

**Individual Histories of Personal and Political Conflicts:
David Hare's *The Great Exhibition***

Doç. Dr. Mehmet Takkaç
Atatürk Üniversitesi
Kâzım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü
takkac@atauni.edu.tr

Arş. Gör. Makbule Genç
Atatürk Üniversitesi
Kâzım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü
gamzegeen@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Human beings are individuals who are to live in societies. This condition may sometimes bring about some unavoidable problems to be faced by each individual. And it has almost been customary for individuals to put the blame for any defect within the society on politicians because they are expected to make every effort to organize particulars of life within their societies. The quality of life within a society and the nature of relations among citizens are believed to reflect the success or failure of politicians. David Hare, a modern British playwright, brings to the stage in *The Great Exhibition* the experience of a couple whose expectations from each other are not met properly due to the forces destroying their marriage. The play suggests that disillusioned individuals will naturally dampen the spirits of those around them.

Key words: political dissatisfaction, marital relations, individual expectations

ÖZET

İnsanlar toplum içinde yaşamak zorunda olan canlılardır. Bu durum zaman zaman her bireyin karşılaşılabileceği kaçınılmaz sorunları ortaya çıkarabilir. Bireyler ise, geleneksel olarak, toplum yaşamında karşılaştıkları sorunlar için, toplumlarının yaşamlarını düzenleme konusunda çaba göstermesi beklenen kişiler olan politikacıları suçlamışlardır. Toplumsal yaşam kalitesi ve bireyler arasındaki ilişkilerin doğası politikacıların başarısı ya da başarısızlığı olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Çağdaş İngiliz oyun yazarlarından David Hare, *The Great Exhibition*'da, beklentilerinin karşılanmaması evliliklerine zarar veren bir çiftin deneyimini sahneye getirir. Oyun, düş kırıklığı yaşayan bireylerin çevrelerindeki insanları da mutsuz etmelerinin doğal olduğunu yansıtır.

Anahtar kelimeler: siyasi düş kırıklığı, evlilik ilişkileri, bireysel beklentiler

David Hare is among the most pre-eminent of the contemporary British playwrights focusing on the theoretical and social background of the state of affairs for the creation of theatrical pieces intended to reflect personal, national, international, educational, political, communal, and religious issues. The most arresting standpoint in his handling of all these concerns is the specific representation of individual experience he brings to the stage to convey his mind-stimulating message to his audience. Throughout his dramatic career he has kept enlightening the audience about “the nature of goodness in an era preoccupied with the malign energy of evil”. (Nothof 1994: 185)

Hare has always thought that improvement in every area of his society could be achieved with a collaborative effort of those who are supposed to spend their energy for this sublime target. In his dramatic works, politicians and institutions are specifically given a higher degree of accountability for this purpose due to the long-rooted anticipation that they are to function properly in their community service. Viewed from this perspective, what he experiences in the social life of his country, for instance, as regards the realization of public expectation, is not for the most part positive, which ultimately provokes a feeling of political dissatisfaction with both conservative and liberal wings (Rusinko 1989: 135). The belief that both political wings have failed to create the means required to satisfy the whole society must have made him feel so. Added to these, the unpreventable spiritual effects of the social unrest stemming from the inability of politicians may be said to be influential in the emergence of conflicts between individuals, which is a predicament that should never be negligible in the playwright’s estimation. This disillusionment is the key factor that has led him to dedicate a large part of his creative energy to the revelation of the realities to be reconsidered by the circles inherently involved in the duty of improving the society as a whole. Hare notes that his political stance in voicing concerns about problems in his society is, in fact, no different from that of other playwrights or of the general public:

The first mistake is to imagine that British writers, at least of my acquaintance, feel themselves in any way marginalized, or indeed that they wish to have any greater influence on the affairs of the nation than they have already. In my experience, they do not wish more than any other citizens to bring about the fall of governments, or to force laws onto the statute book. One of the great pleasures of writing for the theatre in this country is that the ideas you express can be taken so seriously and enter so smoothly into the currency of political discussion. (1991: xi)

Through his description of the panorama of contemporary English drama as such, Hare suggests that he is sure to follow a tradition initiated with the advent of John Osborne’s *Look Back in Anger*. With his mind full of political passions intended to make the first move for the establishment of a social and family life based on sound principles, he even-handedly puts forward what most of his fellow citizens believe is correct and constructive for individuals who have no other choice but to live in Britain (Zoglin 1996: 99). And he confesses that he, like millions of his fellow citizens, had a good many expectations from the Labour Government of 1964. However, he adds that it was quite unpleasant for him to see that the process of change was not developing as expected by a great majority of the public. He notes that by the end of the 1960s the failure of the Labour Government, the reasons of which are not included in the play, to

meet the demands and expectations of the public caused disillusionment on the part of many liberals. Witnessing the state of affairs in his country, he eventually loses his confidence in the Labour Party. Moreover, deducing that there is no easy or possible way to turn despair into hope, he categorizes himself among those liberals who felt a concern for a great deal of problems that the country faced. Therefore, he includes the experience of “a disillusioned Labour MP” (Bull 1994: 179) who once tried to get delighted by his eloquence and the business of talking to people from a platform but who “can’t even mouth the word “revolution” any longer” (52).

As a work dwelling on the specific account of interpersonal discrepancy in the playwright’s assessment, *The Great Exhibition* (1972) demonstrates the issues that, Hare presumes, are commonly experienced by a great majority of individuals in Britain in the past few decades. It is a play strongly emphasizing the idea that politics and social life can, in no way, be separated from each other. In addition, reflections of views stemming from the need to establish a sound base for communal life are also deeply felt in this particular work. The writer is insistent on his presentation of the details causing the deterioration of the quality of life in his country calling attention to both major and minor defects.

Hare’s devotion to the particulars of the quality of social life and political applications which ultimately and unavoidably bring on social degeneration has prompted him to write on a number of issues including even the “botched privatization of the rails” (Coxe 2004), which is a clear sign indicating that he is not indifferent to the happenings in his home land. Bringing such issues to the notice of the audience, he wants to stress that he resolutely deals with the way politics works. Thus, it is not out of the ordinary for him to call public attention to the examples of the failure of politicians. Hare clarifies why he writes about politics as such:

I write about politics because the challenge of communism, in however debased and ugly a form, is to ask whether the criteria by which we have been brought up are right; whether what each of us experiences uniquely really is what makes us valuable; whether every man should really be his own cocktail; or whether our criteria could and should be collective, and if they were, whether we would be any happier. However absolute the sufferings of men in the totalitarian Soviet countries, however decadent the current life of the West, the fact is that this question has only just been asked, and we have not even the first hundredth of an answer. (1992: 10)

The Great Exhibition revolves around the “individual histories of interpersonal conflicts” (Pawling 1992: 48) of a couple, Charlie and Maud Hammett: their mutual life, their extramarital love affairs, their dissatisfaction with each other and their insatiable appetite to attain some things to meet their personal aspirations and passions. Act One of the play outlines Public Life and Act Two is of Private Life. In the former, it is observed that Charlie Hammett, who is presented as a politician who does not attend debates in the Parliament, is doing his best to be far from politics. The reason for his political disillusionment is not openly stated but such hints as the failure of party leaders to fulfil their public service and the general distrust of people to politicians are given as factors that have played the key role in his stance. He feels no desire and need to visit his constituents and does not even want to answer the phone. The problematic nature of

his life is not confined only to politics; his marital life has lost its significance as well, a condition that is overtly expressed by Maud, whom Hammett met in the antinuclear demonstrations. Due to the deterioration of his spiritual condition, he cannot have unassailable connections with those around him including Maud. Their relation having been destroyed to such an extent, Maud prefers to have a relation with her Australian lover, Jerry.

In fact, Maud worked in the theatre and hoped to make contact with real life through her marriage with Hammett. Her explanation of the particulars of her work indicates that she is in need of real people around her: "I've always said there are two kinds of people. Human beings and actors. I work all day with actors, and watch them in the evening. They're all right, I suppose, a broody sort of cattle who respond to the goad, obsessed with themselves, as well as we know, but not quite-people. Right?" (19). Her description of the discrimination between 'actors' and 'real people' is noteworthy: she uses the term 'actors' to define individuals with no reliable personalities and with no passion for honesty and sincerity. She observes that such individuals make up the majority of the society and, unfortunately, she cannot see any hope of change for the better at present as regards human values. She had the estimation that Hammett was not one of them, which later turned out to be wrong. She could not realize her expectations through her marriage to Hammett, and has to lead a semi-isolated life. Her husband sets a detective on her suspecting that she will get farther and farther away from him. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that he is so eager to maintain their relationship and that the couple will have a proper marital life from now on because marriage is no longer a meaningful institution for them as a unifying force.

The effort spent for personal moral choices in an amoral world as reflected through the lives of these characters is the basic point Hare tries to bring to the stage in Act Two (King 1994: 15). Here, the couple may be said to have understood their condition better, which means that however much they try to maintain their relation, by the very nature of things at hand, they should not expect to salvage some lost things in their marriage. It is in this act that the detective is understood to have been hired also by Maud to record Hammett's love affair with Catriona, with whom he has started to have a relation starting from the time he exposed himself to women in public parks, an act triggered by the accumulation of social unrest, political discontent and marital displeasure. Neither Hammett nor Maud can ignore the fact that their marriage is the worst stereotyping of an existence that has made them caricatured figures although they can occasionally touch upon matters with the aim of refurbishing the shortcomings of their marriage. This inevitably causes a feeling of defeat for both parties, and hopelessness prevails in an atmosphere evoked by the awareness of failure in the couple's mutual life.

The lack of love and communication between the leading characters suggests that almost everything commonly shared by them has lost its proper meaning. Believing that Hammett has lost touch with the realities of life, Maud expects no future with him. Hammett's involvement in politics is another issue that means nothing to this character:

HAMMETT (*her [Maud's] clothes draped over him*): I sat down at the age of twenty-one and I thought I'm going to need some enthusiasm to get

me to the grave. And I chose three. Food, sex and socialism. And look at me now.

(MAUD not amused)

I was only trying to make you laugh.

MAUD: You don't make me laugh. You depress me.

HAMMETT *(taking a dart from the dartboard)*: Look-I get up in the morning and I

get out the dartboard. When you've gone to work I ask myself how many people am I going to have to talk to today? I throw the dart. *(He throws the dart)* Ah. What I call a bull's-eye. (15)

Hammett openly expresses his disgust with politics and the daily lives of politicians as seen in his expression above. The fact that he has lost his political ideals contributes to the severity of his criticism and makes his occupation with politics a dull business. The Labour Party, which once meant a lot to him, is no more a focal thing in his life as something estimable. He does not support and is not content with the practice of his party, and is of the opinion that the party cannot meet the demands of parliamentary democracy. In fact, he confesses that he is "disillusioned with Parliamentary democracy" (28) in general because of the improper applications he has witnessed in public service. His dissatisfaction also has to do with his personality. He notes that the personality he "was lumbered with has proved quite inadequate for the job" (49) he is expected to serve.

Although it is true that Hammett does not expect everyone to understand his reasons, he does want those closest to him to try to look at his dilemma from his perspective. Dean defines him as "a hypocrite, an egomaniac, a performer, and quite possibly a fool" (1990: 18) because of his attitude to politics and ways of democracy. Hammett gives such an impression about his personality at first sight; however, with a deeper insight into his personal thoughts one sees that he has reasons for dissatisfaction with some things. His definition of the vicious circle, at the centre of which he stands elucidates his dilemma clearly enough: "I can't talk about what I believe in. I can talk about anything else. Eloquence should be reserved for things that don't matter. I went into socialism as other people go into medicine or the law. It was a profession. Half out of eloquence, half out of guilt" (30). And, the persuasiveness of socialism, once attracting Hammett, and the desire to do some things for not only his citizens but also the human race seem to have lost their significance. The feeling of guilt because of not taking place in actions for the future of humanity, eventually driving him into politics, has left its place to despondency.

Obsessed in thoughts of annoyance, Hammett is continually shown to suffer not only from political mishap but also from family life. He feels powerless and gets insanely excited about the prospect of his marriage. Yet, it is certain that corruption has exerted its destructive influence on his household. Billington's appraisal of the theme of the play also stresses the inevitable consequence of the corruption in society for Hammett, who has already been racked with pain resulting from his political dismay:

Mr Hare's play seems to be built on a rancorous dislike of the generation before him. ... I'll say this for Mr Hare: he certainly lets you know what he dislikes. The

encyclopedic list includes parliamentary democracy, privileged middle-class despair, unfeeling upper-class arrogance, fake hippiedom, verbal culture, ... (1972)

Hare endeavours to convey to the audience true equality, true friendship and understanding, true fidelity and confidence, and true dependence on genuine humanitarian values. His insistence on addressing the importance and indispensability of such issues has led critics to question if he tries to “theatricalize morality” (Olivia 1990: 41). Maud’s appraisal is that “The Labour Party is a moral crusade or it is nothing” (76), but Hammett has lost all his belief in his party and claims, “It is nothing” (76). Taking into account the visible problems of the public in Britain, Hare puts forth these expressions of both characters to show the co-existence of hope and hopelessness. These are deliberately taken into consideration by the playwright, who, calling attention to disorders, wants to be able to initiate change and contribute as much as he can to the probable solutions of the current problems in his country. Hare, bringing to the stage “a politically bankrupt Labour MP” (Bull 1984: 62), sees politics as an area of interest for every ordinary citizen with common sense and a duty of responsibility. He points out the basis on which the play is established as social criticism created by his experience:

I think it was to do with Labour and politics generally in the sixties. The only political experience I had was believing passionately in the Labour Government of 1964, and watching that government sell everything down to river. (Bull 1984: 65)

The need to establish sound and trusting relationships between individuals that are based on friendship, understanding, fidelity, and constructive behaviour may be said to be among the most crucial subjects that the playwright dwells on in *The Great Exhibition*. Hare strictly and straightforwardly notes that “valuable human relationships are based on trust” (Nothof 1994: 197). The lack of trust in the mutual life of the characters, thus, is presented as the real thing to call attention to. Maud’s conclusion, “the stupider, drunker and more illiterate you are, the nearer you are being a real person. It is the last great middle-class myth” (25) is both debilitating and critical because it is the description of the changing feature of the age and the selfishness of human beings. Destined to live in a community in which there is no sign for improvement, modern people are reflected by Hare to suffer from a number of problems they cannot overcome. In view of this notion, Hare concludes that public institutions which have the ability to exert a strong influence on the lives of individuals are to be assigned the duty and responsibility in this area under discussion. Therefore, it can be understood that Hare puts most of the blame on the government, which is expected to handle the problems and expectations of the public seriously. However, he believes that it will also involve the participation of members of the society in every event concerning their lives, and blames citizens for their reticent attitudes towards what is going on around them. This kind of a philosophic probity should, as a matter of fact, be visualized as a constructive step towards building a society on sound principles. The implicit political commentary in the play reveals that the seriousness of the play is not intended to be in vain. The gravity of the problems closely endured by the society is handled in so critical a way that the resulting situation becomes a puzzle whose solution is left to the audience. Indeed, the play’s two acts, ‘Public Life’ and ‘Private Life’, are

not separable from each other in plain terms. Public life is suggested to exert its inevitable influence on the private life of the individual. In Hare's view, the helplessness of individuals in their private life is a direct consequence of public life. It also has to do with corruption, mismanagement and inefficiency of politicians. What's more, Hare maintains that such a condition decreases the level of the reliability of politicians, and thus makes individuals lead a gloomier life. His dealing with issues deeply rooted in both public and private life helps to create an atmosphere more appropriate to raise debates of how politics is viewed by the public:

HAMMETT: I was rather disappointed you were in love with me. I'd hoped there was more to you than that. When I became a politician, "what a bore" I expected you to say.

MAUD: It was a bore.

HAMMETT: But you never said so.

MAUD: I thought you were boring.

HAMMETT: You didn't.

MAUD: I did.

HAMMETT: Oh Christ.

MAUD (*pause*): You seemed to me terribly dull. But I thought it must be my fault that I was missing something in you. That I couldn't at that time understand. Do you see? (41)

The very centre of Hare's debate on political issues in *The Great Exhibition* is occupied by the assumption that the "government and the people are miles apart" (33). Thus, it seems that each side desperately needs to find out and express the ways that will help people to narrow the gap with public institutions. With the solitary aim of fulfilling this duty of virtue, Hare reflects a vision, the validity of which is to be approved by the audience.

Hare conceptualises the need to bring government and people closer together; and stresses that every one should try to overcome the probable difficulties in the way to create a society more acceptable and appreciable by those who form that society. He knows that "people have expectations of plays" (Bull 1984: 69) because a good of the plays reflect the deterioration in his country in the post-war period. Indeed, dedicating himself to the actual establishment of this thought as a basic unifying element, he points out that unless both sides achieve this, the resulting situation will not be pleasant for either of them.

According to Hare, dissatisfaction among people in contemporary British society must be regarded as an outcome of the problems prevailing because of the incapability of those in power. However, what is significant for him is not the gravity of the problems but the deficiency of rulers in coping with them. In fact, he finds it illuminating to note that the trend not to consider problems seriously and seek ways to solve them will eventually cause lack of fidelity, confidence, and mutual respect. Viewed from this perspective, *The Great Exhibition* should be evaluated as a play that reminds the audience of the dire consequences of such a process. To support this assumption, the playwright wishes to add a constructive political dimension to the play

in order to alleviate the hardships experienced by ordinary citizens. For him, a play can make its most important contribution if it reflects the need for a sort of compromise between what there is and what there ought to be to unite the people around common objectives. Hare's approach is somewhat strict in that it is based more on personal observation of existing conditions than imaginative appraisal of the events in contemporary British society. However, it should be noted that his supposition will not readily be acceptable or adoptable by the layman. Because, in such a case, it is largely seen and felt that individuals take sides, which makes it hard to be impartial in any discussion even when it is of vital importance for them. Hare's opinion of what playwriting is corroborates this view:

We write the best of our ability. And we are lost to explain what draws us to one place, and not to another; or why the invention of one character animates us, while another dulls our mind. At no time are we more conscious of this unreason than when we allocate fates to the people we have created. We shoot them, or marry them, we promote them or divorce them, we fulfil them or condemn them to a life of utter loneliness. An impulse which is certainly not justice takes over, and we do what feels right. (1991, 40)

The playwright maintains in *The Great Exhibition* that, in order to deserve respect from others, people must first of all develop a type of personality, which should also be concordant with those common ideals of the individuals. Because, partial and passionate behaviour isolates individuals more and more from those with whom they are to share life, and this undermines social integration. Witnessing the occurrence of this to a large extent in his society, Hare is after a revolution, which will provide the members of the society with ideas whose reliability, respectability and dependability should never need questioning. Saying, "Ideas have a life of their own" (54), he tries to give an incentive to people so that they can contemplate a great variety of ideas to come into being for the society. Believing passionately that "ideologies operate in a manner generally concomitant with the needs of the culture" (Woollacott 1988: 103), he invites each responsible individual to consider their idea of politics in a constructive sense. In this way, he hopes to extend the content of any probable discussion to include the viewpoints of those individuals who are inherently fixed parts of the community. The lack of confidence in politicians is among the concepts Hare particularly stresses in *The Great Exhibition*. Interesting as it may seem, he tries to establish a kind of relation between human nature and human behaviour concerning politics. The former Home Secretary, Clough's appraisal, in the play, of such a relation is worth considering:

People are born, I've always thought, with fundamental nastiness-right-which they've got to work out in some way. And if you choose, as we did, to go into profession of being nasty, which we call politics, then in an odd way you've found a form of self-expression. (29)

The fact that even politicians are not content with the way they are engaged in politics is considered as an issue, the disruptive effect of which can no longer be neglected. That's why, the playwright thinks that politicians should be able to feel the

satisfaction of being involved in their own business. He further claims that politics will not, otherwise, be able to stand much chance to serve the purposes of humanity. Therefore, it must be noted that the play dwells on the “area of self-ignorance” (Hare 1972: 18), which is a concept the writer wants to point out through the reflection of the story of a dissatisfied couple. Including in his play such an issue so valid in the contemporary British society, and categorizing the socialist politicians in the group of socially discontented individuals, Hare wants to demonstrate that he has reasons for his character’s disinclination to take active part in politics. In this sense, Hammett “becomes an anti-hero who dominates the corruption, and in an onstage world where justice is absent, it is left to the audience to supply the positive voice”. (Fraser 1996, 40) Revealing the condition of the society from a variety of viewpoints, Hare openly states that what he truly desires is to be able to contribute to the process of change. First letting the audience know what he dislikes, and blaming their ancestors for causing what he dislikes to happen, he wants to achieve something likeable and dependable, something constructive, something unquestionably irresistible so as to initiate desired change. He wants to include “parliamentary democracy, privileged middle-class, despair, unfeeling upper-class arrogances” (Billington 1972) in the list that, he believes, must reside in a central place in the thoughts of liberals caring for the society. This is what makes the playwright spend his energy creating “a revolutionary drama in a non-revolutionary culture” (Bull 1984, 138). Hare passionately believes that when individuals are allowed to see the reality, they will most probably respond to it. (Mar 22, 2004)

The need for change expected by the playwright is clearly seen in Maud’s evaluation of the case of most of the individuals in the society. Remembering the days that she has spent more or less in vain, and longing for the days that are desired to bring happiness, Maud reflects the expected personal reaction that Hare openly supports:

It gets tiring how one marriage partner is allowed to bag all the suffering. Suffering is so much your undisputed territory that no one else is allowed near

...

If we haven’t the chance to change our lives, to change everything in our lives, regularly and at will, then-there’s no particular point, is there? That’s what I’ve always thought. (43)

Maud’s critical approach to the fact that individuals do not have the chance to change their lives in the way they wish indicates that the modern British society has a lot to do for manifesting itself ready to change. There is a strong need for dreams to coalesce into what might be regarded as a common social goal. Yet, however difficult it may be to initiate change for the better, she thinks that there is still hope, and she wants to convince those around her that they have a good reason to be eager and optimistic: they are the human beings who will solve the problems and then will benefit from the newly created atmosphere. Only after this is achieved will people feel that they are not redundant individuals but are real parts of their society. However, the process of revolution is neither straightforward nor readily attainable. The playwright notes that politicians need to do more than simply rejecting change. They must keep in mind the

fact that every single barrier adds to the discouragement of the individuals. Hammett's following comment on this characterizes Hare's doubtful contemplation of his society:

The ground I've trodden on for ten years has shifted away and I'm conscious of talking in the air. I can't even mouth the word "revolution" any longer. It sounds so limp and second-hand. Those of us who believed that the world would get better have been brought up short. The thing gets worse not just because of what happens, but because of the weight of knowledge of what ought to happen gets greater. As things get more impossible they also get more obvious. As our needs get simpler, they get more unlikely to be fulfilled. (52)

The above statement seems to suggest that improving the nature of life in his society is almost like an obsession haunting the playwright's imagination. If it were not for the self-ignorance and indifference of a great majority of the members of the society, Hare thinks, the attainment of the goal would never be that difficult. Perhaps, the answer to the question, why Hare ironically brings to the stage the feeling that "all middle-class members of the Labour Party are fools" (Fraser 1994, 104) lies in the analysis of the meaning of this self-ignorance and reticence. Indeed, Hare moves one step forward and gives the impression that self-ignorance is a direct result of corruption of individuals who are expected to take strong and courageous actions against corruption. This idea seems also to be connected with the play's title, Hammett's real exposure, the enunciation of his unease: "Everything that's good in us comes from our childhood. Round about ten the rot sets in" (47). Then the powers of corruption all around operate and alter the early innocence.

Hare ends the play stressing that two members of the opposite sexes cannot establish a proper family union if they are far from tolerating and meeting the demands of each other. At the end of all this process, Hammett is seen in crises of identity, and Maud decides that she cannot go on living with him. Neither Hammett nor Maud can rely unquestionably on each other: the former has lost his confidence in the essence of mutual relations and politics, which he once highly regarded, the latter has lost her hopes of establishing a family union in the real sense. Though the playwright explicitly supports the notion that it is the best for these two individuals to lead isolated lives, it is, unfortunately, certain that they will not be able to be happier as unattached individuals, in their future lives either. Their individual histories overtly manifest the interpersonal conflict they have experienced due to reasons they could not overcome.

WORKS CITED

- Billington, Michael. *The Guardian*. 1 Mar. 1972.
- Bull, John. (1984). *New British Political Dramatists*. London: Macmillan
- Bull, John. (1994). *Stage Right*. London: Macmillan.
- Coxe, Donald. "When Good News Is Bad", *Maclean's*, May10, 2004, Vol. 117, Issue 19
- Dean, Joan F. 1990. *David Hare: Twayne's English Authors Series*. Ed. Kinley E. Roby. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Fraser, Scott. 1994. "(Re:)Defining the Assault: Hare's Juvenilia", *David Hare: A Casebook*. Ed. Hersh Zeifman. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Fraser, Scott. 1996. *A Politic Theatre: The Drama of David Hare*. Amsterdam: Rodopi B. V.
- Hare, David. 1972. *The Great Exhibition*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 1991. *Writing Left-Handed*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 1992. "Introduction" in *The Early Plays: Slag, The Great Exhibition, Teeth 'n' Smiles*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . 1996. "Introduction", in *Contemporary Classics*. London: Faber and Faber.
- . "State of the arts" *New Statesman*, 3/22/2004, Vol. 133, Issue 4680.
- King, Robert L. Mar/Apr. 1994. "Big Names and Prize Winners", *North America Review*. Vol. 279, Issue 2.
- Nothof, Anne. 1994. "Virtuous Women: Portraits of Goodness in *The Secret Rapture, Racing Demon, and Strapless*", *David Hare: A Casebook*. Ed. Hersh Zeifman. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Olivia, Judy Lee. 1990. *David Hare: Theatricalizing Politics*. London: UMI Research Press.
- Rusinko, Susan. 1989. *British Drama 1950 To The Present: A Critical History*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Woolacott, Janet. 1988. "Messages and Meanings", *Culture, Society And The Media*. Ed. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Woolacott. London: Routledge.
- Zoglin, Richard. October 7, 1996. "London Calling. Hang Up", *Time*. Vol 148, Issue 17.

