of income from public funds has fallen to % 55. (96)

He foregrounds the attempt on the part of the government to diminish the cost of education within national expenditures, giving less and less governmental financial support to the universities. The officials were also in favour of motivating the academia to collaborate with the business world in order to raise market-conscious

graduates. The bureaucrats serving during the Thatcher government share the Prime Minister's ideas on marketization of higher education, and attack the universities with the accusation that they do not raise competitive students who can survive in free-market economy. Penny Welch quotes the reaction of the Minister of Higher Education, George Walden: "in no other country did students emerge from their education with such a total lack of understanding of economic reality" (103). The negative perception of the universities by politicians of the eighties shaped many education policies at the end of the decade, some of which are mentioned in *Nice Work.* In this respect, the collaboration between an academic and a businessman will be interpreted as an interaction between the commercial and scholarly world.

4.4.1 The Changing Conception of Class, Hegemony and Meritocracy

In the novel, as is discussed broadly in the chapter on theoretical framework, there is the implication that meritocracy contributes to a person's climbing up the social ladder to a certain extent, as in the example of Victor Wilcox. His curriculum vitae, which is given in minute detail, indicates that he is a graduate of a local grammar school, and of the Rummidge College of Advance Technology. The fact that he has not graduated from very prestigious schools does not prevent him from advancing in his engineering career. He is promoted from a junior production engineer to a managing director of one of the leading companies in England, J .Pringle & Sons Casting & General Engineering at the age of forty-five (538) Depicted as a very successful manager, he calculates his every manoeuvre according to the changing economic strategies of his country. In a sense, he is the type of graduate the government aims at in the short run as is specified in the explanations of the England's Minister of Education. He is very adept at dealing with crisis of any kind in the company, and is highly respected by his co-workers. Like Morris Zapp, he is a self-made man, who creates his own chances to be successful. In the novel, the comfortable condition of his house is reflected as a proof of the fact that Wilcox moves up the social ladder through his diligence: "Their own house in those days, a step up the social ladder from Gran's," (537) meaning their old family house inherited from his grandfather. The Gran's house is described lacking all the comforts and luxuries of Wilcox's house, which means that despite coming from a humble family, Wilcox improved his finances.

Nevertheless, from the perspective of many researchers such as Diane Reay, the financial situation of such individuals as Wilcox is only an exception, and is not sufficient to explain the general position of the lower class in the labour market in modern British society. Reay, having published abundantly on education and social mobility, opposes the meritocratic system with such remarks: "In deeply unequal societies such as the United Kingdom and the United States, it operates as an effective form of symbolic violence, as a justification for growing levels of inequality" (665). She believes that meritocracy, in a sense, is used to justify the already present inequalities in society. For her, meritocracy creates the feeling in individuals that if they fail to get to a position they desire, they might think that they do not deserve the position because of lack of qualifications, ignoring the fact that they have never been given the chance to improve those skills. There are a lot of sociologists and educationalists who support Reay's stance. Natasha Kumar Warikoo and Christina Fuhr published a joint study on the perception of meritocracy among students attending Oxford University. Deducing from the data and the student interviews they conclude:

> Despite their understanding that many British youth do not have access to educational experiences that make Oxbridge an attainable goal, most students do not support changes to make access more equitable across class or racial/ethnic lines. This perspective, which legitimates the status students gain through matriculation at an elite university, supports the maintenance of unequal access to an Oxford education despite the advantages that education is known to confer to graduates. The findings demonstrate elites acknowledging the disadvantages of particular groups in society without acknowledging their own advantages in the same system. (699)

Specifically from the perspective of the privileged Oxford students, they gain access to an elite university because of their intelligence and hard work, not because of the familial ties or the advantages that they have been granted up to the university level. The belief in the positivity of the meritocratic system obscures the perception of inequalities within the English society, since many individuals believe in their own merits and its power, thus, the fairness of the meritocratic system. As a result, they overlook the case of lower-class students who have never attained the suitable educational conditions in primary, secondary or high school to meet the challenging criteria of prestigious universities. As discussed before, the level of higher education is too late to demand the same qualities and skills from every candidate

if those candidates have not received the same type of education in the early years of their lives.

Lacking such privileges and familial wealth, Wilcox only manages to go to provincial schools, so he needs to work from dusk to dawn to keep the luxurious life style that he provides for his family. His richness is not the kind of welfare one can maintain without taking pains in the process, thus not comparable to the situations of the elites whose social and cultural capitals, in Bourdieu's terms, are guaranteed by their familial ties. Despite Wilcox's generosity and self-sacrifice, his eldest son, Raymond, criticizes their bourgeois life style when Wilcox complains about the unnecessary and time-consuming technical qualities of their burglar alarm. Raymond describes his father's complaint as "*the suffering of the rich*", and "despises his parents' affluence while continuing to enjoy its comforts and conveniences" (539). Wilcox and Raymond's attitudes are reminder of Stuart Hall's ideas on the fake satisfaction that the lower-class gets from their luxurious life styles, which they gain through their jobs, ignoring the toil they go through for the sake of getting it. As discussed before, Hall emphasizes that their incomes which temporarily provide the lower-class relatively more comfortable lives do not equalize them with the upper class in the long run. It only creates a temporary illusion of equality as in the case of Victor Wilcox.

Whether meritocratic education system contributes to climbing up the social ladder is questioned with respect to the backgrounds of Robyn Penrose and her boyfriend Charles. Robyn is the daughter of a very successful Oxford professor, who studies European diplomacy, yet she rejects attending Oxbridge despite her extremely high grades, and voluntarily opts for Sussex University. Her choice is justified on the basis of her desire to be a part of more progressive education system in what follows: "She chose instead to go to Sussex University, as bright young people often did in the 1970s, because new universities were considered exciting and innovatory places to study at. Under the umbrella of a degree course in English literature, Robyn read Freud and Marx, Kafka and Kierkegaard, which she certainly couldn't have done at Oxbridge" (557). In this explanation there lies the implication that Oxford and Cambridge are not innovatory institutions, a point which is supported by Noel Annan in his famous genealogy of Oxbridge scholars who

support the preservation of the classical and elitist system in higher education. Thus, instead of following the elitist tradition, it seems, initially, Robyn draws a different path for herself from her father's. From Raymond William's perspective, her rejection of tradition shows that she also represents emergent values in English society; hence, she will defy many principles and values in the established system. However, later on, becoming more conscious of the advantages of an elite education, Robyn chooses Cambridge University to do her PhD. Her decision can be interpreted as the difficulty of the rise of the emergent within the established tradition. It is a very challenging process, so Robyn also has her hesitations to fully distance herself from the tradition. The difficulties which she comes across in her career development, like waiting for tenure for a very long time, justifies her concerns, and is suggestive of the limited contribution of meritocratic education system to climbing up the social ladder, or to hold a prestigious position in the professional arena. Although she is very bright and prolific at a very young age, the only position she can find is a part-time post at Rummidge University. Therefore, her initial rejection of the familial network, or in Bourdieu's terms, the social capital, which her father might provide for her, puts her at a disadvantaged position and blocks her path to promotion for a long time. In her case, the social capital she rejects proves to be more influential than her personal skills and merits.

Another point that underlines the complexity of the issue of class is Robyn's own perception of class. As an upper middle-class person who has a comfortable but not a luxurious way of life, her perception of the lower class is highly elitist. As discussed in the chapter on theoretical framework, Gramsci suggests the existence of "esprit de corps", a feeling of high level pride and mutual loyalty, (13) among academics, which also creates the illusion that they are independent from the dominant social group and its ideology. In other words, they regard themselves as another superior form of social formation, a special community. Being a member of such a community, Robyn cannot help despising the accent and manners of her brother's working class girlfriend, Debbie, in their first encounter:

> At first Robyn thought that Debbie's cockney accent was some sort of joke, but soon realized that it was authentic. In spite of her Sloney clothes and hair-do, Debbie was decidedly lower-class. When Basil mentioned that she worked in the same bank as himself, Robyn assumed that she was a secretary or typist." (657)

Just because of her lower-class accent and manners, Robyn undervalues Debbie's talents and believes that she has an unimportant or lesser position in the bank. However, she is corrected by her brother, Basil with these words: "Good Lord, no. She is a foreign-exchange dealer. Very smart, earns more than I do" (657). The fact that Debbie has never gone to the university, and has Cockney accent causes Robyn to be judgmental about Debbie's social status. From her dowdy and exaggerated clothes and hairstyle, Robyn thinks that she is one of the uncultured, vulgar type of girls who is after making a fast buck. She feels that Debbie is not a suitable candidate for her brother, not a person worthy of her family's elegance and prestige. She sees herself as occupying a relatively superior position in society compared to Debbie, resulting from two related factors: the family/class origin and the educational background. Although Debbie earns much more than Robyn, and has access to various types of luxuries that Robyn cannot afford, such as buying her own house, and driving her brand-new car, it is Robyn who feels superior. Stephanie Lawler from University of York explains this middle-class feeling of superiority saying: "Although most working-class people are poor relative to the middle classes, it is not their poverty that attracts contempt, but their alleged ignorance of the 'right ways of being and doing'" (702). In other words, what Robyn despises is Debbie's lack of cultural capital rather than money or wealth of any sort. This perception, once again, supports the suggestion that money gained through one's occupation cannot neutralize the social class differences, or bridge the gap between classes. Judith Kegan Gardiner explains Robyn's stance as a satirical technique utilized by Lodge, and suggests: "Part of Lodge's good joke is making his feminist post-modernist a character out of conventional bourgeois realism and then showing the limits of this position" (303-304). Gardiner implies that alienation from the mundane realities of life is not possible for such characters like Robyn, who belongs to a closed academic circle, and is aware only of the principles and dynamics of that circle. By putting her right in the middle of a dirty factory, David Lodge exposes her to such conditions in the most realistic way possible. Her initial shock and fear turns into a curiosity of an alternative social sphere about which she does not have the faintest clue so far in her life.

As a daughter of an Oxford professor, Robyn's attitude reminds the readers of Noel Annan's claim about the existence of an "intellectual aristocracy", which started in the middle of the nineteenth century in England, and maintained its power in the twentieth century. By tracing the networks created through marriages, and collaborations of professional kind among the distinguished intellectual families in England, Annan tries to prove the presence of such an elitist intellectual community. The members of this community, not necessarily having upper-class backgrounds and wealth, feel aristocratic because of their intellectual capacities and the facilities they gain through this capacity. In time, they established a closed society, whose customs and practices are only familiar to its members, and are passed down to their children. From Annan's perspective, Robyn's attitude towards Debbie shows that she might be maintaining this discriminatory perspective of the "intellectual aristocracy", hence, she does get rid of the influence of her elitist background in judging people who do not have such a background. Robyn's contempt for the lower class becomes more obvious during her conversation with Debbie. Debbie tries to persuade her to engage in business world and earn money, and quit her position at Rummidge University. When Debbie asks her "Why doncher try somethink else?" with her cockney accent, Robyn replies: "Like the money market?" (659). The sarcasm in her attitude is emphasized by the narrator as: "Robyn enquired sardonically though Debbie seemed to take the suggestion seriously" (659). For Robyn, Debbie is an unrefined girl who wraps every notion in her materialistic worldview, so she need not be taken seriously. Like Noel Annan, in his evaluation of the development of intellectuals in England, Gramsci also suggests that despite losing its economic power, the English aristocracy went on controlling the politico-intellectual arena for a very long time (18).

On the other hand, Robyn's boyfriend, Charles, who has a humble family background, is capable of building empathy with Debbie. Robyn tells Charles that her family will consider Debbie common if Basil introduces her to them. However, Charles criticizes Robyn's attitude with these words: "You rather gave the impression that you thought her common yourself. You patronised her terribly" (662). Since Charles does not have an elite family, and he manages to get a proper education only with scholarships and part-time jobs, he can understand Debbie's

position in society. Instead of looking down on her, he takes her seriously, and he gets advice on accounting and finance from Debbie. Robyn's attitude causes Charles to feel uncomfortable, as he does not regard getting rich by merit as a vulgar desire. When Robyn warns him "Don't let's ever become rich, Charles," (663) Charles does not agree with her. The encounter with Debbie is the starting point for their final separation for both of them, since they realize the huge difference between their worldviews and social statues. Charles comes from a lower class family and lacks all the economic and social capital that Robyn has, so he longs for the comfort and luxury which Debbie obtains by working. He does not see anything wrong with earning money with one's merits. Unlike Charles, Robyn, as a member of an upper-middle class family, already possess such luxuries in her family. Although she does not prefer using her family's money and prestige, she knows that she will be provided with economic support whenever she demands. For instance, she retreats to her family's comfortable country house when she needs to finish her book while Charles uses his small apartment or the university library to do the same thing. And this difference becomes the reason for their final separation. Hence, social class is still a divisive factor among individuals who do not share the same familial and economic background in the seventies from Lodge's perspective.

Although there exist such a subtle division between classes as in the case of Robyn and Charles, it is noteworthy that the term "social species" replaces the word class in the description of Robyn Penrose in *Nice Work*. The narrator specifies: "I shall therefore take the liberty of treating her as a character, not utterly different in kind, though of course belonging to a very different social species from Victor Wilcox" (556). Juxtaposing their daily rituals and habits, Lodge depicts two people who are outcomes of two distinctively separate educational disciplines, and familial backgrounds. The reference to belong to different social species, instead of class in their depictions, in a sense, points once again to the fact that the boundaries between social groups begin to be more fluid in the eighties in England. In other words, it was getting more and more difficult to distinguish where an individual stands in the social hierarchy with all the expanding criteria and values of each social class. Specifically, together with the rise of the bourgeois, there appeared middle classes rather than one middle class. As is discussed in the chapter on theoretical

framework, even Karl Marx specified divisions or categories within one single class. Therefore in the novel, there are highly cultured and intellectual middle class academics without any remarkable wealth, but lower-class individuals with considerable amount of money and possessions. It gets gradually difficult to distinguish who belongs to which social segment due to the changing economic and social conditions of the decade.

4.4.2 Capitalist Policies in Higher Education: Collaboration of University and the Business World

Nice Work starts with the description of the capitalist luxuries of Victor Vilcox's house with its en suite bathroom. Marjorie, his wife, is in love with the house just because of this bathroom, and her extreme love of luxury is described as follows:

> The bathroom, with its kidney-shaped hand basin and gold-plated taps and sunken bath and streamlined loo and bidet. And above all, the fact that it was *en suite. I've always wanted an en suite bathroom,* she would say to visitors, to her friends on the phone, to, he wouldn't be surprized, tradesman on the doorstep or strangers she accosted in the street. (537)

Marjorie acts like an arriviste, who imitates higher class habits, with all her showy attitudes. She, obviously, is not in accordance with the higher class life style, since she was not used to be part of it before marriage. All this financial welfare is something new for her, and as they get richer and richer by means of Wilcox's fast promotion in the business world, Marjorie does not know how to deal with all these newly developing economic conditions. In that sense, she represents the difference between being born an upper-class and adapting to such a life-style later in life. And her behaviours, in a sense, implies that there is no way of becoming authentically upper class through the income received as a result of personal effort.

Although Victor Wilcox has the same capitalist tendency of brand awareness like his wife, he is not an admirer of foreign brands. He chooses his belongings from very prestigious, but national brands. His taste is summarized as follows: "Vic has never driven a foreign car: foreign cars are anathema to him, their sudden invasion of British roads in the 1970s marked the beginning of the region's economic ruin in his view – but he has to admit that you don't have a lot of choice in British cars when it comes to matching the top-of-the-range Mercedes and

BMWs" (546). He has a nationalistic attitude of protecting the local brands against the foreign ones in the face of capitalist rivalry. The meticulousness of his market-analysis indicates that he knows where each brand stands in the hierarchy of the world market. As a businessman, he knows that creating a world class brand is necessary to compete in the global arena in the capitalist system, which requires rivalry.

The influence of the dominant capitalist ideology is also felt in the universities in the 1980s. There are frequent reflections of the economic crisis in the novel in the form of lack of resources for academic research, early retirements, financial difficulties of different kinds like the severe budget cuts. When Robyn wants to inquire about the possibility of her future employment at Rummidge, the head of the department, Philip Swallow states: "No chance at all, as far as I can see. The university is desperate to save on salaries. They are talking about another round of early retirements. Even if someone were to leave the Department, or drop dead… even then, I very much doubt whether we should get a replacement" (573). At Rummidge, junior academics face the bitter reality of abolition of tenure, which disturbs Swallow's colleagues. As the head of the department, he feels uncomfortable about not being able to permanently employ such an enthusiastic and talented academic as Robyn Penrose, and wants to manage this crisis as much as possible by explaining his desperation and lack of means without hurting his co-workers' feelings. However, as the situation gets worse, the university exercises other forms of budget cut like getting rid of "all automatic flushing systems from its men's cloakrooms" (589).

The expansion projects in higher education partially fails due to faulty planning, and the novel includes references to this failure. Upon reading about the redundancies and dismissals in the academia, and the abolition of tenure, Philip Swallow likens the process to Big Bang, saying, "It is like the Big Bang theory of the universe. They say that at a certain point it will start expanding and start contracting again, back into the original primal seed. The Robbins Report was out Big Bang. Now, we've gone into reverse" (547). He implies that the expansion in higher education started with the Education Act of 1944, and got out of control: all the universities that have been built in hurry, and the staff that has been employed

at the same speed now backfires. This suggestion is fostered by the advice given to Robyn by one of his professors while she is an undergraduate student at Sussex University. Her tutor warns her saying, ""Look, this place hasn't got a proper research library, and it is not going to get one. Go to Oxbridge". He had seen the writing on the wall: "after oil crisis of 1973 there wasn't going to be enough money to keep all the universities enthusiastically created or expanded in the booming sixties" (559). The downsizing in British economy directly influences the academia, and Robyn is not fully conscious of the situation until she faces this reality during her work-life. However, as partially discussed in relation to class and meritocracy, Charles is aware of the negative effects of the financial constraints on academia from the very beginning, and he evaluates Robyn's situation with these words:

> The irony is that she's easily the brightest person in the Department. The students know it, Swallow knows it, and the other staff know it. But there is nothing anybody can do about it, apparently. That's what this government is doing to the universities: dearth by a thousand cuts". (659)

The play with the word 'cut' is worthy of attention here, since it both means financial cut and bodily injury both connotes that the English academia receives wounds of different sorts due to the capitalist mind-set of the politicians.

As stated, the economic crisis is also felt in the business world. Thus, the situation in the business world is not different from the situation at the universities. Victor Wilcox also struggles with budget problems in Pringles, and is aware of the approaching economic crisis. He knows that there will be redundancies in the factory in the short run if they do not take serious precautions (585). He is even exposed to the trick of his business partner who tries to steal the main suppliers of Wilcox's company, but catches him in the action. Such level of rivalry indicates that the business world is suffering from capitalism. Robyn suggests a change of posts and places for the workers in the Pringles Company when she observes their unenthusiastic, bored expression, and robotic expressions, but Wilcox thinks that it will cause loss of money and time. The workers are described as follows: "They switch off, they daydream" (616), reminding of the Marxist criticism that such repetitive heavy work creates self-alienation in the worker. Wilcox predicts that "One day, there will be lightless factories full of machines" (617). The replacement

of manpower with faster and more efficient machines is again an outcome of the capitalist system based on mass production.

The differences between the corporate and academic world are more obvious in the novel in the description of a project initiated by the government. Being conscious of the mutual need in the academia and the business world to enhance their resources, the government starts the "shadow scheme" which obliges both universities and companies to conduct collaborative work. The necessity of the shadow scheme is described in the Vice-Chancellor of a University's call to the deans as follows:

> There is a widespread feeling in the country that universities are "ivory tower" institutions, whose staff are ignorant of the realities of the commercial world. Whatever the justice of this prejudice, it is important in the present economic climate that we should do our utmost to dispel it. The SS will advertise our willingness to inform ourselves about the needs of industry. (589)

This call is a reminder of the Thatcher government's expectations from the universities with respect to supporting the enterprise culture, and making universities profitable institutions. Specially, local universities want to respond to the call, and refrain from getting into conflict with the political authorities, since they know that such a controversy may cause further cuts on their budgets. The reference to universities being ivory towers is also a reference to Margaret Thatcher's perspective of the universities, as she found them partially hostile against her economic agenda, and oblivious to the financial difficulties that the country was going through. Being recently employed and a junior, Robyn is selected for the team, and needs to visit Victor Wilcox's Company every week on the same day to make observations in the place. Nevertheless, as a person who finds industrial capitalism "phallocentric," (583) Robyn criticizes every process in the factory that is designed by male managers and creates problems for the administrators. On the other side, the impracticality and the abstractness of her humanitarian perspective in the business world is criticized by Wilcox at every chance. In the factory, Victor witnesses workers who vandalize the machines whenever they are unhappy about the working conditions, and finds their attitude quite annoying and primitive. He tries to explain Robyn that the situation is far more complicated than she grasps, and the uneducated workers are very difficult to

handle most of the time. Not only in the factor, but also on the streets the vandalism increases from Victor's perspective, and he shows Robyn the smashed traffic boards on the way to the factory to illustrate people's restlessness with the economic crisis (704). However, Robyn shows Victor the limitations of his perspective. She argues that Victor would complain about being mugged by one those vandals, yet he respects and supports Margaret Thatcher's ideas. She claims: "Thatcher has created an alienated underclass who take out their resentment in crime and vandalism. You cannot blame them" (704). From her perspective it is all government's fault, and can only be solve on the political arena. Yet just like Thatcher and her officials Victor Wilcox criticizes the university education from a hardworking businessman's perspective with such words: "Your universities may be cathedrals of modern age, but do you teach morality in them" (704). The similarity between the attitudes of Victor Wilcox and Minister of education is noteworthy, since they both believe that universities should teach students more than scientific knowledge; that is, the mundane realities of the world the country they live in as well as the ethical way of doing things.

Robyn herself also knows that the literary world has failed to suggest any rational solution to the miseries of the lower class in the grip of capitalist production cycle. Thus, in her lectures, she concludes: "In short, all the Victorian novelist could offer as a solution to the problems of industrial capitalism were: a legacy, a marriage, emigration, or death" (587). Despite her consciousness of the isolation of literature from the horrid conditions of the factory she visits every week, she feels afraid, and wants to return to her sheltered cosy home to write about some classic Victorian novel (597). The realities of capitalist system is appalling for her: "The noise. The dirt. The mindless, repetitive work. The…everything. That men should have to put up with such brutalising conditions…. If this was employment then perhaps people were better off without it" (613). At this point the fact that she considers abandoning work as an option for the factory workers clashes with her fears of losing her own job. Even her choice of studying literary theory results from her anxiety to promote her position in the academia, and get tenure more easily. As emphasized in the previous novel, *Small World*, the literary world values theory in the eighties, and anti-theory people like Philip Swallow were not favoured in the

academic circle. Thus her effort to bring literature and philosophy together results from her desire to guarantee a prestigious position for herself in academia. She does not want to be a part of the shadow scheme, since it is a waste of time from her perspective. She thinks, "It was a distraction from her work. There were always so many books, so many articles in so many journals, waiting to be read, digested, distilled and synthesised with all the other books and articles she had read, digested, distilled and synthesised. Life was short, criticism long. She had her career to think of" (683). Robyn's anxiety about her career shows that she does not perceive her academic studies as a hobby to satisfy her pleasure, rather a serious job through which she can preserve her existence in the academia. While she is anxious about her career she forgets that to work is not only a requirement for herself but also for the factory workers, too. She ignores the fact that all these uneducated workers do not have chances to earn a living if they are all fired, and unemployment means hunger, and more misery for them. Robyn's stance is also hypocritical in the sense that she lacks empathy with the lower-class, and only cares for her own well-being in the capitalist system as is obvious from her attitude toward factor workers and previously to her brother's lower-class girlfriend. Though she wants to create anti-capitalist image, she does not question the situation of lower-class people who do not have the same opportunities, and only theorizes about the workers just like the industrial novelists she criticizes.

4.5 Conclusion to the Trilogy

In the first novel of the trilogy, *Small World* the final chapter "Ending" is in the form of a film scenario, full of interactive dialogues and stage directions. The couples finally come together in a hotel room, and discuss diverse topics such as their complicated betrayals, student revolts and the death of the novel, yet their conversation ends with a postmodern touch, the impossibility of ending a novel properly, which prepares the reader for the following novels about the academic world. Hence, *Changing Places* serves as an introduction for many educational and academic issues that David Lodge, later on, deals with in his voluminous trilogy.

By uniting academics even from the two ends of the world in a small village's bar, or on the street of a little district, *Small World* depicts academia as a unified whole, a world whose limitations and boundaries are perfectly familiar to

its members. Considering that the book opens with a conference with horrid conditions in a provincial university with few attendees, and finishes with the most important conference for the literary world with the stars of the profession, it, in an sense, follows a circular pattern, and finishes again with an academic gathering, but this time, an exact opposite of the one at the beginning. That circular pattern again connotes that academics revolve around the same circle even if they change their places, their world is actually small. In addition, the announcement of Arthur Kingfisher as the UNESCO chair despite his recent unproductiveness in his field confirms the persistence of the educational elites that has been discussed both in this and in previous chapters. As confirmed by joint studies of a set of researchers: "Elite institutions produce an elite accepted by society. Yet it requires, in particular, a dominant class *habitus* to get access to these institutions….Today, educational elites are still known to be more successful accessing top jobs in the graduate labour market" (Tholen, et al.143). Thus, it might be inferred that there are still residues of the old elitist system in the academia, and it is highly challenging to break this hereditary cycle of power.

Being the last novel in the trilogy, *Nice Work* also wraps up many discussions brought up in the trilogy. Firstly, it enlarges the discussion started in *Changing Places* about the idea that the campus, or the novel that centres around the campus as its physical setting, does not reflect the immediate social and economic dynamics that surrounds it closely. The confession Philip Swallow makes at the end of the novel shows the limited perspective of an academic that only engages in his/her studies, and is not interested in the bigger social and economic problems of the county. Swallow states "I feel, by the time I retire, I shall have lived through the entire life-cycle of post-war higher education. When I was a student myself, provincial universities like Rummidge were a very small show. Then in the sixties, it was all expansion, growth new building…. Now, it's all gone quiet" (574). Despite witnessing all the stages of post-war provincial universities, Swallow still fails to make a contribution to their development, and is still oblivious to the immediate effects of bigger socio-economic problems at the university. Therefore, Lodge, after giving a detailed picture of the academic world and its changing dynamics in the first two novels now juxtaposes the industrial world with the

academic world in *Nice Work*, and questions their possible integration and harmony. The fact that both Wilcox and Robyn fail to be a part of each other's world, and prefer their own circles despite all the love and sympathy they feel for each other, suggests the impossibility of reconciling these two worlds. Both protagonists gain insight about each other's social context, and change their perspectives to a certain degree, but it is not enough at the end of the novel to bring them together with future collaborations. Interestingly, Robyn inherits a large amount of money from her family, and gets richer just like the female heroines in the Victorian novels that she ridicules. And Wilcox goes back to his comfortable and luxurious life after getting interested in literature for a short while. Thus, the isolation of the academia from the industrial world is not an easily changeable social dynamic within the novel.

Briefly, David Lodge in his trilogy gives a very broad description of the academia, and crosses the national borders unlike Kingsley Amis and Malcolm Bradbury, who confine their descriptions only to the English academia. By referring to different academics traditions and customs in the academic circle, Lodge touches upon various issues that shaped British higher education with specific references to the period's higher education policies. The explicit and implicit criticisms of the Reports, namely the Robbins Report and the James Report as well as Thatcher's regulations towards the privatisation of universities are evaluated in different contexts and from the perspective of various academics. How the academia suffers from the capitalist ideology, and how it tries to preserve some of its traditional values are also among the central topics in the trilogy, since job insecurity is an influential factor that triggers the power-struggles among many academics depicted in three novels. All the novels in the trilogy, specifically, *Nice Work* questions the possibility of creating a preserved space, namely a campus, which is completely detached from the social and economic realities that surrounds itself. A secluded area with a community whose members are totally oblivious to the socio-political and economic dynamics of the general public, devoting themselves to pure scientific studies. It also questions whether academics are impractical people who keep theorizing about the issues whose real life applications and solutions are unknown to them. Hence, the trilogy provides the reader with multiple perspectives;

that is, the academia is depicted both from the insider's and the outsiders' perspective as in the case of Victor Wilcox. It problematizes the idea that academia is a closed society, and universities are not easily accessible places with Robyn's words in the last novel:

> Universities are cathedrals of the modern age. They shouldn't have to justify their existence by the utilitarian criteria. The trouble is, ordinary people don't understand what they are about, and the universities don't really bother to explain themselves to the community. We have an Open Day once a year. Everyday ought to be an open day. The campus is a graveyard at the weekends, and in the vacations. It ought to be swarming with local people doing part-time courses – using the library, using the laboratories, going to lectures, going to concerts….We ought to get rid of the security men and the barriers at the gates and let people in!. (703)

Thus, Lodge with his writing, let a lot of non-academics readers in, and achieved Robyn's desire at least on the fictional level. A lot of non-academic readers get an insight about the academic practices and campus as a physical setting thanks to his broad depictions. He opens the doors of the campus slightly for the curious reader, and lays bare a lot of dynamics in the academia such as rivalry, hegemony, and politicking.

As for class in these three novels, it has been evaluated from a meritocratic perspective, since in the eighties, the capitalist demand of creating a fixed criteria to select the most gifted students, and use them in the business world gained popularity. The individuals gradually started to be evaluated according to their merits and educational backgrounds instead of their social classes. However, there are implications in the book that the meritocratic system is the preservation of the traditional elitist approach, since it disregards the disadvantages of lower-class students, and expects the same performance from all individuals both in and outside the academia; thus, putting them into an unfair competitive system. Therefore, characters like Persse McGarrigle and Morris Zapp are evaluated against the same criteria, although they are not educated in the same system, one being the product of Irish education, the other is the competitive and capitalist American education. Thus, throughout the trilogy, the validity of the meritocratic ideals are frequently questioned.

CONCLUSION

This study focuses on post-war campus novels, and covers nearly a period of 34 years after the publication of the first British example of the genre, *Lucky Jim*. In this dissertation, the post-war educational reforms and regulations in England from the background of the six campus novels, namely *Lucky Jim, Eating People is Wrong, History Man* and David Lodge's trilogy consisting of *Changing Places, Small World* and *Nice Work*, have been taken under scrutiny. In these novels, there are both subtle and open criticisms of higher education policies in England. One common issue is the hegemonic power struggles the academics face when they step in the academic world, and the survival strategies that they need to develop to maintain their presence in the academia. In this respect, the "struggle for existence" is the common point of the academics from different layers of society, with different academic titles, in different places in the world, since David Lodge partly includes the depictions of academics from different nations apart from the English ones. Nonetheless, deduced from the failure of lower class academics, and the adaptation problems they experience as in the cases of Jim Dixon in *Lucky Jim*, Louis Bates and Professor Treece in *Eating People is Wrong*, and Persse Mc Garrigle in *Small World*, this process of becoming an acknowledged academic is relatively more painful for the lower-class individuals that have long been excluded from British higher education due to their lack of economic, social and cultural capital in Bourdieu's terms. From this perspective, the academics who lack the necessary financial support, familial ties, and cultural sophistication, start their career one step behind their rivals. On top of it, Raymond Williams draws attention to the difficulty of challenging the established tradition in such a preserved and closed community as the English academia. The acceptance to the English academia requires mastery over social decorum from table manners to the love of aesthetics, literature and art whose absence might create a feeling of insecurity and inferiority in the lower class academic as is exemplified in *Lucky Jim*. Thus, the difficulty of the rise of the

"emergent values in Raymond Williams' terms is, in a sense, verified by the cases of Jim Dixon and other lower class academics discussed in the selected novels.

Another common concern of the academics, in all the novels analysed in this dissertation, is the desire to be recognized by the other members of the academia. The examples indicate that this desire bothers not only junior academics but also more senior ones, too. From the first novel to the last, there is the suggestion that obtaining power and prestige in the academia is only one step, since preserving the prestige is an even longer and a more painful process for the academics in the novels. In this respect, the common implication these six novels include is that from the initial steps of their career, the academics find themselves right in the middle of an ambitious circle which is full of politicking and rivalry. Moreover, the capitalist higher education policies adapted in England, with the process of privatisation of universities, aggravate the situation for the academics, and it fosters the already rooted conflicts by putting the academics into a more production-based competition. The petty tricks and manipulations the academics engage in for the sake of getting popularity, and the appreciation of their colleagues create a comic yet a satirical effect in the novels.

As discussed by certain critics such as Janice Rossen, the campus novel is a highly class-conscious genre in addition to being seriously satirical of the academic world's strict hierarchical mechanism. Thus, the main argument about class in the selected novels is that the influence of the traditional class divisions in England maintained its existence for a very long time, and still had its traces on the higher education with an elitist tradition from the 1950s till the end of the 1980s. All the hegemonic pressure Professor Welch exerts upon the young academic, Jim Dixon, such as assigning him to do all the petty errands at the department, suggests that the residues of the traditional chain of command is still preserved in the English academia. This continues in *Small World* with the example of Persse McGarrigle, who is advised to flatter the professors, remain silent to their mistakes to get their appreciation. As discussed, Raymond Williams emphasizes the power of tradition in societies which are conventionally divided into classes, and the difficulty of replacing the established order with new customs and practices.

The residues of such class antagonism has also been implied by Bradbury in *Eating People is Wrong* with the alienation of two lower-class individuals from the academia, one being a very hardworking professor of English, Treece, the other a gifted working class student who aims at becoming a member of the academia, Louis Bates. They are marginalized by the upper-class members of the academia on the basis of their "eccentricity" which ironically is observed in the upper-class, too. The hypocrisy of the upper class in welcoming the oddities in their own circle and shunning the same peculiarities in the lower-class matches up with the double standard of the upper class suggested in *Lucky Jim*. In Bradbury's *History Man*, the same discriminatory mind-set changes hands, though it was written nearly two decades later, and, this time, hegemony is exercised by a lower-class academic to control his students and colleagues: Howard Kirk, a Marxist sociology instructor with lower-class origins, enforces his revolutionary classroom designs and grading system without considering the possibility of their being unfair and faulty. He exploits undergraduate students, assigns them his domestic chores, and lies to gain the support of his colleagues. In other words, Howard acts like the upper-class academics to create his own lobby or power sphere in the academia, verifying Bourdieu's suggestion that the sole method of obtaining a sufficient level of academic capital is to hold a position of power in the academia that allows individuals to supress the others. And unsurprisingly, with his dominant attitude, Howard climbs the career ladder swiftly, publishes popular books, and becomes a famous academic at a very young age. To acknowledge Howard as the representative of the emergent values in the academia in the seventies is to accept that the emergent values of the period consist mainly of following the fashion without much thinking about its scientific and educative value.

In the eighties, the perception of class changed considerably, and David Lodge replaces the term class with "social species" in his campus trilogy to connote this change. The class antagonism which was felt more obviously during the fifties in *Lucky Jim* leaves its place to a more skill-based competition in the academia in the eighties. Nevertheless, from Michael Young and his supporters' point of view, the new meritocratic system in higher education is not much different from the old elitist system which excludes financially and culturally disadvantaged people. The

meritocratic system, based on the criterion of individual talent, fails to provide equal opportunities to people from lower-classes. It is unfortunately the repetition of the traditional class-based injustices, carrying the residues of the old system from Raymond Williams's perspective. David Lodge's female protagonist in the final novel of his trilogy, which was written at the end of eighties, has the same class-based prejudices against lower-class individuals as the upper-class members of academia in *Lucky Jim*. Despite being pictured as more qualified and dignified than the members of bourgeoisie depicted in *Lucky Jim*, Robyn also inwardly looks down on lower-class people, and finds their working-class accents and manners weird and funny. In that sense, the same elitist mind-set that excludes Jim Dixon from the academic circle on the basis of his working class origins and lack of social/cultural capital in the fifties was partly preserved in the eighties.

A close look at the backgrounds of the academics in David Lodge's campus trilogy indicates that the academics who are lucky enough to be born with the necessary network and financial wellbeing are always one step further than the others. Although all the academics in the trilogy are in search of fame, money, and prestige, only the ones with a high-quality education and money can get them in the end, fostering both Williams and Bourdieu's ideas that it is difficult for a lower-class individual to break the hereditary cycle of authority and prestige in the academia without the necessary social and cultural capital.

Despite the residues of traditional structuring, the academia can also be categorized as a distinct class, which does not fall into the classical categories of class drawn by Marxist theory, and is a very complicated community whose dynamics update themselves in the course of time, a point which both Antonio Gramcsi and Noel Annan broadly discuss. The classical definitions of class do not apply to the whole academia as campuses bring together people from different layers of society, and hold them under a set of customs and practices, and expect all of them to follow a set of fixed criteria. As a result of this standardization process, the academics, whether coming from lower or upper classes, formulate common manners, applications, and habits that unify them in the course of time, minimizing the influences of class-based differences, though not eradicating them completely. Thus, further studies on the campus novel may look at the internal

dynamics of the academia as a closed social community as depicted in campus novels. Related to this, there is the claim that campus novels include specific terminology, and, to a certain extent, appeal to an esoteric group rather than the general reading public. For instance, David Lodge's campus trilogy includes abundant literary and linguistic terminology like deconstruction, sign, decoding, and encoding as well as field-specific references that the challenging aspect of this jargon for the outsiders can also be subject for further studies.

As for the penetration of dominant capitalist ideology into the universities, the main finding is that due to the capitalist dominant ideology that increasingly controls the academia, the individuals who decipher and apply the capitalist criteria find the chance to survive in it while the others, specifically the supporters of humanitarian values, and members of lower-classes, are subjected to a serious form of exclusion. The first traces of the penetration of dominant capitalist ideology into the universities are reflected in *Lucky Jim* by referring to the universities as "modern work houses" into which the academics are subjected to a high performance system via certain quality control mechanisms, such as the external examination boards assigned by the government to check the quality of the exams at universities. Since the government spared a good deal of money for scholarships to support the education of returning veterans and people with poor backgrounds in the fifties in England, the authorities wanted to make sure that all this money was spent on the education of skilled graduates that would contribute to the general welfare of the country. This created a pressure upon the academics, and urged them to give unrealistically higher grades to untalented and unsuccessful students, lowering the quality of education in the long run, specifically for the local universities.

In Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong*, the idea that the system of higher education is still controlled by the capitalist ideology is implied by Professor Treece's poverty and lack of finances. His modest life standard does not change very much even after he gets tenure and a regular salary from the university. He gives up his dreams of having a wife and a family, since he knows that he cannot support them with his restricted income. Thus, his situation reveals the fact that provincial universities in England do not support its members financially, and do not provide them with comfortable lives. In the novel, the complaints of the writer

and the academic Willoughby about the financial difficulties that the academics go through also draw attention to the seriousness of the economic problems in the academia. He cannot even pay for his own train tickets to visit different universities and attend seminars.

Similarly, Bradbury's second novel, *History Man* problematizes the relationship between populism and capitalist ideology through the protagonist Howard Kirk's exaggerated love of fashion and his tendency to turn his writing into a form of self-advertisement to earn money rather than to publish a quality work in his field. The paradox between his alleged Marxist stance and his bourgeois life style as well as the inconsistency between his search for equality and his domineering attitude towards people who do not comply with his teachings reveal the difficulty of putting the egalitarian philosophy into practice in the academic circle which is substantially under the influence of the capitalist ideology. Howard also lets the publishers change the content and the title of his book to a version which can sell more, confirming the inconsistency between his theoretical egalitarian teachings and his capitalist tendencies. In *History Man*, even the new blocks built in the campus are more practical and industrial type of buildings; quite different from the old Victorian style buildings on campus. The populist capitalist manners of the academics, the struggle to popularize the academic publications by changing their contents, and the design of the offices all foster the idea that the academia is geared towards capitalism.

In parallel to this, written against a background of extreme financial restrictions at the universities, David Lodge's campus trilogy has references to the privatisation of British universities initiated by Margaret Thatcher's government. The severe budget cuts, the abolition of tenure, and job- insecurity felt by the academics have been frequently pictured in the trilogy. The horrid conditions of the fictitious University of Rummidge depicted in *Changing Places* get even worse years later in the second and third books of the trilogy, which connotes that local universities fail to make a progress despite the initial desire on the part of the government to make them a functioning part of the whole process of economic growth. In *Small World*, the similar capitalist tendencies influence the academia. For instance, "the American Express card replaces the library pass," (275) as Morris

Zapp declares, which means that the academics who are well-off can travel the world and access information more easily than their colleagues who lack money. Being mobile and active is depicted as one of the indispensable requirements of the academic world in the second novel, yet attending conferences and travelling are linked to the financial well-being of scholars. What makes the world *small* from Lodge's perspective then is the financial opportunities that the academics have.

Nice Work (1988) focuses on the cooperation between the business world and the universities, and juxtaposes the working conditions in a big factory with the conditions at Rummidge University. The conflicting dynamics of the business world and the academia are laid bare through the cases of two characters - a businessman and a female humanities instructor - who find it extremely difficult to understand each other's worlds. By creating a character, an expert on Victorian industrial novels, Robyn Penrose, who is oblivious to the dynamics of the industrial world, Lodge brings forward a long debated issue: the isolation of the campus from real life problems. Upon visiting a factory, Robyn cannot hide her astonishment and sadness in the face of such dirt, noise and physical pain endured by the workers.

Carnival is another aspect that is dealt with in this thesis with respect to the behaviour of academics outside their workplaces. Campus novels picture academics during social gatherings and seminars to display the behavioural differences of academics in and out of the workplace. Starting from Jim Dixon, who gets extremely drunk at the first social gathering he is invited to, and continues with the extremities that professors engage in *History Man* and *Small World*, there is the implication that academics try to get rid of the tension of their professional life during these social gatherings, so they act more freely, forgetting about the hierarchical order in the academia which requires a certain level of seriousness and formality. The academics in campus novels analysed indulge in bodily pleasures, alcohol, food, and sex during the parties after the seminars, which can be explained from a Bakhtinian perspective. For Bakhtin, during the time of the carnival all hierarchical privileges are abandoned and temporarily people from all layers of society come together, and have fun regardless of their positions in society. This is the case for the academics in *History Man*, for instance, since they regularly come together at Howard's seasonal parties to use drugs, drink alcohol, and have sex. The

same release of tension is observed in David Lodge's *Small World*, in which academics put on masks and march on the streets to act out Yeats's *Waste Land*, after a seminar on Yeats's poetry. After making their presentations and having serious discussion on the works of the poet, they spare time for fun and get rid of the boredom of the conference presentations. The implication in all these novels is that conferences, or specifically the social gatherings and after-parties have some kind of a rehabilitating effect on the academics, which help them maintain their "normality" in the face of hegemonic pressure and rivalry.

If the definition of class and hegemony changes in the course of time, and the dominant ideology finds its way into the institutions of education as suggested by Louis Althusser, the works of campus fiction writers will continue to provide material to be discussed in these areas. Additionally, after the eighties, authors like Zadie Smith and J.M Coetzee among many others contributed to the genre by enlarging the themes that are already present in the works of the former authors. For instance, there is an increasing emphasis upon work ethics at the universities in the later examples of the genre; that is, the novelists tend to picture the unethical relationships and practices among academics in more detail. This tendency to criticize the malfunctioning in the academia also implies an awareness as well as discomfort about the existence of immoral behaviours in the academic circle.

In this study, the authors of the campus novels are both academics and writers of fiction which means they are the very people who engage in the scientific research on humanities, and write fiction at the same time. The campus novel is the combination of the work place experience with penmanship. By observing the campus, the relationships among their colleagues, and even the multi-layered nature of their own work, the authors of campus novels gather comprehensive first-hand data to fictionalize their facts. In other words, their profession is their source of inspiration, and they write as the insiders of the academic profession. There are a lot of campus fiction writers who write about their academic lives in other countries, too. For instance, Vladimir Nabokov, the famous Russian novelist, is a professor of literature, and he penned *Pnin (1957)*, a campus novel, while he was a professor of Russian and European Literature at Cornell University in New York, and correspondingly, his novel is about a Russian instructor teaching at an American

University. One suggestion related to this is that further studies upon campus novels might question whether it is possible to write about academia without being a member of it, since without any exception, all the campus novel writers have taught at a university at some point in their lives. Does this fact foster the idea that campus is a closed setting which is highly impenetrable by the outsiders? And is it ever possible to read a campus novel written by a non-academic?

Campus novels can also be studied from the perspective of ethnicity, since there are ethnic and cross-cultural prejudices in the academic world as it is reflected in Malcolm Bradbury's *Eating People is Wrong* with the exclusion of the African student Eborabolesa, and other foreigners by the elitist members of the English academia. Thus, the depiction of minorities from the perspective of the English can be another topic for research in campus novels.

Another comprehensive aspect for discussion is the situation of women academics as they are reflected in the campus novels. There are female academics in the campus novels analysed in this dissertation like in many others, so the books can be dealt from the perspective of gender-based inequalities within the academia. For instance, in *Small World*, Hilary, Morris Zapp's ex-wife, later on turns to writing, and becomes a feminist novelist as a middle aged woman, and she complains about sacrificing her career for her husband, saying "I never did finish my MA, so now I sit at home growing fat while my silver haired spouse zooms round the world, no doubt pursued by academic groupies (273). She explains that her generation tended to put themselves in the background to support their husbands, so she discovered her potential quite late in life. Taking such female characters' problems to the centre, further studies might have a feminist analysis of this and other campus novels that include female academics.

Tracing all the clues in these six novels on capitalisation, it can be concluded that the economic conditions of post-war England directly influenced higher education policies, and the selected novels include serious criticism of such policies. Therefore, Philip Swallow in David Lodge's trilogy, though being the product of a relatively humanitarian education system, becomes aware of the inevitability of becoming a part of the capitalist system in the end. He confesses that the expansion projects that started in the fifties did not really become successful

due to faulty planning, and now the government adapts a reduction policy, and forces the universities to get smaller. Based on the references and implications in the novels, the fundamental suggestion about class made by this study is that the English academia is a highly class-based community, and it is difficult to create a system based on egalitarian principles in the long run. For this very reason, the validity or applicability of meritocratic ideals is still a very hot topic at the universities with a lot of criticism about its being a version of old class system. The theories of many twenty-first century educationalists, who are also utilized in this dissertation, still include discussions on the parameters that will create equal opportunity in education in England. Campus novels chosen for this study provide ample material in that they reflect the dysfunctional aspects of governmental policies in England as well as the struggle between the traditional and the newly emerging academics.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources:

Amis, Kingsley. *Lucky Jim*. London: Penguin Books, 1976. Print.

Bradbury, Malcolm. *Eating People Is Wrong*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995. Print.

Bradbury, Malcolm. *The History Man*. London: Arrow Books, 1977. Print.

Lodge, David. *The Campus Trilogy*. New York: Penguin Books, 2011. Print

Secondary Sources

Acheson, James. "Thesis and Antithesis in Malcolm Bradbury's the History Man." *Journal of European Studies* 33.1 (2003): 41-52. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web. 22 Mar.2016

Adelman, Paul. "Part Three: Assessment." *The Rise of the Labour Party, 1880-1945*, 3rd ed., New York: Routledge, 2014, pp. 90-100.

Allen, Ansgar. "Against Meritocracy: Culture, Power and Myths of Mobility." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 66.2 (2017): 284-285. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web.8 Oct. 2017.

---. "Michael Young's the Rise of the Meritocracy: A Philosophical Critique." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 59.4 (2011): 367-382. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web.16 Apr.2017.

Althusser, Louis. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Trans. G.M Goshgarian. London: Verso: New Left Books, 2014. Print.

Amis, Kingsley. *Socialism and the Intellectuals*. London: Fabian Society, 1957. Print.

Anderson, R D. *Universities and Elites in Britain Since 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Annan, Noel. *The Dons: Mentors, Eccentrics and Geniuses*. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999. Print.

Anthony, Constance G. "The Port Hueneme of My Mind: The Geography of Working-Class Consciousness in One Academic Career." *Presumed*

Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia, edited by Y M. G Gutiérrez, Yolanda F. Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P. Harris, pdf, Utah UP, 2013, pp. 300-312.

Archer, Louise, et al. "Chapter I: Social Class and Higher Education." *Higher Education and Social Class: Issues of Exclusion and Inclusion*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003, pp. 5-21.

Arnold, Matthew. "Chapter III: Barbarians, Philistines, Populace." *Culture and Anarchy*, edited by John D. Wilsom, pdf, Cambridge U.P, 1932, pp. 98-128.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, and Elena A. Izvol′skaja. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984. Print.

Barnhart, Robert K, Editor. *The Barnhart Concise Dictionary of Etymology*. New York: HarperCollins, 2000. Print.

Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 36.2 (1975): 351-366. *METU Library Database*. Web.12 May 2017.

"BBC News. In Depth UK Politics: Open Politics." The Open University, Foreign Policy: Towards A Role for the 21st Century. http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/static/in_depth/uk_politics/2001/open_politics/foreign_policy/default.stm

"Benchmarking Meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary." *Cambridge Dictionary Online English Dictionary.* dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/benchmarking.

Bentley, Phyllis. "Contemporary British Fiction." *The English Journal* 28.4 (1939): 251-261. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web. 31 Mar. 2015.

"Beret". *En.Oxforddictionaries.com.* 2016. Web. 7 April 2016.

Beveridge, William H. B. *The Pillars of Security: And Other War-Time Essays and Addresses*. London: G. Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1943. Internet resource.

"Biography of Percy Bysshe Shelley." *British Library*, Accessed 1 May. 2017. www.victorianweb.org/previctorian/shelley/bio.html.

Blanden, Jo, and Stephen Machin. "Educational Inequality and the Expansion of UK Higher Education." *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 51.2 (2004): 230-249. *Cankaya University Library Database*.Web. 8 Mar. 2016.

Boliver, Vikki. "Expansion, Differentiation, and the Persistence of Social Class Inequalities in British Higher Education." *High Education* 61.3 (2010): 229-242. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web. 31 Mar. 2015.

Borojevic, Jelena. "Literary Space in Davild Lodge's Small World." *Research Scholar* 2.1 (2014): 44-53. Web. 11 Feb. 2017. www.researchscholar.co.in/downloads/6-jelena-borojevic.pdf.

Bostock, Paddy. "Poststructuralism, Postmodernism and British Academic Attitudes: With Special Reference to David Lodge, Malcolm Bradbury and Gabriel Josipovici." (1989): *Networked Library of Theses& Dissertations*. Web. 10 Nov. 2015.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1984. Print.

---. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford UP, 2008. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean C. Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Translated by Richard Nice, London: Sage Publications, 1977. Print

Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern British Novel*. Penguin Books, 1993. Print.

---. "Coming Out of the Fifties." *Twentieth Century Literature* 29.2 (1983): 179-189. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 16 May 2017.

---. Interview by Istvan D. Racz. *Hungarian Studies in English*, vol. 21, 1990, pp. 99-102.

---. "The Rise of the Provincials." *The Antioch Review* 16.4 (1956): 469-477. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 16 July 2016.

Bradford, Richard. *Kingsley Amis*. London: Edward Arnold, 1989. Print.

Brown, Phillip. "Education, Opportunity and the Prospects for Social Mobility." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 34.5-6 (2013): 678-700. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 23 Jan. 2017.

Brown, Phillip, and Stuart Tannock. “Education, Meritocracy and the Global War for Talent.” *Journal of Education Policy* 24.4 (2009): 377-392. *METU Library Database*. Web. 13 Sept. 2017.

Celarent, Barbara. “The Rise of the Meritocracy, 1870–2033 by Michael Young." *American Journal of Sociology* 115.1 (2009): 322-326. *METU Library Database*. Web. 11 Nov. 2017.

Clark, Burton R, and Ernest L. Boyer. “The Foundations of the Academic Profession: The Open System.” *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*, Princeton UP, 1987, pp. 45-68.

Clark, Herbert H., and Richard J. Gerrig. “On the Pretence Theory of Irony.” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 113.1 (1984): 121-126. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 Aug. 2016.

Connor, Steven. *The English Novel in History 1950-1995*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2001. Web. 18 Sept. 2016.

Corbett, Ross J. “The Fading Promise of a More Meritocratic Society.” *Perspectives on Political Science* 42.4 (2013): 212-216. *METU Library Database*. Web. 17 Oct. 2017.

Court, Stephen. “Academic Tenure and Employment in the UK.” *Sociological Perspectives* 41.4 (1998): 767-774. *METU Library Database*. Web. 13 Mar. 2016.

Dalton-Brown, Sally. “Is There Life Outside of (the Genre Of) the Campus Novel? The Academic Struggles to Find a Place in Today's World.” *Journal of Popular Culture* 41.4 (2008): 591-600. *METU Library Database*. Web. 15 Mar. 2015.

Danow, David K. *The Spirit of Carnival: Magical Realism and the Grotesque*. Lexington, Ky: University Press of Kentucky, 1995. Print

David, Miriam. “Comparisons of ‘Education Reform’ in Britain and the USA: A New Era?” *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 1.1-2 (1991): 87-109. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 July 2016.

Delamont, Sara. "Gender and Higher Education." *The Sage Handbook of Gender and Education*. Ed. Christine Skelton, Becky Francis, and Lisa Smulyan. London: Sage, 2013. 179-190. Web. 12 Apr. 2017.

De Castella, Tom. "The Anarchic Experimental Schools of The 1970s." *BBC News*, 21 Oct. 2014. www.bbc.com/news/magazine-29518319. Web. 10 May 2017.

Dennison, John D. "Higher Education Policy in the United Kingdom - Reformation or Dissolution?" *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 19.1 (1989): 87-96. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 9 Sept. 2015.

De Vita, Glauco, and Peter Case. "Rethinking the Internationalisation Agenda in UK Higher Education." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 27.4 (2003): 383-398. *METU Library Database*. Web. 19 Aug. 2016.

Digby, Anne. "The Victorian Values and Women in Public and Private." *The Victorian Values*. The Conference on Victorian Values. Edinburgh: British Academy, 1992. 195-215. *METU Library Database* Web. 18 Aug. 2017.

Doering, Jonathan W. "Malcolm Bradbury: A History Man for Our Times." *Contemporary Review* 1622 (2001). *METU Library Database* Web.17 Sep. 2016.

Downing, Douglas, ed. *Dictionary of Mathematics Terms*. Hauppauge: Barron's, 2009. Print.

"Drugs: Medical Use of Valium." *Addiction Blog Drug*. Lee Weber. Web. 4 Mar. 2017. <http://drug.addictionblog.org/tag/valium-use/>.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991. Print.

---. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Metheun, 1976. Print.

---. *Myths of Power: A Marxist Study of the Brontës*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.

Eastman, John K. "Dissimilar Discourses: The Realism of Amis's Conversations in Lucky Jim." *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 2 (1989): 43-51. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 4 Feb. 2017.

Edwards, Reginald. "Commentary: Margaret Thatcher, Thatcherism and Education." *McGill Journal of Education* 24.2 (1989):203-214. *METU Library Database*. Web.10 Jan. 2016.

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

Elster, Jon. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.

Eustace, Rowland. "British Higher Education and the State." *European Journal of Education* 17.3 (1982): 283-294. *METU Library Database*. Web. 5 Marc. 2017.

Everett, Glenn. "Shelley Biography." *The Victorian Web*. University of Tenessee, July 2000. Web. 7 Feb. 2017. <http://www.victorianweb.org/previctorian/shelley/bio.html>.

Fallis, Richard. "Lucky Jim and Academic Wishful Thinking." *Studies in the Novel* 9.1 (1977): 65–72. *METU Library Database*. Web. 8 Apr. 2016.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print

---. *Madnes and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Foucault, Michel, and Alan Sheridan. "Panopticism from Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison." *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Perspectives* 1 (2008): 1. *Project MUSE*. Web. 4 Dec. 2015.

Fowler, H. W. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965. Print.

Furlong, Andy, and Fred Cartmel. *Higher Education and Social Justice*. Maidenhead: Soc. for Research into Higher Education & Open UP, 2009. Print.

Galvani, Robert. "The Changing Experience of English Secondary Education." *Reflecting Education* 6.1 (2010): 75-89. Web. 15 Dec. 2016.

Gardiner, Judith K. "Toward a Feminist Theory of Self: Repressive Dereification and the Subject in Process." *NWSA Journal* 5.3 (1993): 303-324. *METU Library Database*. Web. 11 Feb. 2017.

Glowala, Zbigniew. "University or Universal? Revaluating the Academic Novel" *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature* 34 (2010): 20-34. *Cankaya University Library Database* Web. 19 Feb. 2015.

Goffman, Erving. *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin University Books, 1972. Print.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1989. Print.

Grice, Herbert P. "Further Notes on Logic and Conversation." *Syntax and Semantics: Pragmatics*. Ed. Peter Cole. New York: Academic Press, 1978. 113-128. Print.

Hall, Stuart. 'A Sense of Classlessness', *Universities and Left Review*, 5 (1958): 26-32. *METU Library Database* Web. 8 Oct. 2016.

Halsey, A.H. "Reflections on Education and Social Mobility." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 34.5-6 (2013): 644-659. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Harper, Douglas. "Beret." *Online Etymology Dictionary*, Maoning Tech. 2001, www.etymonline.com/search?q=beret. Accessed 5 July 2017.

Harvey, Lee, and Peter T. Knight. *Transforming Higher Education*. Open UP, 1996. Print.

Head, Dominic. *The Cambridge Introduction to Modern British Novel, 1950-2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Heath, Joseph, and Andrew Potter. *Nation of Rebels: Why Counterculture Became Consumer Culture*. Harper Business, 2009. Print.

Heinrich, Michael. *An Introduction to the Three Volumes of Karl Marx's Capital*. Trans. Alexander Locascio. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2012. Print.

Hirschkop, Ken. "Culture, Class and Education." *The Cambridge History of Twentieth-Century English Literature*. Ed. Laura Marcus and Peter Nicholls. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. 455-473. Print.

Hirst, David L. *Comedy of Manners*. London: Methuen, 1979. Print.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

"James Report 1972 - Full Text." *The History of Education in England*, www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/james/james1972.html#06.

Jesson, David. *The Creation, Development and Present State of Grammar Schools in England*. Centre for Performance Evaluation and Resource Management University of York, 2013. www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/grammarsjesson.pdf. Web. 8 May 2017.

Jung, C G, and R F. C. Hull. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980. Print.

Kim, Chang-Hee, and Yong-Beom Choi. "How Meritocracy is Defined Today?" Contemporary Aspects of Meritocracy." *Economics & Sociology* 10.1 (2017): 112-121. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 Oct. 2017.

Kim, Terri. "Shifting Patterns of Transnational Academic Mobility: A Comparative and Historical Approach." *Comparative Education* 45.3 (2009): 387-403. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 10 May 2016.

---. “Transnational Academic Mobility, Knowledge, and Identity Capital.” *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 31. 5 (2010): 577-591. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Kojève, Alexandre, and Raymond Queneau. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel: Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980. Print.

Lachmann, Renate, Raoul Eshelman, and Marc Davis. “Bakhtin and Carnival: Culture as Counter-Culture.” *Cultural Critique* 11 (1988): 115-152. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Laitin, David D. “Capitalism and Hegemony: Yorubaland and the International Economy”. *International Organization* 36.4 (1982): 687–713. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 5 May 2016.

Lawler, Stephanie. “Heroic Workers and Angry Young Men: Nostalgic Stories of Class in England.” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17.6 (2014): 701-720. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Lears, T. J. “The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities.” *The American Historical Review* 90.3 (1985): 567-593. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Leavis, F R. *The Great Tradition: a Study of the English Novel*. Doubleday, 1954. Print.

Le Mahieu, D. L. “The History Man on Television: Ideology and Mediated Embodiment.” *Adaptation* 10.1 (2017): 127-140. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 8 Oct. 2017.

Lockhart, J. Gibson. *Reginald Dalton*. New ed. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1823. Print.

Lodge, David. “The Campus Novel.” *New Republic* 10 Mar. 1982: 34-35. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 4 May 2016.

Lodge, David. “Interview with David Lodge.” Interview by Raymond H. Thompson. *Robbins Library Digital Projects- Camelot Project*, 15 May 1989, Accessed 10 Jan. 2017. d.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/text/interview-with-david-lodge

Louis Althusser. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses.” *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Ed. Aradhana Sharma and Akhil Gupta. 1st ed. Malden: Blackwell Pub, 2006. 86-111. Print.

Lukács, György. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971. Print.

Machin, Stephen, and Anna Vignoles. *Education Policy in the UK*. Centre for the Economics of Education, London School of Economics, 2006. cee.lse.ac.uk/ceedps/ceedp57.pdf. Accessed 14 Mar. 2017.

Machin, Stephen, and Anna Vignoles. “Overview.” *What's the Good of Education?: The Economics of Education in the UK*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005. 1-12. Print.

Maglaras, V. “Consent and Submission: Aspects of Gramsci's Theory of the Political and Civil Society.” *SAGE Open* 3.1 (2013): 1-8. *METU Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy; V.1*. Trans. Ben Fowkes. 1st ed. London: Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, 1976. Print.

---. *Collected Works: Capital: Vol.3*. Ed. Friedrich Engels. New York: International Publishers, 1998. Print.

Marx, Karl, and David Fernbach. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 2*. London: Penguin Books in association with New Left Review, 1992. Print.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto*. Trans. Martin Milligan. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1988. Print.

Mews, Siegfried. “The Professor's Novel: David Lodge's Small World.” *MLN* 104.3 (1989): 713-726. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 3 May 2016.

Middleton, Nigel. "Lord Butler and the Education Act of 1944." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 20.2 (1972): 178-191. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 7 May 2017.

Mountford-Zimdars, Anna, et al. "Framing Higher Education: Questions and Responses in the British Social Attitudes Survey, 1983–2010." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 34. 5-6 (2013): 792-811. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 4 Sep. 2017.

Nicolau, Felix. "Architectural Symbolism as Intersemiotic Translation: Malcolm Bradbury's The History Man". *Belas Infiéis* vol. 3.1 (2014): 121-130. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 8 Sep 2017.

Noble, Trevor. "Social Mobility and Class Relations in Britain." *The British Journal of Sociology* 23. 4 (1972): 422-436. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Ossowski, Stanislaw. *Class Structure in the Social Consciousness*. Oxon: Routledge, 2013. Internet resource.

Ott, Bill. *American Library's Booklist* October 1997: 11-12.

Parini, Jay. "Gore Vidal Vs. Academe." *The Chronicle Of Higher Education* 4 (2015): 14. *Cankaya University Library Database* Web. 16 Nov. 2015.

Parker, R. B. "Farce and Society: The Range of Kingsley Amis." *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature* 2.3 (1961): 27-38. *Cankaya University Library Database.* Web. 31 Mar. 2015.

Perkin, Harold. *The Rise of Professional Society: England Since 1880*. Abingdon: Taylor and Francis, 2003. Print.

"Philistine." *Cambridge Dictionary Online*. Cambridge Dictionary, 2017. Web. 25 Apr 2017.

"Prime Ministers of Great Britain." *Historic UK*. Historic UK Ltd. Web. 4 Sept. 2017. https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryUK/HistoryofBritain/Prime-Ministers-of-Britain/

Proctor, Mortimer R. *The English University Novel*. Ed. Marie Stareck. New York: University of California Press, 1977. Print.

Quinn, Arthur. *Figures of Speech: 60 Ways to Turn a Phrase*. Davis, California: Hermagoras Press, 1993. Print.

Reay, Diane. "Social Mobility, a Panacea for Austere Times: Tales of Emperors, Frogs, and Tadpoles." *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 34.5-6 (2013): 660-677. *METU Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Reynolds, Jeremy, and He Xian. "Perceptions of Meritocracy in the Land of Opportunity." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 36 (2014): 121-137. *METU Library Database*. Web. 5 May 2017.

Riebel, William. "Macrocheira Kaempferi." *Animal Diversity Web*. University of Michigan, 2011. Web. 11 Sept. 2016. http://animaldiversity.org/accounts/Macrocheira_kaempferi/

"Robbins Report 1963 - Full Text." *The History of Education in England*, www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/robbins/robbins1963.html.

Rossen, Janice. "Philip Larkin and Lucky Jim." *Journal of Modern Literature* 23.1 (1998): 147-164. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web. 31 Mar. 2015.

---. *The University in Modern Fiction: When Power Is Academic*. St. Martin's press, 1993. Print.

Rutherford, Jonathan. "The Market Comes to Higher Education." *LATISS: Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences* 2.1 (2005): 5-19. *METU Library Database*. Web.15 Sept.2016.

Sava, Ramona M. *Quest and Conquest in the Fiction of David Lodge*. 2006. JuliusMaximilians-Universität Würzburg, PhD Dissertation. Accessed 10 Apr. 2017.

Scott, Robert F. "It's a Small World, After All: Assessing the Contemporary Campus Novel." *The Journal of Midwest Modern Language Association* 37.1 (2004): 81-87. *Middle East Technical University Datebase*. Web. 19 Feb. 2015.

Shallock, Michael. "Thatcherism and British Higher Education: Universities and the Enterprise Culture." *Change* 21.5 (1989): 30-39. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2016.

Shattock, Michael, and Robert Berdahl. "The British University Grants Committee 1919-83: Changing Relationships with Government and the Universities." *Higher Education* 13.5 (1984): 471-499. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Shaw, Patricia. "The Role of the University in Modern English Fiction." *Atlantis* 3.1 (1981): 44-68. *Retrieved from Cānkaya University library database*. Web. 19 Feb. 2015.

Shear, Boone W. "Gramsci, Intellectuals, and Academic Practice Today." *Rethinking Marxism* 20.1 (2008): 55-67. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 Sep. 2016.

Showalter, Elaine. *Faculty Towers: The Academic Novel and Its Discontents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.

Singleton, Rachel. "The Angry Young Man Movement and Its Influence on Lucky Jim, Look Back in Anger, and A Clockwork Orange." *Journal of Undergraduate Research: LaGrange College* 8 (2013): 50-63. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

"Spider Crab." *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online Reference Centre*. Chicago: Britannica Online, 1998. Web. 15 Aug. 2017.

Spiegel, John P. "Campus Conflict & Professorial Egos." *Trans-action* 6.11 (1969): 41-50. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 5 Oct. 2017.

Soanes, Catherine, and Angus Stevenson, editors. "Beret". *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th ed., Oxford UP, 2004.

Soanes, Catherine, and Angus Stevenson, editors. "Zeitgeist." *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th ed., Oxford UP, 2004.

"Subtopia." *Oxford Dictionary Online*. 2017. Web. 25 Apr 2017.

Taylor, William. "The James Report Revisited." *Oxford Review of Education* 34. 3 (2008): 291-311. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 8 Mar. 2016.

Themelis, Spyros. "Meritocracy Through Education and Social Mobility in Post-War Britain: A Critical Examination." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29.5 (2008): 427-438. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 7 Mar. 2016.

Tholen, Gerbrand, et al. "The Role of Networks and Connections in Educational Elites' Labour Market Entrance." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 34. 1 (2013): 142-154. *Bilkent Library Database*. Web. 14 May 2017.

Thompson, Chris. "The Fisher King." *Story Archaeology: Uncovering the Layers of Irish Mythology*, 12 Dec. 2012, Accessed 5 Feb. 2018. www.storyarchaeology.com/the-fisher-king

Treiman, Donald J., and Kermit Terrell. "The Process of Status Attainment in the United States and Great Britain." *American Journal of Sociology* 81.3 (1975): 563-583. *METU Library Database*. Web. 5 May 2017.

Trow, Martin. "Reflections on the Transition from Elite to Mass to Universal Access: Forms and Phases of Higher Education in Modern Societies since WWII." *International Handbook of Higher Education*, edited by James J. F Forest and Philip G. Altbach, Dordrecht: Springer, 2007, pp. 244-280. Print.

"What happened later? The British Road to Mass Higher Education: David Watson." *Shaping Higher Education: 50 Years After Robbins*, ed. Nicholas Barr, London School of Economics, 2014, pp. 33-48.

Wheatcroft, Geoffrey. "Dean Acheson and the Myth of Anglo-American Unity." *The Spectator* 5 Jan. 2013. Web. 9 Apr. 2016

Walther, Matthew. "Return of the Kingsley: America Gets Reintroduced to the Original Amis." *The American Conservative* 10 (2012): 38. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 7 Mar. 2016.

Welch, Penny. "The Evolution of Government Policy Towards English Higher Education 1979-2007." *Learning and Teaching* 2.2 (2009): 96-122. *METU University Library Database*. Web. 7 Mar. 2016.

Warikoo, Natasha K., and Christina Fuhr. "Legitimating Status: Perceptions of Meritocracy and Inequality Among Undergraduates at an Elite British University." *British Educational Research Journal* 40.4 (2014): 699-717. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 7 Mar. 2016.

Williams, Jeffrey J. “The Rise of the Academic Novel.” *American Literary History* 24.3 (2012): 561-589. *Cankaya University Library Database*. Web. 31 Mar. 2015.

Williams, Raymond. “Beyond Actually Existing Socialism.” *Culture and Materialism: Selected Essays*. London: Verso, 2005, pp. 252-274.

---. *Culture and Materialism: Selected Essays*. London: New York: Verso, 2005. Print.

---. *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*. New York: Doubleday, 1960. Print.

---. “Culture is Ordinary.” *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*. London: Verso, 1989. 91-100. Print.

---. *Marxism and Literature*. Ed. Steven Lukes. Oxford [England: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.

Wolff, Rick. “Capitalist Hegemony and Contesting Concepts of Class.” *Socialism and Democracy* 16.2 (2002): 153-162. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 8 Mar. 2017.

Van O'Connor, William. “Two Types of “Heroes” in Post-War British Fiction.” *PMLA* 77. 1 (1962): 168-174. *Bilkent University Library Database*. Web. 3 Mar. 2016.

Young, Michael D. *The Rise of the Meritocracy 1870-2033: An Essay on Education and Equality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970. Print.

“Zapata Moustache.” *Oxford Reference - Answers with Authority*, Oxford U.P, 2017, Accessed 10 July 2017. www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199916108.001.0001/acref-9780199916108-e-8949.

“Zeitgeist.” *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2011. Web. 8 May 2017.