oluşturur. Hooper-Greenhill (1991), "Nesne "belge" gibi iş görür, bilgiyi tutar ve kaydeder; biz daha fazlasını öğrendikçe değişmekle kalmaz, aynı zamanda bize ne bildiğimizi hatırlatan bir kapasiteye sahiptir" (102) demektedir.

Müzedeki öğrenme sürecinin önemli bir özelliği de düşünmeyi geliştirmesidir. Bu tür öğrenmede duyular aracılığıyla somuttan soyuta, bilinenden bilinmeyene, gözlemden genellemeye ulaşmak olanaklıdır. Dahası, Hooper-Greenhill'in (1991) dediği gibi, "Öğrenme daha az beceri gerektirir, daha eğlenceli ve gerçekten keşfedici olur" (103). Nesnelerden öğrenmenin temeli duyuları kullanmaktır; dolayısıyla müzenin uygun koşullarda nesneleri yakından gözlemlemeye, elle yoklamaya olanak sağlaması gerekmektedir. Öte yandan, izleyicinin nesneye sadece müzede ulaşması da şart değildir, müze elindeki nesnelerden bir kısmını izleyicilere götürebilmelidir; bunun en etkili yolu da ödünç verme sisteminin kurulmasıdır. Nesneler düzenlenen özel günlerde diğer müzelere, okullara, fabrikalara vb. taşınabilir. Eğitimde fırsat eşitliğine katkıda bulunan bu sistem müzenin işlevlerinin demokratikleşmesini de sağlar. Hooper-Greenhill'in (1991) dediği gibi, "müzelerde öğrenme potansiyeli, nesnelerden öğrenmeyi, müzeler hakkında ve müzelerin ne yaptığı hakkında öğrenmeyi içine alır" (113).

Kaynakça

Bee, H. (1995). *Developing Child*. Yedinci baskı. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Booth, J.H., vd. (1982). *Creative Museum Methods and Educational Techniques*. Springfreld: C.C. Thomas Publisher.

Cleaver, J. (1988). *Doing Children's Museums*. Charlotte, Vermont: Williamson Publishing.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1991). *Museum and Gallery Education*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1996). *Museum and their visitors*. London: Routledge.

Hudson, K. (1992). *Musées: Trésors ou Outils?* Strasbourg: Conseil de l'Europe, Conseil de la cooperation culturelle. Section de l'éducation scolaire et extrascolaire.

Owens, Jr. R.E. (1992). *Language Development. An Introduction*. Üçüncü baskı. New York: Macmilan Publishing Company.

Rose Tremain's *Restoration* and Thatcherism

Susanne Fendler
Ruth Wittlinger
The University of Würzburg

Abstract

Restoration by Rose Tremain was published in 1989 when a decade came to an end in Britain that was not only one of the most contentious periods in the post-war history of the country but also the decade which, from a historical perspective, will probably prove to have had the greatest impact on Britain's further development in terms of social and value change. This article will claim that Rose Tremain used the genre of the historical novel to portray and criticise the reality of Thatcher's Britain, as Rose Tremain perceived it. This article will examine four major issues which repeatedly occur as themes in the novel and constitute important elements of Thatcherism: the 'New Age', authoritarian leadership and the leadership figure, the nature of Thatcherite society and the role of the individual within it.

Rose Tremain'in Restoration Adlı Tarihi Romanı ve Thatcherizm
Özet

Rose Tremain'in *Restoration* adlı eseri 1989 yılında yayınlandı. Bu, sadece Britanya'nın savaş sonrası tarihindeki en tartışmalı dönemlerden biri olmakla kalmayıp, aynı zamanda, tarihsel bir perspektifle bakıldığında, toplumsal değişim ve değer değişimi anlamında ülkede yaşanacak sonraki gelişmelere en büyük etkiyi vurmuş olduğu muhtemelen kanıtlanacak bir on yılın sona erdiği tarihti. Bu makale Rose Tremain'in, tarihsel roman türünü kullanarak, kendi algıladığı biçimiyle, Thatcher'in Britanyasını tasvir edip eleştirdiğini öne sürmektedir. Makale, Thatcherizm'in önemli öğelerini oluşturan ve roman içinde temalar olarak tekrar eden dört ana meseleyi araştıracaktır: 'Yeni Çağ', otoriter liderlik ve liderlik figürü, Thatcherci toplumun doğası ve bu toplumda bireyin rolü.

Rose Tremain's Restoration and Thatcherism

I. Introduction

Restoration by Rose Tremain was published in 1989[1] when a decade came to an end in Britain that was not only one of the most contentious periods in the post-war history of the country but also the decade which, from a historical perspective, will probably prove to have had the greatest impact on Britain's further development in terms of social and value change. This article will claim that Rose Tremain used the genre of the historical novel[2] to portray and criticise the reality of Thatcher's Britain as Rose Tremain perceived it. As Annegret Maack points out it is the contribution of the modern novel to the subgenre of the historical novel that the reader is no longer merely expected to delve into the past but rather that s/he is expected to carry the past over into the present (Maack, 1984: 159). John Berger draws from this the conclusion that "[h]istory is thus the self-knowledge of the living mind" (Maack, 1984: 159).

Along similar lines, Steven Connor argues that " ... every representation of the past is a historicising of the present, making it possible to inhabit or belong to one's present differently" (1996: 140). According to Malcolm Bradbury, novelists' looking back to history had even assumed "near-epidemic proportions" in Britain in the 1980s (1994: 404).

In the historical novel of the late twentieth century the use of historical facts is no longer meant to imply historical truth. Postmodern doubts have entered this genre as well and, as new historicism points out, there is no objective (hi)story anymore. In Tremain's case the historical setting seems rather to serve as a mirror for the present, thus providing a distancing device that might have seemed necessary in view of Malcolm Bradbury's comment that many writers saw the age of Thatcherism " ... as a time of division, decay, human neglect and lost wholeness" (Bradbury, 1994: 401). This paper was inspired by the statement that "*Restoration*'s portrait of a past era suggests telling parallels with the present" which appeared on the back of the paperback edition as well as on the leaflet on Rose Tremain published by the British Council. The task of this article will be to trace these parallels which are drawn with the "Thatcher Revolution".

Our discussion focuses on the link between literature, society and politics. Therefore, it does not claim to deal with all facets of Margaret Thatcher's brand of conservatism, but merely with those aspects that bear some relevance to the novel. To achieve these objectives, this article will examine four major issues which repeatedly occur as themes in the novel and constitute important elements of Thatcherism: the "New Age", authoritarian leadership and the leadership figure, the nature of Thatcherite society and the role of the individual within it.

Apart from "*Restoration*", Tremain has published a collection of short stories and 9 other novels, starting with "Saddler's Birthday" in 1976. Though only her latest novel is also a historical novel, most of her novels show a concern with the impact of

1
Page numbers given in the text in brackets refer to the paperback edition, published by Sceptre, London, in 1990.

2
For a discussion of the historical novel see Margaret Scanlan in Traces of Another Time: History and Politics in Postwar British Fiction (Princeton University Press, 1990) page 4, who sees the interest of postwar British fiction in the past clearly reflected in the publication of books such as David Leon Higdon's Shadows of the Past in Contemporary British Fiction (University of Georgia Press, 1985), Patrick Swinden's The English Novel of History and Society, 1940-1980 (St. Martin's Press, 1986) and Neil McEwan's Perspective in British Historical Fiction Today (Longwood Academic, 1987).

society on people's private lives and depict parallels between personal and national developments. Christopher Bigsby claims that:

> Where earlier books had hinted at a relationship between the self and the society which it inhabited, *"Restoration"* stands as a judgement on the times no less than a powerful exploration of an individual soul[3].

Tremain herself claims that she writes in order to understand and that for this end she seeks out the unknowable[4]. Turning to the past in order to understand the present is thus a further aspect she has added to *"Restoration"*, in addition to her earlier technique of paralleling personal and national topics. Removing a situation in time or place is one possibility of inviting a closer scrutiny. Though this may seem to be a paradox, it allows a better and less impassioned view. The conclusion, the reflection on one's own time, is then to be drawn by the reader.

The title *Restoration* refers to the historical time in which the novel is set. The main character, Robert Merivel, is also the first person narrator and thus he provides the sole perspective on the society of his time. This view, however, becomes broadened as the main character leads a diversified life.

Being born as the son of a glovemaker who works for the King after his restoration, Merivel studies medicine and after he has been presented to the King he is appointed doctor to the King's dogs. Eventually, he also becomes something like the King's jester.

Merivel marries the King's courtesan to provide her with a respectable position. In exchange he receives a title and an estate. Merivel is forbidden ever to fall in love with or desire his wife. Consequently, when he does fall in love with his wife he is expelled and seeks refuge with his former fellow student Pearce who is working in a madhouse with other Quakers. Merivel is expelled once more for a woman, a patient with whom he has started a love affair. He is made to marry her and they return to London. There he meets the King again and is somewhat restored to his favour as he is working seriously as a doctor and has saved a woman from a fire.

The novel is divided into three parts which reflect his life in the favour of the court, life with the Quakers and his return to London. Throughout this development Merivel is confronted with diverse spheres of society which allows for an implicit criticism of these spheres - implicit as Merivel is a rather naive character who innocently repeats what other people tell him or relates what has passed - rarely expressing any active criticism. The existence of his narrative is explained and justified by the fact that Merivel likes to think about himself. Merivel's main concerns and conflicts in life are the attraction of power vs. the dismissal of death; his curiosity vs. his disillusionment with general human concerns.

The discussion in this paper will, however, concentrate on the allegorical qualities of these dichotomies and the reflections those might allow on Britain in the 1980s.

II. Thatcherism - the "New Age"

Margaret Thatcher's years as prime minister are difficult to assess. Which label is to be attached to an era which so openly broke with the British post-war tradition in terms of policy as well as style? Were we witnessing the "Thatcher Revolution", the "Thatcher phenomenon", "Thatcherism at Work" or merely the "Thatcher Experiment"?[5] As this terminology indicates, there have been numerous attempts at analysing Thatcherism and its impact on Britain. Particularly in the early days, Margaret Thatcher's critics attributed the term "Thatcherism" largely to her economic policy with its emphasis on the free market and monetarist principles which seemed to owe more to nineteenth century economic liberalism than to the approach of previous Conservative governments. It soon became apparent, however, that Thatcherism was more than just a different approach to Britain's economic difficulties. Some kind of broad consensus in

3 Leaflet on Rose Tremain published by the British Council

4 Leaflet on Rose Tremain published by the British Council

5 These are all titles of books published in the eighties.

the literature on Thatcherism suggests that it presented a new style of political leadership as well as a set of new policies. Closely related to the question about the nature of Thatcherism is the question about its novel character. What was new about Margaret Thatcher's approach to politics and policies? Again, there seems to be broad agreement that Margaret Thatcher broke with the post-war consensus[6], i.e. the Keynesian model of a mixed economy was largely replaced by extensive privatisation programmes with shares being widely spread in order to create a "property-owning democracy" and promote the idea of "popular capitalism" and, at least at the beginning, by strict monetarist policies which made the fight against inflation the government's main concern, at the expense of fighting high unemployment. Severe trade union reforms diminished the unions' importance and marginalised them to a large extent since they were considered to be one of the major obstacles for the free market forces to create wealth unhindered. The welfare state came under attack because it supposedly created a dependency culture in which the individuals looked at the state to provide everything and private insurance and pension schemes were therefore promoted. Not even lip service was paid anymore to the idea of equality since a certain amount of inequality was considered to be the inevitable price that had to be paid in order to stimulate the free market forces.

The "New Age" à la Thatcher was not only marked by a break with the immediate past, but also provided a vision for the future, based on an earlier past. On several occasions, it soon became apparent that Margaret Thatcher felt a kind of mission to restore Britain and British society to "its former greatness". In a broadcast before the 1979 election she made this point quite clear: "Somewhere ahead lies greatness for our country again. This I know in my heart." (Riddell, 1985: 8). And on another occasion she expressed "the need for renewal of our traditional craftsmanship and civic spirit; renewal at every level, and in every profession, of our old vigour, and vitality." (Riddell, 1991: 7). As this quote indicates, her ambitions to change basic

6
There are some historians (for example Ben Pimlott) who challenge this view. They argue that the so called consensus never existed in the first place. See also Jim Marlow. "Metaphor, Intertextuality and the Post-War Consensus" Politics, 17.2 (1997): 127-133.

assumptions were reaching further than just economic policy. This renewal required the revitalisation of old values, which is the point where Margaret Thatcher claimed some moral leadership[7]. She repeatedly referred to the resurrection of "Victorian values", or, as she clarified in *The Downing Street Years*, she preferred to call them "Victorian virtues" (Thatcher, 1995a: 627). Her favourite vocabulary consisted of words such as freedom, self-responsibility, independence, the family, conviction, choice, self-respect, duty, greatness and initiative (Riddell, 1985: 7). Overbeck summed up Thatcherism as follows:

> Thatcherism is a reasonably coherent and comprehensive concept of control for the restoration of bourgeois rule and bourgeois hegemony in the new circumstances of the 1980s [...] (Quoted from Jessop et.al, 1988: 3).

Margaret Thatcher's election as Conservative Party leader, as accidental as it might have been[8], also meant a considerable break with the Conservative Party's post-war tradition and brought a "New Age" to the Conservative establishment. Some commentators referred to her as having "handbagged" the Conservative Party (Norton, 1987: 21-37) whereas others talked of the "hi-jacking of a political party"[9]. In her autobiography, she comments on the party leadership election in 1975:

> My own surprise at the result was as nothing compared to the shattering blow it had delivered to the Conservative establishment. I felt no sympathy for them. They had fought me unscrupulously all the way (Thatcher, 1995b: 277).

Whether Thatcherism is a "concept of control for the restoration of bourgeois rule and bourgeois hegemony" might be debatable. There is no doubt, however, that Thatcherism offered a new approach to curing the "British disease" at various, if not all levels, in breaking with the post-war tradition with regard to policies, approach to leadership and general values. The parallel to the restoration in Tremain's novel is striking. With Charles II the Stuart monarchy was restored to Britain after a Puritan interregnum under Cromwell. With the political restoration of a monarchy a change of social values was implied. The strictness of

7
It has repeatedly been pointed out that at least one of her predecessors, the late Lord Stockton, explicitly renounced moral leadership to be the task of political leaders. He considered moral leadership to be the domain of the clergy.

8
Several commentators have pointed out that Margaret Thatcher's election as party leader was largely due to the desire of getting rid of Ted Heath rather than the support for her.

9
See chapter 2 in William Keegan, Mrs Thatcher's Economic Experiment (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1985).

the Puritan age came to an end, the most obvious changes were in clothes and manners at court as reflected in *Restoration* comedy - the reopening of the theatre being one of the signs of the new reign. General criticism has it that Charles II brought with him from his French exile not only French courtiers but also French (meaning loose) morals, gaiety, and "joie de vivre" - an image of the restoration which does not at first sight fit the popular image of Thatcher and her set of values. Tremain's adaption to this point will be discussed, however, in the next part.

Merivel is said to be "a man of his time" and he is the only one whose point of view we share in the novel. He is a keen admirer of the king and he attracts his notice when he tells him about the living human heart he touched and realized it had no feeling (23). This realization becomes one of the basic beliefs of his life as it makes him lose his reverence for his own heart and for his feelings (18). The novel's first chapter has the title "five beginnings". The story of the heart is one of the beginnings. In the others he explains his origins and his times. Times have changed from "an honourable age" to "the Age of Possibility" (14). Merivel is suited to the age he lives in due to, among other reasons, his French-sounding name. On the other changes Merivel comments: "The truth is that, when the King returned, it was as if self-discipline and drudgery had exploded in a clap of laughter." (19) To make clear that this did not turn the age into one of frivolity he adds: "Admiration for craft and skill is, I now understand, at the root of the generous but stubborn nature of King Charles II." (19)

The new King breaks therefore with a specifically English form of religion and introduces a more international form of manners. At the same time his values are hard work and skill. With these premises - as Thatcherism did - Tremain's Charles II tries to change his society.

Merivel is a suitable main character and chronicler of this new time as he fits the new age - although he shows an occasional lack of understanding. His French-sounding name is only the

first outer symbol of his suitability. In the King's service he discovers his love for colours which shows in his clothes, and his general untidiness reflects the surface looseness of morals and manners. Merivel remains on the surface and insists on the superficiality of things as he has lost his respect for inner values with the touching of a living heart. For this, he is appreciated by the King (192). When Merivel is cast out because he falls in love with his wife, the King emphasizes how he differentiates within society. Charles emphasizes - like Thatcher - utility and ability. Merivel's falling in love is presented as the effect of his having too little to do:

> You became futile. You had too little work and too much dreaming time. And then you indulged your dreams. You thought you could re-cast yourself. Voilà tout. And now you are no more use to me. (192)

Charles admires craft and skill (19) and this skill determines one's place in society. In this, Tremain has adapted her portrayal of history to suit Thatcherite society. Not the sphere one is born into is important but the place one can obtain through one's own work. Inequality remains, but here it is due to abilities: "[The King] repeated his theory that no man should get above himself, but know his own talents and his own degree." (23) Accordingly, the King's gift to Merivel is a set of surgical instruments inscribed with "Merivel, Do Not Sleep" (127). Thus, instead of a pleasure-loving Charles II, Tremain presents the reader with a hard-working, restless King, who believes in work. In addition he shows no scruples in confiscating estates when he needs money for his war (which might remind the reader of Margaret Thatcher "selling off the family silver" in her extensive privatisation programme). And he regrets the slackness of the times not only in Merivel but in the English in general: "I see this same look in very many of my people, as if they merely prefer to be and no longer to think." (97) Thus, he even welcomes the arrival of the plague as it will wake them up (97). In comparison with historical accounts, Tremain's restoration is not merely the return to a more pleasure-loving, free life. As we will see in the next part, freedom

and pleasure are some of the general effects. However, her spokesman for the "new" values is also strict and demanding - though in a slightly dissimilar respect than the Puritans.

III. Authoritarian leadership - the leadership figure

Throughout the seventies Britain experienced severe economic crises which escalated in 1979 particularly in the field of industrial relations with the "Winter of Discontent". Questions like "Who governs?" dominated both public and academic debates. The traditional authority of the state and its leaders seemed seriously undermined. At least in retrospect it is therefore hardly surprising that a strong leader appeared on the scene at this time of crisis, when governments appeared unable to govern. However, how strong a leader she would turn out to be, could hardly be anticipated at the end of the seventies. Whereas previous governments had aimed at repairing the post-war consensus during economic crises, Margaret Thatcher openly dismissed it: "For me, consensus seems to be the process of abandoning all beliefs, principles, values and policies." (Kavanagh, 1987: 253). Margaret Thatcher did not only offer political leadership, she also never got tired of preaching her personal beliefs and moral principles which largely derived from her personal background and experience. It has therefore been argued that rather than calling it an ideology, "Thatcherism is essentially an instinct, a series of moral values" (Riddell, 1985: 7).

Her personality played a major part in her success as a political leader. She has been described as the "Iron Lady", "La Passionara of middle-class privilege" or as "having a bit of a bulldog breed" in her (Riddell, 1985: 9). Supporters and critics alike have described her as strong-minded, determined and hard-working at her best, bossy, dominant and behaving like a headmistress at her worst.

Her simplistic division of the world and its phenomena into "right" and "wrong" and "good" and "evil" enabled her to build

up her reputation as a "conviction politician" who fought for what is "right" and "good". This is part of the reason why the label "populist" has been attached to her approach to leadership.

During her reign Britain is said to have moved from a traditional collectively responsible cabinet government to a prime ministerial government. Hugo Young even went as far as announcing the "death of Cabinet government" (Quoted from Kavanagh, 1987: 262). The following quote illustrates Margaret Thatcher's "no-nonsense" style of political leadership with regard to dissenting views in her own camp: "It must be a conviction government. As Prime Minister I could not waste time having internal arguments." (Quoted from Hennessy, 1987: 56). In other words: "Her job is to push Cabinet Ministers to do what is right." (Kavanagh, 1987: 253). Other, frequently used quotes like "the lady is not for turning", "TINA" (there is no alternative) also illustrate her authoritarian approach to leadership. On several occasions, external influences also contributed in enabling her to establish herself in the role of an authoritarian leader. The Falkland factor, for example, did not only prove beneficial in electoral terms but also strengthened her standing in the cabinet.

One approach brought forward by Stuart Hall explains Thatcherism and its success in electoral terms using the concept of "authoritarian populism" as Margaret Thatcher's magic recipe. Hall argues that Thatcherism exploited popular dissatisfactions with the post-war order in mobilising them around an "authoritarian, rightwing solution to the current economic and political crisis in Britain"(Jessop et.al, 1988: 68/9).

Just as Thatcher was elected because Britain was arguably in need of a leadership figure, Charles II was restored for the same reason:

> Charles II was restored not through the efforts of diehard Cavaliers but through the political nation's fear of chaos and craving for order expressed through a freely elected parliament (Ashton, 1985: 434).

And:

Charles II had more ability than ambition. His early manhood had been so consumed with passion to secure his rightful throne that once he sat on it all ambition was spent (Laigh, 1985: 203).

But Tremain's king, like Thatcher, wants to revive personal initiative and self-responsibility. No political achievements are mentioned in the novel besides Charles's reclaiming of his throne, but this seems to be sufficient. So he declares:

> [...] this age is stern, Merivel, and those who are afraid will not survive it. Those who are weak will not survive it. You [i.e. Merivel], if you remain as you are, will not survive it. (195/6)

Accordingly, the King expects people to think (94) and to make use of their lives, but all this within their ranks (99). As Charles lives up to his own ideas he is shown to enjoy a fight and to work hard and, also like Thatcher, he does not care about pleasing Parliament:

> [...] he is not a dissembler. Even with his Parliament (towards whom some say he should show more tact) he seems to be incapable of concealing his frequent displeasure. (187)

He unites two contradictory attitudes: he brings with him new manners and gaiety, but he also emphasizes that he dislikes idleness and admires craft and skill. As Merivel points out, the King "has no sympathy for [the dispossessed], for he was once one of them and had to wait years for his restoration." (196) Because he received no help he feels that no one else deserves it.

Tennis becomes a metaphor for Merivel's and the King's attitude to life. They used to play together and Merivel used to be good at it. But when Merivel is summoned back to court after his life at Bidnell he has lost his ability as he has lost his aptness for a life of work:

> I remembered from a previous time that, although His Majesty likes to win at tennis, he does not like to win easily. He likes a fight. He likes the other man to run and run and never give up. (190)

And the King comments:

> "As I foresaw," said the King at the conclusion of the set, "you have become slow." "I know, Sir [...]" I mumbled. "Very slow. And the play, of course, is a fast one." (191)

"The play is a fast one" could not only apply to tennis but to Margaret Thatcher's Britain as well. Charles's ability to lead is shown in his attitude when playing tennis. He likes winning, but he also enjoys a fight. He expects other people to live up to his expectations and to live according to his rules. He has neither consideration nor compassion for the "slow", for those who cannot keep up with the pace set by him. Obviously, Merivel being but one example, the King impresses other people and he has little use for others who wish to infringe on his power, as Merivel's comment on the King's relationship with parliament shows.

IV. Society and the role of the individual

The traditional conservative view of society involves seeing society as an "organic" construct in which individuals and their pursuits are interconnected and therefore interdependent. Margaret Thatcher's ideas about society and the role of the individual within it, however, bear strong resemblance to the "atomistic" perception of society which is at the heart of some strands of liberalism. According to this view, individuals are unconnected beings who pursue their own interests independently.

Margaret Thatcher gave the following account of her perception:

> We've been through a period where too many people have been given to understand that if they have a problem, it's the government's job to cope with it. "I have a problem, I'll get a grant." "I'm homeless, the government must house me."

> They're casting their problem on society. And, you know, there is no such thing as society. There are individual men and women, and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people, and people must look to themselves first [...] . A nation of free people will only continue to be great if family life continues and the structure of that nation is a family one (Quoted from Newburn, 1992: 181).

Margaret Thatcher's attempts at "social engineering" were based on her strong belief that people should not turn to government to help them, but should master their own fortunes. In tune with the supporters of the "overload thesis" (King, 1975) from the seventies, she attempted to redefine the relationship between the state and the individual. In a speech in 1984 she made it clear that she wanted her government to be remembered as one

> [...] which decisively broke with the debilitating consensus of a paternalistic government and a dependent people; which rejected the notion that the state is all powerful and the citizens merely its beneficiary; which shattered the illusion that Government could somehow substitute for individual performance (Kavanagh, 1987: 252).

She set out to fight the dependency culture in trying to give responsibility back to the individual:

> I came to office with one deliberate intent. To change Britain from a dependent to a self-reliant society - from-a-give-it-to-me to a do-it-yourself nation; to get-up-and-go instead of a sit-back-and-wait-for-it Britain (Quoted from Gilmour, 1992: 142).

To put it bluntly: she promoted high-powered individualism which strives at personal materialistic improvements and rejected altruistic collectivism. The forces of the free market would make or break fortunes. The role of the government is to remove barriers which might hinder the free-market forces. Then it is up to the individual to perform. She admires the self-made man who makes his way in the world without political patronage and help from the establishment,

simply by way of hard work (preferably skilled work). Whereas the "One-Nation Tories" had suffered from "bourgeois guilt", she openly dismissed collectivism as having ruined the country. Because of her personal background she did not need to feel this guilt. This is made very explicit in a leader in the Daily Telegraph which appeared after her election as Tory party leader:

> She believes in the ethic of hard work and big rewards for success. She has risen from humble origins by effort and ability and courage. She owes nothing to inherited wealth or privilege. She ought not to suffer, therefore, from the fatal and characteristic twentieth-century Tory defect of guilt about wealth. All too often this has meant that the Tories have felt themselves to be at a moral disadvantage in the defence of capitalism against socialism. This is one reason why Britain has travelled so far down the collectivist road. What Mrs Thatcher ought to be able to offer is the missing moral dimension to the Tory attack on socialism. If she does so, her accession to the leadership could mark a sea-change in the whole character of the party political debate in this country (Thatcher, 1995b: 281).

With the removal of "guilt about wealth" or "bourgeois guilt" as Kavanagh termed it (Kavanagh, 1987: 249) the "survival of the fittest" in materialistic terms seems morally justified. Greed and selfishness are morally justified in the early liberal sense that wealth created by the individual would benefit the nation.

The different ways of organizing society (individual above society - individual as serving society) are represented by the different social spheres Merivel moves in. Society at court and the aristocracy that Merivel becomes part of when he marries the King's courtesan are concentrated on the individual. People feel no guilt about enjoying themselves (19), moral blindness (28) and superficiality (40) rule. However, there are two sides to this attitude. Betterment according to quality is possible as the King demonstrates when he takes Merivel back after he has shown his worth as a doctor. The plot demonstrates, however, that this is only a way for the strong and the disciplined - hard working and

principled as Charles II is portrayed. For weaker persons there is the danger of submitting to the vices of the age as does Merivel. Merivel stops working completely and gives himself over to sensual pleasures. He gives in to his passion for colours, tries to learn how to paint, how to play an instrument and he enjoys riding. Eventually, his love of pleasure proves his undoing as he gives in to his love for his wife. His dilemma is shown when Merivel tries to take up a responsible task - his only responsibility. Merivel is appointed "Overseer of the Poor" (137) and is instructed that there are three categories (impotent, able and idle poor) between which he has to distinguish. Merivel shows his lack of seriousness at this points when he thinks:

> I was briefly tempted to make some flippant rejoinder to the effect that there were many at Court who would infinitely prefer to be thought idle (which indeed they were) than to be thought impotent (which some of them were but went through elaborate performances to conceal). But I truly wished to take my new responsibility seriously [...] (137)

However, even this proves too much for him. He does not know what the King thinks about the paupers (138) and, therefore, he is unable to form an opinion.

By way of the instruction he receives from the judge of his district, criticism of exaggerated bureaucracy is also included which easily transfers to modern times. It is made explicit here that paupers are to be held responsible for their situation except in a few hardly provable exceptions.

This is soon followed by Merivel's expulsion from his "paradise". Surprisingly for the historical context but not in comparison to Thatcher, Puritan ethics stand behind this. Hard work and discipline are the Puritan way, luxury, laziness and sluggishness lead to expulsion, at least for the main character. Fittingly, Merivel flees to his friend Pearce at Whittlesea, an asylum for mad people. It is led by Quakers who believe that the insane are innocent (69). This connects with Merivel's idea that poverty is closely linked to madness (195-22). Thus, the poor are

innocent but easy prey to madness. In all three aspects they are not fit for the new society.

The Quakers strip Merivel of his old identity. It starts by his being addressed as Robert. And this part of the novel, the second, starts with his reflection that he has been "absent from himself":

> A month has passed. April has come. And it is as if, during this month, since my arrival at Whittlesea Hospital, I have been absent from myself. This morning, however, seeing my reflection in the parlour window I once again caught sight of him: the man you know all too well by this time; the person I asked you to picture wearing a scarlet suit; the Fool Merivel. And I could not prevent a sentimental tenderness towards Merivel from creeping over my skin, causing me to blush both with affection and with shame. It is this tenderness that has led me to continue the story, notwithstanding the dismaying fact that when I passed through the gates of the New Bedlam, I passed from one life into another and thus an ending of some kind has been reached. [...] I have become Robert. (213)

The manners in this place are courteous which contrasts with the rest of society. Merivel, or Robert, feels that he has become a useful member (245), later on he realizes that he is no longer of his time, and this shows in his "discovery" that he is connected with other people (264/5). Merivel, for a short time, gives up his insistence on his individuality and separateness.

The two extremes between which he moves are the world of the Quakers and the values they stand for on the one side and the court and the worldly pleasures on the other side. Merivel's pendulum leans to the Quaker's side when he loses his respect for worldly achievements after having touched the living human heart and after his parents have died. At this point he is promoted by the King exactly for having lost his reverence for life which draws him eventually over to the "other" side, the life of the court. Merivel here finds his "sensual paradise" from which he then is expelled when he enjoys it most because he has lost interest in all else. This expulsion forces him to take refuge with the Quakers, thus drawing him back to this other side of his life.

Here, Merivel again has to deny himself most pleasure and he even loses a sense of who he is. The moment he believes that he has adapted, his expulsion threatens again as he takes up a closer relationship with one of the inmates. As usual, he starts out with good intentions, he merely wants to comfort the woman. Each time it is his feeling of achievement which allows him to be trapped and this time he enters a sexual relationship which ends with their both being expelled from Whittlesea. Although he does not think of it as paradise, the situation is a reminder of the expulsion. They have surrendered to sin and therefore they have to leave.

At this final stage Merivel accepts his responsibility - for his life and for other people. This is also due to the fact that Merivel has lost all fear:

> [...] because I no longer hold my life to be a lovely and precious thing, I am no longer afraid of anything at all, not even of death. And I smiled to myself for, unannounced, the King walked into my mind. And he looked at this new fearlessness of mine and sniffed and said: "Good." (311)

In the end, Merivel has learnt to become a useful and responsible person. "Survival of the fittest" is called into question as the plot questions who is the fittest. Neither an individualistic nor an altruistic society is held up as the ideal. The ideal is taking responsibility for others and living in reality instead of looking for a sort of "paradise".

V. Conclusion

It is difficult to assess the impact of Thatcherism on British society. The measures taken to promote "popular capitalism" and a "property owning democracy" like the sale of council houses and wide-spread ownership of small shares increased the number of people who benefited personally from the government's policies. There were also many who thrived in the enterprise culture which was promoted in the 1980s. On the other hand there was an increasing number of people who were either

not given a chance to take part in the fight, like the unemployed, or who turned out to be unfit for the struggle. At the same time the traditional British class system with its party alignments seems to have become blurred. The growing number of "working-class Tories" and the ongoing debate about the emergence of a new underclass illustrate this.

10
Quite contrary to Merivel, Margaret Thatcher obviously does not have a problem distinguishing between the 'deserving' and the 'undeserving' poor.

The consequences of Thatcher's thinking for the welfare state are easily deducted. In her autobiography she explains why she has so much regard for the Victorians:

> [...] the Victorians also had a way of talking which summed up what we are now rediscovering - they distinguished between the "deserving" and the "undeserving poor". Both groups should be given help: but it must be help of very different kinds if public spending is not just going to reinforce the dependency culture. The problem with our welfare state was that - perhaps to some degree inevitably - we had failed to remember that distinction and so we provided the same "help" to those who had genuinely fallen into difficulties and needed some support till they could get out of them, as to those who had simply lost the will or habit of work and self-improvement. The purpose of help must not be to allow people merely to live a half-life, but to restore their self-discipline and through that their self-esteem (Thatcher, 1995a: 627)[10]

Ian Gilmour, a member of one of Margaret Thatcher's early cabinets and one of her fiercest critics from within the Conservative camp, reminds us that the notion of the "deserving" and "undeserving" poor is

> [...] a distinction that was discredited nearly a hundred years ago. The notion that the poor want or choose to be poor is absurd, but the convenience of the belief ensures its survival (Gilmour, 1992: 125).

At first sight Tremain's novel might seem to glorify Charles II - and Thatcher. For there are many parallels as the previous discussion has shown. But the inaptness of the only narrator makes his admiration doubtful to the reader. Merivel so completely admires the king that no explicit criticism is allowed

to enter. Towards the end the narrative is in part explained also as a report. Merivel wants to give his King, whom he compares to God twice (32 and 59), a confession and a justification of his life. As he realizes towards the end of his narrative:

> I could have written to him, but I did not. For it seemed to me, as my fortieth birthday approached, as if I had spent so much of my swiftly passing existence composing letters to the King in my mind that I had run out of words. And this is what I believed: I believed that if, one day, the King wanted to find me, he would find me. I did not know how. I could not even imagine how. I only knew that he would. And that it would not prove to be very difficult for him, for such is his power that surely no corner of his Kingdom is invisible to him and no person within it beyond his reach. (368/9)

This repeats the God-like qualities he assigns to his King. The whole narrative is thus also a confession of what Merivel has done with his life. Having this in mind his positive assessment of Charles II is of course highly suspicious for the reader. On the process of reevaluation of one's own life (which equals the writing of one's own historical novel) Mark Freeman writes:

> This is of course a classic formula for the progress of self-knowledge: in order to become healthy, to "depathologize" oneself, [...] there is the need to strip away the various fictions and myths though [sic] which one has been living, the supposition being that when this stripping-away goes deep enough the true self will happily emerge (Freeman, 1993: 115).

This is the task that Merivel undertakes in his narrative. On the authorial level this is also a contribution towards the process that Tremain undertakes - adding her view of the state of Britain.

The past is used as a foil for the present and the story is told in order to uncover the underlying processes. Merivel as a man of his times may be seen to represent Tremain's version of Everyman.

Criticism can be deduced depending on the reader's position. It evolves, however, towards the end that the main

character only achieves some peace of mind when he has found his own way which differs from the King's suggestions.

Thus, the narrative also throws doubt on the way the society is described as being at this time: self-serving, individualistic, intent on success. The narrative's solution is a middle way.

Bibliography

Ashton, Robert (1985). *Reformation and Revolution*, 1558-1660. London: Paladin.

Bradbury, Malcolm (1994). *The Modern British Novel*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

British Council. *Leaflet on Rose Tremain*.

Connor, Steven (1996). *The English Novel in History*, 1950-1995. London: Routledge.

Freeman, Mark (1993). *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative*. London: Routledge.

Gilmour, Ian (1992). *Dancing with Dogma*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Haigh, Christopher (ed.) (1985). *The Cambridge Historical Encyclopedia of Great Britain and Ireland*. London: Guild-Publishing.

Hennessy, Peter (1987). "The Prime Minister, the Cabinet and the Thatcher Personality" in *Thatcherism: Personality and Politics*. Minogue, Kenneth and Michael Biddiss. (Ed) London: Macmillan.

Higdon, David Leon (1985). *Shadows of the Past in Contemporary British Fiction*. University of Georgia Press.

Jessop, Bob, Kevin Bonnet, Simon Bromley and Tom Ling (1988). *Thatcherism: A Tale of Two Nations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kavanagh, David (1987). *Thatcherism and British Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keegan, William (1985). *Mrs Thatcher's Economic Experiment*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

King, Anthony (1975). "Overload: Problems of Governing in the 1970s." *Political Studies*, 23.2/3: 284-296.

Maack, Annegret (1984). *Der experimentelle englische Roman der Gegenwart*. Darmstadt: wbg.

McEwan, Neil (1987). *Perspective in British Historical Fiction Today*. in *Thatcherism: Personality and Politics*. Minogue, Kenneth and Michael Biddiss. (Ed) London: Macmillan.

Newburn, Tim (1992). *Permission and Regulation: Law and Morals in Post-War Britain*. London: Routledge.

Norton, Philip (1987). "Mrs Thatcher and the Conservative Party: Another Institution 'Handbagged'." in *Thatcherism: Personality and Politics*. Minogue, Kenneth and Michael Biddiss. (Ed) London: Macmillan.

Riddell, Peter (1985). *The Thatcher Government*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Riddell, Peter (1991). *The Thatcher Era and its Legacy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Scanlan, Margaret (1990). *Traces of Another Time:History and Politics in Postwar British Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Swinden, Patrick (1986). *The English Novel of History and Society, 1940-1980*. St.Martin's Press.

Thatcher, Margaret (1995a). *The Downing Street Years*. London: HarperCollins.

Thatcher, Margaret (1995b). *The Path to Power*. London: HarperCollins.

Tremain, Rose (1990). *Restoration*. London: Sceptre.

Feminist Film Politikası: "Mürebbiye" Örneği

S. Ruken Öztürk
Ankara Üniversitesi
İletişim Fakültesi

Özet

Mürebbiye (The Governess), son yıllarda feminist film pratiğinin önemli örneklerinden biridir. Feminist film kuramı içinde temsil sorunu da önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Bu makale, Mürebbiye adlı filmdeki film kişisinin (Rosina da Silva) temsil ediliş biçimine odaklanırken, Lacan'ın ayna evresinden yararlanarak aynada egonun kurulması ile Rosina'nın deneyimlerinin kesişme sürecini irdeler. Yalnızca filmin yönetmeni değil, aynı zamanda öne çıkarılan kadın kahraman da "bakan" konumunda temsil edilir ve etkin kişilerdir. Filmde kadının bağımsızlığını kazanması, "Baba Yasa'sına" karşı çıkması, yaşam savaşı içinde gösterilmesi, kamusal alanı seçmesi ve erkeklerin çıplak olarak gösterilmeleri feminist film pratiğinde olumlu değerlendirilmesi gereken noktalardır.

Feminist Film Politics: "The Governess"

Abstract

The Governess is recently one of the important example of the feminist film practice and the issue of representation also has an important place in the feminist film theory. This article focuses the style of representation of the film person (Rosina da Silva) in The Governess and investigates the process of the intersection between the establishment of the ego and Rosina's experiences. Not only female filmmaker but also heroine in the film is the owner of the gaze and so they are active. Moreover the following points are characterized by positive side in the feminist film practice (and especially in this film): Woman gains her independence, challenges the Law of the Father, chooses the public sphere and she is seen in the struggle of life and men are shown as nude.