Hacettepe University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature

# GASKELL'S *NORTH AND SOUTH*, DICKENS'S *GREAT EXPECTATIONS* AND HARDY'S *JUDE THE OBSCURE*: A DIALECTICAL SOCIAL CRITICISM

Ömer ÖĞÜNÇ

PhD Dissertation

Ankara, 2015

# GASKELL'S *NORTH AND SOUTH*, DICKENS'S *GREAT EXPECTATIONS* AND HARDY'S *JUDE THE OBSCURE*: A DIALECTICAL SOCIAL CRITICISM

Ömer ÖĞÜNÇ

Hacettepe University
Graduate School of Social Sciences
Department of English Language and Literature

PhD Dissertation

Ankara, 2015

## KABUL VE ONAY

Ömer ÖĞÜNÇ tarafından hazırlanan "Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*: A Dialectical Social Criticism" başlıklı bu çalışma, 29 Mayıs 2015 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Doktora Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Prof. Dr. A. Deniz BOZER (Başkan)

Prof. Dr. Huriye REİS (Danışman)

Prof. Dr. Belgin ELBİR

Prof. Dr. Serpil OPPERMANN

Doç. Dr. Aytül ÖZÜM

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. Yusuf ÇELİK

Enstitü Müdürü

# BİLDİRİM

Hazırladığım tezin/raporun tamamen kendi çalışmam olduğunu ve her alıntıya kaynak gösterdiğimi taahhüt eder, tezimin/raporumun kağıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım:

☐ Tezimin/Raporumun tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

☐ Tezim/Raporum sadece Hacettepe Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.

☒ Tezimin 3 yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

29 Mayıs 2015

Ömer ÖĞÜNÇ

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude, first of all, to my advisor Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis, who guided this study, reviewed numerous drafts and discussed this dissertation for hours during the writing process. Her belief in perfection made me develop a new understanding of academic production.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. A. Deniz Bozer and Prof. Dr. Belgin Elbir who followed the progress of this study very closely all these years and provided great support with their expertise.

I am thankful to Prof. Dr. Serpil Oppermann, who also guided this study as my advisor at the beginning, and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aytül Özüm for their effort to provide a critical reading and their support to make this study better as members of the Jury.

I would like to extend my gratefulness to Prof. Dr. Burçin Erol for her dedication to and belief in the postgraduate students and research assistants in the department, which create a sense of commitment in the inexperienced, yet determined, young researchers.

I would also like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hande Seber and Assist. Prof. Dr. Şebnem Kaya who contributed to my academic development in many courses.

Especially, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Himmet Umunç for inspiring me towards an academic career and for enabling a sense of genuine academic creativity characterised by a wide scope of research, curiosity and critical thinking.

I cannot possibly express my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Alev Karaduman, who supported, guided and encouraged my studies not only within the context of this study, but also throughout the entire process that started even before I was an MA student. I sincerely thank her for believing in me.

# ÖZET

ÖĞÜNÇ, Ömer. Elizabeth Gaskell'ın *North and South*, Charles Dickens'ın *Great Expectations* ve Thomas Hardy'nin *Jude the Obscure* Romanlarına Diyalektik Eleştiri. Doktora Tezi. Ankara, 2015.

Elizabeth Gaskell, Charles Dickens ve Thomas Hardy, sırasıyla *North and South* (1855), *Great Expectations* (1861) ve *Jude the Obscure* (1895) romanlarında, Viktorya dönemi romanında sıkça ele alınan, on dokuzuncu yüzyıl İngiltere'sinde sanayileşme ve burjuvalaşma sonucu ortaya çıkmış birey ile toplum arasındaki çatışmayı betimler. Bu tez, İngiltere'deki on dokuzuncu yüzyıl burjuva sanayi toplumunun, egemen orta sınıf değerleri aracılığıyla bireyleri hem toplumsal hem de özel alanda baskı altına alan bir toplumsal düzen yarattığını ortaya koymak için Frankfurt Okulu eleştiri kuramını, özellikle de Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno ve Herbert Marcuse'un teorilerini kullanır. Buna göre, bu romanlarda anlatılan on dokuzuncu yüzyıl bireyleri burjuva sanayi toplumu ile yaşadıkları çatışmaya göre şekillendirilmektedir. On dokuzuncu yüzyılda yaşanan ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel gelişmeler bireyciliği destekler gibi görünmesine rağmen, aslında toplum, bireyciliği toplumsal düzene ve orta sınıf çıkarlarına karşı bir tehdit olarak görmekte ve baskı altında tutmaya çalışmaktadır.

Bu tez Giriş bölümü, üç ana Bölüm ve Sonuç bölümünden oluşmaktadır. Giriş bölümünde, Viktorya Çağı'nın sosyal, ekonomik, kültürel ve entelektüel tarihi, birey ile toplum arasındaki çatışmanın ele alınacağı bir çerçeve olarak sunulmaktadır. Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno ve Herbert Marcuse'un birey ile toplum arasındaki çatışmaya ilişkin görüşlerinin, *North and South*, *Great Expectations* ve *Jude the Obscure* romanlarını incelemede yardımcı olacağı belirtilmektedir. Birinci Bölüm, Elizabeth Gaskell'ın *North and South* romanını, Viktorya Çağı'ndaki orta dönem toplumunun kırsal ve sanayi bölgelerindeki değişen toplumsal dinamiklerini ve burjuva sanayi toplumundaki baskıcı toplumsal düzenden kaynaklanan bireyler ile toplum arasındaki çatışmayı ortaya koyan bir roman olarak incelemektedir. İkinci Bölüm'de, Viktorya Çağı'ndaki ilk dönem burjuva toplumsal değerlerinin bireyler üzerinde baskı unsurları olarak işlediğini ortaya koymak için Charles Dickens'ın *Great Expectations* romanı ele alınmaktadır. Frankfurt Okulu'nun ortaya koyduğu birey ile toplum

arasındaki çatışma düşüncesi, Pip ve Abel Magwitch gibi bireyler üzerindeki toplumsal denetim mekanizması ile gösterilir. Üçüncü Bölüm'de ise, burjuva sanayi toplumunun bireyleri baskı altına alan bir güç olarak ortaya çıktığı Viktorya Çağı'nın son dönemindeki toplumu yansıtan Thomas Hardy'nin *Jude the Obscure* romanı incelenmektedir. Bu romanda, Herbert Marcuse'un görüşleri ışığında, toplumsal düzeni korumak amacıyla tek boyutlu bir insan yaratmayı amaçlayan baskıcı toplumsal süreci gözlemlemekteyiz.

Sonuç olarak bu tez, Elizabeth Gaskell'ın *North and South*, Charles Dickens'ın *Great Expectations* ve Thomas Hardy'nin *Jude the Obscure* romanlarında sunulan birey toplum çatışması Frankfurt Okulu eleştiri kuramı açısından incelendiğinde, bu çatışmanın Viktorya Çağı'ndaki toplumsal düzen tarafından bireyler üzerinde oluşturulan baskı nedeniyle ortaya çıktığı sonucuna varmaktadır. Bu çalışma, ele alınan Viktorya Çağı romanlarında tasvir edilmiş burjuva sanayi toplumunun, Frankfurt Okulu kuramcıları tarafından incelenen sanayi toplumu gibi baskıcı ve kısıtlayıcı olduğunu ve dolayısıyla Viktorya Çağı sanayi toplumunda bireyciliğe yer olmadığı sonucuna varılabileceğini göstermektedir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler**: Elizabeth Gaskell, *North and South*, Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations,* Thomas Hardy, *Jude the Obscure*, Frankfurt Okulu, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, diyalektik eleştiri, çatışma, baskı altındaki birey, tek boyutlu insan.

## ABSTRACT

ÖĞÜNÇ, Ömer. Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*: A Dialectical Social Criticism. PhD Dissertation. Ankara, 2015.

Elizabeth Gaskell, Charles Dickens and Thomas Hardy in their novels *North and South* (1855), *Great Expectations* (1861) and *Jude the Obscure* (1895), respectively, represent the conflict between the individuals and society produced by industrialisation and embourgeoisement in the nineteenth-century England, which was widely represented in the Victorian novel. This dissertation uses the Frankfurt School critical theory, particularly the theories of Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse to argue that in Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*, Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, the nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society in England creates a hegemonic social order in which the individuals are dominated both in public and private spheres, by the hegemonic values of the middle class. Accordingly, the nineteenth-century individuals represented in these novels are shaped by a conflict with the bourgeois industrial society. Although economic, social and cultural developments of the nineteenth century seem to support individuality, society actually views individuality as a threat to the established social order and the middle-class benefits, and tries to suppress it.

This dissertation consists of an introductory chapter, three main chapters and a concluding chapter. In the Introduction, a social, economic, cultural and intellectual history of the Victorian era is presented as the framework for the conflict between the individual and society. It is argued that views of Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse on the conflict between the individual and society help us understand *North and South, Great Expectations* and *Jude the Obscure*. Chapter I analyses Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South* as a novel illustrating the changing dynamics of the mid-Victorian society in rural and industrial areas, and the conflict between the individuals and society stemming from the restrictive social order in the bourgeois industrial society. In Chapter II, Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* is studied to demonstrate that bourgeois social values function as forms of hegemony on the individuals in the early nineteenth century. The idea of the conflict between the

individuals and society, as put forward by the Frankfurt School critical theory, is shown in the social control on the individuals, Pip and Abel Magwitch. In Chapter III, Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* is studied as a representation of the late Victorian society, in which the bourgeois industrial society is fully established as a hegemonic force which suppresses the individuals. In accordance with Herbert Marcuse's views, hegemonic process is observed as society aims to create a one dimensional man to protect the status quo.

This dissertation concludes that, from the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, the conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois society in Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*, Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* is a conflict produced as a result of the oppression on the individuals by the hegemonic social order of the Victorian era. This study shows that the nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society represented in these Victorian novels is as oppressive and restrictive as the industrial society presented by the Frankfurt School theorists, and that there is no room for individuality in the Victorian bourgeois industrial society.

**Keywords**: Elizabeth Gaskell, *North and South*, Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations*, Thomas Hardy, *Jude the Obscure*, Frankfurt School, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, dialectical social criticism, conflict, repressed individual, one dimensional man.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

The Victorian era in English history mainly refers to the reign of Queen Victoria, from the 1830s till her death in 1901. This quite long period was a time of peace, prosperity, refinement in morals and manners and self-confidence for the middle-class Victorians accompanied by a sense of national pride in industrial developments, while it meant poverty, hunger, terrible working conditions, overcrowded slums and lack of recognition for the working class. As a result of the Industrial Revolution, which started in England in the late eighteenth century and continued in the nineteenth century creating an industrialised society, the middle class appeared in the Victorian period with unquestionable economic, political and social domination in society (Gilmour 17). Indeed, the middle class had the power to shape society anew and could be named as the sculptor of the industrial nineteenth-century England. The initial outcome of the Industrial Revolution was the industrial society with a completely new social agenda. As the social order shifted from an agricultural one towards the industrial, the English society, most prominently the emerging classes of society like the working class and the middle class, experienced a series of changes in economy, politics, culture, law and science (Gilmour 18). These changes were highly controlled by the middle class since they gradually acquired economic and political power in the nineteenth century. The working class, on the other hand, was influenced by the middle class and their economic, political and social policies. The increasing domination and hegemony of the middle class, which consisted of both the new manufacturing middle class and the old middle class, remained one of the main concerns of social theorists and novelists till the end of the Victorian era.

In the Victorian novel, there is a concern with the impact of the changes resulting from the Industrial Revolution, which can also be considered as a kind of revolution following the Romanticism of the early nineteenth century in response to the industrial developments and social changes. The Victorian novelists created representations of the Victorian society, in which social problems and turmoil of the nineteenth century were handled. The conditions of the English poor and working-class issues, in addition to social issues resulting from industrialisation, were commonly treated in the early

Victorian novel till the late 1850s.[1] The apparent tranquillity of the mid-Victorian period was reflected through the "Sensation novels" of Wilkie Collins and M. E. Braddon, in which the reading public followed shocking subject matters, rather than the social crisis treated in the earlier novels of the century. The novels of Anthony Trollope and George Eliot might be regarded as exceptions in these mid-century decades in their concern with social issues. Despite Trollope's and Eliot's concern about some of the social issues at the time they wrote their novels, they do not represent a conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society discussed by the Frankfurt School theorists. Accordingly, Trollope's and Eliot's mid-nineteenth-century novels are not included in this study.[2] On the other hand, the temporary interest in the "Sensation novels" in the 1860s and 1870s was replaced by a dark and pessimistic attitude due to the social disappointment and concerns of the novelists in the final decades of the Victorian era, especially in the novels of George Gissing and Thomas Hardy. However, *North and South* (1855) by Elizabeth Gaskell, *Great Expectations* (1861) by Charles Dickens and *Jude the Obscure* (1895) by Thomas Hardy, selected for this study, present a conflict between the individual and the nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society.

Viewed from the Frankfurt School perspective, the conflict between society and the individual represented in *North and South*, *Great Expectations* and *Jude the Obscure* arises from the bourgeois industrial society as it oppresses the individuals by means of dominant bourgeois norms. The Frankfurt School critics believe that there is a hegemonic relationship between the bourgeois industrial society and the individual. The conformity demanded by society to the socially constructed ideals and expectations is a threat to individuality, and it decreases the sense of individuality. Accordingly, such concepts of the Frankfurt School critical theory as the decreasing individuality, the repressed individual and one dimensional man by Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse are relevant in explaining the conflict between the individual and society in *North and South*, *Great Expectations* and *Jude the Obscure*.[3]

As argued in the following chapters, the hegemonic relationship between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society is highly problematic and class-based in Gaskell's

*North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, which all present middle-class ideology as the hegemonic force. In *North and South*, Mr. Thornton tries to comply with the middle-class ideals of respectability as a mill owner. As a member of the new manufacturing middle class, society expects him to be a successful producer, a loyal son, a caring brother and a dominant employer. These are the roles assigned to him within the context of middle-class respectability. His desire to study classics also signifies middle-class priority for education. His employees respect him when he shows a stout character in business. In a similar manner, the workers in his mill and in Milton are also expected to follow the middle-class norms. Although they take part in strikes, an oppositional movement to the middle-class norms, they continue their lives as usual when the strike turns out to be futile. For this reason, the workers in the novel, like Higgins, cannot escape the social norms imposed by the middle-class hegemony and have to live in accordance with middle-class values to become respectable. The protagonist Margaret Hale exemplifies social oppression from her childhood onwards, in the form of her education in London to become a respectable young lady, and her manners in Helstone and Milton to evaluate her environment from a middle-class perspective. So, *North and South* presents a society of oppression for both middle-class and working-class individuals. From the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Gaskell's characters are repressed individuals as they experience the conflict with the bourgeois society. Their individual concerns and decisions are subdued and controlled by respectability. It is clear that in *North and South* individuals are oppressed in economic, social, political and religious aspects and forced to absolute submission to the established social order.

Similarly, Dickens's *Great Expectations*, as a mid-Victorian novel, represents social corruption, utilitarianism and hypocrisy in the early-nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society. As the city is the symbol of industrialisation and urbanisation, Pip wants to change his country origins for a bourgeois identity and become a gentleman in the industrial London. Pip as an individual of rustic origins experiences this process quite painfully. In some instances, Pip feels shame for the behaviour of his fellow people in the country considering his origin in the country to be unrespectable. The insistence of the industrial Victorian society to reject his countryside origins puts Pip in

a dilemma and motivates him to strive for respectability. Consequently, the individual experiences a great conflict as he is forced to conform to the rules of respectability to be accepted as a gentleman. Individuality is destroyed by the system. As argued below, gentlemanliness is a social construct provided by the social system for a respectable status in the hierarchical social order of the bourgeois society. From the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Pip turns into a repressed individual for whom social values become means of oppression on his actions for a higher social status. Pip's conformity to the established social order proves that he is in a state of false consciousness which results in his repression. The dominant social values of the period cause individuals like Pip and other young people educated for gentlemanly qualities to adopt social values for a homogenous social order.

The conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society and its consequent suppression of the individual is different in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* which represents this conflict in the context of the late Victorian society. The protagonist Jude studies classics in his village to go to college in Oxford for a successful academic career. University education is a symbol of respectability and a possible means of upward social mobility. However, Jude's lower-class environment is an obstacle for him. Due to the problems caused by his first wife Arabella, who cannot understand Jude and his aspirations, he is destined to remain a mason in the industrial society. His enthusiasm caused by the middle-class ideals of respectability is not sufficient to be accepted by the middle class, because he is just a mason, limited to his working-class environment. He cannot rise in society and become a respectable scholar in the college. The social boundaries prevent him from rising on the social scale. Moreover, his love affair with his cousin Sue results in unhappiness since their relationship is considered to be inappropriate by society. As a married woman, Sue cannot live with Jude in the Victorian society. The middle-class morality and virtuousness, important concepts of the time, are very strict. Although Sue is portrayed as one of the unconventional characters in the novel, even she cannot overcome bourgeois hegemony. So, the middle-class values regulate the lives of all individuals in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*. Clearly, when viewed from the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Jude and Sue are individuals who aim to make their individual decisions and act like free entities in

the late Victorian society. However, the bourgeois industrial social order oppresses these individuals to make them submit to the restrictions of the system. In the bourgeois industrial society represented in *Jude the Obscure*, these characters could be respectable only as much as they performed the duties assigned by society by means of education and religion. As their case illustrates, through this institutionalised form of oppression, the late Victorian society aims to create one dimensional characters who serve the benefits of the established social order.

According to the dialectical criticism of the Frankfurt School theorists Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, the relationship between the individual and the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society is problematic and conflictual. Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse explain how the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society creates a state of false consciousness which makes the individuals submit to the established social order. They argue that social oppression on the individuals results from the failure of bourgeois promises in an age of individual enterprise. In order to stimulate individuals in a rivalry for better economic and social circumstances, the bourgeois society encourages the individuals to conform to the established social order. However, this conformity leads to social oppression in society and causes the "decline of individuality" (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 143). According to the Frankfurt School dialectical criticism, "when we speak of the individual, we mean not merely […] the sense existence of a particular member of the human race, but, in addition, his awareness of his own individuality as a conscious human being, including recognition of his own identity. This perception of the identity of the self is not equally strong in all persons" (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 128). Individuality, therefore, consists of the awareness and consciousness of one's own identity. The individual has self consciousness especially in opposition to the definitions created and imposed by the bourgeois society. Likewise, Horkheimer and Adorno describe the individual as follows:

> The countless agencies of mass production and [bourgeois] culture impress standardised behaviour on the individual as the only natural, decent and rational one. Individuals define themselves now only as things, statistical elements, successes or failures. Their criterion is self-preservation, successful or unsuccessful adaptation to the objectivity of their function and the schemata assigned to it.

> Everything, which is different, from the idea to criminality, is exposed to the force of the collective, which keeps watch from the classroom to the trade union. (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 21-22)

In view of this comment, the individual has an identity free from social restrictions and is supposed to shape his identity. However, due to the social system, the individual is forced to conform to the expectations of society in which he lives. For this reason, the bourgeois industrial society aims to suppress individuality and create a submissive identity which follows socially constructed ideals in a state of false consciousness formed by social norms. Therefore, according to Adorno,

> the individual is both more and less than his general definition. […] A contradiction like the one between the definitions which an individual knows as his own and his 'role,' the definition forced upon him by society when he would make his living – such a contradiction cannot be brought under any unity without manipulation, without the insertion of some wretched cover concepts that will make the crucial differences vanish. (*Negative Dialectics* 151-152)

The difference between a self-conscious and independent individual free from social impositions and the submissive person is that the latter is manipulated by cover concepts like respectability to conform to the role provided by the system in a state of false consciousness, whereas the former tries to create his own definition. Furthermore, the individual is inherently in conflict with society due to the clashing interests:

> At times the individual would oppose himself to society as an independent being, though a particular one – a being capable of rationally pursuing its own interest. In that phase, and beyond it, the question of freedom was the genuine question whether society permits the individual to be as free as it promises. Temporarily, the individual looms above the blind social context, but in his windowless isolation he only helps so much more to reproduce that context. (Adorno, *Negative Dialectics* 219)

In other words, individuality is defined as an attribution that distinguishes one from others, being free from social control and influence, and it requires independence, self-consciousness and self reliance in actions and thoughts to pursue one's own goals. Individuality means freedom from social control, and the individual is an independent entity by means of individualistic concern and action against society's imposed roles and definitions. The existence of an individual free from the bourgeois society's influence and in pursuit of his own goals is considered to be a problem by the system

according to Horkheimer's and Adorno's perspective. Hence, Horkheimer and Adorno claim that "enlightened reason [in the contemporary industrial society] is in the process of eliminating its ideals of reasonableness, freedom, justice and dignity. It is in danger of losing its grip on nature. It is on the point of destroying itself" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment*, xvi). The enlightened reason, a characteristic of the bourgeois society in an age of industrial and technological developments, is criticised by these Frankfurt School theorists due to the social values that prevent individuality. The dominant social order in the bourgeois industrial society destroys individuality since the bourgeois social ideals of reason, freedom, justice and dignity fail to strengthen individuality. In other words, social structure is established upon a harmonious system that protects bourgeois values. Therefore, in the age of individual enterprise characterised by a capitalist economy, the individual is only expected to serve the social system. As the authority of society results in domination on the individuals that are controlled by the bourgeois norms, individuality is threatened in a bourgeois society. Horkheimer states that in the bourgeois society "the craving for power [and] domination of nature involve domination of human beings" (*Eclipse of Reason* 93). Due to this desire to control people, the bourgeois society in search of power is inevitably in conflict with the individual who is an entity independent of social control. In order to control the individual, the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society decreases the sense of individuality by means of normative values that restrict individual's freedom. Klapwijk states that "humans and society become rationally dominated [in an industrial society], and within these power-structures human beings can no longer be human. They lose their individual significance, their unique values. The meaning of being human is now reduced to the function that human beings fulfil within industrialised society" (4). The industrial society assigns social roles to the individuals, who are only acting out their part of society as much as they can in this social order. In this sense, the individual is no more important for the industrial society unless he serves bourgeois interests. Horkheimer explains this industrial social system and its regulatory effect as follows:

> Who is to be held responsible for this [oppressive system in the industrial society]? Not a single dictator, not some particular class of oppressors. Humans have entrapped themselves in the spiral of guilt and tragedy. Humans are both oppressed and oppressor, not only victims but also instruments of oppression, taking their share of guilt and paying their share of tribute in the social system. Humanity is

> deformed by the social structures but mutilates itself as well. For the greater glory of technical ingenuity all other functions of the human self are discredited. (*Eclipse of Reason* 162)

Evidently, the members of the bourgeois industrial society participate in the construction of the social system, which actually becomes a source of oppression for both the oppressor and the oppressed. As Klapwijk states, in an industrial society "humans have degraded themselves into instruments or objects. Worker and industrialist alike have degenerated into extensions of the established order" (4). So, according to the critical perspective of this study, the lower-class worker, the middle-class mill owner and the southern middle-class girl in Gaskell's *North and South*, and the country boys of the bourgeois industrial society in Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* turn into subjects that conform to the oppressive social system, whereas members of the powerful middle class appear to benefit from the system. Although Horkheimer suggests such ideals as "dignity, justice, freedom, equality and brotherhood" are brought forward in opposition to the established social order in industrial societies (*Eclipse of Reason* 177), and in Klapwijk's terms such ideas "were banners of freedom [and] [t]hey were raised and held high as general concepts that turned against the concrete social systems of suppression" (11), the individual who defends freedom against the dominant bourgeois ideology of the industrial society still remains repressed. Accordingly, the focus on the individual and the analysis of the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society from the Frankfurt School perspective in this study contribute to the studies on the nineteenth-century English novel. As Joseph Childers states, "in so much of the writing of [the Victorian era], the sovereignty of the individual is squarely opposed to the requirements of society" (80). The discussion of individuality in the context of the representation of social issues in the Victorian novel brings a new approach to the analysis of the oppressive social structure.

Therefore, the dialectical criticism developed by the Frankfurt School critics is useful for the analysis of the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society. In dialectical criticism, two concepts are compared from various aspects. Actually, in this comparison, a concept is contrasted to what it is not. This form of

thinking is called negative thinking since negative qualities of a concept are brought forward in another concept. Each concept is, thus, considered with its negative connotation. The bourgeois society as a concept is compared, for example, to the individual. In this example, the individual is the negation of society; while contrasting society to its negative concept, the individual constitutes the basis of the argument. Moreover, the individual is regarded to be the negative element since society establishes an order and assumes a central position while the individual is a threat to this social order. In the Victorian context, the individual is the negation of the bourgeois industrial society. Hence, the Frankfurt School dialectical criticism approaches the industrial, capitalist and bourgeois society through the individual as its negative concept. In the same manner, the Victorian society might be criticised, because the individual challenges and negates the bourgeois hegemony and values. Wolfgang Schirmacher calls this negative element as "critique, contradiction and transcendence" of the positive one (131). As put forward by Schirmacher,

> this element [the negative element, or the individual] cannot be assimilated with the positive. It [the negative element] changes the concept [the social order] in its entirety, in its intent and validity. Thus, in the analysis of an economy, capitalist or not, which operates as an 'independent' power over and above the individuals, the negative features (overproduction, unemployment, insecurity, waste, repression) are not comprehended as long as they appear merely as more or less inevitable by-products, as 'the other side' of the story of growth and progress. (131)

The bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society in the Victorian era oppresses the individuals through normative social values of respectability and morality as discussed below. In this rigid social structure, the individual who does not conform to the system is against the benefits of the established social order. Hence, society incorporates positive qualities, whereas the individual has a negative connotation. So, the bourgeois society creates a state of false consciousness and the individual is easily made to conform to social norms. Consequently, individuality is supressed in the bourgeois society and the system produces repressed individuals who submit to the social order.

Accordingly, the individual in the Victorian era tries to be a respectable person and adopts middle-class values of respectability and morality. Indeed, the individual who begins to submit to the norms of society is no longer an individual, but a repressed

individual since he is subjected by the system. In the bourgeois Victorian society, the respectable person is a conformist who complies with the rules of bourgeois society rather than making his own decisions. So, the respectable person cannot be considered as an individual. Since the established social order justifies the dominant norms of respectability with positive remarks, the individual who challenges the system and rejects to submit to the social norms to become a respectable person is only a negation. Stamps suggests that

> negative dialectics was primarily a method of studying social phenomena. […] Negative dialectics also provided a new way of producing a scientific text. The theorists [like Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse] developed texts that simulated a negative dialogue [the dialectical thinking of the individual as a negation of society] by juxtaposing multiple perspectives on the topics in question. (20)

Negative dialectics, for example between the individual and society, opens multiple perspectives for the oppressed Victorian individual. Moreover, this dialectical approach includes various aspects of the social turmoil like the economic, political, religious, social and cultural issues.

The Frankfurt School critical theory questions the condition of the individual in the industrial society. As a result of industrialisation and embourgeoisement, the individual is treated as an opposition that challenges the established social order. In the making of the industrial society, the notion of the individual comes to the fore as a product of the changing social dynamics. On the one hand, society creates the masses; on the other hand, the idea of individual human being is denied in order to maintain the established social order. In this respect,

> individuality presupposes the voluntary sacrifice of immediate satisfaction for the sake of security, material and spiritual maintenance of one's own existence. When the roads to such a life are blocked, one has little incentive to deny oneself momentary pleasures. Hence, individuality among the masses is far less integrated and enduring than among the so-called elite. (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 129)

In the industrial society, the individual continues his life giving up personal desires for material concerns like working in a good job and becoming a respectable person. The sacrifice of pleasure and individual dreams leads to a sober, conservative and religious lifestyle to satisfy society. Ultimately, the individual belongs to the masses and becomes

a stereotypical or uniform character. However, the so-called elite or the powerful minority at the top of the social structure, who might be called the power holders, are different from these subjects in that the elite do not conform to the same rules, but make the others obey these rules which exist for the benefit of the elite people. Horkheimer, in this regard, suggests:

> On the other hand, the elite have always been more preoccupied with the strategies of gaining and holding power. Social power is today more than ever mediated by power over things. The more intense an individual's concern with power over things, the more will things dominate him, the more will he lack any genuine individual traits, and the more will his mind be transformed into an automaton of formalized reason. (*Eclipse of Reason* 129)

Accordingly, the power holders, or the elite minority, construct the social structure and determine the norms in such a way that they protect their privileged social status, whereas the ordinary person continues to serve the system while, actually, thinking that he is following his own path. Particularly, the economic and political power in an industrial society penetrates all social levels and the individual is influenced by this power through legislation, economic policies, ethics, morals and manners. So, as an ordinary person, like a worker or a middle-class mill owner who has no control over the power holders in the nineteenth century, is preoccupied more with desire to become powerful like the elite people in terms of financial and political matters, he becomes a subject of the social structure and adopts the norms as if they were his own without realising how society captures his individuality. This manipulation of the individual's mind causes false consciousness and makes the individual no more than a subject or servant of the economic and political system. He loses his individual characteristics and becomes subservient to the masters. The totality symbolised by society does not support the citizens, but tends to treat them as subjects that should serve the benefits of society; hence, there is no individuality. Therefore, all sorts of individual desires are subjugated by the system as the individuals are manipulated into false consciousness and lose their state of conscious beings.

In this respect, the representations of the hegemony of the middle class, the conflict between the individual and society, the social norms as forms of oppression on the individuals and the industrial society as a dominant force in Gaskell's *North and South*,

Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* present the bourgeois industrial society as a hegemonic and oppressive force on the individuals. As discussed, by means of dialectical criticism, the Frankfurt School theorists Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse analyse the relationship between the individual and society. In the context of the industrial society, the individual and society are forces in an infinite conflict forming and being formed by each other. Through the criticism of the industrial society and mass culture in the twentieth-century, these theorists analyse the hegemonic relationship between the individual and the industrial society (Bronner and Kellner 9). As Horkheimer states, "even as technical knowledge expands the horizon of man's thought and activity, his autonomy as an individual, his ability to resist the growing apparatus of mass manipulation, his power of imagination, his independent judgement appear to be reduced" (*Eclipse of Reason,* iii). Industrialisation restricts the individual to make him conform to social expectations. For the industrial and capitalist society, the individual who thinks, acts, imagines, resists and challenges the social order is a threat to be avoided. The twentieth-century industrial society, thus, implicitly views the individual and individuality as problems. According to Horkheimer, "[industrial and technological] progress threatens to nullify the very goal it is supposed to realise – the idea of man" (*Eclipse of Reason*, iv). For these theorists the condition of the individual as a product, in fact, a subject, of the industrial society needs to be questioned. The dilemma of the individual, hence, is questioned, because the conflicts surrounding the individual actually reflect society. Judith Stamps states that "for the theorists of the Frankfurt School, the economic dimension is grounded in Marxism, […] linking the topic of cultural economy to the more general one of culture" (4). Industrialisation and the capitalist economy are very important for the analysis of society from the perspective of the Frankfurt School theorists, since industrialisation is accompanied by capitalism and free trade to increase production and profits through industrial rivalry.

In this regard, society and the individual contradict each other. The Frankfurt School critical theory takes into account all social dynamics, which are interconnected to economy, politics, religion and culture, and create hegemony on the individual. This dialectical analysis presents a paradoxical situation for the individual in the industrial society. On the one hand, the bourgeois industrial society in the Victorian era seemed to

allow individuality. In the nineteenth century, free enterprise of the individual was promoted by society due to the capitalist economic order and industrial strife. The era, in this respect, might be regarded as the era of individualism, which is a consequence of free trade conducted by individual entrepreneurs in the economy. On the other hand, individuality was restricted by the expectations of society through social ideals like respectability. While the Victorian society encouraged the middle-class manufacturer to increase industrial production through individual enterprise, this manufacturer was also expected to be successful in business, to be loyal to his family, to be responsible towards society and to have religious faith, which made him respectable in the Victorian era. Therefore, this supposed tendency for individualism that results from capitalist and industrial concerns turns out to be quite paradoxical for the individual, because the idea of the individual is at the same time taken as a challenge to the established social order. The normative social values of the bourgeois Victorian society oppress the individuals and decrease the social value of the individual. As Horkheimer argues,

> individualism is at the very heart of the theory and practice of bourgeois liberalism, which sees society as progressing through the automatic interaction of divergent interests in a free market. […] [Nevertheless], the bourgeois individual did not necessarily see himself as opposed to the collectivity, but believed or was prevailed upon to believe himself to be member of a society that could achieve the highest degree of harmony only through the unrestricted competition of individual interests. (*Eclipse of Reason* 138)

Consequently, liberalism and free trade promoted individual entrepreneurship via rivalry with other enterprises and supported this discourse through social norms and institutions, while the individuals resembled each other. Since respectability was the ultimate purpose for Victorian people, the social norms controlled individuals through this ideal. Although one considered himself an individual due to his enterprise and personal struggle, there were many others who followed exactly the same rules of propriety and tried to become respectable people just like each other. Therefore, society created an illusion of individuality for Victorian people, who thought that they would become individuals through industrial and economic rivalry. However, it was society that benefited from this pseudo-individuality as people contributed to the industrial production and conformed to the social norms for respectability. From the Frankfurt School perspective, the Victorian individuals were oppressed by the social ideals and

they conformed to social norms in a state of false consciousness, which decreased the social value of individuals.

In this regard, respectability was used to control and oppress the individuals in the nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society in England. The outcome of respectability as a social norm was a restrictive social environment for the individuals who felt social control in public and private spaces. According to Isabel Hull, respectability "had at least the dual purpose of defining the bourgeoisie (and defining it as better than other classes) and of protecting the status quo from demographic and hence political revolution. […] Respectability was therefore both existential and political for the bourgeoisie considered as a whole" (248). All sorts of individual pursuits in the Victorian society were rejected if they challenged the social authority. The individual could not question the status quo already established by the totality. Conformity of the submissive individual was necessary for society. According to Horkheimer, this problem is not limited to a small group of people in the community, but it is, to the contrary, a matter of the whole society,

> because modern society is a totality, the decline of the individuality affects the lower as well as the higher social groups, the worker no less than the businessman. One of the most important attributes of individuality, that of spontaneous action, which began to decline in capitalism as a result of the partial elimination of competition, played an integral part in socialist theory. (*Eclipse of Reason* 143)

From Horkheimer's point of view, the totalising effect of the modern – bourgeois, industrial and capitalist – society makes all people conform to the same lifestyle determined by the rules and norms of this society. In such a communal life totalised by social values, the individual has no opportunity to resist the hegemony of society. The notion of individuality, for Horkheimer, refers to "spontaneous," that is unpremeditated, unrestricted and uncontrolled impulse without any external stimulus (*Eclipse of Reason* 143). In line with Horkheimer's remark, this dissertation regards individuality as the freedom of action for individuals over collective or social control. Therefore, it might be stated that, due to the middle-class domination in the Victorian society, there was a gradual decrease in the social value of the individual. Regardless of the economic and social means, the bourgeois oppression limited the freedom of both middle-class and lower-class individuals. Furthermore, Horkheimer's closer analysis of the Victorian era

shows that, "in the nineteenth-century concept of a rational society of the future, the emphasis was on planning, organizing and centralizing mechanisms rather than on the plight of the individual. The parliamentary workers' parties, themselves a product of liberalism, promoted a planned socialist economy in opposition to anarchic capitalism" (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 147). The industrial society aimed to control people to such an extent that even the workers' parties or unions were dominated by the status quo to avoid individualistic claims of the workers. The case of the workers' parties shows the operation of the social mechanism that does not let individuals act against the social norms. As Horkheimer remarks, "it is not technology or the motive of self-preservation that in itself accounts for the decline of the individual; it is not production *per se*, but the forms in which it takes place – the interrelationships of human beings within the specific framework of industrialism. Human toil and research and invention is only a response to the challenge of necessity" (*Eclipse of Reason* 153). The individual works for society, obeys the rules of the power and expects to be a part of it. Since power symbolised through the middle class invades all aspects of social life, the individual then has no alternative except for becoming a useful member in accordance with the social norms. The individual serves society in a state of false consciousness.

Theodor Adorno is the second Frankfurt School theorist, in addition to Max Horkheimer, whose views on the bourgeois industrial society will be widely used to develop a critical argument about the repression of the individuals. Adorno is also a twentieth-century philosopher who analyses the twentieth-century industrial society, yet Adorno's treatment of the formation of the industrial society and its conflict with the individuals proves his theoretical perspective highly relevant for the study of the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society in the nineteenth-century England due to economic and social resemblances. Adorno accepts the dominating power of society as an established and unquestionable authority over the individual. It must also be reiterated that Adorno adopts dialectical thinking as a method to analyse the industrial society. According to Adorno, in his "Dialectic of Enlightenment", the individuals are made vulnerable to the "doctrines" and "norms" of the bourgeois industrial society (71). Adorno thinks that the industrial society was made up of interactions between institutions over the individuals, rather than the relationships between people (Bronner

and Kellner 17). Adorno believes that "society is the living background for every empirical occurrence and that the capitalist market system imposes commodity and exchange relations on every individual act – even as it fuels an overriding rationalization process which provides an apparatus of social control" (Bronner and Kellner 19). Society and the established social order are more important than the individual because of the capitalist economic doctrines that require social control on the individuals. The already established institutions support the permanence of the social system to sustain their control over society, thus over the individual as an independent entity. This idea of imposition coming from a superior authority, "the objective mind" as Horkheimer calls it, and its presentation within society, questions the notion of "administered society", the hegemonic social order, with its unquestionable control over the individual (*Eclipse of Reason* 11). Horkheimer and Adorno consider the individual as a product of a creative culture with various components interacting all the time and constructing the individual during that process. Habermas, one of the later representatives of the Frankfurt School, builds upon these social and cultural views juxtaposing the individual and society in a historical sequence. According to Habermas, "where in an earlier stage of capitalist society, the individual developed his ideas in a free 'public sphere' which protected him from the state, advanced industrial society has redefined that sphere in terms of an artificially induced public opinion which binds the individual to the existing order and undermines his critical capacities" (22). Therefore, the individual, who is the product of complex social relationships organised by the administrative authority of the institutions, is controlled by society.

Accordingly, Adorno argues that "if mankind is to get rid of the coercion to which the form of identification really subjects it, it must attain identity with its concept at the same time. In this all relevant categories play a part" (*Negative Dialectics* 146). The lack of individuality in the industrial society is a result of social restrictions created by the social system in the form of institutions and social norms. Since the individual is a construct of this system, there is actually no individual in the bourgeois industrial society. The members of this society are ranked in line with their usefulness to the system. The nineteenth-century German philosopher and revolutionary socialist Karl Marx criticises the bourgeois social system established by the capitalist economy and

explains the bourgeois attitude in the industrial society, especially towards the working class as follows:

> On the surface of bourgeois society the wage of the labourer appears as the price of labour, a certain quantity of money that is paid for a certain quantity of labour. Thus people speak of the value of labour and call its expression in money its necessary or natural price. On the other hand they speak of the market-prices of labour, i.e., prices oscillating above or below its natural price. But what is the value of a commodity? The objective form of the social labour expended in its production. And how do we measure the quantity of this value? […] In order to be sold as a commodity in the market, labour must at all events exist before it is sold. But, could the labourer give it an independent objective existence, he would sell a commodity and not labour. (*Capital* 373)

Due to economic concerns, labour in the capitalist economy is valuable according to its value, or benefit for the system. Therefore, a worker's labour is evaluated according to the surplus value for the industrial production and is calculated by the number of working hours. In this case, the working-class individual has no significance for the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society other than the value of his wage. Marx continues to criticise the value system in the bourgeois society and points out money as a marker of social attitude characterised by capitalist economic relations. Marx states that

> the first chief function of money is to supply commodities with the material for the expression of their values, or to represent their values as magnitudes of the same denomination, qualitatively equal, and quantitatively comparable. It thus serves as a *universal measure of value* [*sic*]. It is not money that renders commodities commensurable. Just the contrary. It is because all commodities, as values, are realised human labour, and therefore commensurable, that their values can be measured by one and the same special commodity, and the latter be converted into the common measure of their values, *i.e*., into money. Money as a measure of value, is the phenomenal form that must of necessity be assumed by that measure of value which is immanent in commodities, labour-time. (*Capital* 66)

In this respect, money is the determiner of the value system in the capitalist economy organised by the benefits of the bourgeoisie. So, the bourgeois society established money as the basic quantity to measure value. The Frankfurt School perspective is built upon this premise of the value system in the bourgeois society, because the individual in this social structure is evaluated according to the amount of value that one provides for society. In other words, the individual is valuable for the system as long as he serves the

bourgeois interests. However, the subservient attitude of the individual, demanded by society in the first place, decreases the sense of individuality. Adorno asserts that

> the barter principle, the reduction of human labour to the abstract universal concept of average working hours, is fundamentally akin to the principle of identification. Barter is the social model of the principle, and without the principle there would be no barter; it is through barter that nonidentical individuals and performances become commensurable and identical. (*Negative Dialectics* 146)

This exchange between unequal notions paves the way for the loss of individuality, in which people are evaluated according to their surplus value, not individual qualities: "Our critique of the inequality within equality aims at equality too, for all our scepticism of the rancour involved in the bourgeois egalitarian ideal that tolerates no qualitative difference" (Adorno, *Negative Dialectics* 147). Adorno's argument, at this point, includes a discussion of the ontological relationship between the individual and society. The totality of society, by its definition, does not allow the existence of an individual, who represents "the opposite of social totality" (Adorno, *Negative Dialectics* 148). In this respect, "totality is to be opposed by convicting of nonidentity with itself- of the nonidentity it denies, according to its own concept. Negative dialectics is thus tied to the supreme categories of identitarian philosophy at its point of departure" (Adorno 147). In other words, the individual should reject the socially constructed identity, which is suitable for the individual according to social norms and benefits. However, this individual identity is rejected by society to protect the established social order and homogenous lifestyle. Hence, the social identity and the individual identity negate each other. Negative dialectics takes into account the influence of all social institutions to explain this identity dilemma.

Upon this comparison of definitions, identity comes to the fore as the negation of the totality, that is social structure. Identity, which is individualistic at its core, negates and challenges the truth of the established social order. According to Adorno,

> […] the particular, the definite, would come to itself only by voiding that contradiction – in other words, by achieving an identity of the particular with its concept – the individual's concern is not only to hold on to that of which the general concept robs him; he is equally concerned with that 'more' of the concept compared with his need. (*Negative Dialectics* 151)

The logical contradiction in Adorno's remark defines the individual as a negation of society and the established social order. Juxtaposing these two aspects of the individual's definition, Adorno achieves negative thinking; society is negated by the concept of the individual, by what it is not. The ambiguity as to the individual's definition results from the social impulse to resume oppression under the rule of the totality symbolised by power and authority. The clash of the contradictory definitions on the individual – between his own conception and his social role – results in a gap that needs to be filled and justified. Society achieves this mission by rejecting the desire of the individual for 'more' of his definition since this will turn out to be against the totality of the social structure. For Adorno, due to this contradiction between the individual and society,

> either an individual must harmonistically stylize the contrary course of the world and heteronomously obey it, against his own better insight – or, doggedly loyal to his own definition, he must act as if the world's course did not exist and must perish by it. (*Negative Dialectics* 152)

In other words, the individual is defined as a nonconformist and a challenger who rejects the definitions imposed on himself by the system. The individual defines himself free from the course of society which is based on social norms. The bourgeois industrial social order operates to perish such individualistic attempts in order to protect the system. The repressed individual, thus, has no choice but to adapt himself to totality and reproduce the system in his repressed status. On society and individual relationship, Adorno further observes that

> the concept *society* is not in itself rationally continuous. Nor is it to its elements as universal is to particulars; it is not merely a dynamic category, it is a functional one as well. And to this first, still quite abstract approximation, let us add a further qualification, namely, the dependency of all individuals on the totality which they form. In such a totality, everyone is also dependent on everyone else. The whole survives only through the unity of the functions which its members fulfil. Each individual without exception must take some function on himself in order to prolong his existence; indeed, while his function lasts, he is taught to express his gratitude for it. ("Society" 268)

Evidently, society as a site of construction controls the social agenda depending on the individual, and the individual also depends on society for his existence. His gratitude even after he completes his task ordained by the system proves the power and authority

of society on the individual. The rules and norms that regulate human relationships turn out to be binding for every individual. The power structure of society, thus, oppresses all individuals, and the result is a society made up of repressed individuals.

Finally, Herbert Marcuse, the third Frankfurt School theorist whose views will be used in this study, takes all this critical discussion further in *One Dimensional Man* (1964) as he approaches social institutions of the bourgeois industrial social order as the source of repression on the individual. Marcuse focuses on how society creates one dimensional people disguised as individuals. Marcuse considers the industrial society against the individual, who has no means of challenging this structure and creating a force to oppose the oppression of the dominant power (*One Dimensional Man* 4). Marcuse's contribution to the Frankfurt School might be regarded as the culminating point of the dialectical social criticism. According to Marcuse, due to the oppressive social structure, the individual always feels under the control of the social order as a part of it created at the same time by that very structure. While society is analyzed through various perspectives in a multidisciplinary approach as Horkheimer has already stated, the individual becomes both a part and at the same time a product of society. So the individual remains in a paradoxical condition with regard to its interpretation in this highly controlled and dominated environment. Just as Horkheimer and Adorno, Marcuse criticises the industrial society for the conflict between the individual and society. "Such a critical standpoint," Marcuse stresses, "requires developing 'negative thinking,' which 'negates' existing forms of thought and reality from the perspective of higher possibilities. This practice presupposes the ability to make a distinction between existence and essence, fact and potentiality, appearance and reality" (*One Dimensional Man* xv). In this respect, the individual is the only means to negate the existing forms of social reality. In fact, the bourgeois industrial and capitalist society aims to create such one dimensional man to conform to social norms.

As regards the creation of the one dimensional man, in opposition to the individual, Marcuse criticises the totalitarian views of society. In this respect, he states that "contemporary industrial society tends to be totalitarian. For totalitarian is not only a terroristic political coordination of society, but also a non-terroristic economic-technical

coordination which operates through the manipulation. It thus precludes the emergence of an effective opposition against the whole" (*One Dimensional Man* 5). Not only the economic conditions, but also the social norms are arranged to surround and direct individuals to similar ways of life, belief and existence in general. For a person living in this society, there is no possibility of individual freedom, because "all liberation depends on the consciousness of servitude, and the emergence of this consciousness is always hampered by the predominance of needs and satisfactions which, to a great extent, have become the individual's own. The process always replaces one system of preconditioning by another" (*One Dimensional Man* 9). The preconditions for individual liberty do never end, since the individual finds himself in a series of social roles assigned by the community. Since the individual is only a part of the totality, there is no social value of the individual. However, "we are dealing with the dialectics of liberation (actually a redundant phrase, because I believe that all dialectic is liberation) and not only liberation in an actual sense, but liberation involving the mind and the body, liberation involving entire human existence" (Marcuse, "Liberation from the Affluent Society" 276). Accordingly, the existence of the individual as a free entity requires the liberation of one dimensional man in the bourgeois social order. Society is concerned with this process of liberation, because social institutions of the system control all individuals. Society that creates hegemony over the individual is "a relatively well-functioning, rich, powerful society, […] which develops to a great extent the material and even cultural needs of man, […] [which] has the social mechanisms of manipulation, indoctrination and repression" (Marcuse, "Liberation from the Affluent Society" 277). For the industrial society, Marcuse also claims that "from the beginning the critique of political economy established the difference by criticizing the entirety of social existence. In a society whose totality was determined by economic relations to the extent that the uncontrolled economy controlled all human relations, even the noneconomic was contained in the economy" ("Philosophy and Critical Theory" 64). As a result of the capitalist economic order, society is divided into social classes and the economy can control the whole social structure through this division. Ultimately this social reality produces repressed individuals, who actually must conform to the definitions and rules of society to become one dimensional man without any challenge to the established social structure.

In this regard, the question of individuality is a relevant matter in the nineteenth-century England when embourgeoisement in society and capitalisation in economy influence the relationship between the individual and society. On the one hand, the rise of the middle class in economic and political aspects in an industrial age replaced the privileges of the upper class. On the other hand, the industrial conflict between the middle class and the working class led to political and social movements because of the living conditions of the workers. The Victorian middle class intended to create social harmony with ideals that would be adopted by the whole society. Hence, individual acts of questioning would be prevented and the established social order would be protected.

The structure of the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society in the nineteenth-century England needs to be examined in order to point out the relevance of the perspective of the Frankfurt School dialectical criticism for the analysis of representations of the conflict between the individual and society. In this respect, Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt emphasise the effects of industrialisation and capitalisation on the relationship between social formation and the individual in the Victorian era as follows:

> Society is first conceived in the eighteenth century and becomes an identifiable object of inquiry in the nineteenth. Its conceptualisation, moreover, is generally recognised to coincide with the appearance of isolated 'individual' as the primary human subject, and the pairing of these two abstractions, often locked in conflicted interdependence, has been found to dominate bourgeois ideology even as it laid the groundwork for ideology critique itself. (178)

In this respect, the origins of the conflict between the individual and society discussed by the Frankfurt School theorists Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse can be traced back to the nineteenth century, when the bourgeois society was formed as an oppressive force on the individuals. As noted by Roger Ebbatson,

> money brings into existence a community of action of those individuals and groups who stress their separation and reserve at all other points. Money creates an extremely strong bond among members of an economic circle because it refers people to others. The modern individual is therefore dependent upon a complex network of connections. (43)

The new economic order that replaced agricultural economy played an important role in the increasing significance of the middle class, who held economic and political power from the 1830s onwards. Apart from the elite minority in the bourgeoisie, the Victorian individuals, both from the middle class and the working class, had to comply with social norms, because, the individuals were living in the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist network founded by the middle class. The bourgeois hegemony is built around the economic superiority of the middle class and permeates all social levels.

The well-disciplined industrial society – including the lower, middle and upper classes – developed a sense of self-surveillance to become respectable under the bourgeois hegemony centred on economic and political power of the middle class. According to Purchase, "this development ensured that the question of obedience and punishment became a matter of public, as well as private, concern, and that all Victorians were encouraged to watch over and police everyone else" (70). The powerful middle class could shape individuals to serve the capitalist order: "The individual, having internalised the disciplinary power of penitentiary discourses, is partly a construct of such discourses, as with those proceeding from medicine, education and factory systems, with their numerous methods of segregation and social exclusion" (Purchase 71). Particularly the education and factory systems prepare individuals for already established roles in the nineteenth-century England. Success, a sign of respectability, depends on obeying the rules. Nevertheless, the highly class-conscious Victorian society did not easily allow the individuals to rise upward on the social scale because of the hierarchical social order.

For that reason, since the struggle between lower, middle and upper social classes is related to the Victorian historical and social background, the social class formation in the nineteenth-century England is very important for the discussion of the middle-class hegemony. In the nineteenth-century England, there were three broad classes: The upper class (the aristocracy and the gentry), the middle class (professionals and manufacturers) and the lower/working class. Although this division was quite clear as late as the mid-century, due to the appearance of the lower middle class (workers in the service sector) between the middle class and the working class by the third quarter of

the century, the Victorian values such as “merit, competition, money and efficiency” were highly glorified by more people in the Victorian society (Warwick and Willis 149). These values, together with the promotion of individual achievement, glorified individual responsibility to become successful in a capitalist economy and industrial rivalry. The middle-class values began to obstruct and limit individual action through a lifestyle approved for the benefit of the system.

The conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society in the Victorian era resulted from the oppressive social order established by these normative values of respectability and morality in the highly class conscious social structure. In fact, from the early Victorian period onwards, the Victorians considered their era as an age of “change,” and the main reason for this public opinion was the rapid industrialisation and embourgeoisement of Britain culminating in middle-class supremacy (Gilmour 6). Particularly in the mid-Victorian period, which roughly covers the years between the 1850s till the early 1870s, the industrial society was firmly established around the economic doctrines of capitalism and *laissez-faire*, strongly defended and supported by the new manufacturing middle class. Huggins asserts that

> the Victorian middle classes themselves were certainly keen to foster notions of respectability, and it had two major rhetorical thrusts. The first was hegemonic, stemming from middle-class fears of moral misuse by workers and pre-dominantly targeted not at themselves but at the workforce, most especially to encourage the emergence of the 'respectable working-man'. A second thrust was a generational one, aimed at discouraging middle-class youth from more sinful pleasures and curtailing potential leisure freedoms. (586)

Clearly, the middle-class understanding of respectability was a set of values dominant in the Victorian society. The middle class aimed to create respectable people that complied with the bourgeois social order. Moreover, the middle class also raised their own children to conform to bourgeois values so that the members of the middle class served the system throughout their lives.

Accordingly, respectability was a means of guaranteeing a homogenous social order in the bourgeois industrial society. As Hall et al. suggest, it is important to recognise “the transforming character of the Industrial Revolution, effecting massive changes in

society and culture as much as in economic structures" (11). Furthermore, "those stressing the significance of such social changes generally agreed that there was an effective break in British society and politics around 1848, as class relations came to stabilise around the hegemony of the urban, commercial and industrial middle class" (Hall et al. 11). The established bourgeois hegemony produced the hierarchical social order and decreased the significance of the individual. Davidoff states that

> the world-view of Victorian society which has been handed down to us was mostly the creation of those persons in positions of power who has the resources as well as the need to propagate their central position. Within this world-view, those categories of people who are furthest away from the centres of decision-making are ranked accordingly. (103)

In other words, the powerful middle class occupied a central position in the Victorian society, and a hierarchical social order was established in accordance with the middle-class perspective. In this respect, the categorisation of the lower class as the marginal and subordinate necessitated their cultivation with the help of bourgeois ideals. The ranks of the workers and incompatible middle-class members were, therefore, defined by powerlessness and degradation, a threat to the dominant bourgeois industrial society. Hence, these parts of society must be controlled with middle-class ideals of respectability and morality to secure the economic and industrial benefits of the middle class.

For the embourgeoisement observed in the nineteenth-century England, it must be stated that, with the Reform Bills of 1832, 1867 and 1884, a new social order based on the values of democracy and pluralism is presented as a distinguishing aspect of the Victorians. However, the developments that led to these enactments were troublesome since the social balance was destabilised and the privileged groups of the old rule lost their priorities. The Industrial Revolution and the capitalist economy began to influence English society as early as the late eighteenth century. The middle class pioneers the nation during the industrialisation and gains more economic power with international trade. The *laissez-faire* economy and capitalist rivalry increase middle-class domination over the nineteenth-century society since "the most obvious and easily measurable form of power was wealth" (Harrison 52). This economic power is strengthened by the

political power through representation in the Parliament after the Reform Bill of 1832. Thus, the middle class rapidly rises on the social scale and poses a great threat to the upper classes with new values and aspirations. Similarly, the working class appears in the social arena in the 1830s and 1840s when the industrial cities emerge, and the workers demand their own rights, for which the old rule has no answers. Therefore, change becomes an undeniable reality and requires further transformation in society to supply the needs of the people. Thomas Carlyle depicts this condition in *Sartor Resartus*:

> Cannot the dullest hear Steam-Engines clanking around him? […] at home, not only weaving Cloth; but rapidly enough overturning the whole old system of Society; and, for Feudalism and Preservation of the Game, preparing us, by indirect but sure methods, Industrialism and the Government of the Wisest. (118)

The Industrial Revolution is unquestionably the most important development in the nineteenth century with its consequences that changed the entire social structure. The use of machinery in production paves the way for new social ideals that devalue the old ways. As Elizabeth Langland states, "with the rapid increase of wealth generated by the Industrial Revolution, status was fluid and increasingly dependent on the manipulation of social signs" (293). So, commercial activities and economic doctrines in *laissez-faire* establish a society based on money and trade, instead of agriculture and land of the previous centuries. For these reasons, the Victorian society can be considered an industrial society shaped by middle-class values.

The roots of this changing social and political structure might, therefore, be traced back to the 1830s and 1840s when the initial and most obvious impact of the Industrial Revolution began to be observed. Since the working class in the industrial cities was a direct consequence of industrialisation, the major concern of the economic, political and social debates was the condition of the working class and their poverty. This newly emerging group was ignored by the middle class and they were compelled to live in utmost poverty in the cities which also began to emerge at the same time. So, the first political movement of English working class known as Chartism started in 1838 and lasted till late 1840s. The movement is the first example of its kind in history. Rather than its history, the debates it introduced about social conditions in England are more

important for the purposes of this study. The pioneering figure in Chartist arguments is Thomas Carlyle who deals with the industrial problems of his time. In his political debates, Carlyle calls the problems of Victorian society at the time "Condition of England Question" (Carlyle, *Chartism* 1). Although the middle class was enfranchised in 1832 with the Reform Bill, the working class was not represented in the Parliament and, as a result, did not have political power. Matters like universal male suffrage, secret ballot, property qualification to be elected a Member of Parliament, payment for MPs, constituencies of equal size and annual elections for Parliament were some of the major demands of Chartism. The changes in the early industrial society were not reflected in politics and class relationships, so the working-class people were steadily kept out of this process. As Carlyle states in his *Chartism*,

> a feeling very generally exists that the condition and disposition of the working Classes is a rather ominous matter at present; that something ought to be said, something ought to be done, in regard to it. And surely at an epoch of history when the 'National Petition' carts itself in wagons along the streets, and is presented 'bound with iron hoops, four men bearing it,' to a Reformed House of Commons; and Chartism numbered by the million and half, taking nothing by its iron-hooped Petition, breaks out into brickbats, cheap pikes and even into sputterings of conflagration, such very general feeling cannot be considered unnatural! (5)

The living conditions of the lower class must be immediately improved according to Carlyle. The government needed to act on the problems of working class, otherwise, "something will do itself one day, and in a fashion that will please nobody" (Carlyle, *Chartism* 5). Discontent and disposition of the masses grew because of the indifference of the government, especially the middle-class politicians who were supposed to care for the nation. Carlyle views the problems of the working class as the problems of the entire nation since the industrial society created this class out of the agricultural labourers of the past in the 1830s and 1840 and the working class constituted "the great body of people" at the bottom of the social structure (*Chartism* 8). As Carlyle states, "the condition of the great body of people in a country is the condition of the country itself: this you would say is a truism in all times; a truism rather pressing to get recognised as a truth now, and be acted upon in these times" (8). Although the common tendency in the political body and among the middle class was to ignore the masses, they raised their voice through Chartism and urged the Parliament to hear their voice.

Carlyle viewed lack of communication at the core of all social problems between the working class and the middle class. For Carlyle, a little bit of understanding by the middle class might be the first step for the solution:

> It is a question which cannot be left to the Collective Folly of the Nation! In or out of Parliament, darkness, neglect, hallucination must contrive to cease in regard to it; true insight into it must be had […]; a genuine understanding by the upper classes of society what it is that the under classes intrinsically mean. […] All battle is misunderstanding; did the parties know one another, the battle would cease. (Carlyle, *Chartism* 9)

Despite this desolate situation, the initiative of the working class, Carlyle believed, would bring a hopeful future for the nation. The upper classes, at one point, would have to recognise the labourers and discuss 'the Condition of England question' as Carlyle calls it. Some of the problems for English workers were "lower wages to sustain their lives," "lack of a standard payment," "unemployment due to economic conditions," "impossibility for a worker to be accepted among the middle class" and "hunger" always preying upon their families (Gilmour 21-22). Beginning with the 1830s, Irish workers were brought over to England to work in the mills or factories of the time, making it impossible for the English worker to find a regular job (Gilmour 22). In this respect, even the New Poor Law (1834) was insufficient to provide the lower class with humane conditions. Carlyle compared and contrasted the English labourer with "horses," and concluded that even these animals were in a better condition than the workers, since they did not need to struggle to work in winter and were fed by their owners when they did not work, contrary to an ordinary worker (*Chartism* 21).

These circumstances led to a feeling of frustration and disappointment among the workers who came together under Chartism in 1838 for the purpose of having their rights. Although Chartist movement was mainly a political and economic event, the social aspect shows that the working class actually raised their voice towards the middle-class hegemony as early as the 1830s. More than the material torment, the working class resented the attitude of the middle class to the misery of these great masses. As Carlyle asserts,

> nakedness, hunger, distress of all kinds, death itself have been cheerfully suffered, when the heart was right. It is the feeling of *injustice* that is insupportable to all men. […] No man can bear it, or ought to bear it. A deeper law than any parchment-law whatsoever, a law written direct by the hand of God in the inmost being of man, incessantly protests against it. What is injustice? Another name for *disorder*, for unveracity, unreality. […] As *dis*order, insane by the nature of it, is the hatefullest of things to man, who lives by sanity and order, so injustice is the worst evil, some call it the only evil, in this world. (30)

The problem of injustice concerned all lower classes in England, and the source of this complaint was the middle class. John Gardner states that, "for the working classes, society was sometimes a disaffected case of 'them' and 'us', but more often a case of striving to move up in the world" (11). Actually, the consequence of injustice was disorder, which was also against the ideals of the new social rule based on order. In relation to this social order and the middle-class effort to help the working class through the legislation of the New Poor Law, Lauren Goodlad claims that, "in place of a charitable community, united by personalised character-building bonds, critics of the New Poor Law discerned the hardening of a bourgeois social order. In such a world, atomised individuals would vie for material assets, while character devolved into the superficial signs of respectability" (159). This social panorama as early as the 1830s increased working-class hatred towards the indifferent middle class. For Carlyle, the masses would not bear this situation – the ignorance of the middle class towards the problems of the workers resulting from industrialisation – so long. The ultimate point English society would arrive at was the possibility of a revolt, which was another source of fear for the intellectuals and politicians of the time after the French Revolution. So, in order not to awaken old fears, those in power would have to act and improve conditions immediately. Carlyle believed that

> a government of the under classes by the upper on a principle of *Let Alone* is no longer possible in England in these days. […] The Working Classes cannot any longer go on without government; without being *actually* guided and governed; England cannot subsist in peace till, by some means or other, some guidance and government for them is found. (*Chartism* 40)

The major concern of Chartism was the attitude of the middle and upper classes, which were represented in the Parliament. Lawrence Goldman argues that

> nineteenth-century liberalism had its darker aspect: almost as a condition of emancipation it was required that those who placed themselves outside civil society should be penalised. A second type of intervention, 'protective legislation', sprang from the desire of the Victorian middle classes to safeguard their material interests and enforce their moral code. (266)

Since the working class constituted what was known as 'outside civil society,' they were punished by being abandoned in poverty. Although the middle class cried for liberalism in the Parliament, they were not really interested in the working-class problems. Therefore, despite the apparent concern for the condition of the poor, the reality was quite different from the legal actions taken in the Parliament by the middle and upper classes. The middle class continued to ignore the problems of the working class throughout the nineteenth century. As Paul Johnson states,

> in practice the economic activities of workers were consistently regulated in accordance with middle-class prejudices about the character weaknesses of the masses, and these middle-class moral prejudices assumed the position of general social norms. No doubt these norms held greater sway in the Inns of Court and the London clubs than in the workingmen's clubs and local inns, but they appear seldom to have been seriously challenged before the Second World War. (169)

Evidently, the middle class expected the working class to behave properly in order to protect the homogenous social order. The middle class ideal of respectability was used to teach the workers social manners acceptable for the middle class whose dominant position in economic, political, social and cultural aspects turned middle class values into general social norms in the nineteenth-century England. Similarly, Kitson Clark argues that "the problem that engaged the collective imagination, especially that of the cultivated classes, from in the late 1850s into the mid-1860s was how to maintain social distinctions within a mass society and how to reconcile the individual duties and responsibilities, required for civic order with amorphous massification and aggregation" (165). Even in the tranquil and peaceful conditions of the mid-Victorian period, the working class remains a problem for the middle class to be concerned about.

On the other hand, the Victorian middle class aimed to create a homogenous social order that protected its benefits. As they tried to establish a bourgeois industrial society, that caused a conflict between the individual and society. The dominant philosophy of

utilitarianism in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century contributed to this conflict when benefits of society were regarded more important than the individual's. According to British philosopher and founder of utilitarianism Jeremy Bentham,

> the interest of the community is one of the most general expressions that can occur in the phraseology of morals: no wonder that the meaning of it is often lost. When it has a meaning, it is this. The community is a fictitious body, composed of the individual persons who are considered as constituting as it were its members. The interest of the community then is […] the sum of the interests of several members who compose it. (15)

Clearly, according to this view, the individual was considered only as a constituent part of the social whole in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century. Thus, the relationship between the individual and society is organised by the principle of utility. Bentham states that

> by the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever. […] It appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever, and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government. (14)

The benefits of the individual and society clash as a result of this principle that favours happiness of the majority in comparison to the happiness of the individual. This philosophical approach threatened individuality in the early nineteenth century.

Furthermore, due to social restrictions in the Victorian era for middle-class benefits, the nineteenth-century philosopher and political economist John Stuart Mill continued this debate about individuality and the individual's freedom in an increasingly hegemonic social order. Clearly, there is no individuality in the Victorian society when the individual becomes a challenging figure for the established social order. For this reason, Mill states that "the nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual" is important to understand social hegemony (*On Liberty* 6). In the Victorian society, the social power of the middle class is so oppressive that the

bourgeois society produces uniform characters that obey the norms and do not question the middle-class authority. As Mill argues

> when society is itself the tyrant – society collectively over the separate individuals who compose it – its means of tyrannising are not restricted to the acts which it may do by the hands of its political functionaries. Society can and does execute its own mandates: and if it issues wrong mandates instead of right, or any mandates at all in things with which it ought not to meddle, it practices a social tyranny more formidable than many kinds of political oppression, since, though not usually upheld by such extreme penalties, it leaves fewer means of escape, penetrating more deeply into the details of life, and enslaving the soul itself. (*On Liberty* 6)

This social tyranny of imposing rules on people about how to work, how to have a successful career in business and how to behave like a gentleman in public were just one part of the middle-class hegemony, defined by respectability. Since the source of the social tyranny was the middle class due to their economic and political power, the bourgeois society was a mandatory power and a source of repression. In this conflict between the individual and society, the difference between the concept of right and wrong was blurred. Hence, social control was regarded as social tyranny. This social control creates subjects who are subservient to society while individuality is absolutely prevented. For Mill, this form of oppression is worse than political tyrants because social oppression is not limited and can meddle with personal lives more directly. Mill believes that

> there needs protection also against the tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling; against the tendency of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them; to fetter the development, and, if possible, prevent the formation, of any individuality not in harmony with its ways, and compels all characters to fashion themselves upon the model of its own. (*On Liberty* 9)

In this respect, Huggins states that in the Victorian society "the two contexts where social pressure for compliance was strongest were the moral, Christian home, and those of religious observance, the Sunday schools, church and chapel congregations" (587). The social hegemony started in the domestic sphere and increased in the public sphere. As Mill has stated, the middle class used other means than civil penalties in private and public life to continue social control and social tyranny. As Higgins further states, "respectable public behaviour was underpinned by fear of pressure from church,

neighbours, friends and family within these communities. Certainly contents of mid-Victorian diaries or private letters often seem dictated by rules of propriety and lacking in spontaneity, with few personal confessions or mentions of non-respectable behaviour" (587). Similarly, Houghton states that "the *summum bonum* for everyone not born into the aristocracy was success. To win the race of life, to outdistance your competitors, to reach the top and hold a position in which you gave the orders that others executed – this was the crowning glory" (191). The industrial rivalry and economic concerns were influential on the Victorian respectability and social oppression of the individuals.

Additionally, John Mill's discussion about the freedom of the individual is highly related to the utilitarian theory that justified social oppression on the individuals. In addition to Bentham's remarks above, utilitarianism was quite influential on the nineteenth-century English society. Society ignored the individual's happiness since the standards in the Victorian society are not based on the individual, because, according to John Stuart Mill, "that standard is not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether" (*Utilitarianism* 14). The emphasis on the happiness of the majority justified the middle-class attempts to construct a society that would serve bourgeois benefits. John Mill states that "utilitarianism could only attain its end by the general cultivation of nobleness of character, even if each individual were only benefited by the nobleness of others, and his own, so far as happiness concerned, were a sheer deduction from the benefit" (*Utilitarianism* 14). For the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people in this worldview, the individual was expected to sacrifice his causes and deduce happiness from the happiness of the others in society. Moreover, the individual was restricted in utilitarianism due to the principle of responsibility towards society. As Mill states, "habits of self-consciousness and self-observation" play an important role in the social relations of the individual who is burdened by the requirement of self-control (*Utilitarianism* 14). The Victorian social order established the notion of self-observation in the individual, which could be achieved by means of the Victorian values. Self-control and self-observation led to the regulation of all individual behaviours. Mill asserts that "[greatest happiness principle], being, according to the utilitarian opinion, the end of human action, is necessarily also

the standard of morality" (*Utilitarianism* 15). Therefore, the individual is constructed by society through social values like respectability and morality, so that s/he exists only for happiness and benefits of society.

From a historical perspective, the development of the industrial society in the nineteenth-century England can be analysed in three periods that reflect political, economic and social discussions on Chartism, the Condition of England Question, liberty in the industrial society and the utilitarian doctrines. In this context, the industrial society was constructed during the first half of the nineteenth century. Indeed, by the 1850s, when the mid-Victorian era started, the middle-class hegemony was firmly established, and the Victorian society was a bourgeois industrial society. For all social classes, the middle-class values set the norms, and their economic, political and social authority was not questioned. Despite the misery and poverty in the early Victorian period, the third quarter of the nineteenth century was rather tranquil, at least for the middle class. However, the debates on the condition of people still continued. As Gallagher states, "in 1854 it was already a cliché to note that general prosperity depended on the distribution of wealth, and not its mere accumulation" (68). The distribution of wealth is a clear reference to the poverty of the working class and the financial inequality between the middle-class people. The great discrepancy between the economic means of the lower class and middle class is disguised by the overall prosperity in the mid-Victorian period. Although the middle class had risen to power in these decades, it was a result of social control on the individual for the benefits of the industrial society.

The last decades of the Victorian era were shaped by the new acts of the Parliament. The Second Reform Bill (1867) widened the franchise to the working class and provided more egalitarian representation in the Parliament. After the elections, one of the initial actions of the new parliament was to enact the 1870 Forster Education Act, which opened the way to education for all children. The purpose of this legislation was to meet the need for an educated and self-conscious generation. As Linda Hughes argues, "though the effects of this legislation would not be felt until additional schools were built and a bureaucracy established, henceforth Great Britain had in place one of

the givens of late capitalist culture, a literate and universally educated populace with the required skills to sustain mass production, innovation and consumption" (37). This new generation in the late Victorian period was a product of the 1870 Education Act. They were educated to contribute to the development of the industrial society characterised by mass production and consumption. Hence, the individuals began to be standardised to meet the expectations of society. In relation to this control of the industrial society in the nineteenth century, Higgins states that,

> the ideology of middle-class respectability […] was still powerful up to the century's end. It had some results, especially in terms of public rhetoric and public behaviour in some contexts. Certainly the upper classes adjusted their image to make it acceptable to middle-class morality. Its rhetoric, acting through preaching, the pages of the press, political platforms, and magistrates' pronouncements, can be seen as a powerful agent of hegemony. (587)

At the end of the century, thus, Victorian individuals were made to lead moral and respectable lives with self-imposed duties, self-control and internalised bourgeois norms. Nevertheless, the most important outcome was the raising consciousness in the individuals, particularly lower and middle-class, towards the conditions in England. The working class began to question the bourgeois hegemony, which is obvious in the foundation of the Labour Party in 1900, since education meant awareness for many lower-class people. In line with the questioning generation of the time, Hughes says that

> after 1870 confident assumptions about Britain's steady 'progress' and its potential for unchecked prosperity were more tenuous, more laboriously maintained. Doubt as to the desirability of the status quo became an increasingly credible position for middle-class intellectuals as well as reformers and working-class organizers. (48)

In the late Victorian era, the individual questions the middle-class authority with the influence of education and economic conditions. The prosperity of the mid-Victorian era ends with international rivalry (Gilmour 24). As the middle class cannot compromise a wealthy society, in which the capital is equally distributed, the lower-class individual begins to realise the failure of the bourgeois promise for happiness through the industrial society led by the middle class. The early and late Victorian periods are similar for these reasons, particularly in terms of the pessimistic environment. Despite the tranquillity of the mid-century decades, the social, economic

and industrial problems of the early Victorian period are awakened in a different manner by "international rivalry" for colonies and markets around the world in the late Victorian period (Harrison 22). The rising economic and industrial powers of Europe threaten English superiority over international trade and the English lose their economic prosperity, which is immediately reflected on the middle and lower classes (Hughes 54).

In addition to the economic impact of the middle class, there was the social and cultural domination of the middle class since the conservative middle class imposed a new way of life on society. In fact, "the term Victorian suggests a quite specific historical juncture, tending to connote a peculiarly rigid set of ideas, circumstances, values and attitudes" (Purchase, xi). As J. Harrison states, "the tone of society was unmistakably bourgeois. […] Even the working class was bourgeois in this most bourgeois of nations. By the later years of the century the values, attitudes and assumptions of the middle classes had become endemic in the national life" (49). Evidently, the middle-class authority started with the economy since they were the manufacturers and wealthy businessmen of the industry. This economic power contributed to the political power that they gained in the Parliament with the Reform Bill of 1832. It was believed that the increasing authority of the middle class could be sustained only if their values were imposed on all people who would adopt these values. Once the middle-class lifestyle was adopted, the entire Victorian society would serve the benefits of the industrial middle class.

Since the middle-class lifestyle was used to create a way of living different from the upper class and the working class, their values covered a great range of areas, and they tried to establish a new understanding of a proper living for the Victorian society, regulated by middle-class norms. As Catherine Hall states, "1780-1830 has been called the period of the making of the industrial bourgeoisie. That class defined itself not only in opposition to the new proletariat, but also to the classes of landed capitalism – the gentry and the aristocracy" (75). Hall further underlines that "their [the bourgeoisie] class definition was built not only at the level of the political and the economic – the historic confrontations of 1832 and 1846 – but also at the level of culture and ideology" (75). The middle-class lifestyle became a symbol of this cultural and ideological

struggle against the upper class and the working class. Although there were some differences even among the middle-class members, for example, a clerk of the lower middle class and a mill owner of the upper middle class were quite different in the later decades, they still shared a set of standards and ideals established in the Victorian era. As Sally Mitchell explains, "in addition to maintaining a certain kind of house, the middle class despised aristocratic idleness; the majority valued hard work, sexual morality, and individual responsibility" (20). Additionally, the middle class was characterised by domesticity as a solution to all sorts of immorality that the middle-class men and women could be exposed among the corrupt working class and the idle aristocracy. As Mitchell further suggests, "family togetherness and the idealisation of family life were typically middle class: many among the working class had to send children out to work when they were very young, and upper class children were raised by servants and saw little of their parents" (20). Working hard and taking individual responsibility were also regarded as virtues that helped the individual in the social rivalry, and these values actually guaranteed the individuals' contribution to the industrial society. Furthermore, the conservative middle class included religious beliefs into the construction of this lifestyle. Their rigid and vigorous values were justified with a strong religious discourse. As Hall puts forward, "Evangelicalism provided one crucial influence on this definition of home and family. Between 1780-1820, in the Evangelical struggle […] over the reform of manners and morals, a new view of the nation, of political power and of family life was forged. This view was to become a dominant one in the 1830s and 1840s" (75). Mitchell asserts, in a similar sense, that, "the middle classes were churchgoers: generally the professional middle class attended the Church of England, while manufacturers and tradesmen were more likely to be Nonconformists" (20). So, the religious views, regardless of sectarian variations, contributed to the development of domesticity and morality as norms among the middle-class people. In this middle-class religious and domestic discourse, the struggle against upper and lower classes was grounded in the domestic world of the family. Therefore, it appears that the home, family and church were at the centre of middle-class morality.

In order to develop individual responsibility, proper education was also encouraged by the middle class for the youth and, sometimes, for the adults. Education meant a successful career and business life in the cruel industrial rivalry. So, "education was important; sons who were not sent to the elite boarding schools went to local grammar schools or to private schools with a practical curriculum" (Mitchell 20). Education also "aimed at discouraging middle-class youth from more sinful pleasures and curtailing potential leisure freedoms" (Huggins 586). Education served a decent purpose in that it enabled the younger generations to reach a better position in society through professional career and adoption of acceptable social manners. Linda Shires argues that "maturing correctly is a prerequisite for functioning well in Victorian bourgeois society" (66). Through education, children could adopt the middle-class values from their childhood onwards, so that they would become respectable adults in society. In other words, domesticity, family life and individual responsibility would be developed by proper education, which turns into a means of institutional control of the individual towards the end of the nineteenth-century England.

In addition to domesticity, religiosity and education, the middle class values included socially acceptable behaviours of all kinds so that a homogenous lifestyle could be maintained through common public manners. Gertrude Himmelfarb states that "the English idea of Victorian values is more comprehensive because it includes the family as well as hard work, thrift, cleanliness, self-reliance, self-respect, neighbourliness, patriotism" (5). Similarly, Mitchell argues that "other middle-class virtues included sobriety, thrift, ambition, punctuality, constructive use of leisure, and prudent marriage – indeed the wish to be financially secure before starting a family meant that middle-class men often did not marry until they were past age 30" (21). It might be deduced that these Victorian values were determiners for every single action of the individual from his childhood to adulthood. As Himmelfarb further suggests, "this canon of values included not only the familiar ones of work, thrift, cleanliness, temperance, honesty, self-help, but also obvious ones that were crucial to the work-ethic: promptness, regularity, conformity, rationality" (29). The emphasis on work-ethic, particularly on leading a regular life, conforming to the norms and improving oneself might be considered as vital for industrial production in the nineteenth century. By means of

these values, the agricultural workers of the early nineteenth century could be transformed into the working class in the 1830s and 1840s to serve the interests of the middle class. Similarly, for the middle-class people themselves, these values denoted a lifestyle approved by society as they restricted individual actions that might be contradictory to the norms. Purchase believes that "as part of their complex middle-class ethos, the Victorians are just as famous for their liberalism and sense of industry. Concepts such as hard work, bustle, determination, energy, purpose and progress are all frequently attached to the Victorians, as are practical philosophies such as self-help" (xi). Although individualism and the individual were deemed to be quite significant in the nineteenth century, the emphasis on the middle-class values challenged individuality and individual liberty for the benefit of the bourgeois industrial and capitalist society. It is clear that individualism was valid only in industrial rivalry and the individual was respected to the extent that he complied with the Victorian values and as long as he did not challenge social authority. For this reason, this dissertation emphasises the position of the individual only as a tool that served middle-class benefits in the Victorian society.

Respectability was possible if the individual conformed to the social values and norms. In other words, the respectable man accepted all of the middle-class values and norms, and did not disturb public order: "In public places such as streets, shops, museums, busses, or parks the well-mannered individual obeyed the rules of the place and took care not to incommode others who also used the facilities. The Victorians were very proud of their orderly public life" (Curtin 295). The desire to become a respectable citizen required the individual to conform to the public expectations. Respectability was, therefore, a combination of middle-class ethics and repression. As Mike Huggins claims, "respectability, many have argued, was a sharp line of social division, consolidating bonds between middle and working-class respectables, in order to reform now distanced working-class roughs" (585). Moreover, respectability could be used as a way of explaining "the nature of social and political divisions and modes of social integration in Victorian Britain" (Huggins 585). In this context, Victorian respectability refers to, as Purchase states, "a severe moral probity, restraint, reserve, family values, a certain dourness or lack of humour, uncomfortable attitudes towards sex, stony faces in photographs and black clothes" (xi). Such social values, dominant attitudes and culture

of the bourgeoisie in the nineteenth-century England were referred to as Victorianism to emphasise the respectable and moralistic stance of the middle class in the public sphere. The term Victorianism, attributed to the way of living in the Victorian England, is significant in that it presents the middle-class values as characteristic features of the Victorian society. In the construction of bourgeois social order, the middle-class benefits were reflected in all aspects of social life. So, the individual could not escape middle-class control. As Mitchell states, "*Victorianism* remains a living concept in social and political debates, although its meaning is ambiguous: it is used to describe exploitation and class division, sexual repression, hypocrisy, values of hard work and self-help, moral certainties about family life, and a wide variety of arrangements intended to solve public problems" (Introduction, xiii). In this regard, moral restraint and sexual repression for men and women as well as the youth, hard work, proper education, an exemplary domestic life, religious devotion, professional progress and social conformity constituted the basis of respectability. This attitude, however, rested on class division and exploitation of the working-class and middle-class individuals, who adopted these values and served the middle-class authority: "The ideology of respectability was universally accepted at all times into hearts and minds, as a lived code of values, across the whole range of the middle classes" (Huggins 586). Respectability defined the rules of a conformist social life for the middle-class individuals. As Huggins further asserts "there were many for whom respectability was all-encompassing in private as well as in public life. There is plenty of evidence that much middle-class life was relatively sober, hard working, law abiding and pious" (586). In this regard, respectability, the ideology of the Victorian middle class, was a form of social oppression on middle-class and working-class individuals who were made to conform to the bourgeois respectability.

In fact, respectability enabled a very strict form of regulation of the middle-class life. Kitson Clark argues that "middle-class morality presents a more difficult question, since that is connected with the conception of respectability which was considered to be almost the determining characteristic of the middle class" (7). The middle-class domination in politics and economy, particularly after the Reform Bill of 1832, influenced the nineteenth-century English society in terms of its social structure. So,

middle-class respectability and morality constituted the basis of a lifestyle for all social classes: “Just as law, in civilised society, is a surrogate for force, so morality is a surrogate for authority. And so too manners are a surrogate for morals. This was one of the functions of morality” (Himmelfarb 50). Huggins argues that the Victorian middle class had “a seriousness of approach, with the key function of re-creating men for work and establishing respectable credentials” (585). Hence, Victorian individuals were expected to work for and to be subservient to the industrial society. In this new world order, everyone worked for the middle-class benefits and served the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society. Hence, there was actually no room for the individual or individuality.

Additionally, many other actions were agreed to be respectable in accordance with the dominant middle-class understanding. According to Simon Cordery, “first, to be respectable was the same as appearing respectable; it was a matter of conforming in dress and outward behaviour to certain standards” (37). The Victorian society expected people to dress within a widely accepted dress code. As Peter Chrisp stresses,

> upper- and middle-class Victorians enjoyed many different sporting and leisure activities, including riding, hunting, fishing, boating, cricket, golf, tennis, croquet, archery, ice-skating, and hill walking. Different leisure activities demanded different sets of clothing. In 1884 *The Gentleman’s Fashion Magazine* pronounced, ‘Every man with a grain of respectability, on the river puts on white trousers, with white flannel shirt, straw hat, striped flannel coat’. (36)

It is clear that even the personal space of the individuals was regulated. Also, there were some activities one could be interested in according to his social class. In fact, *The Gentleman*’s announcement shows the extent of social control over the individual. Cordery states that, “religious, educational, and self-help organisations inculcated and reinforced respectable behaviour” (37). A detailed analysis shows that “Victorian aspirations are eating out, family limitation, clothing, education, regular payment of rent, a private backyard, miners' slipper baths, trips to the Great Exhibition” (Cordery 38). Similar to these socially acceptable behaviours of the middle-class individuals, the working class was expected to behave in a certain manner, too. Rita Felski asserts that “frugality, decency, and self-discipline, rather than an enthusiasm for Dionysian orgies, have often been the core values of the poor. Such values have their own cultural

distinctiveness as forms of life" (35). These distinctive features of the working class were imposed by the middle class within the context of respectability, which included work ethic as a significant requirement for the workers. Thus, it may be argued that the working class and the middle class were both shaped by the bourgeois ideology of respectability. Felski further states that "working-class women, in particular, often have a powerful interest and investment in respectability, as a means of distancing themselves from sexualized images of lower-class women's bodies" (35). It is in this sense that respectability was a working-class ideal, too. Respectability promised better status and recognition among the bourgeoisie to the lower-class individuals.

Clearly, this ideology of respectability divided society into the respectable and the non-respectable above all other social divisions. Nevertheless, it also denoted a unifying and cohesive social norm that attributed similar social values to the respectable people. Respectability was cohesive to such an extent that it could be instantly addressed to the mill owner and the worker, because the common cult of middle-class lifestyle that was built upon bourgeois values was imposed on the whole Victorian society. Respectability became a marker of social status, and the members of the Victorian society were hierarchically ranged according to their respectability. Moreover, respectability rendered compliance with the social norms profitable by promising a higher social status. As Bailey further states:

> Respectability is again respectable. Long employed as a convenient and unfocused shorthand for all that was taken to be typical of social correctness among the Victorian middle and lower middle class, […] historians now identify respectability as a highly specific value system of considerable normative power, whose most important consequence was to incorporate a minor but significant sector of the working class into the social consensus that assured mid-Victorian society in particular its overall cohesion and stability. (336)

Viewed from this perspective, the condition of the individual is defined by social oppression and the individuals are shaped by the normative middle-class values. In other words, respectability enabled the middle class to repress the individuals into a state of false consciousness and, thus, decreased their sense of individuality as they struggled to become acceptable members of society in the nineteenth-century England.

Many forms of this hegemonic relationship between the bourgeois society and the individual in the nineteenth century are represented in the Victorian novel. In the Victorian novel, middle-class values obstruct individual desires and prevent individuals from acting according to their own will. Hence, there is a continuous conflict between the bourgeoisie and the individual in the Victorian novel. As Childers points out

> separation of industrialism and the novel is nearly impossible in the years between 1832 and 1867. Each looked to the other for models of effecting and controlling as well as understanding change. Novels turned to the "record of industrialism," for example to parliamentary reports and the press, for the details of everyday life that came to characterize their narratives, while the social investigations looked to the novel as the most effective way of organizing and presenting those details. The result is often a blurring of generic lines and practices, not to mention perceived intentions. (78)

That is, there was an interaction and similarity between the social issues and their fictional representations in the nineteenth century. Especially in the early Victorian period and in the early 1860s, the process of industrialisation and the capitalist economy rendered the middle-class hegemony unquestionable in society. As Linda Shires puts forward, "the main subject matter of the Victorian novel is the relation between self and society, a topic that can be explored in many different ways" (61). As stated above, the Frankfurt School dialectical criticism explains such kind of social relationship between the individual and society. It identifies oppression on the individual as a means of establishing a homogenous social order.

Victorian ideal of respectability and the consequent conflict between the individual and society form the background to the representations in Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*. It is clear that the individual is forced to conform to the middle-class values and middle-class domination prevails in the Victorian society throughout the whole nineteenth century. In fact, the middle-class hegemony gradually increases towards the end of the nineteenth century as the bourgeois industrial society becomes more powerful and authoritarian. For social harmony, the middle class makes use of the notions of virtue and virtuousness as the criteria to decide on the individual's respectability. According to Hugh Cunningham, "the middle classes saw themselves and were seen as the embodiment of virtue" (22). As "duty, industry, morality and domesticity triumphed," the middle class excluded all

the challenging individuals through unsuccessful career in business, unemployment and lower social status (Gardner 5). Carolyn Betensky also argues that "the self is constructed and actively constructs itself, out of its relationships with the real, outside world and those who people it. Unlike a private self, the relational self is intrinsically social, historical and fluid" (14). The individual – the self – is constructed as a result of his/her relationship with society. The characters in *North and South*, *Great Expectations* and *Jude the Obscure* form their identities in relation to the middle-class hegemony due to a process of identity construction through middle-class norms.

Dickens's *Great Expectations*, Gaskell's *North and South*, and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* depict the formation and maintenance of the increasing bourgeois hegemony over the individuals in the early, mid and late nineteenth century, respectively. As Philip Davis points out, "amidst all the difficulties of public discourse and spiritual mission, [these novels are] about personal vocation, the need to find one's own line, with that wonderful homing poetic stress laid upon 'own'. [The quest of these novelists] is about the Victorian individual seeking some freedom from the common prison of passivity" (116). It is observed that social oppression represented in these novels increases towards the end of the Victorian era as the industrial society is fully formed as a hegemonic force. In the first chapter on Gaskell's *North and South*, as suggested by the Frankfurt School theorists, there is a conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society. The conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society is analysed in the social experiences of Margaret Hale, John Thornton and Nicholas Higgins. While class conflict between the middle class and the working class in Milton is taken into consideration in terms of the increasing middle-class hegemony, different tastes and understanding of the new manufacturing middle class in Milton and the old middle class in the south illustrate the results of oppression on the individuals. As a result of social oppression, the repressed individuals reproduce the system as they conform to socially constructed roles in the society.

In the second chapter, it is observed that the protagonist Pip in Dickens's *Great Expectations* is the individual who is indoctrinated to become a respectable gentleman from his childhood onwards from the perspective of dialectical social criticism. The

social values of the bourgeois society are taught to Pip and he is never allowed even to think about his choices in life. All decisions on his future are made for him according to the dominant norms in order to move him to a higher and respectable social status. This identity construction of the individual increases so much that Pip does not understand his pursuit after a certain point, and he questions the reason for his quest to become a gentleman. Pip is an example of the repressed individual in the bourgeois industrial society through his conformity from the perspective of the Frankfurt School dialectical criticism. Accordingly, his life shows how the bourgeois industrial society represses the individual, and forces the individual, like the naïve country boy Pip who knows nothing about middle-class respectability and propriety, to submit to the established social order. Hence, from the Frankfurt School critical perspective, Pip as an individual is in conflict with society in *Great Expectations*.

The third chapter on Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* argues that the bourgeois industrial society, fully established through social norms which serve middle-class benefits in the late Victorian period, creates one dimensional man according to the benefits of the system. The protagonist Jude's education in his village by the end of the nineteenth-century England introduces him the possibility of rising upward on the social scale through respectability. Hence, Jude follows the ideal of respectability for many years until he is disappointed by the rigid hierarchical social structure that condemns him to his lower-class status. Furthermore, the relationship between Jude and Sue is not approved by the bourgeois understanding of morality dominant in society, and these characters are forced to act and live against their free will. Clearly, the established social order in the late Victorian society represented in *Jude the Obscure* aims to produce one dimensional, or even robotic characters that exist only for the benefits of the established social order. Individualistic traits are regarded as destructive challenges against the status quo, and such attempts that contradict one dimensional society are punished as in the social response to outcast Jude and Sue. In conclusion, the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society represented in Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* imposes its norms of respectability and morality on the individuals and creates one dimensional characters as defined by the Frankfurt School critical theory.

# CHAPTER I

## HORKHEIMER'S AND ADORNO'S DIALECTICAL SOCIAL CRITICISM IN ELIZABETH GASKELL'S *NORTH AND SOUTH*

Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*, which was initially serialised in Charles Dickens's *Household Words* between 1854 and 1855, was published in the novel form in 1855. In this novel, Gaskell represents the position of the individual in relation to economic, industrial, social and cultural conditions of the mid-Victorian period. Accordingly, the setting of this novel covers three distinct, yet closely related, locations in the south and north of England: London and Helstone in the south and Milton Northern in the north, respectively. Depicting the social circumstances in these three places, Gaskell represents the changing dynamics of the country and their impact on the individual. In the early chapters of the novel, the lifestyle of the upper-middle-class in London is compared to lifestyle in the rural Helstone. The old middle-class communities in London and Helstone are, then, contrasted with the industrial community in the northern city, Milton. Industrialisation and the changing social structure are presented through Margaret Hale's experiences in *North and South*. While Margaret is trained to become a respectable young lady by her relatives in London, she does not adopt bourgeois values so easily and questions social norms of the middle class. The main focus of the novel is Margaret Hale, her life and values in London, her hometown Helstone, in the industrial Milton and finally back in London again. Margaret's life illustrates the change in English society as it changes from an agricultural society to an industrial one. In this context, the hegemonic middle-class values and bourgeois social order in the mid-Victorian society represented in Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South* lead to a conflict between the individuals Margaret Hale, John Thornton and Nicholas Higgins and the bourgeois industrial society. Therefore, this chapter is concerned with this conflict and argues that, viewed from the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, hegemonic middle-class values of the mid-Victorian period in *North and South* are

forms of restraint and social control and they suppress individuality for the establishment of a homogenous social order.

In *North and South*, the mid-Victorian society is depicted from Margaret Hale's middle-class perspective. Although Margaret's family lives in a small village, she is brought up by her middle-class relatives in London and is thus shaped by bourgeois manners. Consequently, Margaret's return to her hometown reveals the differences between London and rural Helstone in terms of dominant social values. Margaret's and her family's arrival at the industrial city, Milton Northern, eventually introduces the bourgeois industrial community that is growing into prominence. In Milton, the differences between the old middle class in the south and the new manufacturing middle class in the industrial north are presented from a critical perspective in addition to the conflict between the manufacturing middle class and the working class. As Kate Flint states,

> with the removal of the Hale family to Milton, the novel's central preoccupation with industrial relations becomes increasingly clear. […] This topographical mobility emphasises the fact that Gaskell is not dealing simply with a localised set of problems, but is raising questions of social responsibility which bear on the country as a whole, and on a whole range of human relations. (36)

Despite the fact that the novel begins in London and continues in Helstone, the narrative quickly moves on towards the north. There is a quick shift between rural and urban communities, and the old and the new middle class, which exposes the hegemonic bourgeois norms imposed on the individuals in various settings throughout the novel. Indeed, the social oppression exercised on the individuals by the bourgeois industrial society in *North and South* is the type of oppression identified by the Frankfurt School theorists.

In this regard, the subjects of industrialisation and consequent social problems in *North and South* show that Elizabeth Gaskell responded to the social changes resulting from industrialisation in the Victorian era and depicted the social problems of the industrial society in her industrial novels like *Mary Barton* (1848) and especially *North and South* (1855). As Simmons states, "from the late 1830s on, with issues such as the factory

question, the hungry forties, the repeal of the Corn Laws, and the Chartist uprisings as rich ground from which to mine subject matter, novels about problems of class conflict and capitalism became one of the most significant subgenres of Victorian literature" (336). Similarly, Sussman argues that "from the need of the bourgeoisie to comprehend and mitigate industrialism, or – from a more critical perspective – to control the workers and justify their own power, there emerged from this early industrial moment a new literary form, the industrial novel" (248). The industrial novel tended to reflect the social panorama in order to criticise the social circumstances and the suffering of the working class. Gaskell's *Mary Barton* and *North and South* are industrial novels in this context. Accordingly, the conflict between the individual and society in *North and South* is presented in the larger context of the social class conflict between the middle class and the working class in addition to the old middle class and the new manufacturing middle class. As Louis Cazamian states,

> in *North and South* the industrial question is no longer the whole of the novel. Manchester – renamed Milton in the book – stands for the industrialised, despoiled areas which, in turn, become one of the two poles on which England turns. The opposition is between the old and the new forms of civilisation, rather than merely capital and labour. The slow-moving agricultural South, pastorally idyllic, is contrasted with the feverish energy and tough austerity of the North. (226)

The social problems resulting from rapid industrialisation in the north are depicted in *North and South*. The industrial city Milton symbolises a new lifestyle and social order characterised by the bourgeois society. The novel compares the industrial and bourgeois society of the north to the old middle class in London and to the rural community in Helstone. As Margaret Hale wanders among these locations, the differences of the social structure are presented in accordance with the changing social dynamics. As the protagonist moves to London and then to Milton, bourgeois hegemony increases in line with the middle-class domination in society. Since industrialisation produced a huge economic and social difference between the South and the North, Gaskell's novel represents this social transformation. Evidently, there is a huge contrast between the southern and northern parts of the country that can be represented in pairs. The English society in *North and South* is divided along the lines of industry and agriculture, masters and workers, middle class and lower class. Sussman states that

> whether written by Gaskell, the wife of a Manchester clergyman, or Dickens, a casual visitor to the midlands from London, the shape of the industrial novel replicates the shape of the industrial city. […] [F]or the middle-class writer, representing working-class life necessarily involved a journey, socially between classes, geographically between districts, imaginatively between cultures. (249)

In Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*, the protagonist Margaret Hale moves away from her home in Helstone as a little girl to be educated at her aunt's home in the fashionable Harley Street in London before she comes to the industrial northern city Milton Northern with her family. Hence, in line with the literary tradition of the industrial novel, Gaskell takes her southern middle-class protagonist to the north for the representation of the social problems of the industrial mid-Victorian society. Raymond Williams emphasises this connection between the industrial issues and the condition of the individuals in *North and South*:

> The emphasis of the novel is almost entirely now on attitudes to the working people, rather than on the attempt to reach, imaginatively, their feelings about their lives. […] The relationship of Margaret and Thornton and their eventual marriage serve as a unification of the practical energy of the Northern manufacturer with the developed sensibility of the Southern girl: this is stated almost explicitly, and is seen as a solution. (92)

In this respect, Gaskell's *North and South* compares the effects of the Industrial Revolution in different settings in the mid-Victorian era. The conflict between the individual and society is actually a result of the changing dynamics in the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society. In this regard, Margaret's attitude changes when she lives in London to be educated for conformity with the middle-class social values, and when she goes to Helstone where her sense of freedom comes forward in a rural setting. The consequences of industrialisation and urbanisation are revealed in the northern city of Milton. Gaskell takes into account the entire social structure to represent the changing dynamics of the mid-Victorian society. As O'Farrell states, "the sort of novel Gaskell is writing concerns men and masters in manufacturing Darkshire, strikers, the police, doubting clergy, the intrusions on gentility of shoppy people and of workers who feed and die on inhaled cotton fibers" (58). In the novel, there are such important characters as the country girl Margaret living with her wealthy Aunt Shaw in London to be educated for social propriety, the dissenting vicar in the small parish Helstone, the mill owner John Thornton who is in conflict with the middle-class expectations and his

employee Nicholas Higgins who is made to conform to the social values in the industrial Milton Northern.

The power struggle between the social classes reveals the authoritarian attitude of the middle class and its efforts to maintain the status quo. On the one hand, the Victorian society seems to be polarised in an industrial strife between the middle class and the working class in the industrial city Milton Northern in *North and South*. On the other hand, the middle-class authority creates a highly controlled way of living through middle-class values for a homogenous social order that serves bourgeois interests. This social control in the bourgeois environment suppresses individuality; hence there is no freedom for the individual in the bourgeois mid-Victorian society represented in *North and South*. As John Lucas states, "it is obvious enough that Mrs Gaskell is a novelist much concerned with the nature of social change. Her famous social problem novels [industrial novels] *Mary Barton* and *North and South* are, among other things, studies of the effects of industrialisation on working-class and middle-class families" (1). The protagonist Margaret Hale, the mill owner John Thornton and the working-class member Nicholas Higgins have to conform to the middle-class Victorian social values to achieve respectability.

The titles to the fifty-two chapters in *North and South* provide a general outlook to the themes and issues that Elizabeth Gaskell represents in this novel. The early chapters present depictions of the social environment of the old middle-class society in London. The protagonist Margaret Hale is initially in London to acquire middle-class values. However, in a very short time, she is taken back to her home, Helstone, which is the symbol of untouched purity for Margaret. However, Margaret's journey continues towards the industrial city in the north, Milton Northern, and the author introduces three different settings of the mid-Victorian period in the first six chapters of the novel. The epigraph to the sixth chapter, "Farewell," depicts the Hales as they leave Helstone (*North and South* 49). However, this chapter at the same time refers to the changing times in England since the social circumstances and environment in the southern parts of the country are replaced by "New Scenes and Faces" of the industrialised northern England in the next chapter (*North and South* 54). The north, thus, becomes the focal

point of the novel and opens the way for the representation of bourgeois hegemony on the individuals.

In *North and South*, social oppression on the individual is illustrated in Margaret's education at Aunt Shaw's house in London where Margaret adopts propriety in manners and appropriate attitudes designed for a respectable middle-class young girl. Actually, Margaret is oppressed by middle-class hegemony while her family and Aunt Shaw simply become representatives of the system to control Margaret. In this case, Aunt Shaw represents middle-class hegemony as she becomes a symbol of middle-class control on Margaret and trains the protagonist to conform to middle-class lifestyle in London. Therefore, Margaret's oppression is particularly noticeable in her training for bourgeois manners while she cannot make her decisions, and this oppression creates a conflict between the individual and society as defined by the Frankfurt School critical theory. Margaret Hale, eighteen-year old at the beginning of the novel, was sent to London about nine years ago to live with her wealthy Aunt Shaw for the purpose of learning how to become a respectable young lady in accordance with the middle-class values (*North and South* 8). Margaret's family actually lived in a small village, Helstone (*North and South* 6). Yet, they believed that if Margaret was educated to become a respectable lady in London, she would have better prospects in life (*North and South* 9). In an age of industrialisation, the Victorian society was rapidly changing from a rural society to an urban society, so that the Hales considered it necessary for Margaret to go to the city and learn the appropriate manners in the middle-class social environment. Her education mainly consisted of learning social manners and habits that would make her a respectable young woman in the middle-class society (*North and South* 8). This form of education was provided for Margaret by her family, as they expected her to acquire middle-class values. Evidently, Margaret's middle-class upbringing is a form of social construction. As it is depicted at the dawn of her cousin Edith's marriage, Margaret was to be "tamed" in her relatives' house: "Margaret looked round upon the nursery; the first room in that house with which she had become familiar nine years ago, when she was brought, all untamed from the forest, to share the home, the play and the lessons of her cousin Edith" (*North and South* 8). Margaret's parents were obviously aware of this construction to improve her prospects in the bourgeois society: "The long

hoping, and planning, and contriving they [the Hale family] had gone through at home, before her wardrobe could be arranged so as to suit her grander circumstances" (*North and South* 8). Their relatives in London are considered as an opportunity for Margaret to become bourgeois, and the Hales try to send Margaret to London in an acceptable appearance. During her stay there, Margaret is re-formed according to the middle-class values. The nurse, who was depicted as a figure of authority, "was terribly particular about clean hands and torn frocks" (*North and South* 8). The oppressive figure of the nurse is so influential for Margaret that the little girl cannot even cry after she is left alone at night: "[…] [I]n that first night, […] she was bidden not to cry by the nurse" (*North and South* 8). It is important to note that the manners and behaviours teach her how to be respectable in the mid-Victorian society under the strict control of the middle-class lifestyle, and require her to forget her small village and the lifestyle she was accustomed to. For this reason, Margaret is afraid of being laughed at by Henry Lennox, her first suitor, as she tells him about her life in Helstone: "Helstone is like a village in a poem – in one of Tennyson's poems. But I won't try and describe it any more. You would only laugh at me if I told you what I think of it – what it really is" (*North and South* 12). She is quite right in her anxiety since Lennox compares Helstone to "a village in a tale rather than in real life" (*North and South* 11). In fact, the countryside, symbolised by the rural and agricultural community of Helstone in *North and South*, appears as a place of escape from the industrial and urban community of the middle class associated with London and Milton. For Margaret, the countryside and the social environment of the rural community mean freedom from the middle-class values and norms. Despite Margaret's training to conform to middle-class lifestyle in Aunt Shaw's house, she misses her village and her ordinary habits like walking around without social concerns, instead of riding or driving a carriage that seem to be "appropriate" for a lady (*North and South* 12). Her suitor Lennox describes her character as "the idea of stately simplicity" that is consistent in all her behaviours (*North and South* 11). The reason for the simplicity in Margaret's manners might be traced back to her early childhood in the countryside, which makes it possible for her to realise the freedom in the daily life of the rural community contrary to the middle-class obsession with social norms and rituals in the cities. Margaret's simplicity in her behaviours is against the bourgeois habits regulated by middle-class social values. For

example, while Margaret likes to walk alone in nature in Helstone (*North and South* 36), her aunt wishes her and Edith to be accompanied by a footman in London (*North and South* 67). It is not socially appropriate for young ladies like Margaret and Edith to walk alone in the city, and it is definitely not respectable in the bourgeois community. Hence, it must be asserted that Margaret's behaviour is strictly controlled by bourgeois social values and she is not allowed to act freely. Moreover, the middle-class education brings Margaret as an individual into a conflict with society since she does not adopt the social values as she is taught. On the contrary, she continues her individualistic traits, like being simplistic, in the middle-class environment she is educated. Accordingly, Margaret exemplifies the conflict between the individual and the mid-Victorian society. From the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Margaret's education for conformity to middle-class values in London is an example of bourgeois hegemony on the individuals to create submissive members of society. Nevertheless, Margaret's experience of freedom from these social restrictions during her childhood in Helstone prevents her from complying with middle-class demands in London.

Margaret's training in *North and South* to acquire better social circumstances reflects social inclination towards a particular characteristic and type of behaviour established by middle-class respectability. As Michael Paterson suggests, "Victorian society was obsessed with status and social advancement. The era saw the rise of a huge and wealthy middle class whose members – pleased with their attainments but unsure how to behave – looked to the aristocracy for social guidance" (195). As stated, social status and social advancement were important aspects of respectability in the Victorian era. Upward social mobility and individual improvement were conceived as social responsibilities and these were necessary for respectability in the middle-class community. It should also be noted that the Victorians were obsessed with these norms for the bourgeois social order. So, the individual was controlled by the social norms that required personal improvement and a better social status. For this reason, similar habits and practices were conducted in many bourgeois houses for the control of the individual. In *North and South*, Margaret is accustomed to the guests who frequently visit them, although, in the opening chapters, the visitors are there particularly to celebrate Edith's wedding and the ladies are looking at Edith's shawls and dresses in the

wedding (*North and South* 5). The call of the visitors, a social incident to make acquaintances among the respectable middle-class families, is depicted as follows:

> [Margaret's] aunt Shaw was talking to the five or six ladies who had been dining there, and whose husbands were still in the dining room. They were the familiar acquaintances of the house; neighbours whom Mrs Shaw called friends, because she happened to dine with them more frequently than with any other people, and because if she or Edith wanted anything from them, or they from her, they did not scruple to make a call at each other's houses before luncheon. (*North and South* 6)

This social activity of visiting other people is quite important in that people are acquainted with more people. Moreover, they achieve a better social status as they are invited and accepted in a greater social environment and more respectable middle-class members. These visits help the Victorians establish social connections and acquire contacts among the respectable families. In other words, to become respectable requires meeting respectable people. As Paterson states, "though entirely forgotten today, the complex procedures for giving and receiving social calls occupied the energies of many thousands of women, in towns and cities throughout Britain, until almost within living memory" (196). The ladies who visit Mrs Shaw with their husbands exemplify this tradition of the mid-nineteenth-century England. Making a visit is regarded as a necessity, rather than a casual event, determined by social rules in the bourgeois Victorian society and as a sign of respectability. The Victorian society determined the rules of visiting other people through social norms that regulated the lives of the individuals, who complied with the social expectations:

> Visits were not made before three o'clock in the afternoon and never after five unless the visitor knew the family extremely well. The convention was that from three to four was the most formal time to visit, suitable for strangers or slight acquaintances; from four to five was a somewhat more relaxed period, fitting for those who may have known the hostess for some time. From five to six was for relations or old friends. In spite of all this, the practice of visiting was referred to as 'morning calls.' (Paterson 197)

Although there are visits in other communities in the Victorian era, these visits in the middle-class community have a particular purpose of "making acquaintances" with respectable middle-class people (Paterson 198). Margaret Hale in *North and South* gets used to the custom of social calls in order to meet respectable middle-class members.

Nevertheless, her disinclination to participate in these social meetings and to show Edith's shawls suggests her resistance to this social practice. Margaret is presented as a young girl who is tired of the preparations for Edith's marriage when she is asked "to bring down [Edith's] shawls" (*North and South* 8).

Evidently, Margaret is an example of the individual questioning and challenging this middle-class hegemony, while Edith is the figure of respectability and propriety in *North and South*. Edith is actually portrayed as an obedient young girl who conforms to the social norms. At the beginning of the novel, Edith is introduced as a naïve young girl, "winking and blinking her eyes at the stronger light, shaking back her slightly-ruffled curls, and altogether looking like the Sleeping Beauty just startled from her dreams" (*North and South* 9). Margaret and Edith have been living in the same house for almost a decade. Although Margaret is the middle-class country girl, Edith is the sleeping beauty with her lovely curls in the domestic sphere provided and secured by the middle-class social circumstances. Edith is a symbol of fragility and submissiveness in accordance with middle-class rules of propriety. She is introduced in *North and South* as follows:

> [Edith is] talking about wedding dresses, and wedding ceremonies; and Captain Lennox […] and the difficulty of keeping a piano in good tune (a difficulty which Edith seemed to consider as one of the most formidable [*sic*] that could befall her in her married life), and what gowns she should want in the visits to Scotland, which would immediately succeed her marriage. (*North and South* 5)

Edith as a young girl is about to marry the handsome soldier, her future husband Captain Lennox suitable for the family as well. She deals only with the preparations of her marriage and her future domestic environment. Her only concern seems to centre on her duties as a submissive wife attending her husband in her new life and entertaining her husband with her female company: "[Edith] lay curled up on the sofa in the back drawing room in Harley Street, looking very lovely in her white muslin and blue ribbons. If Titania had ever been dressed in white muslin and blue ribbons, and had fallen asleep on a crimson damask sofa in a back drawing room, Edith might have been taken for her" (*North and South* 5). Edith's outlook is accompanied by her delicate manners as she easily falls asleep even when talking to Margaret: "[Edith's] whispered

tone had latterly become more drowsy; and Margaret, after a pause of a few minutes found, as she fancied, that in spite of the buzz in the next room, Edith had rolled herself up into a soft ball of muslin and ribbon and silken curls, and gone off into a peaceful little after-dinner nap" (*North and South* 5). This emphasis on Edith's fragile appearance and easily falling asleep helps to demonstrate her weakness. Furthermore, Edith's submission to the social authority might be observed even in her response to the dinner for the guests. Edith's mother, Mrs Shaw, considers the dinner as an appropriate social incident for Edith's marriage and a necessary social call as mentioned above. Although Edith initially seems to object to her mother's decision, she quickly yields to her authority. This event is depicted in the novel as follows:

> Edith had rather objected to this arrangement, for Captain Lennox was expected to arrive by a late train this very evening; but, although she was a spoiled child, she was too careless and idle to have a very strong will of her own, and gave way when she found that her mother had absolutely ordered those extra delicacies of the season which are always supposed to be efficacious against immoderate grief at farewell dinners. She contented herself by leaning back in her chair, merely playing with the food on her plate, and looking grave and absent. (*North and South* 6)

Both in her present status and future life, Edith follows the rules of propriety which are suitable for a girl of her age from the perspective of the middle class. As Horkheimer suggests, "things dominate the individuals [who] lack any genuine individual traits" (*Eclipse of Reason* 129). In this regard, Edith is a product of the bourgeois industrial society since middle-class norms of respectability and morality dominate her and, consequently, she has no individual traits. The Victorian social values control her manners and actions restricting individuality. Edith has spent all her life in the middle-class community, so that she does not question her social environment. She is satisfied with her own condition as an obedient and submissive young girl.

However, it is clear that despite the middle-class training she received, Edith's submissiveness and conformity are not transferred to Margaret. Edith is a young lady who knows exactly social expectations and requirements both as a young girl and a married woman. In the context of respectability, she leads her life in congruity with her family. Her anxieties towards married life show that she will continue her life in submission just as she has lived a conformist life until then. As Enid Duthie states

"[Margaret's] aunt belongs to the well-to-do upper middle class. She and her daughter Edith lead a pleasantly cushioned existence; the domestic wheels are well-oiled, and hospitality constantly dispensed to a circle of neighbours" (56). Margaret performs her duty, yet she is not excited about the incident or the marriage like Edith. Moreover, Margaret does not even like her suitor Henry Lennox. Her lack of interest in these domestic concerns and acceptable social values show that Margaret is a challenging character. She does not obey the normative social values on matters like domesticity, education, femininity and Victorian family values. Margaret is an individual and her story, which includes her training in the middle-class community, is an example of the conflict between society and the individual as defined by Adorno and Horkheimer. Although Edith is a subject of the Victorian society through her obedience, Margaret is an individual unconstrained by middle-class social values.

When Margaret is back in Helstone, the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society is replaced by Margaret's sense of individuality. From the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Margaret Hale as an individual challenges the middle-class hegemony symbolised by dominant social values in her education for propriety in the bourgeois society. Despite the normative values of the middle class in London, Margaret experiences freedom from social boundaries in her village, Helstone. This rural setting is important for Margaret as it gives her the opportunity to escape middle-class hegemony in the industrial society. Although middle-class values dominate the industrial urban community, the rural community is not controlled by the middle-class values. Consequently, the individual is not oppressed by society. Helstone is like a paradise in the bourgeois Victorian society for Margaret who rejects social expectations of London middle class:

> It was the latter part of July when Margaret returned home. The forest trees were all one dark, full, dusky green; the fern below them caught all the slanting sunbeams; the weather was sultry and broodingly still. Margaret used to tramp along by her father's side, crushing down the fern with a cruel glee, as she felt it yield under her light foot, and send up the fragrance peculiar to it, – out on the broad commons into the warm scented light, seeing multitudes of wild, free, living creatures, revelling in the sunshine, and the herbs and flowers it called forth. (*North and South* 16)

The pleasure Margaret feels in nature is accompanied by her attitude towards common people living in this environment. She actually admires the untouched beauty of nature after the long time she has spent in London. Furthermore, she likes the simplicity of common people living in Helstone. She elaborates on this rural community as follows:

> Its people were her people. She made hearty friends with them; learned and delighted in using their peculiar words; took up freedom amongst them; nursed their babies; talked or read with slow distinctness to their old people; carried dainty messes to their sick; resolved before long to teach at the school, where her father went everyday as to an appointed task, but she was continually tempted off to go and see some individual friends – man, woman, or child – in some cottage in the green shade of the forest. (*North and South* 16)

There seems to be no social boundary to prevent her from following her desires like making friends with everyone, speaking the way she likes, communicating with the entire community and deciding her daily routine on her own. She is closely acquainted and has friendly connections with all the people in Helstone regardless of social status and economic means. She feels the freedom of acting on her own since she does not have to follow social rules of propriety. Her freedom in society of Helstone strengthens her sense of individuality and enables her to act like an individual: "The simplicity of pastoral Helstone" and "her capacity for social sympathy" are particularly emphasised in this rural setting to show the difference between rural and urban communities (Garson 296). Margaret comments on the social boundaries constructed by the middle-class norms of propriety:

> Mrs. Shaw's ideas of propriety and her own helpless dependence on others, had always made her insist that a footman should accompany Edith and Margaret, if they went beyond Harley Street or the immediate neighbourhood. The limits by which this rule of her aunt's had circumscribed Margaret's independence had been silently rebelled against at the time: and she had doubly enjoyed the free walks and rambles of her forest life, from the contrast which they presented. (*North and South* 66)

Margaret can walk alone without the restrictive attitude of Aunt Shaw – the symbol of social authority – in the countryside, because the rural community does not treat this behaviour as improper. A young girl's spending some time alone walking in nature is not considered to be inappropriate or unrespectable in the village. It is significant that the rural community is presented as untouched by the industrial changes. Indeed,

Margaret's knowledge of freedom in the rural community is the reason for her "silent rebel[lion] against" the middle-class control on her behaviours (*North and South* 66).

A stronger form of conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society is presented in Milton according to the Frankfurt School critical theory. Gaskell's *North and South* describes the urban society in the industrial northern city of Milton as a place where this conflict takes a more pronounced form. It is clear that social order is constructed by the middle-class economic and social power in the industrial city Milton Northern and the middle class has established bourgeois values as the social norms that control society and oppress individuals in Milton. Margaret is subjected to middle-class values again when she moves to Milton with her family. While Helstone is a source of natural beauty and social freedom for Margaret, the industrial city of Milton is dark among the mills owned by the middle-class manufacturers who try to establish their values as dominant norms. Accordingly, the contrast between Milton and Helstone is underlined:

> For several miles before they reached Milton, they saw a deep lead-coloured cloud hanging over the horizon in the direction in which it lay. It was all the darker from contrast with the pale grey-blue of the wintry sky; for in Heston there had been the earliest signs of frost. Nearer to the town, the air had a faint taste and smell of smoke; perhaps, after all, more a loss of the fragrance of grass and herbage than any positive taste or smell. (*North and South* 55)

Moreover, the environment is strikingly different in Milton and Helstone, too: "Quickly they were whirled over long, straight, hopeless streets of regularly-built houses, all small and of brick. Here and there a great oblong many-windowed factory stood up, like a hen among her chickens, puffing out black unparliamentary smoke" (*North and South* 55). Margaret has previously considered this smoke as a sign "to foretell rain" (*North and South* 55). Margaret realises the devastating effects of industrial production on nature as she walks into the city. For Margaret, hopelessness is the dominant feeling in Milton:

> At night when Margaret realised [that they had to stay in Milton], she felt inclined to sit down in a stupor of despair. The heavy smoky air hung about her bedroom, which occupied the long narrow projection at the back of the house. The window, placed at the side of the oblong, looked to the blank wall of a similar projection,

> not above ten feet distant. It loomed through the fog like a great barrier to hope. Inside the room everything was in confusion. All their efforts had been directed to make her mother's room comfortable. Margaret sat down on a box, the direction card upon which struck her as having been written at Helstone—beautiful, beloved Helstone! She lost herself in dismal thought. (*North and South* 62)

In the Victorian England, the mills, especially the cotton industry, provided employment for the working-class people. Accordingly, the occupations of the inhabitants of Milton differ from those in the south: "Margaret had now and then been into the city in her drives with her aunt. But there [in London] the heavy lumbering vehicles seemed various in their purposes and intent; here every van, every wagon or truck, bore cotton, either in the raw shape in bags, or the woven shape in bales of calico" (*North and South* 56). The cotton industry in Milton is controlled by the middle-class mill owners and the workers are employed in those mills. The industrial production, the mill owners and the working-class people are all new for Margaret, and she is acquainted with industrial issues in a short time. Through Margaret's perspective as a southern middle-class young girl in Milton Northern, the bourgeois industrial society is introduced as opposed to the rural community in Helstone and upper middle class in London. This representation invites a critical approach towards the conflict between the individuals and the oppressive bourgeois industrial society represented in *North and South* from the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory since this oppression is a threat for individuality while the middle class tries to establish a homogenous social order to protect economic and social benefits. Horkheimer argues that, "there is a contradiction between the bourgeois order's ideas and reality, between its words and deeds. The bourgeois social order places the great universal ideals, justice, equality and freedom, at the centre of its political and moral philosophy. It claims to put universality into practice by creating the conditions for free and just exchange" ("Formulation of Critical Theory" 183). However, the promises of the bourgeois society to provide equality and freedom depending on economic and political power is futile since the benefits of the middle class overcome these universal ideals and the bourgeois society prefers to dominate the individuals through constructed ideals that result in the conflict between the individual and society.

In Milton, it is John Thornton who represents the hegemony of the industrial, capitalist and bourgeois Victorian society. John Thornton is a "wealthy manufacturer" in the gloomy Milton (*North and South* 61). He is also the son of a highly conservative and stout mother, Mrs Thornton, "with a look of black sternness on her face" (*North and South* 162). Margaret's father, Mr Hale, intends to go to Milton Northern since "there is an opening for a private tutor" and "[he has been] recommended to a Mr Thornton […] a very intelligent man as [he] can judge from his letters" (*North and South* 36). So, Thornton is at the same time a student of Mr Hale as they will study classics together. On the other hand, Nicholas Higgins is a poor worker in a cotton mill and a stout activist in the Union struggling for their rights against the middle-class mill owners as he says "I'll fight on too; and I'll get it this time. It'll not take long for to make 'em [the master] give in, for they've getten a pretty deal of orders, all under contract; and they'll soon find out they'd better give us our five per cent than lose the profit they'll gain" (*North and South* 141). Higgins' decisive comment shows that he is in a war against the middle-class mill owners like Thornton in order to protect the working-class interests against the masters. He is also Bessy's father, who is about to die because of her illness resulting from unsanitary working conditions in the cotton mill: "And I think, if this should be th' end of all, and if all I've been born for is just to work my heart and my life away, […] wi' them mill-noises in my ears for ever, until I could scream out for them to stop, […] and wi' the fluff filling my lungs, until I thirst to death for one long deep breath o' the clear air" (*North and South* 95). As Margaret observes, in the industrial Milton Northern, Thornton and Higgins are the individuals in conflict with the social values and ideals of the industrial mid-Victorian society. Their conflict clearly results from the injustices of the bourgeois society. In this respect, Horkheimer states that,

> the further bourgeois society moves from keeping its revolutionary promise of justice, equality and freedom, the more it can be said to fail against its own standards. The ideology of liberal capitalism [the economic doctrine established by the middle class to continue industrial production for their economic benefits rather than the individual's benefits] which preached a harmony between egotistical individual interest and societal progress conceals the negative dialectic, that masses, by means of their work produce a reality which enslaves them to an increasing degree and threatens them with every kind of suffering. ("Formulation of Critical Theory" 184)

As illustrated by Horkheimer, the masses in the bourgeois society are formed by a state of false consciousness as people struggle against each other to improve their condition in the hierarchical social structure. Since they do not realise that the system subordinates them in the first place, they continue to serve this system and submit themselves to the hegemonic bourgeois social order. As Adorno and Horkheimer suggest, a questioning approach can only be provided by individuality, through which the individual questions the social structure that leads to the suffering of the masses. Since liberal capitalism, the economic order in the nineteenth-century England, promoted rivalry among individuals to have better social circumstances and oppressed them in a state of false consciousness to maintain their servitude, the bourgeois Victorian social order always conflicted with individuality. Margaret Hale's role in this social and economic structure is important in that she triggers the questioning process in a middle-class mill owner John Thornton and a worker Nicholas Higgins in the novel, who can be considered as examples to the masses until they begin to question the system (*North and South* 286). She believes that once Thornton and Higgins could think independently from social norms, they would contend that a form of mutual understanding would be possible. Margaret enables them to question their roles as a mill owner and a worker in the industrial society. She is also a social critic for Gaskell since, as pointed out above, her education in London among her upper-middle-class relatives and her childhood experiences in Helstone lead her to ask questions as regards the validity of the established middle-class social order in Milton. In this respect, Margaret is considered to achieve individuality in *North and South* as she questions bourgeois ideology in a state of consciousness. Hence, Margaret's unusual manners and habits according to the acceptable social norms in Milton, as well as her attempts to resolve social problems between the middle-class and the working-class members, lead other characters like Thornton and Higgins to question the bourgeois ideology.

It is important to note that the industrial and capitalist mid-Victorian society creates a false consciousness to control these individuals easily and to protect the status quo against individualistic challenges for a harmonious social order. The state of false consciousness serves bourgeois interests as the individuals' behaviours and decisions are restricted by means of regulatory norms. Hence, society aims to prevent the

individuals from realising their subjection by the system. For the Frankfurt School critical theory, this state of false consciousness destroys individuality since the individual can no longer challenge social oppression. In a letter dated 14 July 1893, the nineteenth-century German social scientist, political theorist, philosopher and father of Marxist theory Friedrich Engels states that

> ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker [or, the individual] consciously, indeed, but with a false consciousness. The real motives impelling him remain unknown to him […]. Hence he imagines false or apparent motives. […] He works with mere thought material which he accepts without examination […], he does not investigate further for a more remote process […]; indeed its origin seems obvious to him, because as all action is produced through the medium of thought, it also appears to him to be ultimately based upon thought. (Engels)

Hence, the individuals are incapable of realising the true nature of exploitation, oppression and social hegemony created by the impositions of the bourgeois society. Herbert Marcuse asserts that "the products [of the industrial bourgeois society] indoctrinate and manipulate; they promote a false consciousness which is immune against its falsehood" (*One Dimensional Man* 46). For the neo-Marxist Frankfurt School critical theory, false consciousness is the way in which ideological, institutional and social processes in capitalist society mislead the individuals in order to hide the "true nature" of the relations of forces between social classes and "the state of social affairs" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 47). Through false consciousness, the ideological, institutional and social processes aim to maintain the status quo in the industrial society for the economic and social privileges of the powerful middle class that establishes this system for their own benefits. The middle-class values in *North and South* create false consciousness to establish middle-class social and cultural hegemony. False consciousness thus makes the individuals agree with the idea that the middle-class values serve their benefits, whereas these social values actually serve the status quo for the benefits of the bourgeoisie. For example, John Thornton in *North and South* cares about the expectations of society and tries to be a respectable man. The ideology of respectability requires him, first of all, to be a successful man in his job. As a mill owner, he must be successful in trade so that other mill owners respect him. Thornton's father is the best warning for him, since failure in business led to his suicide when

Thornton was a little child (*North and South* 80). Thornton's difficult times and struggle to survive in the industrial bourgeois society is depicted as follows:

> [The Thornton family] absolutely lived upon water-porridge for years—how, [Mr Bell] did not know; but long after the creditors had given up hope of any payment of old Mr. Thornton's debts (if, indeed, they ever had hoped at all about it, after his suicide,) this young man [Thornton] returned to Milton, and went quietly round to each creditor, paying him the first instalment of the money owing to him. No noise—no gathering together of creditors—it was done very silently and quietly, but all was paid at last. (*North and South* 82)

Clearly, Thornton suffered after his father's suicide as the son of a failed manufacturer in the bourgeois society. Since he is aware of the significance of respectability in the mid-Victorian society, he tries hard to restore the family's reputation as a respectable family by paying the debts of his father. His silence also shows that he just wants to be done with the creditors and continue his life as a conformist member of the community. Furthermore, Victorian ideal of domesticity is important for him since creating a safe domestic environment for his mother and sister through economic and social success makes him a respectable man in the middle-class society (*North and South* 78-79). Thornton has learned that he can achieve respectability as a mill owner as long as he complies with the norms of bourgeois and capitalist social order. However, he is not aware of his subjection by the middle-class norms until the end of the novel. According to the Frankfurt School critical perspective, although Thornton assumes that he is an independent individual who follows his free will, he actually obeys the normative social values of the Victorian society. His obedience to the social norms serves only the capitalist and industrial social structure. The Victorian society expects Thornton to act the social role of a middle-class mill owner without questioning his responsibilities. As Thornton's case illustrates, while adoption of the middle-class values without questioning is achieved through false consciousness in the industrial society, the individual who questions these normative values needs consciousness to criticise these truths continuously in order to reconstruct the relationship between himself – the individual – and society.

When Thornton is treated as a conformist middle-class individual who begins to change, it seems that Margaret influences his opinions and moves him towards a more

challenging position. In contrast to Thornton who achieves respectability by means of his conformity to the social expectations, Margaret is a symbol of contest against social norms. She is a conscious individual in the bourgeois society, which could be observed in the simplicity of her manners – pointed out by Henry Lennox earlier in the novel – and her sense of freedom associated with the independence in Helstone. Margaret continues to question the bourgeois values beginning with her ignorance towards Thornton in Milton (*North and South* 62) and her disapproval of the grandeur in Thornton's house (*North and South* 141). She tests the validity of bourgeois values from her own perspective and disputes their truth through her reactions towards Thornton. As a conscious individual that challenges bourgeois social values in London, Margaret starts a new process for Thornton in which he comes to realise the repressive social order condemning him to a lifestyle standardised by the bourgeois benefits. Margaret's move from Helstone to London and, then, from Helstone to Milton in *North and South*, thus, helps to reveal the hegemonic attitude of the middle class towards the individual in the industrial society. Horkheimer argues that "all factors in the total societal process are held to be in the process of movement. This includes the relation of parts to whole. Through the constant interaction and development of parts – whether they be individuals, social classes, or institutions – the whole also changes, realising some of the possibilities given in prior stages" ("Formulation of Critical Theory" 181). Margaret Hale plays an important part in the relationship between individuals – parts of the whole – and the Victorian society – the whole – since her rural background and experience of freedom from social hegemony in Helstone enable her to question the middle-class social norms of the Victorian era both in London and in Milton.

The social and cultural formation of the Victorian society in *North and South*, thus, shows a panorama dominated by the hegemonic middle-class values in economy, manners and attitudes. The upper-middle-class manners and habits that Margaret was exposed to during her nine-year education in Harley Street in London change to a great extent in the north, but the social expectations in Milton are still determined by the norms of propriety and respectability. As Mark Girouard points out, "different sets of values are seen working through different (though sometimes overlapping) sections of all classes. One can see this model at work, more generally, in all the different interests

and enthusiasms which informed the Victorians. Almost any Victorian activity can be followed up the social pyramid to a peak made up of aristocrats" (49). In other words, the bourgeois society in the industrial city of Milton has established economic and social rules, which are to be obeyed by both middle-class and working-class people.

The bourgeois ideal and the conflict it leads to between society and the individual can be observed in Thornton's life in *North and South*. John Thornton was born and bred in Milton and spent his life in industrial rivalry against other manufacturers. Moreover, he has struggled for financial benefits against the workers who claim their rights for better living conditions. As an inhabitant of the industrial city Milton, Thornton is accustomed to the social circumstances of industrial rivalry particular to the north. Accordingly, as a man of business in the industrial society, it is necessary for Thornton to continue his control among the middle-class people and the workers, as argued below. However, Thornton's control and assertive manners are challenged during his first encounter with Margaret, who creates the image of an unusually confident young girl quite astounding for Thornton:

> He did not understand who she was, as he caught the simple, straight, unabashed look, which showed that his being there was of no concern to the beautiful countenance and called up no flush of surprise to the ivory of the complexion. […] Mr Thornton was in habits of authority himself, but she seemed to assume some kind of rule over him at once. […] [N]ow he calmly took a seat at her bidding. (*North and South* 58)

Clearly, Margaret's bold and confident manners in this meeting are unexpected from Thornton's perspective and the young lady's attitude is quite challenging for Thornton. Perplexed by Margaret's treatment, Thornton feels it necessary to stay in the room rather than rushing for his business (*North and South* 58). Her attitude leads Thornton to question his own condition in the company of this unexpected lady. Her straight manner is a source of disturbance for him, since he interprets this manner as a kind of rejection of his masculine authority: "Thornton was a good deal more surprised and discomfited than she. Instead of a quite, middle-aged clergyman, a young lady came forward with frank dignity, - a young lady of a different type to most of those he was in the habit of seeing" (*North and South* 58). Clearly, Margaret "rule[s] over" Thornton in her self confidence (*North and South* 58). Margaret overlooks Thornton's expectation of a

submissive role for a woman and even bids Thornton to take a seat, which is a source of "discomfiture" for the mill owner who believes that he is "rule[d] over at once" (*North and South* 58). As Jessica Malay underlines, "control of the self and of others is essential to the Victorian understanding of masculinity and class structure" (41). The middle-class male can maintain his authority only by means of economic and social supremacy. Margaret's indifference towards this authority and her self-confidence, rather than a submissive attitude, contributes to Thornton's insecurity in her company. Malay argues that "if money is the motivator for Thornton […], a secure masculine identity is the goal" (48). As a manufacturer, economic concern in production and trade plays a very important role in Thornton's interests to bring him a respectable status, which is obvious in his eagerness to go back to work: "He had been getting impatient at the loss of his time on a market-day, the moment before she appeared" (*North and South* 58). Thornton cannot tolerate loss of time since his enterprise at the mill depends on his success in trade. While he is startled by this meeting, Margaret is also troubled with Thornton's rude and impolite behaviour: "She thinks Thornton so far beneath her socially that she does not respond to him as a man at all" (Garson 303). Margaret complains about Thornton's ignorance towards her, which is inappropriate for a respectable young man:

> He [Thornton] never went on with any subject, but gave little, short, abrupt answers. […] I hardly know what he is like. […] About thirty – with a face that is neither exactly plain, nor yet handsome, nothing remarkable – not quite a gentleman; but that was hardly to be expected. […] With such an expression of resolution and power, no face, however plain in feature, could be either vulgar or common. I should not like to have to bargain with him. He looks very inflexible. Altogether a man who seems made for his niche, mamma; sagacious, and strong, as becomes a great tradesman. (*North and South* 60)

The first impression that Thornton leaves on Margaret shows a man of the industrial north, dedicated to his work, without any concern for his environment – even to a young and impressive lady like her, as he interprets her – except for the economic or industrial issues. He is quite resolute and powerful in his interests, to the extent that he disturbs Margaret since he seems to be ready for all topics in a conversation as long as they are matters regarding industry. Roper and Tosh argue that "masculinity (like femininity) is a relational construct, incomprehensible apart from the totality of gender relations; and

it is shaped in relation to men's social power" (2). Thornton's social power, which is actually his respectable status in the bourgeois society, requires him to deal with economic issues in his business all the time for a successful career. While masculinity plays an important role in this social power, it also reflects his propriety, or his adoption of the middle-class values. As Catherine Stevenson also states, "[Thornton] is shown to have entered industry in order to redeem a compromised masculinity. [He] does this by transforming himself into a self-made man, thrifty, self-denying, entrepreneurial and contemptuous of others who haven't made it" (11). After his father committed suicide and left the family in debt, it was Thornton, who, with the support of his mother, became a successful manufacturer to pay the debts of his father and to provide a wealthy life for his mother and sister. Hence, he is a self-made man, and he is self-denying and thrifty. Although these features are highly esteemed in Milton among the middle-class people and render Thornton unrivalled among other manufacturers, Margaret considers his features to be insufficient to become a gentleman as she clearly puts it in her description, "nor yet handsome, nothing remarkable – not quite a gentleman" (*North and South* 60). As Duthie explains,

> Margaret Hale feels certain, on first seeing Thornton, that he will never conceivably qualify as a gentleman. One cannot but admire the skill with which Elizabeth Gaskell, through her use of Margaret as the focal point of the entire novel, relates the conflict of interests to the deeper conflict of values and makes of an industrial novel at the same time a far-sighted analysis of the problems of a new society in the process of evolution. (80)

Hence, Victorian social values in the north and south are compared in a brief meeting between the protagonist Margaret Hale and John Thornton. While the industrial northern community is controlled by the middle-class values leading to a conflict between the individual and society, the southern rural community of Helstone is characterised by individual freedom as Margaret feels in her hometown. Although Thornton and Higgins understand social values of the industrial society since they live in the same community, Margaret provides the questioning approach due to her southern origins. The northern community and its social values are, thus, questioned from Margaret's perspective, and this critical perspective is directed towards the industrial and bourgeois society. As Adorno and Horkheimer suggest, for industrial society, it might be argued that the acceptable social role of a respectable manufacturer

for Thornton is imposed on him by the mid-Victorian society. He begins to assess his values again in a questioning manner after Margaret provides a new perspective for him in social matters. Thornton's state of false consciousness might be challenged and replaced by a state of consciousness if he develops an awareness of the social hegemony on himself. As Horkheimer states "[…] masses, by means of their work, produce a reality which enslaves them to an increasing degree" ("Formulation of Critical Theory" 184). In the representation of the industrial society in Gaskell's *North and South*, Thornton, by means of his hard work and success in business, serves the benefits of the middle class, so that he is enslaved by the social norms to increase the middle-class hegemony on the individual. In a state of false consciousness, he fulfils the social role assigned by society without questioning. In fact, Thornton serves the social system, while he believes that he is acting for his own benefits as he becomes more powerful through his economic success.

In addition to the differences between Thornton's and Margaret's attitudes, the social setting of the industrial society should also be taken into account in order to analyse the social oppression on the individual. A closer look into their households demonstrates that Thornton is strictly controlled in the domestic sphere, whereas Margaret is more individualistic through her freedom in the decoration of their house. The middle-class hegemony on the individual and the consequences of the lack of freedom of the individual are observed in the visits between Thornton and the Hale family. When Thornton visits the Hale family for the first time, he observes a great contrast in terms of domestic habits (*North and South* 73). While the influence of the anxiety for social appearances could be observed in Thornton's house (*North and South* 75), Margaret acts much more independently in the decoration of the Hales' house (*North and South* 105). As Thornton strives to become middle class, the quality of the furniture in his house reflects his social concerns. The freedom of Margaret in decorating their house for their own comfort is quite surprising for Thornton, because he realises that the Hales decorate their house just for their comfort, rather than showing off in the manufacturing middle-class community. The domestic setting of the Hales is depicted in comparison to Thornton's home as follows:

> Somehow, that room [Margaret's drawing room] contrasted itself with the one he [Thornton] had lately left [the drawing room in Thornton's home]; handsome, ponderous, with no sign of feminine habitation, except in the one spot where his mother sat, and no convenience for any other employment than eating and drinking. To be sure, it was a dining-room; his mother preferred to sit in; and her will was a household law. (*North and South* 74)

In the house of the bourgeois mill-owner, the interior design reflects the bourgeois taste strongly advocated by his mother. However, Margaret's influence for convenience and comfort does not consider social response. Thornton's mother, Mrs Thornton, absolutely controls all domestic issues in an authoritarian manner in his house without giving him an opportunity to decide the interior design: "He [Thornton] never thought of interfering in any of the small domestic regulations that Mrs. Thornton observed, in habitual remembrance of her old economies" (*North and South* 133-134). Thornton's perception and comparison of the house continues as follows:

> The drawing room [in Thornton's home] was not like this. It was twice – twenty times as fine; not one quarter as comfortable. Here were no mirrors, not even a scrap of glass to reflect the light, and answer the same purpose as water in a landscape; no gilding; a warm, sober breadth of colouring, well relieved by the dear old Helstone chintz-curtains and chair covers. […] Pretty baskets of work stood about in different places: and books, not cared for on account of their binding solely, lay on one table, as if recently put down. (*North and South* 74)

As Thornton compares this house to his own, he recognises that it is a comfortable domestic environment, rather than a reflection of the anxiety to keep up appearances. Although his typically middle-class house seems to be congruous with the norms of his middle-class environment for the respectability of a wealthy manufacturer, as "it was twice – twenty times as fine", he realises that his luxurious house is not comfortable at all: "[…] Not one quarter as comfortable" (*North and South* 74). This realisation is possible only after Thornton visits the Hales' house, where he observes that these people decorate their house only for their own comfort. This comparison makes it clear for Thornton that conformity with social expectations for the sake of respectability constrains him to live in line with the hegemonic middle-class values. Thornton is subjected by bourgeois hegemony.

The middle-class domestic environment is just an example of social appearances in Milton. Before the arrival of the Hales, Thornton did not realise the imposed taste of the middle-class community in a state of false consciousness. He could not question even his mother's will in the domestic design in a submissive attitude. However, his consciousness develops in line with his interactions with Margaret and her sense of freedom. Margaret's freedom from such impositions like caring for social appearances in the decoration of their house is clear even before the family moves into Milton. When Margaret sees the wallpaper in their new house in Milton, she asks them to be changed for their "taste" and "comfort" (*North and South* 59). She has no concern for the opinion of other people, so that she does not look for luxurious household goods for their home, which is contrary to the case in Thornton's house. She complains to her mother that "oh mamma! Speaking of vulgarity and commonness, you must prepare yourself for our drawing-room paper. Pink and blue roses, with yellow leaves! And such a heavy cornice around the room!" (*North and South* 61). This complaint about the colour of the wallpaper shows the anxiety of the Hales in creating a domestic environment only for their comfort. Margaret's desire for a simple decoration reflects her individualistic taste compared to the Thorntons' care for bourgeois taste in luxurious decoration in order to show off and impress the middle-class community through economic power and social status in Milton.

In this respect, it must be stated that in the nineteenth-century English society, the middle class intended to create a homogenous lifestyle that was obeyed by all members of society through common social values that organised domestic environment and decoration of the interior space. As Garson states, "no doubt relevant to Gaskell's wallpaper episode was the establishment in 1853 of the Department of Science and Art, to diffuse taste throughout English society, with the aim of refining the products of British industry" (304). On the matter of refining British taste in art and encouraging technological developments, the department reflected taste of the bourgeoisie and enabled its imposition on society. Richard Jarrell points out that

> the creation of the Department of Science and Art was both an experiment in government and a reflection of bureaucratic process. Commissioned by the commissioners of the 1851 London Exhibition, themselves mindful of the fact that the United Kingdom was in peril of losing its paramount position amongst

> industrial nations, the department was to be organiser and overseer of a system of industrial education for the working class. This reflected the ideas […] that science must be taught to those who actually came into daily contact with technological processes [and] that science and technology were the bases for national wealth. (331-332)

Clearly, the lifestyle of the Victorian people was strictly monitored and controlled by a social institution to establish bourgeois social order, which would increase national power and wealth on an international scale. The condition of the individual was not as important as the social benefits, which the department policy indicates through the education of the people. It can be suggested that refinement, simplicity and tasteful decoration of the domestic environment in a homogenous manner had become main concerns of the bourgeois Victorian society as early as the 1850s. It can be further argued that the wallpaper incident in the novel reflects the hegemony of the Victorian society on the individual even in the decoration of a house. Thornton lives in a house decorated in line with the social expectations that require respectability through showing off in the middle-class community, although he does not find it comfortable. Margaret Hale challenges his understanding of the domestic environment during this visit. Thornton realises that the middle-class taste is imposed on his domestic environment, even though he does not enjoy it. His realisation may be considered as a sort of awakening as regards social hegemony on the individual. The visit returned by Margaret and her father is important in that the values of the new manufacturing middle class might be compared to the southern values and there is an indication of Thornton's rising consciousness. Thornton begins to question his middle-class environment and the middle-class domestic ideals. Garson states that

> a sociologist might see him as an upwardly mobile young man, eager to assimilate the preferences of his social betters, who is studying to rise into their class. […] Margaret's proper taste in wallpaper is a reliable sign of her feeling for domestic harmony and comfort and Thornton's appreciation of it a reliable sign of his readiness to take what she has to give. (304)

During Margaret's visit to Thornton's house, Margaret also wonders "why people who afford to live in so good a house, and keep it in such perfect order, did not prefer a much smaller dwelling in the country, or even some suburb; not in the continual whirl and din of the factory" (*North and South* 105). The design of Thornton's house (*North and*

*South* 105, 106, 107, 150) and the preparations for social occasions when other middle-class mill owners were invited (*North and South* 149, 150,151) aim to create an image of a respectable family on behalf of the Thorntons. Hence, the respectable families in Milton and members of the respectable middle class will be acquainted with them. The feast at Thornton's house and the visit of the mill owners are exactly like the visits between middle-class families in London that were strictly regulated by social norms and aimed at establishing social bonds with respectable people. The abundance of luxurious items and the desire to show off prove the significance of social appearances for respectability.

These rituals in the domestic sphere show that the individuals are forced to lead their lives in accordance with the bourgeois taste, which is an example of social control on the individuals. In the Victorian era, the oppression of the individual starts in the domestic environment where the individual is introduced to the normative values as unquestionable facts. Due to the training in the domestic environment from childhood onwards for conforming to social expectations, the individual does not question bourgeois hegemony as it is naturalised by society. Similar to the imposition of bourgeois values on Margaret Hale in London during her training for nine years, Thornton is also imposed on bourgeois values in his own home, which addresses middle-class taste and values, rather than his own, as he realises only after meeting Margaret. Under the influence of her middle-class taste she has acquired in Aunt Shaw's house in London, Margaret judges upon Thornton's domestic environment. As Samuel Smiles asserts "home is the first and most important school of character. It is there that every human being receives his best moral training, or his worst; for it is there that he imbibes those principles of conduct which endure through manhood, and cease only with life" (*Character* 31). These social events are part of the attempt at social structuring. It is clear that the necessity for propriety in society is actually a form of repression on Thornton.

In *North and South,* Mrs Thornton reflects the influence of social hegemony in Thornton's life as she has learned from the mistakes of her husband that it is necessary to comply with social norms. She has raised her son in order to conform to social

expectations thoroughly, because she discovered in her loneliness in the bourgeois industrial society that economic success and a respectable social status are vital in the Victorian society to be recognised as decent people: "All his [Thornton's father's] former friends shrunk from the disclosures that had to be made of his dishonest—wild, hopeless struggles, made with other people's money, to regain his own moderate portion of wealth. No one came forwards to help the mother and this boy" following her husband's failure in business (*North and South* 82). In addition to this isolation from bourgeois environment, the hierarchical social structure condemned Mrs Thornton and her children to poverty among the lower class: "They absolutely lived upon water-porridge for years – how, he did not know" (*North and South* 82).. In line with Mrs Thornton's guidance, Thornton has become an ambitious young man for respectability among the middle-class people in Milton:

> Long after the creditors had given up hope of any payment of old Mr. Thornton's debts (if, indeed, they ever had hoped at all about it, after his suicide,) this young man [Thornton] returned to Milton, and went quietly round to each creditor, paying him the first instalment of the money. No noise—no gathering together of creditors—it was done very silently and quietly, but all was paid at last; helped on materially by the circumstance of one of the creditors, a crabbed old fellow (Mr. Bell says), taking in Mr. Thornton as a kind of partner. (*North and South* 82)

Clearly, under the guidance of his mother, Thornton has learnt the significance of respectability and works hard to provide a respectable status for himself and for his family. While Mrs Thornton had to acquiesce to the demands of the system, she imposes these demands on her son in order to protect him from a lower status in society. For Mrs Thornton, her son is the only means of respectability in the industrial society after her husband has gone bankrupt and committed suicide. She considers Thornton as "the principal, the sole object, - her son, her pride, her property" (*North and South* 194). Accordingly, Mrs Thornton objects to Thornton's study of classical texts with Mr Hale since it is not appropriate for a respectable mill owner in her opinion, while Thornton is supposed to work harder for success in business. Her reaction demonstrates the attitude of bourgeois society towards the individuals who do not follow social expectations. For Mrs Thornton, a respectable middle-class mill owner should be dealing only with trade to rise successfully on the social scale. She reflects middle-class work ethic that underlies bourgeois pragmatism and material gain. Mr Hale and Thornton are

acquainted since Thornton wants to study classics and Mr Hale tutors him in these subjects. Mrs Thornton, however, rejects the learning of such texts since she is a defender of the established middle-class norms that require a mill owner to be successful focusing just on his trade:

> I have no doubt the classics are very desirable for people who have leisure. But, I confess, it was against my judgement that my son renewed his study of them. The time and place in which he lives, seem to me to require all his energy and attention. Classics may do very well for men who loiter away their lives in the country or in colleges; but Milton men ought to have their thoughts and powers absorbed in the work of today. At least, that is my opinion. (*North and South* 106)

Mrs Thornton believes in strict work ethic for the middle-class mill owner. Although she explains this as her opinion, she actually expresses social expectations. As Duthie states, "in the industrial milieu of Milton, wealth, and the power wealth gives, are the standards by which success is judged, and the new social prestige of money clashes with the centuries-old prestige of class. […] Culture is another traditional value which has depreciated in the industrial world" (81). Cultural hegemony of the middle class has established new social norms through economic power like the work ethic expressed by Mrs Thornton. Margaret tries to argue against Mrs Thornton as she believes that concentration on a single object like trade might be hazardous in accordance with her understanding of education acquired in Helstone and London that prioritises the traditional value of culture and old texts: "Surely, if the mind is too long directed to one object only, it will get stiff and rigid, and unable to take in many interests" (*North and South* 106). However, for Mrs Thornton, the symbol of the new manufacturing middle class in *North and South,* wealth and its power entailed by success in business are of vital importance, because she knows that economic success is necessary to achieve respectability in the bourgeois society. She thinks that the middle-class pioneering role in industrialisation has firmly established middle-class cultural hegemony. Mrs Thornton believes that

> [h]aving many interests does not suit the life of a Milton manufacturer. It is, or ought to be, enough for him to have one great desire, and to bring all the purposes of his life to bear on the fulfilment of that. […] To hold and maintain a high, honourable place among the merchants of his country – the men of his town. Such a place my son has earned for himself. Go where you will – I don't say in England

> only, but in Europe – the name of John Thornton of Milton is known and respected amongst all men of business. (*North and South* 106)

The concept of an ideal man is, thus, defined within the context of respectability, which includes success in business, responsibility towards his family, complying with the norms of domesticity and a notable status in society. Mrs Thornton stresses success at work as the key to respectability in the bourgeois mid-Victorian society. Indeed, Thornton has already adopted these middle-class values, and he is not aware of the social repression on him as an individual. Mrs Thornton has stated that "to hold and maintain a high, honourable place among the merchants of his country – the men of his town" is a priority for the Milton mill owners (*North and South* 106). Likewise, Thornton also asserts that "now when I feel that in my own case it is no good luck, nor merit, nor talent, - but simply the habits of life which taught me to despise indulgences not thoroughly earned, - indeed, never to think twice about them" (*North and South* 79). This is the middle-class work ethic, which is the primary requirement for all mill owners: Work harder and manufacture more products to earn more. For this reason, Thornton believes that "this suffering, which Miss Hale says is impressed on the countenances of the people of Milton, is but the natural punishment of dishonestly-enjoyed pleasure, at some former period of their lives. I do not look on self-indulgent, sensual people as worthy of my hatred; I simply look upon them with contempt for their poorness of character" (*North and South* 80). Thornton's opinion proves that he is clearly a product of the Victorian society, constructed through the middle-class values. Clearly, he associates respectability with middle-class work ethic that depends on hard-working and self-denial. As stated above, Thornton's lifestyle and his values present the power of dominant ideology on the individual.

Thornton is a repressed individual as he is made to accept the middle-class taste in his household defended by his mother Mrs Thornton. Until Thornton is acquainted with the Hale family and encounters their domestic environment, he does not question whether the decoration in his house is really suitable for his taste. In other words, Thornton lives in a house that conforms to the dominant bourgeois taste, which is supposed to bring respectability according to Mrs Thornton, as it is clear in the visit by other middle-class members. So, Thornton reproduces the social context that oppresses him in the first

place, which definitely makes him a repressed individual. As Garson argues "Gaskell associates such narrowness of focus [that of Mrs Thornton both in education and social life] with bad taste. She positions the Thornton women, steely Mrs Thornton and enervated Fanny, as foils to Margaret, and the Thornton mansion with its showy vulgarity as the antithesis of all the values, domestic and aesthetic, exemplified by the heroine" (305). Margaret's critical perspective poses questions on the validity of the middle-class values in Thornton's social environment in Milton. The comparison between the Thorntons' and Margaret's taste shows that the Thornton family is so occupied with social appearances that they do not realise their own vulgarity, which is exposed only after Margaret's design of the Hales' house is depicted as a criticism of their lifestyle. Margaret's values, both domestic and social, are presented in this case as the antithesis of the middle-class social values adopted by the Thorntons. Thornton might be also regarded as Margaret's antithesis due to his adoption of Victorian middle-class social norms. As a sign of his submission to these social expectations, Thornton states that "now that I am able to afford my mother such comforts as her age, rather than her own wish requires, I thank her silently on each occasion for the early training she gave me" (*North and South* 79). He is, therefore, a respectable member of the Victorian society as a result of his obedience and conformity and has become an exemplary mill owner to continue production in his mill and to contribute to the authority of the middle class and its ideology by means of economic power and cultural hegemony. While promoting middle-class lifestyle and norms, he comes to reproduce a homogenous Victorian social order centred on the middle-class values. Thornton is an individual in the Victorian society who is, thus, controlled by the normative social values, which actually establish and maintain bourgeois status quo.

However, Thornton is more a figure of conflict than a figure of conformity. Although initially he is presented as a typical middle-class mill owner who has adopted the bourgeois values as stated above, after meeting Margaret, Thornton develops a new point of view and interprets middle-class values differently. In this respect, Thornton's attitude during the strikes started by Higgins's union can be interpreted as an evidence of Thornton's conformity to the established social order just like his mother: "Mr Hale began to talk about the strike. Mr Thornton's face assumed a likeness to his mother's

worst expression" (*North and South* 109). For his economic power in trade and respectability among the middle-class circles, Thornton treats the workers in his mill in a relentless manner as a sign of his authority. In a hostile attitude towards the workers, Thornton does not yield to the demands of the workers. He says that

> the fools [workers] will have a strike. Let them. It suits us well enough. But we gave them a chance. They think trade is flourishing as it was last year. We see the storm on the horizon and draw in our sails. But because we don't explain our reasons, they won't believe we're acting reasonably. We must give them line and letter for the way we choose to spend or save our money. […] We Milton masters have today sent in our decision. We won't advance a penny. We tell them we may have to lower wages; but can't afford to raise. So here we stand, waiting for their next attack. (*North and South* 110)

Thornton's opinion explains the middle-class attitude towards the working-class people. For him, working-class demands have no meaning at all. In this social structure, which lacks mutual trust and understanding, Thornton, just like any other middle-class member, knows that there is a war between social classes. Enid Duthie states that "with his pride in the achievements of industry, Thornton combines a strong sense of independence. He feels that he belongs to a new order, which should evolve its own laws. The pride of a new urban aristocracy is reflected in his attitude to his workers" (76). The new industrial order expects Thornton to act in a way that keeps his authority over the working class and among the mill owners in an authoritarian manner. His respectability depends on his economic and social power and Thornton clearly enjoys economic and social power over the workers and mill owners. The main reason for the industrial strife is, thus, revealed through the middle-class obsession for economic and social control in society. Such actions that result from social norms are not to be considered as personal choices in the bourgeois industrial society, as Horkheimer states, "every human way of acting which hides the true nature of society, built as it is on antagonisms, is ideological" ("Notes on Science and the Crisis," 55). If respectability is considered as an ideology, Thornton's actions serve the benefits and expectations of this ideology, while there is apparently a mill owner who fights for his interests. In *North and South*, Thornton's actions and decisions reflect bourgeois respectability as an ideological construct.

In the conflict between the mill owners and the workers, it is clear that the middle class is ready for a war to defend their economic and social benefits against the working class. Thornton imagines himself waiting for an attack by his opponents against the bourgeois social order. Although his decisions as the master influence the workers more than his fellow middle-class mill owners, he ignores their cause and rejects their arguments in order to protect his respectable status among other mill owners. The functioning of the middle-class economic policy that serves bourgeois benefits and its negative consequences on the working class underlines the difference between the powerful middle class and the disempowered working class. Horkheimer further states that "as an existing society is increasingly endangered by its internal tensions, the energies spent in maintaining an ideology grow greater and finally the weapons are readied for supporting it with violence" ("Notes on Science and the Crisis," 55). Indeed, Thornton justifies his decisions and actions through arguments in political economy, and the industrial strife between him and the workers comes to a peak during the strike, which is eventually suppressed by the armed forces after Margaret has been wounded by a stone thrown by the striking workers. The withdrawal of the strikers as they move away from Thornton's home is depicted as follows:

> The retrograde movement towards the gate had begun – as unreasoningly, perhaps as blindly, as the simultaneous anger. Or, perhaps, the idea of the approach of the soldiers […] even the most desperate – Boucher himself – drew back, faltered away, scowled, and finally went off, muttering curses on the master, who stood in the unchanging attitude, looking after their retreat with defiant eyes. The moment that retreat had changed into a flight (as it was sure from its very character), he darted up the steps to Margaret. (*North and South* 168)

The struggle of the workers is aimed at the social order in *North and South*. The individuals like Higgins and Boucher try to defend their economic rights against the established order. The workers' attack at Thornton's house is actually an attack at the social system that condemns them to poverty and desolation. The bourgeois social order is protected by the armed soldiers that reflect the system against the protesting individuals who challenge social impositions. Since the middle-class domination in society results from economic power, which also entails social and political power, the capitalist economy and middle-class economic interests are highly crucial in the construction of the bourgeois social order. The doctrines of this new economic system

play a very important role in the social structure, as it is clear in the conflict between the middle class and the working class in *North and South*. Herbert Marcuse claims that "the transformation of economic conditions involves the transformation of the entirety of human existence. […] In a society whose totality was determined by economic relations to the extent that the uncontrolled economy controlled all human relations, even the noneconomic was contained in the economy" ("Philosophy and Critical Theory," 63). As stated above, nineteenth-century England is characterised by changing dynamics in the social and economic aspects of life. The changing economic doctrines towards an industrial and capitalist order fundamentally changed the social structure, which is now controlled by the middle class as a result of their increasing economic power. As Marcuse has stated, "economic relations" control all social interactions, so that the capitalist and industrial society is constructed according to the economic benefits of the middle class ("Philosophy and Critical Theory," 64). Society is transformed throughout the century as a result of economic and social developments.

Accordingly, industrialisation thoroughly changes mid-Victorian social structure in Gaskell's *North and South*. The social environment in Margaret Hale's hometown Helstone is completely different from what she experiences in London, and even more different in Milton. The transformation of the Victorian society from an agricultural to an industrial society is accompanied by the changing economic and political doctrines. The notions of *laissez-faire* trade and the capitalist economy glorified by the industrial middle class, as discussed above in Thornton's reactions, are responded by Chartism and the trade unions by the working class as Higgins and his friends exemplify: "I'm a member o' the Union; and I think it's the only thing to do the workman any good. And I've been a turn-out, and known what it were to clem [starve]; so if I get a shilling, sixpence shall go to them if they axe it from me" (*North and South* 270). These economic changes influence all individuals whether they are from the middle class or the working class. However, "The labour process," as Marcuse states, includes the entire process about how people work, who controls their work and, in a broader sense, how "methods of the capitalist management reduce pleasure" in strict control ("Philosophy and Critical Theory," 65). The working-class individual, in this economic order, is subject to the brutality of management skills and capitalist control in social life,

because social and political issues in daily life are all related to the economic issues in the capitalist and industrial society of the Victorians. For a rational social order, Marcuse supports "freedom" of the masses from the bourgeois social control that appears in the form of restrictive social norms and "happiness" of the working-class individuals in the capitalist and industrial society ("Philosophy and Critical Theory," 65). The individual's happiness and freedom are necessary in this society. The conflict between the individual and society is resolved as the economic concerns in the bourgeois Victorian society cease to function like social boundaries in noneconomic issues. So, Thornton desires to be free from the established norms of the Victorian society: "I have been unsuccesfull in business, and have had to give up my position as a master. […] I can depend upon myself for having no go-ahead theories that I would rashly bring into practice. My only wish is to have the opportunity of cultivating some intercourse with the hands beyond the mere 'cash-nexus'" (*North and South* 398). The 'cash-nexus' he mentions refers to the anxiety to increase his profits and to make more money, which was to bring him respectability. However, Thornton is also aware of the fact that his desire is almost impossible: "But it might be the point Archimedes sought from which to move the earth, to judge from the importance attached to it by some of our manufacturers, who shake their heads and look grave as soon as I name the one or two experiments that I should like to try" (*North and South* 398). Thornton's opinion is formed as such towards the end of the novel, because Margaret Hale causes great changes in his understanding. Until the strike scene in the novel, Thornton only cares for "the cash-nexus" (*North and South* 316). However, beginning with Margaret's intervention and her desire to protect Thornton from the striking mob, he replaces the cash-nexus with the human interest.

In line with the criticism of the bourgeois industrial social structure, Thornton becomes an individual in a second stage of his life, when he begins to act for his freedom of social constraints and happiness of his social environment. At the point of the crisis and the strike, Margaret is also involved in the class conflict between the middle class and the working class since her perspective is presented as an objective way of looking at this industrial conflict. She initially reckons Thornton's right on his investment as "a human right" without challenging him (*North and South* 110). This comment seems to

be a justification of the masters' argument. However, Margaret continues her comments as regards this class conflict and says that "on the very face of it, I see two classes dependent on each other in every possible way, yet each evidently regarding the interests of the other as opposed to their own; I never lived in a place before where there were sets of people always running each other down" (*North and South* 111). The north of England characterised by industrialisation is a site of economic and social struggle between these two classes. As a southerner, Margaret is unaware of the economic terms or conditions of these middle-class and working-class people. Still, believing in the futility of an endless class struggle and supporting the workers, she states that "it was considered to the advantage of the masters to have ignorant workmen, not hedge-lawyers […] who questioned and would know the reason for every order" (*North and South* 111). Furthermore, she mentions the name of Higgins, the unionist worker, and repeats the working-class view about the masters: "The masters would like their hands to be merely tall, large children – living in the present moment – with a blind unreasoning kind of obedience" (*North and South* 112). Margaret blames the masters, the middle-class representatives, for their cruelty and lack of understanding. As a solution to the class conflict, however, Margaret maintains that this mutual threat and hatred constitutes the main reason for the industrial struggle between middle class and working class. Her perspective is supported through her search for friendly acquaintances among the inhabitants of this industrial city. The capitalist economy renders the mill owner cruel towards the worker, while the worker sees the master as an enemy. So, the working-class individual and the middle-class individual hate each other because of the economic doctrines and the social values that are produced by the social system. The individual experiences hegemony of the social norms in accordance with his social status. While the bourgeois society expects the individuals to serve the status quo, the individuals are repressed by the system that also creates this class structure in the bourgeois industrial society.

In this respect, Nicholas Higgins in *North and South* is an individual who is in conflict with the established social order. In the novel, the working class is represented by Nicholas Higgins and his dying daughter, Bessy. Margaret meets them accidentally while she walks in Milton streets. Before she meets them, she comes across some

workers of Milton, and her reaction shows the middle-class prejudice towards the working class:

> In the backstreets there were many mills, out of which poured streams of men and women two or three times a day. Until Margaret had learnt the times of their ingress and egress, she was very unfortunate in constantly falling in with them. They came rushing along, with bold, fearless faces, and loud laughs and jests, particularly aimed at all those who appeared to be above them in rank or station. The tones of their unrestrained voices, and their carelessness of all common rules of street politeness, frightened Margaret a little at first. (*North and South* 66)

In this early encounter, Margaret is surrounded by workers in a new social environment. Margaret experienced freedom in her actions and leisure walks in nature when she was in Helstone. However, she lived through oppressive norms of the middle-class community in London for the sake of propriety. In this example, the working-class community draws her attention with their freedom and lack of interest in the social response of the environment. Margaret is shocked by their ignorance of the rules of propriety, because in Harley Street, for example, "Mrs Shaw's ideas of propriety and her own helpless dependence on others, had always made her insist that a footman should accompany Edith and Margaret, if they went beyond Harley Street or the immediate neighbourhood" (*North and South* 65). Margaret does not know the working-class people and their habits. For this reason, their behaviours seem to be impolite and disrespectful to a middle-class girl educated in London in middle-class manners. She criticises their attitude and disdains them for their lack of appropriate manners, while the class antagonism is mutual, at least before Margaret meets Higgins and his daughter Bessy. Sussman claims that "workers identified themselves as members of a group or a class defined by difference from the masters or owners, held together by a powerful and always at least potentially radical political culture grounded in opposition to those with economic power" (247). Margaret Hale is not one of these working-class people and she looks different on Milton streets even with her outlook. As Margaret walks alone in Milton streets, "the girls with their rough, but not unfriendly freedom, would comment on her dress, even touch her shawl or gown to ascertain the exact material" (*North and South* 67). Although she thinks of these friendly actions and comments as "womanly sympathy," similar responses from the workmen are sufficient to make her fear this community: "But she alternately dreaded and fired up against the workmen, who

commented not on her dress, but on her looks, in the same open fearless manner. She, who had hitherto felt that even the most refined remark on her personal appearance was an impertinence, had to endure undisguised admiration from these outspoken men" (*North and South* 67). These actions of these working-class people are immoral from a middle-class perspective as Margaret feels uncomfortable in their company: "[A] thunderous atmosphere, morally as well as physically, around her" (*North and South* 160). Margaret's interpretation of immorality for the working-class people is a sign of the middle-class respectability, which defines proper behaviour for the Victorian people. As a middle-class young girl, Margaret's education in London for middle-class social propriety leads her to consider these behaviours as opposed to bourgeois values. She is aware that in a respectable and morally appropriate social sphere, respectable gentlemen would not treat her like that. From her point of view, which reflects the middle-class attitude, there is no respectability among the working-class people. However, the workers appear to be quite content with their social condition regardless of the middle-class norms, and they reject to be subjects of the middle-class social order in an antagonistic manner. As D'Albertis states, "at first, Margaret dreads public scrutiny as a compromise to her dignity or virtue. […] The invasion of privacy (in this case, the workingmen's usurpation of linguistic privilege), interpreted as primarily sexual, is also a method of breaching social barriers between classes" (66). Nonetheless, her understanding of the lower class changes after she meets Nicholas Higgins and his daughter. In one of her adventures in Milton streets, she comes across this worker who calls her "your bonny face, my lass [young lady], makes the day look brighter" (*North and South* 67). She is surprised by these remarks that she hears from a worker. This worker is Nicholas Higgins, who becomes a friend to Margaret, with his daughter Bessy, and who provides the human interest for Margaret in the industrial Milton. Higgins enables Margaret to view the working-class community from a new perspective and provides Margaret with human interest in industrial and capitalist bourgeois society:

> Margaret went home, wondering at her new friends, and smiling at the man's insight into what had been passing in her mind. From that day Milton became a brighter place to her. It was not the long, bleak sunny days of spring, nor yet was it that time was reconciling her to the town of her habitation. It was that in it she had found human interest. (*North and South* 69)

Moreover, Margaret's meeting with a worker presents a panorama of the working-class condition in *North and South*. The condition of the working-class individual, like Higgins, is highly problematic in the industrial mid-Victorian society. Firstly, the working-class individual is oppressed by the bourgeois society as an individual who needs to conform to the social values. Margaret's attitude that reflects bourgeois concern for respectability and morality during her encounters with the working class is an evidence of this social oppression. Secondly, the working-class individual is oppressed by the bourgeois work ethic due to economic benefits of the middle class to maintain industrial production in the mills that are disciplinary institutions. Hence, the working-class individual is doubly oppressed in the industrial bourgeois social order of the mid-Victorian period. For the middle-class community in Milton, the working-class individual is definitely the other. Margaret's eventual meeting with the working class paves the way for the middle-class mill owner Thornton to understand his workers, since Margaret makes the communication between the working class and the middle class possible only after she has friends among the workers. Prior to Margaret Hale's arrival, the working-class people find it impossible even to befriend the middle class. As a result of Margaret's increasing influence on Thornton and Higgins, a solution, in the form of a reconciliation between these two Milton men, to the class conflict is provided towards the end of the novel.

This class conflict that resulted from class antagonism and middle-class domination was a serious problem to be solved in the nineteenth-century England. As Thomas Carlyle states in *Chartism*, "all battle is misunderstanding; did the parties know one another, the battle would cease" (9). The offer of mutual understanding as a solution to the battle – class conflict – is achieved only after the characters – the middle-class mill owner Thornton and the working-class member Higgins – begin to question socially constructed roles for social classes. In this case, the worker Higgins ultimately questions his condition in the industrial society as a worker and realises the fact that the problems might be solved once social norms and prejudices are left behind. Sussman believes that "for Gaskell, the individual workers are noble, but only inasmuch as they resist absorption into the crowd" (250). Margaret's initial fear of the working-class people, whom she considers to be no more than a violent mob as she walks in Milton streets,

comes to an end when Higgins speaks to her in a humane manner. In the following chapters of the novel, Higgins's decision to be dissociated from the crowd upon Margaret's persistence contributes to his individuality, and the working-class individual interprets the social problems like the class conflict. In the novel, Higgins's changing perspective towards a peaceful stance is a consequence of his rising individuality, which is repressed by the Victorian society before he meets Margaret Hale.

In addition to the human interest in the industrial society, Higgins provides the voice of opposition to the hegemonic bourgeois social order. His objections seem to aim at two main issues. First, he criticises the rigid economic doctrines put forward to justify the actions of the middle-class manufacturers. Secondly, the bourgeois expectation of a silent, subservient and unquestioning working class means the violation and ignorance of all working-class rights in the Victorian society. For Higgins, these problems might be overcome only through the collective action of the workers and through class consciousness among them just as the middle-class mill owners come together and support each other against the workers. Higgins actually resists the bourgeois hegemony in the form of economic doctrines and social norms. He aims to raise consciousness among the working class and form a workers' front. He explains the reason of the strike to Margaret:

> Why, yo' see, there's five or six masters who set themselves again' paying the wages they've been paying these two years past, and flourishing upon, and getting richer upon. And now they come to us, and say we're to take less. And we won't. We'll just clem [starve] them to death first; and see who'll work for 'em then. They'll have killed the goose that laid 'em the golden eggs, I reckon. (*North and South* 126)

As a worker, Higgins mentions the tyranny of masters who deprive the workers of their rights for the wages they deserve. Although there were strikes in the past, these were not successful since "that strike was badly managed. Folk got into th' management of it, as were either fools or not true men. Yo'll see, it'll be different this time" (*North and South* 125). As one of the leading figures of the working-class movement, Higgins believes in their success this time, because, for him, a strike could become successful only through the true devotion of workers who are aware of the middle-class enmity towards them and ready to struggle for their "just cause" (*North and South* 125). He

resembles their action to a war: “I dunnot. I just look forward to the chance of dying at my post sooner than yield. That’s what folk call fine and honourable in a soldier, and why not in a poor weaver-chap?” (*North and South* 126). Like Thornton, Higgins resembles himself to a soldier who is ready to die for a glorious purpose against the enemies. His struggle is a lifelong battle in the bourgeois social order. He is fighting against the middle-class hegemony. As a worker whose wife has already died in a strike and whose daughter is currently lying on her deathbed because of the lack of care for workers in cotton industry, Higgins is ready to die for the cause of his worker friends and challenges the status quo through the workers’ front. The strike is held against the injustice of the middle-class mill owners who regard the mills as disciplining institutions for the disobedient workers. The solidarity between the workers contributes to the working-class identity as a form of resistance against the middle-class hegemony. The recognition of the social and political problems of a worker increases one’s consciousness against the socially constructed false consciousness. This unionist movement, therefore, paves the way for individuality among the workers in as much as it creates awareness in the working-class individual as regards the cultural hegemony of the bourgeois social order. The collective struggle of the working-class people – the masses – against the middle-class oppression increases their consciousness about social, political and economic conditions as they fight against the system. Higgins gives an account of his resistance that strengthens his identity as an individual:

> My lass, yo’re but a young wench, but don’t yo’ think I can keep three people – that’s Bessy, Mary, and me – on sixteen shilling a week? Dun yo’ think it’s for mysel’ I’m striking work at this time? It’s just as much in the cause of others as yon soldier – only m’appen, the cause he dies for is just that of somebody he never clapt eyes on, nor heerd all his born days, while I take up John Boucher’s cause, as lives next door but one, wi’ a sickly wife, and eight childer, none on em’ factory age; I don’t take his cause only, though he’s a poor good for-naught, as can only manage two looms at a time, but I take up th’ cause o’ justice. Why are we to have less wage now, I ask, than two year ago? (*North and South* 126)

Margaret is a young and naïve girl for Higgins who spent his life in this class struggle. He explains why he cannot support his two daughters with the offered wage. Moreover, there are many workers, like John Boucher, who have to feed more children than him. In this respect, Higgins is strong enough to fight against bourgeois hegemony and assures other workers that raising their voice against middle-class hegemony will

improve their living conditions. John Boucher, who is not so strong as Higgins, commits suicide later on, since he cannot support his family (*North and South* 274). This conflict between middle-class wealth and working-class poverty is also a result of the middle-class interests that deprive the workers of economic means. Due to their economic depravity, the working-class masses have to conform to the middle-class social norms that constrain their behaviours to socially acceptable manners. Hence, these working-class people cannot achieve individuality against the bourgeois social order. While nobody else in the working-class collectivity tries to help Boucher's family after his suicide, Higgins appears as a unique individual in taking the responsibility of Boucher's orphan children. Under these economic and social circumstances, Higgins stands out as an individual who tries to challenge the social order established upon middle-class values. While the working-class community does not stand out for their fellow people, Higgins cares for them on his own. He does not serve the norms and expectations of society, which contributes to his individuality. Although the middle-class values try to create a respectable workingman, Higgins makes his own decisions and opposes social norms.

Despite this social conflict between the middle class and the working class resulting from bourgeois hegemony, the middle-class mill owners still aim at resuming the social order by suppressing the strike. It is clear that they only care about the profit through industrial production in the mills. The unionist attempts are against the bourgeois interests, so the middle-class mill owners ignore the workers' demands as they continue their lives in line with middle-class values. In this respect, Thornton's house, previously depicted as a means to show off, is presented as the site of a feast for the mill owners during this upheaval. Margaret's perspective is again presented as a critical attitude towards this lavish dinner. She thinks that

> Mrs Hale [who wonders how dinner is managed in Milton] would have been more than interested, - she would have been astonished, if she had seen the sumptuousness of the dinner-table and its appointments. Margaret, with her London cultivated taste, felt the number of delicacies to be oppressive; one half of the quantity would have been enough, and the effect lighter and more elegant. But it was one of Mrs Thornton's rigorous laws of hospitality, that each of separate dainty enough should be provided for all the guests to partake, if they felt inclined. (*North and South* 149)

Margaret points to the difference between southern and northern understanding of elegance and hospitality. Despite the huge amount and kind of food served at the dinner, there is a matter of cultivation for her. Rather than creating an elegant atmosphere, the dinner turns into another means of showing off. Moreover, the furniture, which was kept under cover against dust during Margaret's and her father's previous visits, is demonstrated this time to impress the guests: "Every cover was taken-off, and the apartment blazed forth in yellow silk damask and a brilliantly-flowered carpet. Every corner seemed filled up with ornament, until it became a weariness to the eye" (*North and South* 150). This glittering hall accompanies the grandeur of the dinner served to the guests. Mrs Thornton's only desire for such decoration and social manners is to illustrate her son's wealth and power to the middle-class guests invited for the dinner. As his successful career is displayed through this social act in his luxurious house, Thornton's respectability is reinforced. Moreover, Thornton is a man of authority among other mill owners:

> Some dispute arose, which was warmly contested; it was referred to Thornton, who had hardly spoken before; but who now gave an opinion, the grounds of which were so clearly stated that even the opponents yielded. […] Among his fellows, there was no uncertainty as to his position. He was regarded by them as a man of great force of character; of power in many ways. There was no need to struggle for their respect. He had it, and he knew it; and the security of this gave a fine grand quietness to his voice. (*North and South* 152)

In this social setting, Thornton knows that his wealth and social status bring him respectability among the middle-class mill owners. He has actually spent his life to come to this position. However, Thornton experiences difficulties in business that are not compatible with his mother's showing off at that time. His explanation for lowering the wages of the workers depends on his assumption of a crisis in industry. The economic situation does not allow such grandeur as Mrs Thornton displays. Actually "he was denying himself the personal expenditure of an unnecessary sixpence, and had more than once regretted that the invitations for this dinner had been sent out" (*North and South* 150). He is a thrifty and self-denying man, but he does not allow his mother to feel the effects of the economic crisis. He tries to maintain his social appearance as a powerful and authoritarian man in the middle-class community. Despite his economic

difficulties resulting from trade and the conflicts with employees, he tries hard to continue to keep his powerful appearance. From the example of his father, Thornton knows that respectability is dependent on success in business.

Despite this image of a powerful mill owner respectable among the middle-class members and in the industrial world, John Thornton is a repressed individual since his actions and decisions are controlled by the hegemonic middle-class norms. He cannot lead his life in accordance with his free will under social restrictions, which means that Thornton as an individual is in conflict with society. He is formed by these social norms to conform to the social order, so he cannot challenge the system. The middle-class community, like other mill owners, expects him to act particularly for the benefits of the bourgeois community. He is not allowed to put his own opinions into practice. The following remarks by Thornton show that his dichotomy might be seen earlier in *North and South* when he shares some of his opinions with Margaret and her family as regards the condition of the working class and his real intentions in treating the workers. After mentioning the endless power of the manufacturers a century earlier, or even at the beginning of the nineteenth century, Thornton says:

> I only name such things to show what almost unlimited power the manufacturers had about the beginning of this century. The men were rendered dizzy by it. Because a man was successful in his ventures, there was no reason that in all other things his mind should be well-balanced. On the contrary, his sense of justice, and his simplicity, were often utterly smothered under the glut of wealth that came down upon him; and they tell strange tales of the wild extravagance of living indulged in on gala-days by those early cotton-lords. (*North and South* 78)

Thornton's criticism towards the earlier manufacturers is against their misuse of economic and industrial power. The fact that bourgeois society considers a man to be respectable due to his economic and social status does not mean that the successful mill owner is actually an individual. As he underlines, wealth and status can easily lead one to ignore humanitarian values like justice and simplicity, which also appear to be the failed promises of the middle class, as Horkheimer argues, "the bourgeois social order places the great universal ideals, justice, equality and freedom, at the centre of its political and moral philosophy" ("Formulation of Critical Theory," 183). These failed ideals of the bourgeoisie are replaced by the anxiety to profit more through industrial

production and a highly controlled social order that protects the middle-class benefits. Hence, economic concerns are reflected in social interactions. In this respect, individualistic actions and decisions are not considered to be appropriate because of the threat to the system. The search for power and authority has no limits as in the example of old cotton lords. Thornton outlines the current relations between the middle class and the working class as follows:

> There can be no doubt, too, of the tyranny they exercised over their work-people. […] Some of these early manufacturers did ride to the devil in a magnificent style – crushing human bone and flesh under their horses' hoofs without remorse. But by and by came a reaction; there were more factories, more masters; more men were wanted. The power of masters and men became more evenly balanced; and now the battle is pretty fairly waged between us. We will hardly submit to the decision of an umpire. (*North and South* 78)

The industrial rivalry decreased the power, authority, unquestionable status and respectability of these early manufacturers. The war fought between the workers and the mill owners was accompanied by the increasing political awareness of the workers through Chartism and the working-class people could raise their voice to demand their rights. Although the mill owners are still dominant in the industrial strife, Thornton is quite aware of the fact that the ambition of the middle class resulted in the contemporary conditions. He criticises the old cotton lords for their actions and injustice towards the workers, yet, he lives in a similar fashion. This condition is an evidence of the conflict between the individual and society. Although he believes that the working class is treated in a cruel way, he feels it necessary to treat them cruelly to serve the economic and social benefits of the bourgeoisie as he is expected by the middle-class community. In his submission to the bourgeois norms, he becomes a repressed individual. After he meets Margaret Hale, Thornton begins to change in terms of his attitude towards the workers, which is apparent particularly in his relationship with Higgins. The conflict between the individual and society leads to the change in Thornton's attitude as a turning point. This change in Thornton can be explained through individuality, which means that he begins to act independently from the Victorian social norms and prejudices against the working class. As Guy argues, "the Thornton whom we (and Margaret) see in the early part of the novel – the arrogant, stubborn mill-owner who has not yet learned the importance of feeling and emotion – is

presented as a parody of a political economist. He represents exactly that type of unbending dogmatism" (169). This portrayal of an unbending dogmatist as a mill owner is transformed as Thornton learns to act independent from social restrictions. In this second stage of his life, Thornton becomes an individual and rejects bourgeois impositions that lead to class antagonism between the middle class and the working class. Contrary to the middle-class expectations, Thornton's decision to treat his workers in a compassionate manner listening to their demands, in particular Higgins' asking for a job, challenges the social order, and this is a step towards becoming an individual free from bourgeois oppression in the industrial society. In this way, the middle-class mill owner Thornton opposes the bourgeois social order.

Thornton's changing attitude towards the working class is influential in the development of his individuality, and this process begins after Higgins comes to ask for Thornton's help in *North and South*. Although Thornton does not like the rioting mob which attacked him at the mill and wounded Margaret with a stone thrown by Boucher himself, Higgins is determined, for the sake of Boucher's helpless children, to ask Thornton for a job. Still, he keeps his pride as a unionist worker that would never yield to the oppression of a master. For this dilemma, Margaret says:

> I should guess from their [the workers'] tones that they had Irish blood in them. I wonder what success he'll have tomorrow [to get a job]. If he [Higgins] and Thornton would speak out together as man to man – if Higgins would forget that Thornton was a master, and speak to him as he does to us – and if Thornton would be patient enough to listen to him with his human heart, not with his master's ears. (*North and South* 286)

This comment actually refers to the limitations set up by social values. As a worker, Higgins challenges the social authority of the masters both ideologically with his thoughts and unionist political stance, and through his actions by participating in the strike. Yet, being a worker and a member of the union causes him to be on the opposition against the manufacturers and middle-class norms. As a working-class individual, he feels bourgeois oppression in political, social and economic aspects. Stoneman asserts that "this vulnerability of the individual is, of course, the rationale for Trade Unions, since unity is strength" (82). Higgins feels pride in the union since he

believes that the union is the only means to empower the desperate individual against the tyranny of the masters. He says:

> State o' trade! That's just a piece o' masters' humbug. It's rate o' wages I was talking of. Th' masters keep th' state o' trade in their own hands; and just walk it forward like a black bug-a-boo, to frighten naughty children with into being good. I'll tell yo' it's their part,—their cue, as some folks call it,—to beat us down, to swell their fortunes; and it's ours to stand up and fight hard,—not for ourselves alone, but for them round about us—for justice and fair play. We help to make their profits, and we ought to help spend 'em. It's not that we want their brass so much this time, as we've done many a time afore. We'n getten money laid by; and we're resolved to stand and fall together; not a man on us will go in for less wage than th' Union says is our due. (*North and South* 126)

Clearly, Higgins trusts in the power of the union to protect their right against the oppressive middle-class mill owners. While the bourgeois social order tries to train workers like naughty children to be submissive to the authority of the bourgeoisie, the union forms a workers' front against social and economic oppression. Nevertheless, this working-class attempt to stand against the bourgeois hegemony develops into a form of oppression for the individual as Higgins criticises the union as a form of restraint on the working-class individual:

> If a man doesn't belong to th' Union, them as works next looms has orders not to speak to him—if he's sorry or ill it's a' the same; he's out o' bounds; he's none o' us; he comes among us, he works among us, but he's none o' us. I' some places them's fined who speaks to him. Yo' try that, miss; try living a year or two among them as looks away if yo' look at 'em; try working within two yards o' crowds o' men, who, yo' know, have a grinding grudge at yo' in their hearts—to whom if yo' say yo'r glad, not an eye brightens, nor a lip moves,—to whom if your heart's heavy, yo' can never say nought, because they'll ne'er take notice on your sighs or sad looks (and a man 's no man who'll groan out loud 'bout folk asking him what 's the matter?)—just yo' try that, miss—ten hours for three hundred days, and yo'll know a bit what th' Union is. (*North and South* 215)

In addition to the economic and social expectations of the middle class, the workers' union also expects the workers to conform to their rules. Hence, the working-class individual is also doubly oppressed due to his social and economic status. Individual freedom is destroyed in the mid-Victorian society represented in *North and South*.

Despite its authority on the workers, the union cannot control the strike, which turns out to be another example of unsuccessful attempts, and the workers are left to the mercy of the mill owners. Stoneman argues that "*North and South* focuses on mill-owner rather than worker precisely because Elizabeth Gaskell has recognised the workers' impotence to control the terms of the class struggle; heroic and justified as they are, they have no option but to adopt the aggressive, confrontational position forced on them by the dominant class" (83). In other words, the working-class member Higgins is also produced by the bourgeois Victorian society to serve the economic and industrial needs of the social structure through the disciplining function of the mills, the notion of work ethic and method of industrial production. The social system asks for his submission to bourgeois authority and he can raise his voice only through the strikes that stand against the middle-class hegemony. Higgins has to go to Thornton, albeit unwillingly, to ask for a job. Although he prefers not to yield to the masters for his own cause, he tries to be friendly with Thornton in order to look after Boucher's orphan children. Duthie states that "it is not help he asks for himself and his class but what he considers justice" (77). Higgins's demand of justice is one of the promises of the bourgeois society that is not granted to the workers. Although the workers strive for better living conditions, the middle-class mill owners treat them in an unjust and cruel way.

Following Margaret's convincing conversation, Higgins agrees to go to Thornton in order to ask for a job that will help him support Boucher's orphan children. At the same time, Thornton is affected by Margaret's opinions and friendship with the working-class people. Thornton contemplates Higgins's cause and his waiting for him for hours as a sign of honesty, which he actually does not associate with the working class. Thus, he decides to offer him a job and comes to his house:

> [Thornton] had tenderness in his heart – 'a soft place,' as Nicholas Higgins called it; but he had some pride in concealing it; he kept it very sacred and safe, and was jealous of every circumstance that tried to gain admission. But if he dreaded exposure of his tenderness, he was equally desirous that all men should recognise his justice; and he felt that he had been unjust in giving so scornful a hearing to anyone who had waited, with humble patience, for five hours, to speak to him. (*North and South* 300)

Thornton succeeds in dealing with the social prejudice about the malevolence of the working class and the cruel attitude of the middle class towards them. This freedom from social constraints of the industrial bourgeois society enables him to show his notion of justice to everyone. Similarly, Higgins recognises Thornton's changing attitude and talks to him free from middle-class oppression. On the offer of a job, he says:

> Yo've called me impudent, and a liar, and a mischief-maker, and yo' might ha' said wi' some truth, as I were now and then given to drink. An' I ha, called you a tyrant, an' an oud bull-dog, and a hard, cruel master; that's where it stands. But for the childer, Measter, do yo' think we can e'er get on together. (*North and South* 302)

Higgins declares his thoughts without any restraint. These two men act like individuals free from social concerns, and peace is established between the middle class and the working class. Following this conversation, they shake hands, which is a sign of peace between these men who used to hate each other as the master and the hand. Once the social norms and expectations are given up, as it is exemplified in this case, the conflict between the individuals and society is resolved for the benefit of Thornton and Higgins. As Brodetsky states,

> this leads to a much greater awareness, by them both, of the problems of the other side of the industry, and to some interesting changes in their outlooks. The most significant of these is Thornton's increasing interest in the general welfare of his men. He takes upon himself some of the responsibility of providing for the Boucher family, now orphaned, and, even more significantly, he builds a dining room for his employees. (61)

The conflict between the individual and society is, thus, overcome through individual interaction that becomes possible only after Thornton acts like an individual, free from social restrictions. On the one hand, Higgins becomes a regular employer contributing to Thornton's business, despite the enmity during the strike and refusal of the union. He acts on his own for a personal cause, regardless of social restrictions. On the other hand, Thornton becomes a mill owner who cares for his workers as equals, listens to them and tries to solve their problems. Thornton also acts independently from social expectations, even though the mill owners do not want to employ Higgins due to his unionist stance. Thus, these two characters make their decisions and act against social norms. This is an

evidence of their rising consciousness and increasing individuality. The ideals of "justice" and "simplicity," which Thornton mentions quite earlier in the novel (*North and South* 78), are achieved once the middle-class ideal of respectability, which necessitates success in business through strict loyalty to the rules of political economy, loses its influence in Thornton's life. Marcuse states that

> the actual course of the transformation and the fundamental measures to be taken in order to arrive at a rational organisation of society are prescribed by analysis of economic and political conditions in the given historical situation. The subsequent construction of the new society cannot be the object of theory, for it is to occur as the free creation of the liberated individuals. ("Philosophy and Critical Theory," 58)

Higgins, too, is not the submissive worker anymore, to the contrary, he asks for his rights in an individualistic way. He takes an active role in the industrial strife, reasoning with Thornton about the condition of the working-class people. Their reconciliation shows that individuality is possible in the industrial Victorian society only through freedom from social constraints. In other words, these characters become individuals as long as they challenge socially imposed identities and act independently. When Thornton and Higgins shake hands, the class conflict produced by the system dissolves. Hence, these two characters, as liberated individuals, contribute to the construction of a new social order in *North and South*. This seems to be what Gaskell offers as a fictional solution to the conflict between the individual and the Victorian society. These individuals are, thus, presented as the negation of repressive and hegemonic social order. As they free themselves from social norms, in particular the desire to achieve respectability, they can be considered as individuals that are not controlled by the bourgeois society. Moreover, the status quo is negated as a result of this individualistic action. So, bourgeois social order is negated in a new framework characterised by individuality.

However, it is clear that although Thornton and Higgins initiate a new relationship between the individual and the Victorian society, the social order still controls them through economic doctrines, because they cannot escape from the capitalist economy. Towards the end of the novel, Thornton goes bankrupt, despite his attempts at

establishing a new relationship with the working class. His individualistic endeavour cannot overcome the capitalist economic order of the Victorian era:

> But now had come one of those periods of bad trade, when the market falling brought down the value of all large stocks; Mr Thornton's fell to nearly half. No orders were coming in; so he lost the interest of the capital he had locked up in machinery; indeed, it was difficult to get payment for the orders completed; yet there was the constant drain of expenses for working the business. Then the bills became due for the cotton he had purchased; and money being scarce, he could only borrow at exorbitant interest, and yet he could not realise any of his property. (*North and South* 389)

The rules of capitalist economy, which he had defended in his earlier discussions with Margaret, lead to his failure. As a solution to Thornton's economic difficulty, it appears that Mr Bell has left all his wealth to Margaret before his death. Hence, Margaret owns a great amount of property, including the land on which Thornton's mill is situated, and Thornton suddenly becomes her tenant: "She's my landlord now, you know, Higgins. I hear of her through her agent here, every now and then. She's well and among friends" (*North and South* 390). In this time of crisis, Thornton still keeps his strength and tells his mother that he will "be always the same John Thornton in whatever circumstances; endeavouring to do right, and making great blunders: and then trying to be brave in setting to afresh. But it is hard, mother. I have so worked and planned. […] [N]ow all is over. I am too old to begin again with the same heart. It is hard, mother" (*North and South* 392). His despair in this capitalist economic order is, thus, reflected in his grievances. Nevertheless, he keeps his determined attitude against the difficulties he has to overcome. The solution to Thornton's economic difficulty is offered through his marriage to Margaret, which lets him inherit her wealth, and he is relieved during his meeting with Margaret in the last chapter entitled "Pack Clouds Away," when Margaret offers her fortune to him. She says, "here it is! […] if you would take some money of mine, eighteen hundred and fifty-seven pounds, lying just at this moment unused in the bank, and bringing me in only two and a half percent – you could pay me much better interest, and might go on working Marlborough Mills" (*North and South* 402). Margaret presents her wealth in Milton to John Thornton, who can deal with his industrial business as a mill owner again. Margaret's marriage despite her great wealth shows that she submits herself to the expectations of the bourgeois society. When she finds an

appropriate suitor, she is expected to marry him and lead her life as a submissive wife, which has already been pointed out in the case of Edith. Margaret is not supposed to deal with economic and industrial issues in the bourgeois industrial society. To the contrary, she is expected to stay in her house as a loyal wife, and her decision to marry Thornton proves that she ultimately yields to the mid-Victorian social norms. Similarly, Thornton also finds economic means to start his business again as a mill owner. He knows that his respectability depends on his economic and social status in the bourgeois society. Therefore, Thornton also conforms to the social norms by turning back to his business for economic success. He marries an appropriate young girl like Margaret, and continues his life as a conformist middle-class mill owner. Both of these characters comply with the normative values of the mid-Victorian bourgeois society. Guy suggests that

> the novel seems to indicate that the new understanding demanded of both Margaret and Thornton can be a prototype of a new solution to contemporary social problems. In so doing it appears to locate responsibility for social order firmly within the hands of the middle classes. […] *North and South* is concerned with describing the nature of the moral re-education which is necessary if reactionary masters like […] Thornton are to learn to live amicably with figures like Nicholas Higgins. (161-162)

As a repressed individual dependent on bourgeois society, Thornton has to accept the imposed norms in Milton. In the capitalist economy and industrial rivalry, economic conditions determine all social interactions. The system can be challenged only by the individuals who pursuit their own goals independent from social norms.

As pointed out, in *North and South*, the mid-Victorian society, dominated by economic and political power of the middle-class, is presented, not only from industrial and economic, but also from social and cultural perspectives. The middle-class values dominate the lives of the individuals. The hegemonic bourgeois social order in *North and South* is weakened by the freedom of individuals who question their condition as repressed members of the industrial society. Nonetheless, the bourgeois industrial society continues to oppress the individuals despite all attempts to challenge the established order. While Margaret Hale, the young girl, finds herself a suitable husband at the end of *North and South*, John Thornton, the mill owner, has to continue industrial

rivalry to achieve success and respectability both for himself and his family. It is only working-class member Nicholas Higgins who seems to challenge the social order due to his lower-class status, devoid of respectability. The attempts of his middle-class employers to create an appropriate worker in line with the ideology of respectability result in the imposition of middle-class values. So, Higgins as an individual is always in conflict with the bourgeois social values. *North and South* presents a world, in which the individuals are in conflict with the bourgeois society and they are forced to "a more strict conformity" to maintain the homogenous social order (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 141). As Adorno asserts, "self-reflection may free the individual consciousness from that dependence and expand it. […] The subject has no way at all to grasp universals other than in the motion of individual human consciousness" (*Negative Dialectics* 46). The subject who questions the established facts and norms of the system can become an individual independent from social restrictions through rising individual consciousness. However, in the examples of Margaret Hale, John Thornton and Nicholas Higgins in *North and South*, it is clear that these characters are subjected and forced to submit to the established social order, while the system tries to protect the status quo through false consciousness embedded into the subject's mind. At the end of the novel, there is reconciliation between the old middle class represented by Margaret and the new manufacturing middle class represented by Thornton by means of their marriage. Moreover, peace is established between the manufacturing middle class and the working class when Thornton and Higgins shake hands and begin to cooperate for mutual interests. The ending in *North and South* indicates that a peaceful solution to the problems in the industrial society is possible if the members of society try to understand and communicate with each other as it is obvious in the relationship between Margaret, Thornton and Higgins at the end of the novel. However, it is also clear that there is still a conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society represented in *North and South* despite Gaskell's offer of a solution in the form of a marriage between Margaret and Thornton, and industrial cooperation between Thornton and Higgins. These individuals are forced to conform to bourgeois norms of respectability to have a better status in society. Therefore, it can be concluded that oppression of the individuals continues to create a conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society in *North and South*.

# CHAPTER II

## HORKHEIMER'S REPRESSED INDIVIDUAL IN CHARLES DICKENS'S *GREAT EXPECTATIONS*

In the first chapter, it has been argued that the middle-class values dominate the mid-Victorian society represented in Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South* to the extent that individuals in this society are highly controlled and restricted in the manner defined by the Frankfurt School critical theory. As illustrated, there is a clash of interests between the individuals and the mid-Victorian bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society in *North and South*. Different from the discussion of more clearly defined social roles in the form of ideals in the first chapter, Dickens's *Great Expectations* represents the early nineteenth-century English society from a mid-Victorian perspective and this novel demonstrates the formation process of these social ideals through respectability at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In the light of the critical perspective of the Frankfurt School theorists Horkheimer and Adorno, this chapter argues that the bourgeois society in the early nineteenth century represented in Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* (1861) controls the individuals through normative values of the middle class and a process of identity construction enabled by false consciousness continues to shape the individuals' identity in order to protect the established social order. Hence, the hegemonic middle-class values in the early nineteenth century are treated as means of subjecting the individuals to social order. The protagonist Pip desires to become a gentleman all his life and he tries to adapt himself to the expectations of the middle-class society in London. Pip believes that social mobility is possible if he conforms to dominant norms imposed on the individuals. In *Great Expectations*, the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society is experienced by Pip who is formed by the normative and homogenous social order to serve society.

As one of the significant works of the nineteenth-century English literature, Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* started to be published in his weekly periodical *All The Year Round* on 1 December 1860 and continued for thirty-six instalments till August

1861. *Great Expectations* then appeared in the novel form in late 1861. By the end of 1860, Dickens's weekly periodical *All The Year Round* was going through a difficult period due to the descending circulation numbers of Charles Lever's serialised novel (Sanders 422). For the purpose of increasing the readership of the periodical and protecting his investment, Dickens decided to intervene with a novel that "would take pole position in the journal" (Sanders 422). The publication of *Great Expectations* turned out to be another example of literary success for Dickens.

Although *Great Expectations* was published in the mid-Victorian period, its setting is the beginning of the nineteenth-century England. As the story begins in the marshes of the southern countryside in Kent, the reader is introduced to Pip who is the protagonist and narrator in this novel. Pip's perspective constitutes the focal point in all the incidents that happen in the novel. The conflict between the individual and society is observed in Pip's life in *Great Expectations*. The process of identity construction is conducted by the bourgeois society through middle-class values of respectability as Pip's identity is shaped in accordance with social norms. The Frankfurt School critical perspective helps to illuminate the regulatory force of the bourgeois society in Pip's development. As in a *Bildungsroman, Great Expectations* is about Pip's psychological and moral growth from his childhood to adulthood. Pip encounters the convict Abel Magwitch in Kent marshes, and the relationship between these two characters, albeit reluctant on Pip's side, triggers the action in the novel (*Great Expectations* 6). At the beginning of the novel, Pip is a young orphan boy living in a village with his sister Mrs Joe Gargery, who always complains about her life, and her husband Joe Gargery, the village blacksmith (*Great Expectations* 7). Then, he is apprenticed by Joe to become a blacksmith (*Great Expectations* 41). So, Pip is a country boy and he belongs to the working class leading his life in a small village in the early nineteenth century. However, the sudden news of a secret benefactor for Pip dramatically changes the plotline, and Pip's movement to London to benefit from this financial opportunity brings forth questions as regards the relationship between the individual and the industrial society (*Great Expectations* 129). Pip wants to become a gentleman and tries to conform to the social norms adopting thereby middle-class manners and moral values in the city.

Pip's aspirations, however, create a conflict between Pip and society because he is unwilling to give up his country values as a working-class young boy. Pip's life becomes more difficult with the influence of Estella, his eternal love, who is brought up by the eccentric old lady Miss Havisham in order to torture men (*Great Expectations* 163). Although Miss Havisham wants to take revenge on the man that left her at the altar on her wedding day, she uses Estella as a means of her revenge. Hence, Pip is victimised by his love for Estella, because Pip has to become a respectable gentleman to be an appropriate husband for Estella and he has to conform to bourgeois values for his aspirations. Moreover, Pip's secret benefactor turns out to be Magwitch, the convict Pip has met at the beginning of the novel (*Great Expectations* 301). After he was caught by the soldiers, Magwitch was deported to Australia, yet he did not forget how Pip helped him when he was in need, and he decided to make a gentleman out of the little boy (*Great Expectations* 302). Magwitch intends to respond to the industrial society that turned him into an outcast through Pip, who is supposed to be a respectable young man in the bourgeois society. Pip finds himself in the middle of a scheme to turn him into a gentleman according to bourgeois norms. As the truth behind his benefactor is revealed, Pip begins to question his own condition in society. Although he used to disdain the countryside and look down upon his people, he changes his attitude towards them upon learning the source of his income that helped him realise his ambitions. In *Great Expectations*, the individuals of the country, like Pip and his acquaintances, are in conflict with the hegemonic values and oppressive expectations of the bourgeois industrial society associated with London. Since the Frankfurt School critical theory has pointed out the repression of the individuals by society as the reason for the "decline of individuality" (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 138), this critical perspective shows that Pip the individual is controlled by the social values to be a conformist in every part of the novel, and his sense of individuality decreases. Accordingly, Pip accepts social oppression in a state of false consciousness, since he believes that he can have an affair with Estella if he complies with social norms and becomes a respectable gentleman. Therefore, Pip's identity is constructed throughout the events in *Great Expectations*, and the individual cannot escape social boundaries created by the dominant bourgeois values as argued by Horkheimer (*Eclipse of Reason* 140).

In this respect, due to the control on the individual, in Pip's life particularly, Pip moves from the rural community in his village to the bourgeois industrial community in London, and he is introduced to the oppressive social values. Pip's relationship with Miss Havisham and Estella, who humiliate Pip for his inferiority as a common boy, triggers upward social mobility and forces Pip to adopt the bourgeois manners (*Great Expectations* 100). As Horkheimer suggests "the bourgeois individual did not necessarily see himself as opposed to the collectivity, but believed or was prevailed upon to believe himself to be a member of a society that could achieve the highest degree of harmony only through the unrestricted competition of individual interests" (*Eclipse of Reason* 139). As a result of this conflict between the individual and the industrial society, Pip cannot continue his life as an individual after he decides to be a respectable gentleman. Indeed, oppression of the individual by the industrial, bourgeois and urban society is observed as early as the beginning of the nineteenth-century England. As it is clear in Pip's case, in the early nineteenth century, Victorian norms of respectability impose on Pip a new lifestyle approved by the dominant middle class, and Pip is expected to serve the established social order accordingly.

In other words, the bourgeois society creates an illusion of social harmony for the individual who assumes that he keeps his individuality in the bourgeois society while he struggles for his own interests. In fact, Pip has such illusions as he struggles to become a gentleman, because he never realises the fact that he only becomes a conformist in the industrial society for his ambition to be with Estella. As Horkheimer argues "[the individuals], isolated though they were by moats of self-interest, nevertheless tended to become more and more alike through the pursuit of self-interest. In our era of large economic combines and mass culture, the principle of conformity emancipates itself from its individualistic veil, is openly proclaimed, and raised to the rank of an ideal *per se*" (*Eclipse of Reason* 139). Evidently, the bourgeois social order expects the individuals to conform to the bourgeois norms in order to have a higher social status. As the individuals are in a rivalry with each other, they feel it necessary to submit themselves to the social expectations in order to be more successful. The bourgeois society creates thus an illusion, or false consciousness, in the individual to ascertain that

the individuals continue their struggle without realising what they are actually doing. In *Great Expectations*, Pip finds himself in such a situation when he assumes that he is competing with other people in society for a respectable status. For example, Pip does not realise that all the boys educated in Mr Pocket's house to become a gentleman are trained in the same way without any individualistic concern (*Great Expectations* 175), and there is no difference between them. In effect, it is the principle of conformity that becomes an enthusiastic ideal for the individuals.

In *Great Expectations*, Pip's condition is presented under the imposition of social norms from his childhood onwards. The family plays an important role in this social formation as Mrs Joe and family friends attempt to train Pip for appropriate social manners. In this respect, Horkheimer argues that

> from the day of his birth, the individual is made to feel that there is only one way of getting along in this [bourgeois] world – that of giving up his hope of ultimate self-realisation. This he can achieve solely by imitation. He continuously responds to what he perceives about him […] emulating the traits and attitudes represented by all the collectivities [social bonds and relations] that […] enforce a more strict conformity, a more radical surrender through complete assimilation. (*Eclipse of Reason* 141)

As Horkheimer suggests, the individual surrenders to the demands of society in order to get along with the community and become a respectable member. This surrender means that the individual is no more acting in a self-conscious manner. On the contrary, in a state of false consciousness, the individual only conforms to the social order. So, it can be put forward that there is no individuality in the bourgeois industrial society since the individual only emulates the social norms adopting them as if they were his own values. The established social order entraps the individual in a circle of control in all aspects of social life. As Adorno asserts,

> at times the individual would oppose himself to society as an independent being, though a particular one – a being capable of rationally pursuing its own interest. In that phase, and beyond it, the question of freedom was the genuine question whether society permits the individual to be as free as it promises. […] Temporarily, the individual looms above the blind social context, but in his windowless isolation he only helps so much more to reproduce that context. (*Negative Dialectics* 219)

Evidently, the bourgeois society does not allow the individual to be free from social hegemony. Under the strict control of the social order, the individual experiences the illusion of freedom and individuality, whereas he just complies with the social expectations. Although the individual sometimes feels himself socially independent and continues to strive for his benefits, he still serves the benefits of the bourgeois society. In other words, the individual continues to reproduce the social context that is the cause of his subjection. In *Great Expectations*, Pip in a similar manner struggles to become a gentleman, which requires his absolute submission to society and guarantees that his individuality will be destroyed by the same society.

Pip's identity begins to be shaped by the bourgeois society from his childhood onwards for a conformist attitude to submit to social norms. However, Pip is initially portrayed as a little child free from social constraints. He changes his name from Philip Pirrip into Pip, which indicates a state of consciousness in the young protagonist quite early in the novel (*Great Expectations* 5). In order to analyse Pip's conflict as a member of the early nineteenth-century English society, his interaction with his social environment needs to be accounted for from his childhood onwards. As Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* unveils in the marshes of Kent, where the young Pip tries to make sense of the world in which he lives, Pip is a questioning individual at the very beginning of the novel. The opening chapter of the novel takes place in the graveyard near their house in which Pip invents his name making use of the tombstones. In fact, Pip chooses his own name: "My father's family name being Pirrip, and my Christian name Philip, my infant tongue could make of both names nothing longer or more explicit than Pip. So, I called myself Pip, and came to be called Pip" (*Great Expectations* 5). The naming process is a sign of Pip's authority on his own life as a child. It is at the same time a sign of his individuality and freedom from social concerns. Following Pip's attempt to make meaning for himself, the protagonist in the Victorian social environment is surrounded by his relatives and their friends. These opening chapters of *Great Expectations* show the social disciplining Pip undergoes as a little child. Individuality of the boy who decides and chooses an appropriate name for himself is replaced by Victorian social norms that Pip's family imposes on him to make him a respectable member of society. Therefore, early in his life Pip is subjected to social discipline.

The conflict between the individual and society can be observed in Pip's childhood as a result of social hegemony. Pip's relationship with his elders like, especially, his sister Mrs Joe Gargery and Uncle Pumblechook shows us how he is influenced by Victorian social aspirations of respectability. As he learns the significance of Victorian respectability, Pip begins to long for such socially appropriate norms. In this stage of his life, Pip is completely controlled by Mrs Joe, whose influence on Pip, thus, begins with his education in the domestic sphere for appropriate conduct in public. Pip's sister Mrs Joe is a figure of authority in Pip's and Joe's life, since she imposes social values on Pip to keep social appearances. For instance, Mrs Joe reproaches Pip for coming home late while she has to finish the preparations on Christmas Eve: "Perhaps if I warn't [*sic*] a blacksmith's wife, and (what's the same thing) a slave with her apron never off, *I* should have been to hear the Carols" (*Great Expectations* 22). Pip is afraid of Mrs Joe's anger and he feels it necessary to comply with her wishes, which indeed reflect bourgeois norms of respectability, as follows:

> Joe, who had ventured into the kitchen after me as the dustpan had retired before us, drew the back of his hand across his nose with a conciliatory air, when Mrs. Joe darted a look at him, and, when her eyes were withdrawn, secretly crossed his two forefingers, and exhibited them to me, as our token that Mrs. Joe was in a cross temper. This was so much her normal state, that Joe and I would often, for weeks together, be, as to our fingers, like monumental Crusaders as to their legs. (*Great Expectations* 22)

Mrs Joe's authoritarian and angry manners make it impossible for Pip and Joe to challenge her orders. In fact, Mrs Joe is a figure of oppression as the wife of the village blacksmith. Frost claims that "this self-image of domestic slave with time off for nothing she would like to do […] informs her whole life" (61). Mrs Joe is discontented with her living conditions since she is the wife of the village blacksmith. Her social position as a housewife in the country condemns her to poverty as a member of the lower class. Actually, she is angry about her prospects in life, because she cannot move upward on the social scale and she cannot enjoy her life. Nevertheless, her husband, Joe, is a man who is happy with his condition as the village blacksmith. Joe is a naïve and patient man in the village and he does not seem to resent his lifestyle. For this reason, Pip sees him as a friend: "[Joe] was a mild, good-natured, sweet-tempered, easy-going,

foolish, dear fellow – a sort of Hercules in strength, and also in weakness" (*Great Expectations* 9). Joe and his wife might be considered as Pip's family since Pip has no relatives. Still, Pip barely escapes being beaten with Mrs Joe's "Tickler," the name of the stick that she uses to beat Pip (*Great Expectations* 11). Then, as she gets angry with the whispers between Pip and Joe, she initially attacks her husband: "By this time, my sister was quite desperate, so she pounced on Joe, and, taking him by the two whiskers, knocked his head for a little while against the wall behind him: while I sat in the corner, looking guiltily on" (*Great Expectations* 13). She is quite an angry young woman that terrifies Joe and Pip when she rampages on them. Despite the harsh beatings and severe discipline of Mrs Joe in the domestic environment, Pip puts up with these conditions in the village. Still, he enjoys his life in the countryside, which he depicts as "ours was the marsh country, down by the river, within, as the river wound, twenty miles of the sea" (*Great Expectations* 5). Despite Mrs Joe's domestic violence, Pip appears to be a happy child in his friendship with Joe and he is quite content with his circumstances in the village. This young boy does not have any concerns for his future except for his angry sister.

However, social pressure is still there and there is an attempt to educate Pip according to the middle-class norms. On the Christmas day, Mrs Joe and her husband have many guests that visit their house after the sermons in the village church. This dinner appears to be a traditional event that repeats itself every year. Moreover, there is much emphasis on social appearances beginning with Mrs Joe's manners and preparations at home unlike the usual domestic environment for Pip and Joe:

> When Joe and I got home, we found the table laid, and Mrs. Joe dressed, and the dinner dressing, and the front door unlocked (it never was at any other time) for the company to enter by, and everything most splendid. […] The time came, without bringing with it any relief to my feelings, and the company came. […] I opened the door to the company,—making believe that it was a habit of ours to open that door. (*Great Expectations* 24)

Clearly, Pip hates these social formalities at this stage of his life, mostly because his sister and family friends try to discipline him. Mr Wopsle, the clerk at the church, Mr and Mrs Hubble, the wheelwright and his wife and, last of all, Uncle Pumblechook arrive at the house for Christmas dinner (*Great Expectations* 24). Actually, this

company is always ready to give Pip moral lessons and teachings. Among this company, Pip criticises particularly the pretensions of Uncle Pumblechook and Mrs Joe. In the following account, Pip draws attention to their hypocritical manners as they appear to enjoy this gathering in an exaggerated way. Although he is a little child, Pip indicates a critical assessment of their pretentious greeting in the form of a necessary convention, which ironically repeats itself every year, as follows:

> 'Mrs Joe,' said Uncle Pumblechook; a large hard-breathing middle-aged slow man, with a mouth like a fish, dull staring eyes, and sandy hair standing upright on his head, so that he looked as if he had just been all but choked, and had that moment come to; 'I have brought you as the compliments of the season – I have brought you, Mum, a bottle of sherry wine – and I have brought you, Mum, a bottle of port wine. Every Christmas Day he presented himself, as a profound novelty with exactly the same words, and carrying the two bottles like dumb-bells. Every Christmas Day, Mrs Joe replied, as she now replied, 'Oh Un-cle Pum-ble-chook! This is kind!' Every Christmas Day, he retorted, as he now retorted, 'It's no more than your merits. And now are you all bobbish, and how's Sixpennorth of halfpence?' meaning me. (*Great Expectations* 25)

Pip observes that there is hypocrisy and pretentiousness in the behaviours of these characters. While Mrs Joe treats Pip and her husband in an angry way at home, she appears like a woman of joy and happiness in the company of the guests for the purpose of her social appearance. Similarly, Uncle Pumblechook's attitude towards Mrs Joe is completely different from his treatment of Pip (*Great Expectations* 25), as they look respectable in the company of other people.

Themselves moulded by social expectations, Mrs Joe and Uncle Pumblechook aim to train Pip according to the principles of social propriety and acceptability. Pip as an individual is actually made to conform to social values by means of such social occasions. The little boy is told to act in a socially appropriate way through his elders' advice and is introduced social values as unquestionable norms. The individual is shaped by the established social order which he does not have the means to challenge. Pip does not want to be involved in this traditional dinner, yet he is made to sit at the table, and he is expected to benefit from the advice of the elder people. Pip comments that "they wouldn't leave me alone. They seemed to think the opportunity lost, if they failed to point the conversation at me, every now and then, and stick the point into me"

(*Great Expectations* 25). This eventually becomes a kind of social project conducted according to the norms of the Victorian society.

There are several occasions in which Pip is taught to behave properly during the dinner. In this regard, Mrs Joe tells Pip to "be grateful" to his family in line with the expectations of his elders (*Great Expectations* 26). Uncle Pumblechook supports this remark, "especially, […] be grateful, boy, to them which brought you up by hand" (*Great Expectations* 26). In this case, gratefulness to his elders constitutes an aspect of respectability for Pip. Mr Hubble calls Pip "naturally wicious [*sic*]" (*Great Expectations* 26) for he thinks that Pip is never grateful to the people that provide everything for him. Even the pork served at this dinner is used as an example to "many a moral for the young!" (*Great Expectations* 26). Pip should see gluttony in the pig and avoid such bad manners. If it was not for Mrs Joe and her husband, Pip would not be, as Uncle Pumblechook states, "I mean, enjoying himself with his elders and betters, and improving himself with their conversation, rolling in the lap of luxury. Would he have been doing that?" (*Great Expectations* 27). Therefore, Pip encounters social expectations as a little boy while he is disciplined with rules of proper conduct, morality and respectability. Pip begins to realise that his social status is determined by his submission to the values dominant in society. At the end of this process, the protagonist is expected to adopt social norms of respectability and morality as his own values.

As stated, Pip's introduction to Victorian social aspirations, upward social movement, conformity to bourgeois norms and education to be a conformist begins at home through his sister Mrs Joe Gargery who teaches him socially appropriate and acceptable behaviours. Mrs Joe thus represents the voice of the established social order in *Great Expectations* as she directs Pip's behaviours and expects him to conform to Victorian social values. John Lindberg states that

> Mrs Joe's passion for respectability is central to the main theme of *Great Expectations*, because more than any other person she has had the shaping of Pip's conscience, his infantile and perdurable sense of right and wrong. The novel as a whole treats of social injustice, and that theme too may also explicate Mrs Joe's private struggle with her own conscience, for Dickens is apparently very concerned with the conflict between respectable prosperity and shameful poverty in the public

> scene and with the individual attempt to adapt private values to the status quo. (118)

In this respect, the relationship between Pip and his sister Mrs Joe needs further investigation for the analysis of bourgeois social oppression of the individual in the early nineteenth-century English society. Clearly, Mrs Joe and her aspirations for respectability constitute a guideline for Pip as regards his ambition for a higher social status. Mrs Joe's sense of propriety in line with middle-class values makes Pip yearn for respectability. Pip thinks that

> my sister, Mrs Joe Gargery, was more than twenty years older than I, and had established a greatest reputation with herself and the neighbourhood because she had brought me up 'by hand'. Having at that time to find out for myself what the expression meant, and knowing her to have a hard and heavy hand, and to be much in the habit of laying it upon her husband as well as upon me, I supposed that Joe Gargery and I were both brought up by hand. (*Great Expectations* 9)

Despite Mrs Joe's lower-class status in the village as the wife of the blacksmith, her belief in social mobility causes Pip to follow middle-class prospects. As a woman that strictly controls Pip, Mrs Joe affects Pip also through her attitude towards social values. She is the first character in the novel to introduce Pip to Victorian bourgeois norms. Her discontent with her living conditions leaves a deep impact on Pip, who also begins to question his social status in a short time. The concern for respectability becomes a common concern for Mrs Joe and Pip. As Lindberg states,

> Mrs Joe is a hysterical, passionate woman, barely in control of herself. Her sweetness to Pumblechook, even her struggle to keep herself and Pip off the parish before Joe took pity of them, betray the specious piety of a barbarous egotism seeking status in a conventional respectability. She is fiercely respectable, with a suspect carefulness in minutiae of conduct. (118)

Similarly, as Lucy Frost argues, "in *Great Expectations* it is the psychologically aberrant women, not the admired models of Victorian womanhood, who engage Dickens's subtle and complex imagination" (60). Mrs Joe's authoritarian and powerful representation in the domestic sphere challenges the socially accepted gender roles. Her position forces Pip to learn and to conform to bourgeois social values in the early nineteenth-century society. Just as Mrs Joe has a prominent role in Pip's upbringing, she

contributes to Pip's apprenticeship to Joe due to her social concerns about his appearance in society (*Great Expectations* 41). Later, Pip's meeting with Miss Havisham and Estella, who inspire Pip for upward social movement, is also initiated by Mrs Joe's authority (*Great Expectations* 49). Mrs Joe's strong belief in social norms restrains Pip who feels himself under control of social authority since Mrs Joe makes him act in accordance with socially acceptable manners. Mrs Joe's discontent with the rural lifestyle becomes a driving force for Pip in adopting bourgeois social values and disdaining his rural and lower-class social environment. As Pip complies with the expectations of the bourgeois social values, the individual at the beginning of the novel is replaced by a young boy of conformity in order to become a respectable young man.

In line with the social practices in the countryside, Pip is expected to be involved in daily life more seriously for the sake of conformity as he grows up. Since Joe is the blacksmith of the village, Pip is apprenticed by Joe to learn this trade and contribute to his family with his labour. In these years of his life, Pip has not yet been introduced to the industrial society and urban living conditions. As a boy living in the southern countryside, he simply begins to work as Joe's apprentice to become a craftsman. At the time, being an apprentice means not only work ethic, but also a form of social discipline. Pip says that "when I was old enough, I was to be apprenticed to Joe, and until I could assume that dignity I was not to be what Mrs Joe called 'Pompeyed', or (as I render it) pampered" (*Great Expectations* 41). Mrs Joe expects Pip to behave in a grave and solid manner. His acting in a proper way includes his responsibility towards the community in the town. Pip further explains:

> I was not only odd-boy about the forge, but if any neighbour happened to want an extra boy to frighten birds, or pick up stones, or do any such job, I was favoured with the employment. In order, however, that our superior position might not be compromised thereby, a money-box was kept on the kitchen mantel-shelf, into which it was publicly made known that all my earnings were dropped. (*Great Expectations* 42)

Pip here exemplifies the relationship between the individual and the bourgeois society. Accordingly, in the social setting of the countryside, Mrs Joe does not allow Pip to be spoiled for the sake of social acceptability in the community. She keeps their status above everything and sends Pip away to do all sorts of things in the town in order not to

be reproached. Moreover, she keeps an appearance of justice towards Pip in the eyes of society storing Pip's money in a box available for everyone. However, she can easily sacrifice Pip's endeavours as he says "I know I had no hope of any personal participation in the treasure" (*Great Expectations* 42). So, Pip learns how society, including his own sister, makes use of his merits in order to benefit financially. Mrs Joe also presents Pip as an example to other kids in the village because of his hard work and diligence to keep their "superior position" (*Great Expectations* 42). While Pip is controlled by social values, his productivity is also encouraged. Horkheimer states that "as for the ideal of productivity, it must be observed that economic significance today is measured in terms of usefulness with respect to the structure of power, not with respect to the needs of all. The individual must prove his value to one or other of the groups engaged in the struggle" (*Eclipse of Reason* 154). Horkheimer further states that "nor is efficiency, the modern criterion and sole justification for the very existence of any individual, to be confused with real technical skill […]. It inheres in the ability to be 'one of the boys,' to hold one's own, to impress others" (*Eclipse of Reason* 154). Pip's productivity and diligent efforts determine his usefulness in the early nineteenth-century society. So, his contribution to his family – on a microcosmic level – plays an important role in his social status. Through his hard work, Pip evidently shows that he conforms to social expectations. Pip's productivity, therefore, depends on his conformity to social expectations like those of Mrs Joe. So, he is rewarded by being one of the good boys in the village, and he impresses the community through his submissive attitude.

This process of disciplining the individuals is strengthened by the nineteenth-century utilitarian theory which aimed to maximise total benefits, indeed the benefits of society. This submission of the individuals to social needs is expected by the bourgeois industrial society to maintain social harmony and to protect benefits of society. Pip's training at his home and apprenticeship are, actually, results of the utilitarian philosophy dominant in the Victorian society. Since utilitarianism and self help are influential philosophies that determine individual conduct in the nineteenth-century England, they will be studied in relation to their reflections in *Great Expectations*. In line with the bourgeois intention to control the individual, the Victorian society makes use of utilitarian philosophy. According to utilitarianism, the individual struggles for the

greatest amount of happiness for other people, rather than himself. For the responsibility of the individual towards society, John Mill states that

> when once the general happiness is recognised as the ethical standard, it will constitute the strength of the utilitarian morality. This firm foundation is that of the social feelings of mankind; the desire to be in unity with our fellow creatures, which is already a powerful principle in human nature, and happily one of those which tend to become stronger, even without express inculcation, from the influences of civilisation. […] Man never conceives himself otherwise than a member of a body; and this association is riveted more and more, as mankind are further removed from the state of savage independence. (*Utilitarianism* 32)

In the light of Mill's argument, it must be stated that society and its benefits are the standards the individuals should adopt to serve society. The function of the individual in the utilitarian philosophy is to unite with other "fellow" people in line with human nature (Mill, *Utilitarianism* 32). As the unity among people is, thus, naturalised, the individuals are supposed to feel happy for being a part of this natural unity. People cannot consider themselves independent from society, which means that the individuals are all constituent parts of society as a whole. As discussed in the Introduction, the Frankfurt School critical theory suggests that the individuals cannot exist as independent beings in this society, because the individual is simply a part of the whole, or society. Since society treats the individuals only as parts of a union, the individuals are oppressed by such philosophies like utilitarianism which uses them for the benefits of society.

Furthermore, utilitarian philosophy of social benefit is considered to be "human nature" as John Mill states (*Utilitarianism* 32). The greatest happiness principle also supports work ethic as a moral standard since it contributes to the whole society. The hard working individuals at the same time feel themselves to be a useful component of the social system. The individuals devote themselves and their work to the benefit of the bourgeois industrial society. According to Mill, those individuals who consider themselves free from the social system belong to "the state of savage independence," which the Victorian society has successfully overcome in the course of its development towards a more civilised social order (*Utilitarianism* 32). Hence, in utilitarianism the bourgeois social order expecting the submission of the individual is justified, whereas

the independence of the individual is recognised as a "savage" state (*Utilitarianism* 32). As Mill further states, "any condition, which is essential to a state of society, becomes more and more an inseparable part of every person's conception of the state of things which he is born into, and which is the destiny of a human being" (*Utilitarianism* 32). In this respect, the individual is subordinated to society in a submissive and subservient manner.

Accordingly, the concept of self help also contributed to the domination of the individuals in the Victorian society. Just as utilitarianism prioritises the principle of greatest happiness for the greatest number of people – society – disregarding the individual, self help also puts the benefits of society before those of the individual, who is expected to support himself without being a burden on society. Hence, self help turns into a means of oppressing the individual like utilitarianism. Samuel Smiles asserts that

> this spirit of self-help, as exhibited in the energetic action of individuals, has in all times been a marked feature in the English character, and furnishes the true measure of our power as a nation. Rising above the heads of the mass, there have always been a series of individuals distinguished by others, who have commanded the public homage [respect]. But our progress has been owing to multitudes of smaller and unknown men. […] Even the humblest person, who sets before his fellows an example of industry, sobriety, and upright honesty of purpose in life, has a present as well as a future influence upon the well-being of his country. (11)

The notion of self help, thus, encourages personal development for the purpose of development on a larger scale. As the pioneering figure of industrialisation, the middle class promotes such an understanding so that the individuals perform their duty for society while they empower the social system that dominates them. The individuals are expected to serve bourgeois benefits. As Black and MacRaild argue

> public opinion may be said to be, that sentiment on any given subject which is entertained by the best informed, most intelligent, and most moral person in the community, which is gradually spread and adopted by nearly all persons of any education or proper feeling in a civilised state. […] As most of these prerequisites are to be found in the middle class of [Victorian] society as well as the upper, it follows that the power of public opinion depends in a great measure on the proportion that the upper and middle class of society bear to the lower, or on the quantity of intelligence and wealth that exists in the community. (260)

In the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist Victorian society dominated by middle-class values, public opinion demands social control and supervision in all public actions to protect the harmonious social order. The requirement to be considered respectable in social interactions is to contribute to the development of the bourgeois society. Black and MacRaild state that respectability "was meant to demonstrate an individual's willingness to support the institutional life of society at all levels. […] Responsible membership of society was stressed [in the Victorian era]" (262). This rivalry among the individuals to be more respectable was encouraged by the norms of Victorian morality, which "placed people within a hierarchy. With society becoming more impersonal, moral values came increasingly to be stressed in terms of what individuals could do for society through their own personal morality. […] This lay at the heart of the Victorian idea of progress" (Black and MacRaild 262). Accordingly, the individual who successfully carries out his duty towards society is rewarded with a respectable social status. Hence, the conformists are considered to be more respectable than the nonconformists who challenge the normative values. The middle class, thus, maintains the status quo for their own privileges. Gilmour states that "the description of the nineteenth century as the age of great expectation and unwearied striving after better things plays an important part in *Great Expectations*, as it did in the real world out of which the book was written" ("Gentleman," 111). Black and MacRaild assert that in the Victorian society "work was perceived to be both a responsibility and a duty. This did not simply mean paid employment, however. […] Work, duty, good moral character – all these things stressed the respectability of the individual and its benefits to society. […] Respectability was meant to be a way of emphasising appropriate behaviour across class boundaries" (264). As Gilmour further claims,

> [*Great Expectations*] is unique among [Dickens's] fiction in that its real subject is not a specific social abuse, or a series of related abuses, but nothing less than civilisation itself; more accurately, it is a study in social evolution, a drama of the development of conscience and sensibility in a child who grows up in the early years of the nineteenth-century. ("Gentleman," 118)

Self help and benefits of utilitarian philosophy were not available for the lower class, as respectability was a middle-class ideal. By means of self help, upward social mobility seems possible in the Victorian society. However, the lower-class people have no access

to the means like training and professional education that enable personal development. Pip actually resents his environment for the lack of social and economic means that will enable such transformation through personal development (*Great Expectations* 66). He knows that he cannot improve his personal skills and manners in the village while he lives with his family (*Great Expectations* 66). Pip's great expectations require conformity. Self disciplining is a precondition for self help, and it results in conformity as the individual adopts social norms. Therefore, self discipline and self help are necessary for Pip's social mobility. Pip as an individual, who should discipline himself for self help and serve benefits of society in line with utilitarian philosophy, becomes no more than a product of the established social order since he is formed according to social norms.

In the light of self help and self discipline in the Victorian era, it is obvious that Pip's conflictual relationship with society develops out of two major incidents that lead to Pip's transformation into a boy with aspirations and his development of a new identity. Firstly, Pip meets with Miss Havisham and Estella, upper class characters compared to Pip's position as a coarse worker (*Great Expectations* 53). Secondly, Jaggers offers Pip great expectations coming from a mysterious benefactor to make Pip socially equal to upper class people through education (*Great Expectations* 128). The ideal of becoming a gentleman is crucial for Pip while it at the same time means that he will be strictly controlled by the normative bourgeois values and manners which he will have to learn in his training in London. As Ruth Glancy states,

> because Pip's great expectations involve becoming a 'gentleman,' many of the characters in the novel help Dickens define what he means by that term. According to British custom, the title of the gentleman was an inherited one, based on family background and wealth acquired from property. It also implied the possession of good manners and morals, as typified by the knight, the gentle man of the Middle Ages. (128)

Clearly, the social status of the gentleman shows differences in centuries beginning from the Middle Ages onwards. By the early decades of the nineteenth century, however, the social structure of the English society dramatically changed with the social mobility of the middle class as a result of free trade and industrialisation. Hence, the

term gentleman acquired various connotations apart from its origins in the previous centuries. As Glancy points out

> by the nineteenth-century, […] the Industrial Revolution had made the title less easily defined because a new class of wealthy industrialists had risen from humble origins. Many of the new self-made men were disdainful of the class from which they had risen and were anxious to acquire respectability and gentility. And the old families continued to reject this new class on the grounds that they had no pedigree and they were engaged in trade. (128)

The definition of the gentleman, thus, includes the middle class due to the changing economic, social and political circumstances. By the early Victorian period, the middle class was dominant in the English society due to economic and political power of this class. As Donald Hawes states,

> the class system in Victorian England had three broad divisions: upper, middle and lower. In the first category were the aristocracy and the landed gentry. The second group was subdivided: the upper middle class included professional and business men along with well-to-do Church of England clergy; the lower middle class included clerks and small shop owners. Some people who belonged to this last-named subdivision, on the border between the middle and lower classes, were given the epithet 'shabby-genteel.' The lower classes were the manual workers and their families, below whom were the unclassifiable thousands of poor and destitute men, women and children. People were expected to know their place. (34)

The establishment of free trade and capitalism as economic doctrines was supported by the rights of the middle class to be represented in the parliament earned by the Reform Bill of 1832. Hence, the middle class moved upwards in society to a powerful position that brought bourgeois domination in the Victorian era. By means of industrialisation, the Victorian society was going through a process of transformation in every aspect. Daniel Pool states that "the changes in English society in the 1800s altered the somewhat static hierarchy. To begin with, industry and manufacturing created new sources of wealth that could compete with land, even though its holders frequently had to put some of their wealth into the landownership of a country estate, to be really accepted" (46). In these decades, the enclosures of agricultural lands and mechanisation of agriculture via the Industrial Revolution constituted a threat to the traditional village life as they changed the social dynamics in favour of urban life. Towards the mid-nineteenth-century, professions became both more influential and more respected

resulting in the division of middle class into lower and upper middle classes through clerks and government officers as people of lower middle class: "In effect, these vast and rapid changes meant that status was more and more what you yourself could make. […] If you were Ferdinand Lopez or Pip, you asked to be taken seriously as a gentleman. Progress into a higher class necessitated mastery of various social rituals, speech patterns, and even habits of spending" (Pool 47). These developments rendered the middle-class authority unquestionable in the nineteenth-century English society. The individuals who aspired to respectability in the bourgeois society had to adopt middle-class manners and values.

Accordingly, gentlemanly qualities were systematically imposed on the individuals as social norms in public life to ascertain that they would not be challenged. In his *Self Help* (1859), Samuel Smiles also deals with the question of the true gentleman. This guidance book primarily handles the individual's condition in the Victorian society and provides Victorians with instructions about how to behave in the community. While such guidance books help the middle-class members comply with the social values, they threaten individuality and personal freedom at the same time. As regards the gentlemanly qualities, Smiles states that "the crown and glory of life is character. It is the noblest possession of a man, constituting a rank in itself, and an estate in the general good-will; dignifying every station, and exalting every position in society. It exercises a greater power than wealth, and secures all the honour without jealousies of fame" (192). A good character is deemed to be the most important characteristic of a person and the character plays a determining role in one's status in society. Here, economic means are not as influential as a decent character in terms of gentility. In this regard, "character is human nature in its best form. It is moral order embodied in the individual. Men of character are not only conscience of society, but in every well-governed state they are its best motive power; for it is moral qualities in the main which rule the world" (Smiles 192). Morality is also an important part of the gentleman's character, and social conscience needs to be built upon morality of the individual in this sense. Smiles states that "riches and rank have no necessary connection with genuine gentlemanly qualities. The poor man may be a true gentleman, – in spirit and in daily life. He may be honest, truthful, upright, polite, temperate, courageous, self-respecting, and self-helping. The

poor man with a rich spirit is in all ways superior to the rich man with a poor spirit" (201). In other words, the economic circumstances do not determine one's being a gentleman as much as qualities of character, and this understanding denotes certain behaviours for the individual. Smiles makes a connection between Victorian social values and the qualities of a gentleman: "Gentleness in society is like the silent influence of light, which gives colour to all nature. […] Morals and manners, which give colour to life, are of greater importance than laws, which are but one of their manifestations. The law touches us here and there, but manners are about us everywhere, pervading society like the air we breathe" (197). In the Victorian society, middle-class values like morality and respectability are indispensable aspects of social life. In an ideal man, these qualities are expected to be integrated into gentleness. Nevertheless, economic means are also important to a great extent in the formation of gentleness since social class is mainly determined by profession and income. It is for this reason that Pip's mysterious benefactor demands him to leave his village and start a new life in London where he is to be trained to become a gentleman.

The notions of gentility and being a gentleman result in the conflict between Pip as an individual and the bourgeois society in *Great Expectations*. Although Pip has aspired to have better circumstances than his rural environment could provide in his childhood and become a part of the bourgeois community through his gentlemanly qualities, he learns that his great expectations connect him to a convict. Furthermore, his friend Herbert's remark on the qualities of a true gentleman proves that one must be "a true gentleman at heart [and] a true gentleman in manner" (*Great Expectations* 166). In other words, a socially acceptable appearance is not sufficient to be a gentleman. Hence, Pip encounters two different forms of a gentleman that are exemplified by Compeyson's and Herbert's cases in *Great Expectations*. Christine Berberich states that "gentleman – a word simultaneously conjuring up diverse images, yet one so difficult to define. When we hear the term, we might think of Englishness; of class; of masculinity; of elegant fashions; of *manners and morals*. […] The term *gentleman* is highly ambiguous and amorphous, and consequently almost impossible to pinpoint" (3-4). Likewise, William Hazlitt explains that "at the beginning of the nineteenth century, what it is that constitutes the look of a gentleman is more easily felt than described. We all know it

when we see it, but we do not know how to account for it" (209). The gentleman in this changing social structure became the embodiment of bourgeois social values. Hence, the person that complies with the values of the middle-class Victorian society is considered to be a gentleman. Nevertheless, a character like Compeyson could easily be misconceived as a gentleman due to the standardised notion of a gentleman only through his appearance. In *Great Expectations*, there is ambiguity in the sense of being a true gentleman since the bourgeois society is mainly occupied with appearances. For this reason, as Majumdar argues "Dickens who saw gentleman from the outside came to appreciate both the centrality of the gentlemanly idea in Victorian culture and its underlying irony however moralised; the concept depended for its existence upon exclusion on separating the gentleman from the non-gentleman. *Great Expectations* is the fruit of that understanding" (100). The characters that do not have gentlemanly qualities in *Great Expectations*, such as Bentley Drummle, Compeyson and Orlick, help Dickens provide a guideline for the representation of a gentleman. Although the definition of the gentleman seems to be rather ambiguous, Pip's desire for upward social movement exemplifies the domination of the middle class and the need for the individual to comply with social expectations symbolised by gentlemanly qualities. Pip's encounter with the middle-class values through his aspirations and his desire to become a gentleman display the conflict between the individual and society. From a theoretical perspective, it could be put forward that Pip aims to conform to the social values that are represented by appearances in the bourgeois industrial society. Except for Herbert's comment on being a gentleman, Pip always tries to comply with the appearances in society. Therefore, he never feels himself like a true gentleman at heart in his search for a status that he could not exactly define. He just conforms to the social norms in a state of false consciousness caused by his ambition to be an appropriate suitor for Estella.

In relation to the discussion of gentlemanly qualities, the first main incident that leads to Pip's transformation into a boy with aspirations in *Great Expectations* is Pip's visit to Miss Havisham's house, which teaches Pip the hierarchical structure of the bourgeois industrial society and the necessity for social mobility towards a respectable social status (*Great Expectations* 53). Especially, Estella's elegant manners and higher social

status affect Pip from their first meeting onwards. Under the influence of his first love and Estella's higher social status, Pip begins to question his own lower-class condition. Pip believes that respectability is the only means to be equal to Estella and to be loved by her. So, he feels ready to embrace bourgeois manners and norms at the end of his visit to Miss Havisham. Pip finds Estella's arrogant attitude while she looks down upon him so strange that he wonders why she acts like that: "Though she called me 'boy' so often, and with a carelessness that was far from complimentary, she was of about my own age. She seemed much older than I, of course, being a girl, and beautiful and self-possessed; and she was as scornful of me as if she had been one-and-twenty, and a queen" (*Great Expectations* 54). On the first day at Satis House, Pip is made to play with Estella. At the end of their card game, Pip feels ashamed of himself for the first time in his life because of Estella's humiliation of his manners and appearance: "'He calls the knaves, Jacks, this boy!' said Estella with disdain, before our first game was out. 'And what coarse hands he has! And what thick boots!'" (*Great Expectations* 57). Her explicitly degrading manner causes embarrassment in Pip, who is yet to understand what actually happens around him:

> I had never thought of being ashamed of my hands before; but I began to consider them a very indifferent pair. Her contempt for me was so strong, that I became infectious, and I caught it. She won the game, and I dealt. I misdealt, as was only natural, when I knew she was lying in wait for me to do wrong; and she denounced me for a stupid, clumsy labouring-boy. (*Great Expectations* 58)

In this instance, Pip is humiliated for being a countryman and being a worker, the apprentice of a blacksmith. For Pip, his lower-class origins, his being a blacksmith's apprentice and his rural upbringing are all sources of shame compared to Estella's upper class and wealthy condition. Pip does not have the social manners to be recognised as a respectable gentleman by his first love Estella, which leads to self questioning for him:

> I took the opportunity of being alone in the courtyard, to look at my coarse hands and my common boots. My opinion of those accessories was not favourable. They had never troubled me before, but they troubled me now, as vulgar appendages. I determined to ask Joe why he had ever taught me to call those picture-cards, Jacks, which ought to be called knaves. I wish Joe had been rather more genteely [*sic*] brought up, and then I should have been so too. (*Great Expectations* 59)

Hence, Pip learns the hierarchical differences between people in the bourgeois society. His current appearance signifies his inferiority in comparison with Estella, who looks down upon Pip. Moreover, she continues to humiliate Pip due to his commonness and Pip hates his social status more. As Estella brings food and drink to Pip in the yard, she treats him like a filthy animal to be detested:

> She came back, with some bread and meat and a little mug of beer. She put the mug down on the stones of the yard, and gave me the bread and meat without looking at me, as insolently as if I were a dog in disgrace. I was so humiliated, hurt, spurned, offended, angry, sorry – I cannot hit upon the right name for the smart – God knows what its name was – that tears started to my eyes. (*Great Expectations* 59)

On the point of crying, Pip feels desperate in his desolation. He knows that nobody around understands his situation and his shame for being inferior to Estella. At that moment, he, in fact, realises his commonness resulting from rural and lower-class origins, which is the reason for being exposed to this humiliation from his own perspective. As he says, "my sister's bringing up had made me sensitive" (*Great Expectations* 59). He considers his sensitivity towards Estella's injustice as an important factor in his current situation. The social environment that has created him does not help him overcome his problem. The act of calling the knaves as Jacks, having coarse hands as a sign of hand labour and thick boots without style indicating his lower-class status and lack of economic means actually cause humiliation and shame when Pip walks into the middle and upper class social environment. As a common labouring boy, he contemplates on the way back to the forge that he "was in a low-lived bad way" (*Great Expectations* 62). When he comes back home, Pip cannot tell what happened in Satis House, since he thinks that Mrs Joe and Uncle Pumblechook will not be able to understand his experience during the few hours he spent there. Nevertheless, he confesses later to Joe, who has always been a friend, that "I felt very miserable. […] that she had said I was common, and that I knew I was common, and that I wished I was not common" (*Great Expectations* 66). In line with his wish of not being common, a process of self degradation continues in Pip. He immediately compares his lifestyle and social environment to Estella's. Thus, he gradually believes in the idea of his inferiority and commonness resulting from his social status:

> When I got up to my little room and said my prayers, I did not forget Joe's recommendation, and yet my young mind was in that disturbed and unthankful state, that I thought long after I laid down, how common Estella would consider Joe, a mere blacksmith: how thick his boots, and how coarse his hands. I thought how Joe and my sister were then sitting in the kitchen, how I had come up to bed from the kitchen, and how Miss Havisham and Estella never sat in the kitchen, but were far above the level of such common doings. […] That was a memorable day to me, for it made great changes in me. (*Great Expectations* 68)

This conflict in Pip's identity actually results in his aspirations towards a higher social status and respectability. In this stage, bourgeois construction of Pip's identity to adapt himself to bourgeois norms is observed. Additionally, Pip believes that his lower-class status justifies such treatment by Estella. So, class differences occupy Pip's mind to the extent that upward social movement becomes a vital matter for him. As Jeremy Tambling asserts, "*Great Expectations* certainly recognises itself to be about the creation of identities, imposed from higher to lower, from oppressor to oppressed. […] Identities all become a matter of social control and naming. […] Pip remains the passive victim whose reaction is to blame himself for every action he is in" (131). The oppression coming from the higher social classes on the lower-class individuals renders Pip as the victim of the Victorian social structure. Chesterton points out that the process leading to Pip's self-questioning "describes how easily a free lad of fresh and decent human instincts can be made to care more for rank and pride and the degrees of our stratified society than for old affection and for honour" (112). Furthermore, it must be pointed out that "Pip is meant to show how circumstances can corrupt men" in the bourgeois Victorian society (Chesterton 113). Hobsbaum states that

> for all oddity, Miss Havisham shows Pip a glimpse of Society beyond his previous life. It is one to which, with all its falsity, he begins to aspire. Miss Havisham's accent is different, her manner is different; she has a beautiful young ward who treats Pip with disdain. All this goes to make him aware of his common origins. In these weird surroundings, anything natural seems uncouth. […] Pip, then, is made discontented, and not just with his home. He feels nothing but disgust for his trade, his indentures and his kindly master, the blacksmith. (225)

Pip, who was previously a simple country boy, starts to yearn for having the appearance and manners of a respectable gentleman that will impress Estella. The change in Pip's perspective leads to the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society since

this self-questioning is a threat against individuality along with Pip's intention to conform to the social norms.

Pip's changing attitude is related to this social environment that imposes conformity as a necessity to be recognised by the dominant middle class. Clearly, the early Victorian society is in conflict with the individuality of the protagonist in *Great Expectations*. In his *Eclipse of Reason*, Horkheimer states that "in the era of free enterprise, the so-called era of individualism, individuality was most completely subordinated to self-preserving reason. In that era, the idea of individuality seemed […] to become merely a synthesis of the individual's material interests" (138). As stated, although individualism underlies the rise of the middle class in economic and social aspects, the middle class restricts individuality to maintain the established social order for its own benefits. As Horkheimer further states, "individualism is the very heart of the theory and practice of bourgeois liberalism, which sees society as progressing through the automatic interaction of divergent interests in a free market" (*Eclipse of Reason* 138). Accordingly, in *Great Expectations*, Pip's willingness to conform to the social values and his submission to the bourgeois ideals to become a gentleman lead him to unhappiness and loss of individuality. As Horkheimer asserts,

> by echoing, repeating, imitating his surroundings, by adapting himself to all the powerful groups to which he eventually belongs, by transforming himself from a human being into a member of organisations, by sacrificing his potentialities for the sake of readiness and ability to conform to and gain influence in such organisations, [the individual] manages to survive. It is survival achieved by the oldest biological means of survival, namely, mimicry. (*Eclipse of Reason* 142)

Pip's desire to rise on the social scale, to leave his rural environment behind, to be a part of the bourgeois society and to be a gentleman by conforming to the bourgeois social values is a result of submission to the powerful middle-class authority and mimicry of the bourgeois appearances in the Victorian society. Since the middle class "glorifies the world as it is," the poor country boy is deceived by this glorious social environment of the industrial society (Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* 142). The social status of the individual is highly influential on his awareness of identity in the bourgeois society. Pip as a lower-class individual is ready to imitate middle-class habits and customs to be a respectable member of society. Horkheimer asserts that "the more intense an

individual's concerns with power over things, the more will things [social values and norms] dominate him, the more will he lack any genuine individual traits, and the more will his mind be transformed into an automaton" (*Eclipse of Reason* 129-130). Pip's adoption of bourgeois values makes him mechanically serve bourgeois benefits. As Horkheimer points out, "in the nineteenth-century concept of a rational society of the future, the emphasis was on planning, organising and centralising mechanisms rather than on the plight of the individual" (*Eclipse of Reason* 147). Similarly, Pip, in *Great Expectations*, thinks that social mobility will bring him a higher social status and becomes a subject in the planning and organisation of the Victorian society. Through this process, Pip becomes a repressed individual in the industrial society.

As stated, Pip's transformation can be traced under the influence of social norms. As Dianne Sadoff suggests "because he wants not to be 'common,' Pip dedicates himself early to self-education, to autodidaction. He assumes that scholarship – mastering the skills and mysteries of language – will help him 'rise' in the class structure. […] Pip decides education and knowing the correct language will cure his coarseness" (186). However, as pointed out, Pip's attempt at self improvement is limited by the circumstances in the countryside, yet he is a resolute country boy who believes that "the best step I could take towards making myself uncommon was to get out of Biddy everything she knew" (*Great Expectations* 68). Although Biddy willingly helps Pip educate himself through books, newspapers and reading sessions, her efforts are not sufficient for Pip. Biddy is also a country girl and Pip compares Biddy with Estella while Estella continues to be his ideal girl due to her upper class status. During their studies together, Pip thinks that "she was not beautiful, - but she was common, and could not be like Estella, - but she was pleasant and wholesome and sweet-tempered" (*Great Expectations* 116). Pip's focus on improving himself for a better future cannot be released from the image of Estella as his humiliator, who is compared to Biddy in manners and appearance. This attitude shows that the naïve child at the beginning of the novel is replaced by a young boy who attempts to break away from his lower-class and common roots. In other words, the individual obeys social authority in a submissive manner becoming a subject, or dependent, of society for a respectable status. As stated above, it is clear that Estella has put the idea for social mobility in Pip's mind.

It is therefore a timely revelation that Mr Jaggers announces the availability of the necessary economic means to rise on the social scale, which is actually the second main incident that transforms Pip into a boy with ambitions. In other words, Pip learns about his great expectations. Pip, the poor country boy, is to be educated in London by a professional as a middle-class boy. During his visit, Mr Jaggers, a lawyer coming from London, affects Pip with his authority and respectability among countrymen. In *Great Expectations*, Jaggers is introduced through his discussion with Mr Wopsle on the subject of a "highly popular murder" committed in the country (*Great Expectations* 124). The legal arguments proclaimed by Jaggers against Mr Wopsle in the company of the local people bring the lawyer to an acclaimed position in the eyes of the crowd, which results from Jaggers' gentlemanly qualities and respectability. Pip explains Jaggers' influence on the crowd as follows:

> We were all deeply persuaded that the unfortunate Wopsle had gone too far, and had better stop in his reckless career while there was yet time. The strange gentleman, with an air of authority not to be disputed, and with a manner expressive of knowing something secret about every one of us that would effectually do for each individual if he chose to disclose it, left the back of the settle, and came into the space between the two settles, in front of the fire, where he remained standing, his left hand in his pocket, and he biting the forefinger of his right. (*Great Expectations* 126)

This man of authority leaves a great impact on Pip with his direction and control of the argument he has with Wopsle, a man of good reputation in the town. Pip remembers this man that will change his life as a man with "his large head, his dark complexion, his deep-set eyes, his bushy black eyebrows, his large watch-chain, his strong dots of beard and whisker, and even the smell of scented soap on his great hand" (*Great Expectations* 127). Pip observes Jaggers closely in Joe's home as Jaggers explains the reason for his coming to their town. Jaggers reveals that a secret benefactor has decided to provide Pip with economic means for his education in London:

> Now, I return to this young fellow. And the communication I have got to make is, that he has Great Expectations. […] I am instructed to communicate to him […] that he will come into a handsome property. Further, that is the desire of the present possessor of that property, that he be immediately removed from his

> present sphere of life and from this place, and be brought up as a gentleman – in a word, as a young fellow of great expectations. (*Great Expectations* 129)

The revelation of the real benefactor, towards the end of the novel, to be the convict Abel Magwitch whom Pip helped as a little child on the marshes causes great controversy in Pip's worldview. However, Pip enjoys the offer to become a gentleman at this stage in his life since he will become a respectable man in the bourgeois society. Actually, Pip becomes the subject of a long lasting plan that aims to create a gentleman out of the blacksmith's apprentice as Magwitch aims to take his revenge on the bourgeois society that denied him a respectable status due to his lack of economic and social means.

Accordingly, the relationship between Pip and Magwitch in *Great Expectations* presents another aspect of the social hegemony in the Victorian era and Pip's identity is constructed according to social norms. It is revealed that Magwitch was convicted at the court, in particular, for his lack of bourgeois manners to be considered as respectable when he was put on trial with Compeyson who set him up to appear as an outcast in society. Magwitch is another individual pressurised into socially appropriate behaviours by the Victorian society. His lower-class origins and lack of economic circumstances bring him into a closer relationship with Compeyson, the villain in the novel, who causes Magwitch to participate in illegal actions. Compeyson is presented as another example to how a gentleman should not behave, in addition to Drummle, since he initially leaves Miss Havisham on their wedding day (*Great Expectations* 167), and, secondly, he takes advantage of Magwitch leaving him alone in the courtroom to be despised because of his lower-class status. Compeyson might also be compared to Pip in terms of Pip's commitment to become a gentleman in the Victorian society. Actually, Compeyson and Magwitch's trial illustrates bourgeois obsession with social appearances as Magwitch is punished for his unrespectable appearance. Pip's benefactor depicts their common past as follows:

> Not to go into the things that Compeyson planned, and I done—which 'ud take a week—I'll simply say to you, dear boy, and Pip's comrade, that that man got me into such nets as made me his black slave. I was always in debt to him, always under his thumb, always a working, always a getting into danger. He was younger

> than me, but he'd got craft, and he'd got learning, and he overmatched me five hundred times told and no mercy. (*Great Expectations* 319)

The great difference between these partners puts Magwitch in an unfavourable position compared to Compeyson at that time. Their relationship is significant for the conflict between the individual and society in terms of Magwitch's prejudiced treatment at the court when Compeyson was favoured due to his social status as a gentleman. After they were caught for felony, Compeyson offers him separate defences and Magwitch is left as a miserable and poor man on his own. He depicts the rest of their trials as such:

> When we was put in the dock, I noticed first of all what a gentleman Compeyson looked, wi' his curly hair and his black clothes and his white pocket-handkercher, and what a common sort of a wretch I looked. When the prosecution opened and the evidence was put short, aforehand, I noticed how heavy it all bore on me, and how light on him. When the evidence was giv in the box, I noticed how it was always me that had come for'ard, and could be swore to, how it was always me that the money had been paid to, how it was always me that had seemed to work the thing and get the profit. (*Great Expectations* 320)

By means of his socially appropriate conduct and respectable clothing, Compeyson presents himself as a better and respectable man, like a gentleman, next to Magwitch, the outcast, at the courtroom. Magwitch is trapped by Compeyson the gentleman according to the appearances in the bourgeois society. His barrister also compares them in line with their appearance and background. He implies that the young and better educated Compeyson who comes from a respectable family is innocent, while the old man is not a decent and good citizen (*Great Expectations* 320). Such representation of these two characters exemplifies not only corruption in the legal system and bourgeois society, but also class bias against the lower class:

> [T]hen I see the plan plainer; for, says the counsellor for Compeyson, 'My lord and gentlemen, here you has afore you, side by side, two persons as your eyes can separate wide; one, the younger, well brought up, who will be spoke to as such; one, the elder, ill brought up, who will be spoke to as such. […] Can you doubt, […] which is much the worst one?' (*Great Expectations* 320)

The final attack against Magwitch at the courtroom comes through the knowledge of social habits, manners and values that Compeyson makes use of affecting the judge for his appeals, which leave Magwitch as a desolate convict in the eyes of society. Their

characters are evaluated within the context of respectability in the Victorian society, disregarding Magwitch's personal pleadings, and affirming Compeyson as a better and respectable man:

> And when it come to character, warn't it Compeyson as had been to the school, and warn't it his schoolfellows as was in this position and in that, and warn't it him as had been know'd by witnesses in such clubs and societies, and nowt to his disadvantage? And warn't it me as had been tried afore, and as had been know'd up hill and down dale in Bridewells and Lock-Ups! […] And when the verdict come, warn't it Compeyson as was recommended to mercy on account of good character and bad company, and giving up all the information he could agen me, and warn't it me as got never a word but Guilty. (*Great Expectations* 320)

Magwitch's partnership with Compeyson resulted in a destructive situation with his deportation to Australia. However, he did not forget Compeyson and the treatment he received at the courtroom. Glancy states that "if Victorian society wrongly identified family background with gentlemanly status, so did many mistake wealth and possessions with moral superiority. The villain Compeyson has managed to pass himself off as a gentleman because he has the right schooling, accent and clothes" (128). Hagan also asserts that

> the trial of Magwitch and Compeyson is so important a key to the novel's larger meanings that the former's description of it […] should be read in entirety. What the passage reveals is that impartiality in the courts is often a myth. Judges and jury alike may be swayed by class prejudice. The whole judicial system may tend to perpetuate class antagonism and hostility. […] Though not entirely so, Magwitch is certainly, in part, a victim. ("The Poor Labyrinth," 170)

The identification of gentlemanly behaviour with appearance in the Victorian society might be easily manipulated by a villain like Compeyson as in the example of Magwitch. Although the real character of Compeyson is hidden in the courtroom, Magwitch follows the same path of making up appearances for Pip. Furthermore, Magwitch offers Herbert economic support to make him a gentleman just as he did for Pip (*Great Expectations* 358). Clearly, Magwitch still believes that the appearance of a gentleman will work. Anthony Dyson claims that "Magwitch knows that he is not himself a gentleman, by any stretch of imagination, but he believes that money can buy a successful gentleman in his stead. The world which has judged him and found him

wanting will, then, be duly confounded by a gentleman created *ex nihilo* by Magwitch, yet fully up to the standards prescribed by itself" (238). As Hagan argues

> though deprived from childhood of the opportunity to become a 'gentleman' himself, [Magwitch] does not vow destruction to the 'gentleman' class. Having seen in Compeyson the power of that class, the deference it received from society, he fashions a gentleman of his own to take his place in it. He is satisfied to live vicariously through Pip, to show society that he can come up to its standards, and, by raising his pawn into the inner circle, to prove that it is no longer impregnable. ("The Poor Labyrinth," 171)

It seems that Magwitch has decided to imitate social manners of the bourgeoisie in order to be respected in the Victorian society, though he aims to achieve this purpose by means of Pip as he provides Pip with the economic means for becoming a gentleman. Through this process of identity construction, Magwitch aims to respond to the bourgeois society by creating a gentleman who will be a respectable member of society with the help of Magwitch's economic support. Nevertheless, he clearly understands that he was in a disadvantageous position from the very beginning. Magwitch explains his intention as follows:

> Yes, Pip, dear boy, I've made a gentleman on you! It's me wot has done it! I swore that time, sure as ever I earned a guinea, that guinea should go to you. I swore arterwards, sure as ever I spec'lated and got rich, you should get rich. I lived rough, that you should live smooth; I worked hard, that you should be above work. What odds, dear boy? Do I tell it, fur you to feel a obligation? Not a bit. I tell it, fur you to know as that there hunted dunghill dog wot you kep life in, got his head so high that he could make a gentleman,—and, Pip, you're him! (*Great Expectations* 293)

For this reason, Magwitch never forgets Pip, the little child that helped him in a most compassionate and merciful manner. Magwitch has planned to make a gentleman out of Pip, who would be respectable in society that condemned him, and this young man would do everything that he could not do as a criminal. He endures all the difficulties, filthy conditions of being a herdsman in exile and humiliation by other people he encounters. The only reason for Magwitch's endurance is to know that he helps a young country boy in England who will become a gentleman with his help. This young boy – Pip – will be respectable in the bourgeois Victorian society that suppressed Magwitch due to his lower-class origins.

The question of Pip's becoming a gentleman in *Great Expectations* is highly related to the repression of the individual in the bourgeois society. In his *Negative Dialectics*, Adorno also touches upon this relationship between the individual and the bourgeois society:

> The chief characteristic of the modern self is that it is constituted through a process of renunciation; that is, through a process of giving up things. The history of civilisation is the history of the introversion of sacrifice – in other words, the history of renunciation. […] All who renounce give away more of their life than is given back to them, more than the life they preserve. (43)

Accordingly, Pip is expected to renounce his rural lifestyle and acquaintances in the country altogether. Before Pip leaves his village for London, he has no clear idea as regards what he is going to experience in London, where he experiences bourgeois social oppression to shape his identity. However, it is clear that *Great Expectations* as a novel that represents the conflict between the individual and the early nineteenth-century English society introduces Pip as an individual radically shaped by society. Pip's awareness about "victims and oppressors, people of gentility and low-class people" in the bourgeois society makes him a victim oppressed by the established social order since he knows that he is a common boy among the lower class and that he should rise in society to be eligible for Estella (Rawlins 79). The reason for Pip's transformation, therefore, is the social structure that causes a dramatic change of perspective in the little boy. As Lionel Trilling points out, "modern society bases itself on great expectations which, if they are ever realised, are found to exist by reason of a sordid, hidden reality. The real thing is not the gentility of Pip's life but the hulks and the murder and the rats and the decay in the cellarage of the novel" (211). Indeed, Dickens deals with social problems in the Victorian era in his works including *Great Expectations* and frequently represents the conflict between the individuals that suffer because of the expectations of society. Along with industrialisation, a process of embourgeoisement continues in the early nineteenth century as represented in *Great Expectations*. As Dickens looks back to the beginning of the nineteenth century from the 1860s, he actually depicts the transformation of the Victorian society towards a bourgeois industrial society. In other words, Pip's story is at the same time the story of the beginning of a new social order, characterised by industry and the bourgeoisie in an

urban setting. Through Pip, *Great Expectations* presents the appearance of this social oppression in its earliest form in the early nineteenth-century England. The Victorian attempt of constructing a new social order as represented in *Great Expectations* might be depicted as follows:

> On the one hand there is England of 1860, relatively stable, relatively prosperous, conscious and rightly proud of the considerable advances in civilisation which the previous forty years had seen; and on the other hand there is the recent memory of a very different world, the harsh and brutal society of the eighteenth century which the Victorian reformers set out to transform and which still survived as a background to their efforts – a source of congratulation but also of uncertainty and anxiety. Here one can begin to see the contemporary significance of the social ironies in the novel. (Gilmour, "Gentleman," 116)

Although Pip has great expectations for his future, society also has great expectations that the protagonist needs to accomplish for respectability. The new bourgeois social order of the early nineteenth-century England aims to create conformist members who easily submit to the middle-class domination in society and serve the middle-class benefits. In order to achieve his ideals, Pip submits to middle-class hegemony and conforms to bourgeois values after his secret benefactor provides him with economic means for his training to become a gentleman. Miller asserts that, "for Dickens, such submission means to lose all one's specifically human qualities of self-consciousness and freedom. […] The individual may be destroyed altogether by society, and remain behind only as the trophy of somebody's successful manipulations" (252). In a state of false consciousness, Pip just submits to the middle-class domination and contributes to the established social order. Miller states that "the Dickensian hero can submit to the complete dehumanisation which society or his stepparents would practice upon him, or, finally, he can take upon himself the responsibility and the guilt of a selfhood which is to be made, not accepted from the outside" (253). Similarly, Gilmour claims that "Pip's desire to become a gentleman is real too and has a representatively positive element, in the sense that it is bound up with that widespread impulse to improvement, both personal and social, which is a crucial factor in the genesis of Victorian Britain" ("Gentleman," 111). In an age of change and development, the Victorians demand and encourage personal development to contribute to society, since they have realised that

personal development brings development on a national scale. However, as Horkheimer asserts

> as for the ideal of productivity, it must be observed that economic significance today is measured in terms of usefulness with respect to the structure of power, not with respect to the needs of all. The individual must prove his value [to society]. […] Moreover, the quantity and quality of the goods or services he contributes to society is merely one of the factors determining his success. (*Eclipse of Reason* 154)

Clearly, the industrial society is built upon economic interests that are followed in all aspects of social life. The middle-class economic interests require a strictly controlled social structure, which is enabled by dominant norms. Cheadle argues that

> it is not disconcerting that Pip should find virtue in gentlemanly capitalism, for few manage to live outside the system. […] The elevation of right feeling helps to construct a specifically bourgeois form of virtue. […] And the ultimate bourgeois consolidation of right feeling as its cultural capital comes through the accommodation of manners to morals in the disciplining of Pip. (80-81)

Victorian morals and manners in the form of "such Victorian middle-class virtues as industry, honesty, self-denial, chastity and deference" are imposed on Pip to live as an acceptable member of society (Spector 229). So, there is no individual freedom in the bourgeois industrial society represented in *Great Expectations*. Adorno states that "in the shadow of its own incomplete emancipation [from feudal order and scholastic ontology] the bourgeois consciousness must fear to be annulled by a more advanced consciousness; not being the whole freedom, it senses that it can produce only a caricature of freedom" (*Negative Dialectics* 21). Without individual freedom and a state of consciousness, there are only repressed individuals in the bourgeois industrial society.

Social control that induces changes in the repressed individual influences Pip immediately after he is informed about his great expectations. Pip is expected to wear new clothes when he goes to London to appear like a respectable young boy. Since Jaggers has told Pip not to come to London in his old clothes, he is to go to the town to buy new clothes (*Great Expectations* 132). However, Pip does not want to have any connection to the lower-class people after he begins to appear like a respectable

gentleman in his socially appropriate clothes. Pip tells Joe that "I have been thinking, Joe, that when I go down town on Monday, and order my new clothes, I shall tell the tailor that I'll come and put them on there, or that I'll have them sent to Mr Pumblechook's. It would be very disagreeable to be stared at by all the people here" (*Great Expectations* 135). For Joe's offer of the interest of their neighbours, Pip simply retorts that "that's just what I don't want, Joe. They would make such a business of it – such a coarse and common business – that I couldn't bear myself" (*Great Expectations* 135). Even for his sister, Biddy and Joe to see him in his new clothes, Pip says that "I shall bring my clothes here in a bundle one evening – most likely on the evening before I go away" (*Great Expectations* 135). Although Pip has for a long time complained about Estella's humiliating manners towards his country manners and working-class origins as the apprentice of the village blacksmith and felt sorry for his commonness in the eyes of Miss Havisham and Estella, he treats his own environment in the same demeaning way right after he has the means to rise upward in society. Pip's great concern for social manners and habits results in a situation that decreases his sense of individuality. For Pip, even his own room looks like "a mean little room that [he] should soon be parted from and raised above, for ever," while his own bed "was an uneasy bed now, and I never slept the old sound sleep in it any more" (*Great Expectations* 136). The changes in the individual's thinking are observed as the middle class dominates the individual's mind. Clearly, Pip does not make his own decisions any more. Just before setting off from his village by the finger-post, he describes his feelings as such: "The village was very peaceful and quiet, and the light mists were solemnly rising, as if to show me the world, and I had been so innocent and little there, and all beyond was so unknown and great, that in a moment with a strong heave and sob I broke into tears" (*Great Expectations* 149).

The first interaction between Pip and the bourgeois society in London illustrates that Pip actually criticises this urban environment, and this attitude shows that he is still capable of questioning society. The initial observation of the urban environment in the city presents a stark contrast with the countryside and the grown up narrator depicts the attitude of the early nineteenth century society in a critical manner: "We Britons had at the time particularly settled that it was treasonable to doubt our having and our being

the best of everything: otherwise, while I was scared by the immensity of London, I think I might have had some faint doubts whether it was not rather ugly, crooked, narrow, and dirty" (*Great Expectations* 150). The Victorian understanding of being the most civilised in comparison to the previous centuries is criticised in a brief description of the city. Moreover, Pip's expectations in the bourgeois urban society are questioned as the social reality in the city is presented from a critical perspective. The bourgeois society's promise of elegance and social superiority is futile as Pip explores the urban social environment in London. Pip's move to the city for his great expectations might not have the results that Pip wished in the village. Although he disdained his friends and rural people for their commonness, the social reality he observes in London is a disappointment for the protagonist. Pip comes across with the filthy atmosphere around Jaggers's office and the Newgate prison as he looks out for Jaggers. He talks to "an exceedingly dirty and partially drunk minister of justice" who offers to take him into a courtroom to see the Lord Chief Justice "in a front place for half a crown," and he is shown the "Debtors' Door, out of which culprits came to be hanged" (*Great Expectations* 152). The condition of the people trying to speak to Jaggers, who sends them away in great indifference to their pleas, keeps Pip in such awe that he just walks next to Jaggers without uttering a single word (*Great Expectations* 153). This precise and punctual guardian sends Pip to his lodgings with his clerk Wemmick while Pip only tries to understand his surroundings (*Great Expectations* 154). The contrast between the countryside and the city makes the protagonist feel creepy. Nonetheless, Pip is determined to follow his future prospects. In fact, Pip's earlier questioning views towards the bourgeois society in London are quickly replaced by admiration of the urban environment, since he is preoccupied in his education to become a gentleman.

In London, Pip meets with Mathew Pocket, who is responsible for Pip's training to become a respectable gentleman of the bourgeois society in a conformist manner according to the bourgeois norms. Mr Pocket is professionally occupied with educating young men for better prospects at his home. He teaches them bourgeois manners and appropriate conduct in public life to behave like respectable people. In Mr Pocket's house, Pip meets Bentley Drummle, "the next heir but one to baronetcy", and Startop, who are other young fellows being educated there (*Great Expectations* 175). Drummle

is portrayed in the novel as a snob leading his life through the wealth of his family and spending money for his pleasure. Since he later becomes Estella's cruel husband, he is an example of what a gentleman should not be in *Great Expectations* (*Great Expectations* 332). Jaggers also warns Pip about Drummle as he says that "don't have too much to do with [Drummle]. Keep as clear of him as you can" (*Great Expectations* 200). These young men are educated at Mr Pocket's house to become gentlemen and to be respectable in the Victorian society, particularly among the middle-class and upper class circles. So, Pip is not alone in his desires and struggles to become a gentleman. Respectability is an important norm in the Victorian era for people other than Pip. As regards the mission to make a gentleman out of Pip, Mr Pocket is more intelligent and experienced than Pip:

> [Mr Pocket] knew more of my intended career than I knew myself, for he referred to his having been told by Mr Jaggers that I was not designed for any profession, and that I should be well enough educated for my destiny if I could 'hold my own' with the average of young men in prosperous circumstances. I acquiesced, of course, knowing nothing in the contrary. (*Great Expectations* 181)

As a result of the mutual trust between the instructor and the pupil, Pip is advised to go to different places like gentlemen's clubs in London to meet respectable people in the community (*Great Expectations* 182). Paterson states that "men would either be earning their living or socialising – at their clubs or on a sports field – in masculine company" (203). In relation to his respectable acquaintances in those new social circles, Pip will learn the way a gentleman behaves in the public arena. In other words, Pip will follow and imitate the examples of other people who are considered to be respectable gentlemen by society. He will also act according to these social values as he is subject to Mr Pocket's surveillance. So, it appears that social norms shape the individuals as they are trained to conform. Mr Pocket's house is an institution where young men are educated in the early nineteenth century to conform to dominant bourgeois values. In this house, social values are systematically imposed on young men to be adopted in accordance with social expectations.

Joe's visit to Pip in London illustrates the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society at this stage since Pip is formed as a middle-class gentleman and he

rejects his connections to lower-class people like Joe. As a young man educated to be a gentleman, Pip aims to maintain his respectability among the middle-class community. This incident is inconvenient for Pip who thinks that even his association with Joe, the village blacksmith, might jeopardise his respectability among the bourgeoisie. Pip does not want to be treated like a common boy in his bourgeois social environment. As a young man on the way to become a gentleman, Pip is still haunted by his oldest fear of being considered as a common boy since Estella humiliated him years ago for his commonness, which is presented as the major reason for Pip's ambitions for social mobility. Pip is waiting for Joe's arrival

> not with pleasure, though I was bound to him by so many ties; no; with considerable disturbance, some mortification, and a keen incongruity. If I could have kept him away by paying money, I certainly would have paid money. My greatest reassurance was that he was coming to Barnard's Inn, not to Hammersmith, and consequently would not fall in Bentley Drummle's way. […] So, throughout life, our worst weaknesses and meannesses are usually committed for the sake of the people whom we most despise. (*Great Expectations* 200)

Pip feels embarrassed for Joe's visit considering that his association with an incompatible man in an urban social environment will be harmful for his social status and reputation. He is especially afraid of Bentley Drummle's seeing him with Joe, because Drummle is a socially superior young man compared to Pip. Pip is ashamed of Joe for his clumsiness and rough actions, which he considers inappropriate in his London dwelling (*Great Expectations* 200). In their conversation after an awkward entrance, both of them feel uncomfortable (*Great Expectations* 201). While Joe tries to keep up with Pip's assumed appearance of a gentleman, Pip tries to calm him down in his utmost anxiety. All this while, Joe does not act like himself, and his manners seem quite ridiculous beginning with his unusual hat which he drops every now and then (*Great Expectations* 204). Pip is irritated by Joe's uncomfortable actions more than the news of this visit. Their conversation becomes worse when Pip interrupts Joe for insistently calling him 'sir,' which culminates in Joe's remarks for their separate lives incongruous with each other:

> Pip, dear old chap, life is made of ever so many partings welded together, as I may say, and one man's a blacksmith, and one's a whitesmith, and one's a goldsmith, and one's a coppersmith. Diwisions [*sic*] among such must come, and must be met

> as they come. If there's been any fault at all to-day, it's mine. You and me is not two figures to be together in London; nor yet anywheres else but what is private, and beknown, and understood among friends. (*Great Expectations* 206-207)

Joe's final words signify the growing difference between these two characters as they inhabit distinct environments and lead their lives according to separate social conditions. In this case, Joe represents the exact opposite of what Pip aims to achieve in the bourgeois society. It is quite clear that Pip certainly feels shame for Joe's lower-class manners. Moreover, Joe is aware of the social differences between Pip and himself after Pip has come to live in London. Joe is ready to go away and not to see Pip ever again in the city for this reason.

Furthermore, Pip aims to look like a respectable gentleman in line with his social status when he visits the country during his training in London. He does not want to stay with Joe and Biddy, since he finds it socially appropriate to stay alone in town (*Great Expectations* 262). He also finds an opportunity to accompany Estella during her stay in London in all the luxurious places spending quite a lot of money, which he considers to be an opportunity of showing off in his new lifestyle appropriate for a true gentleman (*Great Expectations* 263). While Pip tries to improve his manners all this while and acts like a gentleman, his economic prospects still depend on his secret benefactor. In other words, amidst his haughty appearance and luxurious life, Pip only spends money to impress his environment. Moreover, he distracts Herbert from his purpose of starting a business on trade and finance as they are indulged in an irresponsible lifestyle characterised by spending money extravagantly (*Great Expectations* 190). Waters claims that "Pip's pursuit of the fairy-tale world of wealth and gentility he identifies with Estella is also marked by his embrace of an aristocratic economy" (161). While Pip does not seem to be concerned about his own economic situation, he is anxious about the consequences of their lifestyle for Herbert. As a good friend, he is quite considerate towards Herbert as he believes that "my lavish habits led [Herbert's] easy nature into expenses that he could not afford, corrupted the simplicity of his life, and disturbed his peace with anxieties and regrets" (*Great Expectations* 250). Their luxurious lifestyle based on spending more than they can afford results in debts that they find difficult to pay back. Miller claims that "there comes a moment, then, when Pip discovers the

futility and hollowness of his expectations [during his exploration of a gentlemen's club in London]. Already he has discovered that the mere unlimited possession of money is not enough" (269). In this regard, Pip and Herbert join the famous club called Finches of the Grove, increasing their debts to a great extent for the purpose of keeping elegant company, while they only spend more money. For this club, Pip says that

> the object of which institution I have never divined, if it were not that the members should dine expensively once a fortnight, to quarrel among themselves as much as possible after dinner, and to cause six waiters to get drunk on the stairs. I know that these gratifying social ends were so invariably accomplished, that Herbert and I understood nothing else to be referred to in the first standing toast of society: which ran "Gentlemen, may the present promotion of good feeling ever reign predominant among the Finches of the Grove." (*Great Expectations* 251)

While Pip aims to look like a gentleman in the middle and upper class circles, he tries to make sense of this bourgeois environment. Actually, he finds it quite difficult to comprehend bourgeois manners in such gentleman clubs. For Miller, "Pip's transformation into a gentleman only plunges him into deeper disquietude and weariness of spirits [since] Pip the gentleman, spending money in London, enjoying the frivolities of his club has no authentic relation to anybody" (269). His great expectations seem to be too vague for him at this stage of his life. For this reason, Pip thinks that

> as I had grown accustomed to my expectations, I had insensibly begun to notice their effect upon myself and those around me. Their influence on my own character I disguised from my recognition as much as possible, but I knew very well that it was not all good. I lived in a state of chronic uneasiness respecting my behaviour to Joe. My conscience was not by any means comfortable about Biddy. When I woke up in the night, I used to think, with a weariness on my spirits, that I should have been happier and better if I had never seen Miss Havisham's face, and had risen to manhood content to be partners with Joe in the honest old forge. Many a time of an evening, when I sat alone looking at the fire, I thought, after all there was no fire like the forge fire and the kitchen fire at home. (*Great Expectations* 250)

Particularly the last two remarks about his wish not to have seen Miss Havisham since he still considers her to be his benefactor and his desire for the warmth of the fire at his home in the village show that Pip has realised his unhappiness in the pursuit of great expectations. In other words, Pip is not happy with what he thinks is gentlemanly. Clearly, there is a conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society as the individual is shaped according to social norms, which is indeed the main reason for the

individual's unhappiness. These opinions that Pip can confess only to himself illustrate the negative impact of his great expectations. His desire to leave everything behind for better prospects does not bring him happiness as he has imagined. In his struggle to become a respectable gentleman, he just makes an effort to keep up with society since he does not know how his life and prospects are shaped out of his control. Whereas Pip questions the bourgeois society in London and feels unhappy for his experiences among the middle-class community, he still follows his pursuit to be eligible for Estella as a result of his efforts to become a gentleman and a respectable member of the bourgeois community, which proves that he is a conformist above all.

As a result of the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society, Pip realises that his pursuit of social mobility has only submitted him to social norms in the form of appearances, which he obviously does not comprehend. The individual has not acquired benefits as he was constructed to become a gentleman in line with Magwitch's plans. Clearly, Pip knows that he has never belonged to the bourgeoisie. Miller argues that "Pip discovers the emptiness of his hope of being given a justified place in the ruling class. […] This discovery is really a discovery of the self-deception of his great expectations, his recognition that they were based on an irreconcilable contradiction" (270). Likewise, Sanders states that "Pip will be given a series of false economic and social expectations that he will have to work out. Pip's promotion to the status of a gentleman by means of Magwitch's money makes an artificial and socially inadequate man of him (at least in Dickens's eyes)" (429). Barbara Hardy also claims that "Pip, like a spoilt child, is really given something to cry about. […] He is forced into the gross parody and ordeal of stomaching Magwitch, who has paid for Pip's education and fastidiousness" (47). Pip actually finds himself where he was at the beginning of the novel. As a twenty-three year old young man, Pip has spent his life following his great expectations to be a gentleman, yet all his struggle has turned out to be meaningless. For Pip, this moment is a realisation of the reality underlying social appearances in the Victorian era. Pip's point of view is actually a criticism of the bourgeois society. Miller, further, comments that "Pip stands ready to face the truth which lies at the very centre of *Great Expectations*: all the claims made by wealth, social rank, and culture to endow the individual with true selfhood are absolutely false" (271). Pip's search for

respectability that would enable him to deserve all these qualities results in failure. His submission to the impositions of society turns him into nothing more than a snob. It seems that Pip ends up as a repressed individual that has spent his life in an attempt to conform to the social expectations. Since Pip has always aimed to become a respectable member of the bourgeois society, his realisation that he cannot be a respectable gentleman actually wrecks him. Although he willingly acquiesced to social repression and complied with bourgeois norms at the beginning of the novel, Pip finds his association with a convict unacceptable for social mobility since it destroys his respectable appearance. Pip's great expectations really refer to a higher social status in the early nineteenth century. Therefore, Pip was ready to struggle against social difficulties, obstacles and barriers that prevented his upward social movement. Although Pip tried to adopt social appearance of a gentleman, it has always been futile since the revelation of Magwitch as the source of his great expectations, instead of Miss Havisham who would make an appropriate benefactor as an upper class lady, would eventually destroy Pip's reputation of a gentleman.

By the time Magwitch comes to visit Pip and see the outcome of his great project of creating a gentleman in his lower condition, Pip's great expectations suddenly come to end. In an extremely dangerous incident, Pip tries to save Magwitch by taking him out of the country. If Magwitch is caught in England, his sentence will be capital punishment. Despite all his attempts, Pip cannot help his escape since Magwitch has been followed by his lifelong enemy Compeyson and Magwitch is caught (*Great Expectations* 406). While he is waiting to be hanged in the prison, Magwitch dies, which leaves Pip as a penniless boy in London because of the forfeiture of Magwitch's wealth by the state (*Great Expectations* 407). Pip is aware of what will happen to the property of Magwitch, a catastrophic end on his account:

> I imparted to Mr. Jaggers my design of keeping him in ignorance of the fate of his wealth. Mr. Jaggers was querulous and angry with me for having 'let it slip through my fingers,' and said we must memorialize by and by, and try at all events for some of it. But he did not conceal from me that, although there might be many cases in which the forfeiture would not be exacted, there were no circumstances in this case to make it one of them. I understood that very well. I was not related to the outlaw, or connected with him by any recognizable tie; he had put his hand to no writing or settlement in my favour before his apprehension, and to do so now

> would be idle. I had no claim, and I finally resolved, and ever afterwards abided by the resolution, that my heart should never be sickened with the hopeless task of attempting to establish one. (*Great Expectations* 409)

The death of Magwitch and forfeiture of all of his property has a vital consequence in Pip's life. Since he loses his benefactor, Pip loses the opportunity to become a gentleman all together. In the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist Victorian society, it is not possible for Pip to be a respectable young man without economic means. Pip has already left his friends in the countryside for his prospects in the city. Furthermore, his intention to go back to his village in order to propose to Biddy, another attempt by the protagonist to save himself, also turns out to be futile since Biddy is by this time married to Joe. As Gilmour points out, "gentlemanliness in the nineteenth century world involves exclusion and repression for someone like Pip, alienation from Joe and the warmth of instinctive life which the blazing forge symbolises" ("Gentleman," 119). Now, Pip is a lonely man in utmost desolation without any prospects in the bourgeois industrial society of the early nineteenth-century England.

Under these circumstances, Pip gives up the social ideal of becoming a gentleman according to the bourgeois values in Magwitch's plans, and he follows the example of many other young men in the Victorian society to survive in the bourgeois society, because he simply does not have any options at this stage. Accordingly, Herbert helps Pip find a job in his company to work in Cairo, which keeps Pip away from England for several years before coming back to find Estella hopefully. Pip's acceptance of his situation and his determination to improve his skills for such a socially acceptable task regardless of his economic means and social status might be considered as an example to the conformity of Pip as a repressed individual who tells his new life as follows:

> I sold all I had, and put aside as much as I could, for a composition with my creditors,—who gave me ample time to pay them in full,—and I went out and joined Herbert. Within a month, I had quitted England, and within two months I was clerk to Clarriker and Co., and within four months I assumed my first undivided responsibility. […] Herbert had gone away to marry Clara, and I was left in sole charge of the Eastern Branch until he brought her back. (*Great Expectations* 438)

This successful experience in business can be regarded as another form of conformity, because Pip has no choice other than following the example of many young men in the Victorian era going abroad to work for colonial companies. Clearly, Pip can only follow the example of his friend Herbert and become a clerk in his company, which serves the benefits of the bourgeois industrial society. Sanders argues that "Pip is not to *stay* an apprentice. But, having acquired the status and manners of a gentleman, nor is he to stay the kind of gentleman that Magwitch wanted to make him. Pip has to learn about a different kind of status, one defined by work, rather than by a distaste for work" (431). Pip eventually begins to work for the interests of the middle class as a submissive clerk. While Pip's only hope to be eligible for Estella requires him to work in a respectable job appropriate for the middle class, the individual serves economic interests of society. As Marcuse argues "even the noneconomic was contained in the economy" ("Philosophy and Critical Theory," 63). So, the economic relations of the individual determine the non-economic circumstances as in Pip's example. Pip's attempt to be with Estella requires his economic success according to bourgeois norms. In the conflict between society and the individual, "Pip must abandon all the proud hopes which have formed the secret core of his life. He must abandon forever his project of being a gentleman, the belief that somewhere there is a place for him which he can posses by right" (Miller 274). Pip continues to struggle for respectability as he works in a company while he still hopes that he will be suitable for Estella. In a state of false consciousness, Pip could only become a repressed individual.

In relation to Pip's experiences in the early nineteenth-century society, his friend Joe's condition needs to be elaborated for the discussion of embourgeoisement and social oppression on the individuals. In *Great Expectations*, Joe is not constructed by the middle-class norms and he is presented as the opposite of Pip's conformity for social mobility. Joe proves himself to be helpful to all those in need, especially Pip when he cannot take care of himself and pay his debts (*Great Expectations* 424, 431), sets himself as an example to society, is known for honesty and good will as well as making himself useful to the community in the country. Therefore, in *Great Expectations*, Joe is an example of being a gentleman despite his lower-class and rural origins, because Joe is a true gentleman at heart and in manner. Joe does not care about the middle-class

social values for respectability, and he leads his life as an individual free from social hegemony. As Cheadle states, "[Dickens] expos[es] the dream of great expectations as an aspiration to false gentility and idleness, making Joe the yardstick of right feeling" (81). Despite Pip's great concern for social mobility and great expectations until the end of the novel, Joe acts like an individual unrestrained and uncontrolled by the early nineteenth-century society from the beginning of the novel. He is actually portrayed as an example to individuality in the repressive bourgeois social order.

In *Great Expectations*, Pip is a young boy growing up in the early nineteenth-century bourgeois society under the influence of social aspirations for a higher social status and respectability. From the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Pip is a repressed individual while he tries to conform to the social norms. Accordingly, it is difficult to observe his individualistic traits. On the contrary, he seems to be formed by bourgeois norms, a code of behaviour, to be followed for respectability in society. Since social mobility depends on the conformity of the individual to this normative code of respectability, Pip as an individual has to submit to these social requirements. Accordingly, Pip is initially introduced an appropriate code of behaviour in his home, which stands for commonness and lack of bourgeois manners judged by Estella and Miss Havisham. Magwitch's secret plan to help Pip rise on the social scale brings him great expectations, and the plan is to educate Pip for appropriate conduct among the bourgeoisie. So, it might be claimed that "the novel's focus on class is ultimately, and unromantically, about the process of *embourgeoisement*" (Sanders 431). Hence, Pip's embourgeoisement is consequent to a plan devised according to the bourgeois values. In Mr Pocket's house, institutional training of young men for gentlemanliness has become a form of industry, in which young men are shaped and their behaviours are regulated just like standardised products of a factory. Due to this standardisation, there is no individuality in the bourgeois industrial society as the Frankfurt School critical theory suggests. Thus, Pip's identity is constructed to turn him into a beneficial member of society. Pip is released from his great expectations only when Magwitch's plans fail. Pip realises that he is not content with his current pursuit of becoming a gentleman. Therefore, he starts over again for a new career as a clerk in a company abroad next to his friend Herbert, which is another form of conformity to social norms of the time. At

the end of the novel, Pip is quite certain that he will be suitable for Estella when he has a respectable status in the bourgeois industrial society of the early nineteenth century. Actually, it is revealed in at the end of *Great Expectations* that Pip's conformity to social norms enables him to finally have an affair with Estella as Pip says "I took her hand in mine, […] and in all the broad expanse of tranquil light, I saw no shadow of another parting from her" (*Great Expectations* 443). Clearly, Pip's submission to social norms is rewarded by his respectable status as a company clerk which appeals to Estella as a sign of Pip's higher status. The conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society creates the repressed individual, who is formed according to dominant social values.

# CHAPTER III

## MARCUSE'S ONE DIMENSIONAL MAN IN THOMAS HARDY'S *JUDE THE OBSCURE*

In the second chapter, the representation of the hegemony of the early-Victorian society on the individual in Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* has been discussed. Pip's attempts to become a gentleman and to have a respectable social status lead to his becoming an individual repressed by the normative social values of the bourgeois society. In the light of Max Horkheimer's and Theodor Adorno's views, bourgeois society of the early nineteenth century has been identified as an oppressive force on the individual and called the social code that determined appropriateness in Pip's life as a part of the bourgeois social order that constructed the individual to serve in the interests of the bourgeois society. As Adorno and Horkheimer suggest for the relationship between the individuals and the contemporary industrial society, Pip's conformity to social requirements of the bourgeois society is an example of social oppression. In this bourgeois social setting, Pip is a repressed individual as he is coerced by the bourgeois society to conform and follow the rules to be a respectable member of the same society. Pip's efforts to become a respectable gentleman fail, because, indeed, the early nineteenth-century bourgeois society would force him to submit to its values, but would not recognise him as a gentleman, unless he has the necessary economic and social means. Accordingly, as argued in the previous chapter, Pip never makes a free decision about becoming a gentleman, because it is the only opportunity to be a suitor for Estella, which requires social mobility and adoption of middle-class values. On the contrary, as stated, the bourgeois society denies him the individual freedom to choose by producing his choices and subjecting him to them. As Herbert Marcuse also points out

> to the denial of freedom, even of the possibility of freedom, corresponds the granting of liberties where they strengthen the repression. The degree to which the population [or the individual] is allowed to break the [social harmony] is frightening […] because it expresses the lawful and even organised effort to reject the Other [the individual] in his own right, to prevent autonomy even in a small, reserved sphere of existence. (*One Dimensional Man* 249)

According to the Frankfurt School perspective, as long as one accepts social authority and submits to social norms to produce the social context that submitted him, he is only a repressed individual: "The struggle against freedom reproduces itself in the psyche of man, as the self-repression of the repressed individual, and his self-repression in turn sustains his masters and their institutions" (Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization* 26). The individual is expected to conform and serve social demands in a repressed state. Even in Magwitch's example, despite his being an outcast in the early nineteenth-century society, he tries to create a gentleman out of Pip according to the norms of society. So, as argued in Chapter II, there is no individuality in bourgeois society of the early nineteenth century represented in Dickens's *Great Expectations*.

This chapter argues that there is a conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society of the late Victorian period represented in Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* and oppression on the individuals has increased more than ever since the social order is fully established at the end of the nineteenth century. For the individuals in *Jude the Obscure*, there are more clearly defined social roles in the context of the bourgeois norms of respectability and morality. The bourgeois social order aims to create one dimensional man to serve the social system as a result of "organised capitalism," as Herbert Marcuse argues (*One Dimensional Man* xxv), and this systematic shaping of the individuals for social benefits decreases the social value of individuality. Accordingly, this chapter is concerned with Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* in which Jude Fawley decides to leave his village so that he can become a university graduate and earn a respectable social status in the nearby city. So, Jude readily assigns himself the duty to study ancient texts for his future career in the university. His social status and lack of means, however, prevent him from rising upward in society. He fails to realise his hopes of social mobility because of the rigid class structure. Jude is simply advised to remain a worker to be a beneficial member of society. In an attempt to conform to the social norms, Jude is allocated a socially suitable condition for him since the one dimensional bourgeois industrial society needs only one dimensional people who submit to the social norms. Furthermore, when Jude Fawley tries to have a relationship with Sue Bridehead against the bourgeois norms of morality in the late Victorian period, Jude and Sue are excluded by society due to their

nonconformist behaviours. The fully established bourgeois industrial society that creates one dimensional characters as a result of organised capitalism, as explained below, operates by means of social norms and institutions. In *Jude the Obscure*, Victorian morality resulting from middle-class religiosity is imposed on Jude, Sue and Phillotson as a means of social control of the individuals. Moreover, education as a bourgeois social institution produces socially beneficial and profitable people in line with the requirements of the system. The bourgeois society in *Jude the Obscure* treats the individuals as raw materials that come out of the public education system as useful products. Therefore, the institutionalised society constructs individual's identity more strictly through education and continues to supervise the individual's behaviour in public sphere by social values. The ultimate purpose in this process is to create one dimensional man, as Herbert Marcuse calls, to provide society with eligible members for the benefits of the established social order.

In Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, it is possible to observe the transformation of the Victorian society which continued throughout the nineteenth century into a new social order. Especially, the changes in the demographic features of society, educational and religious institutions, along with industrialisation and rivalry for economic supremacy in the world created an industrial society different from the previous decades. As a significant political and social incident, the Second Reform Bill of 1867 has been regarded to be the beginning of the late Victorian period. The transformation towards an industrial and urban society reached at its peak after the 1870s and a majority of the Victorians that inhabited urban settings were exposed to the bourgeois values. Beside its political significance, the Second Reform Bill proved to be another marker of social hierarchy in the nineteenth century. John Davis states that "the rhetorical need for a qualitative distinction between voters and non-voters became clear, and the assertion that the vote was a badge of respectability became commonplace, even as it became more implausible" (115). The increasing population, which was a result of social and scientific developments in the previous decades, required systematic forms of control on society, indeed individuals, to protect the status quo. As Herman Ausubel states,

> probably the most remarkable developments of the late Victorian age – and to some people of the time the most alarming – were the changes that took place in

> the size and distribution of the population. According to the census of 1871, there were almost 23 million people in England and Wales. Because of the decline of the death rate, which resulted from the growth and application of medical knowledge, this figure increased thirty years later by 10 million. (10)

In addition to this increasing population in the late Victorian period, the rate of urbanisation also changed social structure towards an urban, bourgeois and industrial society. As Ausubel further states, "not only did the population grow appreciably in the late Victorian times, but its distribution was impressively altered. In 1871, the census returns classified three-fifths of the people as urban and two-fifths as rural. By the end of Victoria's reign in 1901 more than three-fourths were urban and less than one-fourth rural" (10). This increasing urban population of the late Victorian period resulted from the social tendency to move to larger towns for better living conditions. Harrison claims that "whatever status landowning conferred it did not bring much economic prosperity in late Victorian Britain [for neither the farmer, nor the agricultural labourer]. As industrialisation proceeded apace, the relative importance of agriculture declined" (20). Farmers and landlords could not compete with cheap food imports from America and Canada after 1870s: "They were plagued by a depression that began in the mid-seventies, and while it varied in severity, it lasted almost until the end of the nineteenth century" (Ausubel 12). Meanwhile, British industry also had to compete with industrial countries like Germany and America as industrial production started in these recently industrialised rivals. Despite being one of the wealthiest countries in the world and the steady increase in its national income, there was also social unrest in the final decades of the nineteenth-century England. As Harrison puts forward

> the wealth was not spread sufficiently widely among all classes. The failure of late Victorian society to remedy the effects of poverty and gross inequalities whose existence had been acknowledged fifty years earlier raised doubts about the economic and social changes claimed as progress. Was progress always to be accompanied by (perhaps even conditional on) poverty, as unavoidable as the reverse side of a coin? (21)

Clearly, there was a rush to the urban centres at the end of the nineteenth century as people were in search of better living conditions. So, population density increased in larger towns towards the millennium. In line with urbanisation and overcrowding in these centres, bourgeois anxiety to control society and to maintain the homogenous

social order also increased. Victorian values like respectability and morality were strongly emphasised to protect the status quo and to control the crowds in the urban centres. Hence, bourgeois industrial society began to be oppressive for the individuals on a new organised level that strengthened middle-class domination.

Moreover, living conditions of the late Victorians came to be widely discussed from the 1870s onwards. In this regard, the conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society also needs to be emphasised as a part of the turmoil in the late Victorian society. Just like the economic and social conditions which led the individuals to look for upward social movement in the early and mid Victorian periods, the later decades of the century had a similar social setting that forced the individuals to comply with bourgeois social values. Harrison argues that

> in the 1880s this general social complacency [of the mid-Victorian period] was rudely shaken and a second age of inquiry began. Issues of overcrowding, poverty, sexuality and immorality suddenly reappeared on the political and social agenda in response to pressure from articulate sections of the population [the middle class]. A sense of shock and a demand that 'something must be done' constituted an important element in the process of social change in late Victorian Britain. (184)

On the one hand, public concern for "the Condition of England Question" came to the fore once again. On the other hand, the oppressive social order prevented unusual and challenging voices against the system and gave the impression of a harmonious society. As Rosalind Crone argues,

> after the defeat of Chartism in the late 1840s and with the emergence of a new generation of workers there was a general acceptance of industrial capitalism accompanied by a settling down of society. Rises in real wages after 1850 helped to smooth tensions, and allowed for the appearance of a labour aristocracy who were able to move to the suburbs and begin to ape the lifestyles of those above them. (260)

Because of better living standards, improved working conditions and a harmonious lifestyle in the mid-Victorian period, bourgeois society could easily control the individuals both of the working class and the middle class. Especially, the better off among the working class intended to look like the respectable middle class. Crone suggests that "the upper echelons of the working classes […] had embraced respectable

culture" (260). The Second Reform Bill actually contributed to the readiness to embrace the respectability of the bourgeois society: "The extension of the franchise in 1867 […] also promoted the image of the respectable working class man as something for those immediately below to aspire to" (Crone 260). For the individuals, upward social mobility through respectability was promoted by means of economic, political and social standards provided by the established social order. Hence, the middle class and its values became more dominant towards the end of the nineteenth century and the pressure on the individuals to conform increased to a greater extent in this social order.

In the late Victorian society, social institutions also gained importance as agents of bourgeois control on the individuals since the middle class aimed to protect its privileges and benefits in this more crowded and mostly urban society. As stated, while there was oppression of the bourgeois society on the individuals in the earlier decades of the nineteenth-century England, the final decades of the Victorian era are characterised by an increase in this oppression due to the educational and religious institutions through which bourgeois values like respectability and morality were naturalised. These social institutions are highly influential in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* since the characters in the novel are forced to conform to the social norms imposed by means of these institutions. For the role of religion in the Victorian society as a symbol of the established social order, Maureen Moran states that

> Christianity was the most powerful cultural presence in the Victorian milieu. Its beliefs and values shaped social behaviour through emphasis on duty, self-sacrifice and sexual propriety. It structured leisure time, defining in many households what was read, said and done. Religious structures and terminology lie at the heart of ideal Victorian family, with the *paterfamilias* as the patriarchal authority and the wife as the innocent angel dedicated to his service. The Church offered professional career structures for men and, for women, a sense of purpose outside the home through philanthropic societies and projects. (24)

Clearly, religion was an essential aspect of the hegemonic bourgeois social order, because Victorian understanding of morality depended on middle-class religiosity. The authority of the middle class was strengthened through a display of religious commitment and moral stance. Morality was recognised as a part of respectability in order to force the individuals to adopt bourgeois lifestyle and worldview and it was

maintained that morality and respectability could be measured by an individual's commitment to bourgeois social values.

Education, too, helped to maintain these economic, political, industrial and social issues successfully. The Elementary Education Act, commonly known as Forster's Education Act, in 1870, was a landmark for the education of the youth in accordance with the benefits of the bourgeois society. The act made it compulsory for children between the ages of five and thirteen to attend school. In fact, the Parliament passed nine education acts between 1870 and 1893. Although compulsory education seemed to be a necessary and beneficial improvement especially for the poor country children, the circumstances that led to this enactment were actually related to the condition of the bourgeois industrial society. According to Follett Osler, who was from Birmingham and the superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, the intention to pass such a comprehensive act was to "embrace all classes in a whole system that worked on one broad plan embracing even the higher departments of knowledge, so that while all go on together, each pupil may be able, as he advances, to study such special subjects as his abilities or the circumstances of his case may render desirable" (qtd. in Booth 18). The necessity of the education of children was emphasised due to the practice in America at the time and the advantages of mass education for the industrial society. The industrialists, trade unions and the House of Commons, which represented the respectable middle class and working class through the enfranchisement, were looking forward to find means to compete against the industrial rivals like the US and Germany, and to bring back the mid-Victorian prosperity and social welfare. These public schools would be supplemented by the government, subject to state inspection, and empowered by the government to compel the children to attend schools for compulsory education, since the "educated workmen" in America and Germany were regarded as the reason for England's disadvantage in the industrial rivalry (Armytage 122). As Armytage asserts, the purpose in this attempt of educating English children was "to make England more competitive through the immediate establishment of efficient primary schools, followed by a complete and connected system of secondary and high schools – all free, which might readily be connected with the long endowed schools of the country" (122). Through compulsory education, the bourgeois society established a network that made

it possible to shape the individual's identity. Hence, a process of identity construction was carried out successfully to create submissive members of society. Furthermore, not only the industrialists of the middle class, but also trade unionists, skilled artisans and their representatives in the parliament supported these education acts. Raymond Kent claims that "it was right and proper for the government to encourage the development of schools for the working classes, such education was seen to consist of the minimum amount of instruction necessary to keep the working classes contented and reconciled to their lowly station in life" (31). Respectable members of the bourgeois industrial society were active participants in this process. As Kent puts forward, "members of the various statistical societies were mostly middle-class men who were professionals, industrialists or members of the establishment, and they espoused policies of free trade and economic laissez-faire" (31). Clearly, the middle-class people were protecting their own economic, political, social and cultural benefits, whereas it appeared that the only purpose of the system was to provide free education. McCann also argues that

> this interest in government educational policy was symptomatic of the changed outlook of mid-Victorian artisans as compared with militant Chartists of a previous generation. […] The working class of the 1830s and 40s, ragged and hungry, eager for justice and socialism, had been succeeded by well-dressed working men whose main topic of conversation was their shares in Co-ops and building societies. The skilled artisans of the 1860s valued prudent saving, temperate habits and a conscientious attitude to work. (135)

Thus, the respectable members of the bourgeois industrial society, albeit from the working class, supported these education acts because of their benefits in an industrial social order that competed with other industrial countries. Although the working class was completely against the middle-class attempts to oppress the workers in the 1830s and 1840s during the Chartist movement, the bourgeois society in the 1850s and 1860s successfully created a respectable working class that served and supported the middle-class benefits. As McCann further argues "this support was made easier by the fact that trade unions had for some years been speaking and acting on the education question. At the first Trades Union Congress, in June 1868, papers on technical education were read and demands voiced for a national system of primary instruction" (136). Clearly, these public schools that provided free education for especially poor children of the lower class were created for the benefits of the bourgeois society since the middle-class

manufacturers, entrepreneurs and merchants, along with the respectable members of the working class who were closely related to industrial production aimed to benefit from an educated working class. Therefore, the bourgeois industrial society, or actually supporters of the capitalist economy, tried to create a generation that served the status quo through education acts which taught middle-class ideals and increased social oppression on the individuals. Consequently, the conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society grew due to the organised attempts of society.

Evidently, the bourgeois industrial society of the late Victorian period turns into an oppressive force stronger than previous periods of the nineteenth century. By means of social ideals of respectability and morality imposed on the individuals through social institutions like education and religion, the individuals are forced to become one dimensional and to comply with the established order in a subservient way. In Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, Jude Fawley, Sue Bridehead and Richard Phillotson struggle against the oppressive demands of society. The bourgeois industrial society, thus, operates via fully established bourgeois institutions that impose social values on the individuals.

Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* appeared in serial form in *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* under the titles *The Simpletons* and *Hearts Insurgent*, subsequently in the first and second instalments, in 1894. Hardy finally decided on the title of his work which was published in the novel form in late 1895. Due to the editorial interventions in the serial form, it was more appropriate for the middle-class reading public, whereas the uncensored novel form turned out to be quite controversial for the late Victorian society. As Norman Vance points out,

> by April 1894 [Hardy] had begun to realise that the story was becoming unsuitable for the rather conservative family readership of *Harper's* and offered to cancel his agreement with them. But he was persuaded to continue on the understanding that the serial version would need to be milder than the book version which would follow. He subsequently noted on the manuscript that his blue – or green-pencilled deletions and alterations were for the serial edition only. (*Jude the Obscure*, "Introduction," vi)

*Jude the Obscure* was written as a harsh criticism of the late Victorian society and social oppression. The critical response to *Jude the Obscure* showed the editorial intervention on the writing process that allowed only the publication of selected moral and respectable works appropriate for society. The censorship on a work might be considered as a form of social oppression on a different level, because the bourgeois industrial society cannot tolerate challenges to the status quo. Mary Rimmer states that

> the market for fiction expanded with the booming magazine trade, […] but it also came under increasing scrutiny from a variety of censors (publishers, churches, middle-class subscribers to periodicals and libraries) who tried to regulate the fictional representation of controversial subjects such as sexuality, gender and unorthodox religious positions. (136)

The reactions of the reading public to *Jude the Obscure* confirm Hardy's anxieties for the representation of social issues in this novel. Both common readers and literary critics attacked Hardy for his representation of the social conditions. Rebekah Owen suggested Hardy to change the title as "obscene," instead of *Jude the Obscure* (qtd. in Slack 261). The harsh reaction was on a larger public level: "The Bishop of Wakefield announced that he had burned the book; it was ordered to be withdrawn from Smith's Circulating Library; Hardy received it back as a packet of ashes from distant Australia" (Slack 261). In 1896, Jeannette Gilder wrote that "I thought that *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* was bad enough, but that is milk for babes compared to this. Aside from its immorality there is coarseness which is beyond belief" (qtd. in Slack 261). Mrs. D. W. Oliphant "screamed that the novelist was trying to establish a wicked anti-marriage league" (qtd. in Schwartz 797). While the *Bookman* calls it "a novel of lubricity," Harry Peck in *The Critic* calls the novel "as one of the most objectionable books he has ever read" (qtd. in Schwartz 798). Albert Guerard thinks that "the book suggested that life was an unpleasant experience for all but a privileged or insensitive few and an incoherent experience for all" (37). Geoffrey Harvey claims that "Hardy was aware that he had written a subversive novel, championing the oppressed working class, and the Women's Movement of the day questioning the sanctity of marriage vows, exploring the ground of religious faith, and challenging dominant social institutions such as the universities" (88). Indeed, the novel favours the lower class as it depicts the dilemma of the lower-class individuals in the late Victorian period. Hardy himself describes the

novel's subject as "the shattered ideals of the two chief characters as their instincts are forced by society into moulds that do not fit them" (qtd. in Harvey 89). Clearly, *Jude the Obscure* disturbed the middle-class readers because of its criticism of their social norms via unacceptable depictions of immorality. Hence, the respectable members of the bourgeois society, like editors, members of the clergy and wives of respectable middle-class men, attacked Hardy for his representation of bourgeois society. As stated above, this critical response was proof of social oppression, because the bourgeois norms that enabled such oppression of the individuals were considered to be unquestionably established facts of society. Social oppression on Jude and Sue that forces them into "moulds that do not fit them," as Hardy suggests (qtd. in Harvey 89), actually positions Jude and Sue as one dimensional characters that only serve interests of society in a subservient manner. The public desire to control the individuals' decisions and actions is an example of bourgeois obsession to create a harmonious social order that is never questioned by individualistic traits. Accordingly, as Ellen Sprechman states, "the restrictive mores of Victorian society had always troubled Hardy, and he had dealt with such issues as religion, marriage, and the role of women more strongly in each succeeding book" (101). Similarly, as William Phelps states, "it is probable that one reason why Mr Hardy quit novel-writing was the hostile reception that greeted *Jude the Obscure*" (506). For this reason, *Jude the Obscure* is the last novel written by the author before he turned his attention on poetry. Hardy himself believed that

> if this sort of thing [harsh criticism on the novel and humiliation] continues, no more novel-writing for me. […] A man must be a fool to deliberately stand up to be shot at. […] Perhaps I can express more fully in verse ideas and emotions which run counter to the inert crystallised opinion – hard as a rock – which the vast body of men have vested interests in supporting. […] If Galileo had said in verse that the world moved, the Inquisition might have let him alone. (qtd. in Emily Hardy 57-58)

In *Jude the Obscure,* Hardy primarily represents the hegemonic influence of the bourgeois society on the individuals. As he explains, the subject of the novel is "the shattered ideals of the two chief characters" (qtd. in Harvey 89). The reason for the misery of the characters in a catastrophic end is the bourgeois society's oppression on the individuals. The individualistic ideals of Jude and Sue are crashed by the system

since they challenge social harmony defined by respectability and morality. Their individuality is recognised as a threat to the social harmony, and the late Victorian bourgeois industrial society punishes them for their lack of subservience, labelling Jude and Sue as "the Other" in the hierarchical social structure (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 249), as Marcuse asserts,

> the crime is that of a society in which the growing population aggravates the struggle for existence in the face of its possible alleviation. The drive for more 'living space" operates […] within the [bourgeois industrial] nation. Here expansion has, in all forms of team-work, communal life, and fun, invaded the inner space of that isolation in which the individual, thrown back on himself alone, can think and question and find [consciousness, and, thereby, individuality]. (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 248)

Accordingly, it might be put forward that individuality is destroyed by social repression in the bourgeois industrial society, and the living space of the individual is invaded on account of social harmony. As Merry Williams suggests, "[*Jude the Obscure*] speaks to our own condition more clearly than any other work of its time" (181). Similarly, Kramer asserts that

> *Jude the Obscure* is an unmistakably contemporary novel in concentration on central questions of the late nineteenth century: the difficulties of being a working woman (and of being simply an independent woman), and the strain of professional ambition in an increasingly striated society, the loss of religious faith in a conventional society, the revision of class-based university ambitions. It has not lost its currency a century later. […] [S]ome of the issues are mirror images of today's. (169)

Clearly, the novel is occupied with individuals in conflict with the social order represented by institutions, norms, conventions and manners. Hardy deals with the individual's dilemma in the bourgeois, industrial and urban society from economic, social and cultural perspectives.

In *Jude the Obscure*, the hegemonic social order of the late Victorian society is an example to the "organised capitalism" which creates "one dimensional man" as defined by Marcuse who builds upon the critical arguments of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer. In his groundbreaking book *One Dimensional Man* published in 1964, Marcuse invented a new concept, "one dimensional man" for his theoretical arguments

as he discussed the oppressive bourgeois industrial society that aimed to repress individuals through the established social order. Marcuse's theory of one dimensional man concerns organised capitalism, the kind of capitalism in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*. According to Marcuse, organised capitalism means "the economic planning in the state, automatisation in the economy, the rationalisation of culture in the mass media, and the increased bureaucratisation of all modes of social, political and economic life [that] created a 'totally administered society' resulting in the decline of the individual" (*One Dimensional Man*, "Introduction," xxv). The main features of organised capitalism are capitalist economy protected by the state, industrialisation through the use of machinery as a method in mass production, the justification of a harmonious mass culture imposed on society and an official discourse in social, political and economic issues to control the decision making process on behalf of the whole society. This social organisation results in a controlled social environment in which all decisions and actions are predetermined by the social system. Hence, the living space of the individual is invaded. In this regard, organised capitalism produces "one dimensional man" as a result of the restrictive social, political and economic rules.

Hence, the social control of the individuals creates one dimensional man who conforms to the expectations of society. Marcuse argues that

> the individuals identify themselves with the existence which is imposed upon them and have it in their own development and satisfaction. This identification is not illusion but reality. […] There is only one dimension, and it is everywhere and in all forms. The achievements of progress defy ideological indictment as well as justification; the false consciousness of their rationality becomes the true conscious. (*One Dimensional Man* 19)

Accordingly, the established social order is imposed on the whole society, so that political, social, cultural and economic relations result in one dimensional society. In this social order, one dimensional man is defined as the restricted individual who adopts the values and concerns of the one dimensional bourgeois industrial society. The individual, or actually the one dimensional man, mistakes this state of false consciousness as his true consciousness. Marcuse states that "a comfortable, smooth, reasonable, democratic unfreedom prevails in advanced industrial civilisation, a token of technical progress" (*One Dimensional Man* 3). By the end of the nineteenth century,

the dominant middle class established Victorian social order in a way that all sorts of labour and production of the individuals contributed to the industrial society. For the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society, Marcuse asks "indeed, what could be more rational than the suppression of individuality in the mechanisation of socially necessary but painful performances; the concentration of individual enterprises in more effective, more productive corporations; the regulation of free competition among unequally equipped economic subjects?" (*One Dimensional Man* 3). The economic norms, therefore, control the individual as manual labour and handicraft lose economic importance, as in the case of Jude Fawley, the countryman, who moves to the city to work as a stonemason. In *Jude the Obscure*, the individual is against the system. Marcuse states that

> the rights and liberties which were such vital factors in the origins and earlier stages of industrial society yield to a higher stage of this society: they are losing their traditional rationale and content. Freedom of thought, speech, and conscience were – just as free enterprise, which they served to promote and protect – essentially critical ideas. […] Once institutionalised, these rights and liberties shared the fate of society of which they had become an integral part. (*One Dimensional Man* 3)

The reason for these liberties to be curtailed without serious opposition is the social order itself that seems to provide the individuals with all sorts of social, economic and cultural means to meet their needs. Marcuse believes that "independence of thought, autonomy and the right to political opposition are being deprived of their basic critical function in a society which seems increasingly capable of satisfying the needs of the individuals through the way in which it is organised" (*One Dimensional Man* 4). In this society, social values, norms, principles and institutions are readily accepted, because society is constructed and produced in such a way that opposition is definitely out of question: "Under the conditions of a rising standard of living, non-conformity with the system itself appears to be socially useless, and the more so when it entails tangible economic and political disadvantages and threatens the smooth operation of the whole" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 4). As Marcuse argues, this totalitarian system works "through the manipulation of needs by vested interests" (*One Dimensional Man* 5). Therefore, the individuals that do not conform to the authoritarian social system are confined to the lower strata of the social hierarchy: "Contemporary industrial

civilisation demonstrates that it has reached the stage at which the free society can no longer be adequately defined in the traditional terms of economic, political and intellectual liberties" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 6). In fact, as the needs of the individuals are also produced and controlled by society, these "needs themselves and their claim for satisfaction are subject to overriding critical standards" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 7). At this point, particular attention must be paid to what Marcuse calls false needs. Marcuse defines these false needs as

> those which are superimposed upon the individual by particular social interests in his repression: the needs which perpetuate toil, aggressiveness, misery and injustice. Their satisfaction might be most gratifying to the individual, but this happiness is not a condition which has to be maintained and protected if it serves to arrest the development of the ability to recognise the disease of the whole and grasp the chances of curing the disease. The result is unhappiness. (*One Dimensional Man* 7)

These false needs are actually not the needs of the individual. To the contrary, they condition the individual to struggle in society to meet these needs in a state of false consciousness. One of the most prominent among these false needs appears in the form of the need to develop oneself for a better status in society in accordance with social norms. Although the individual assumes that he improves his social and intellectual skills, he actually becomes an appropriate member of society and serves the bourgeois benefits as much as he can. Like the educational institutions in the late Victorian society, the individual is conditioned and encouraged for such personal development by the system. However, the bourgeois society keeps its promises only to the extent that the individual is supposed to be beneficial to the social order as in the example of Jude Fawley who studies hard for upward social movement through his education, but is not granted a respectable status as a university scholar in the bourgeois society. Jude's status as a stonemason and his country origins prevent him from rising upward on the social scale, because he obviously does not have economic and social means appropriate for the middle class. Jude does not have economic means and social acquaintances to grant him a respectable status in the bourgeois society. For this reason, he is always a stranger when he moves into the town. The result for Jude turns out to be an endless struggle all his life and absolute unhappiness in the bourgeois society as a stonemason,

squeezed into the lower strata of the social structure. For these false needs of the individual, Marcuse further claims that

> the question of what are true and false needs must be answered by the individuals themselves, but only in the last analysis; that is, if and when they are free to give their own answer. As long as they are kept incapable of being autonomous, as long as they are indoctrinated and manipulated (down to their very instincts), their answer to this question cannot be taken as their own. (*One Dimensional Man* 8)

Clearly, freedom of the individual is the key point in this conflict with the bourgeois society, since the individual is in a state of false consciousness. In *Jude the Obscure*, Jude is conditioned to struggle for respectability by the system, not as an individual independent from socially constructed ideals. In this respect, it must be reiterated that

> in the most highly developed areas of contemporary [bourgeois and industrial] society, the transplantation of social into individual needs is so effective that the difference between them seems to be purely theoretical. […] The range of choice open to the individual is not the decisive factor in determining the degree of human freedom, but what can be chosen and what is chosen by the individual. (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 10)

In the light of Marcuse's comment, the question towards the condition of the individual, like Jude, in an attempt to move upward on the social scale must be about the number of choices one has. Although Jude might be quite happy as a countryman in his village, he is shown the choice of a better education. In fact, as it will also be further discussed below, Jude is looking for economic prosperity and social respectability. Apparently, there does not seem to be as many choices for the protagonist as it is suggested by the bourgeois urban society.

In fact, Jude appears to confuse social interests with his individual benefits. Several forms of social control invade both his public and private life. In a society controlled by organised capitalism as Marcuse states,

> the private space has been invaded and whittled down by technological reality. Mass production and mass distribution claim the entire individual, and industrial psychology has long ceased to be confined to the factory. […] The result is, not adjustment but mimesis: an immediate identification of the individual with his society and, through it, with society as a whole. (*One Dimensional Man* 12)

By means of the interplay between the needs of society and the individual, the bourgeois society succeeds in blotting out the notion of individuality in the socially conditioned conscience of the people. Hence, economic doctrines of capitalism that characterise the late Victorian society permeate all social formations. Marcuse explains the success of the bourgeois society as follows:

> The inner dimension of the mind in which opposition to the status quo can take root is whittled down. The loss of this dimension, in which the power of negative thinking – the critical power of Reason – is at home, is the ideological counterpart to the very material process in which advanced industrial society silences and reconciles the opposition. The impact of progress turns Reason into submission to the facts of life. […] The efficiency of the system blunts the individuals' recognition that it contains no facts which do not communicate to the repressive power of the whole [society]. If the individuals find themselves in the things which shape their life, they do so, not by giving, but by accepting the law of things – the law of their society. (*One Dimensional Man* 13)

Eventually, the bourgeois social order succeeds in creating so-called individuals who do not challenge the impositions of society. These conformist people serve only the interests of the social order. They identify social benefits as if they were their own. Therefore, "there is only one dimension and it is everywhere and in all forms. […] The false consciousness of [the individual's] rationality becomes the true consciousness" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 13). In *Jude the Obscure*, since the individual is expected to adopt economic doctrines of capitalism, social values like respectability and cultural norms like living a morally appropriate life, the individual accepts all social impositions without opposition. Hence, the socially constructed "abstract individual […] experiences only that which is given to him, […] has only the facts and not the factors, [and his] behaviour is one-dimensional and manipulated" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 187).

In *Jude the Obscure*, the protagonist Jude Fawley, Sue Bridehead and Richard Phillotson are portrayed as one dimensional characters who are forced to conform to the status quo. The dilemma of these characters in the novel, in particular Jude and Sue, results from the oppressive norms of the late Victorian society, easily described as a bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society. As stated above, one dimensional man is someone "conforming to existing thought and behaviour and lacking a critical

dimension and a dimension of potentialities that transcend the existing society" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* xxvii). Devoid of oppositional and questioning abilities, the so-called individual cannot exceed the given facts of society and cannot overcome the singularity of the truth value of social norms. Furthermore, one dimensional describes "practises that conform to pre-existing structures, norms, and behaviour, in contrast to multidimensional discourse, which focuses on possibilities that transcend them" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* xxvii). In this respect, it is clear that especially Jude and Sue are enforced to conform to the acceptable norms and lifestyle imposed on them by Victorian respectability and morality, and they eventually comply with these pre-existing social forms in their actions. As Marcuse states, Jude and Sue are "assimilated into the object and [follow] the dictates of the external, objective norms and structures, thus losing the ability to discover more liberating possibilities and to engage in transformative practice to realise them" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* xxvii). Moreover, it seems that they

> lose individuality, freedom, and the ability to dissent and to control [their] own destiny. [For Jude and Sue,] the private space, the dimension of negation and individuality, in which one may become and remain a self, is being whittled away by a society which shapes aspirations, hopes, fears and values, and even manipulates vital needs. (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* xxvii)

As Marcuse suggests, "the price that one dimensional man pays for satisfaction is to surrender freedom and individuality" (*One Dimensional Man* xxvii). In this context, all sorts of aspirations and hopes, like Jude's desire to go to Christminster for education, are created by society. According to Jude, respectability depends on upward social mobility. Although his decision to go to the city for better prospects seems to be his ideal, it is actually society that leaves the man only this choice. Because of this conflict between the individual and society, Jude is devoid of freedom and individuality. As Marcuse asserts, "one dimensional man does not know its true needs because its needs are not its own – they are administered, superimposed and heteronomous; it is not able to resist domination, nor to act autonomously, for it identifies with public behaviour and imitates and submits to the powers" (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* xxviii). Accordingly, by trying to realise his own dreams to be a respectable man in the city, Jude tries to achieve society's ideals. Jude as a one dimensional man does not know that

what he believes to be his true needs are constructed by society. On the contrary, he accepts the administered and superimposed needs of the bourgeois society and follows the example of Phillotson in an attempt to copy the dominant behaviour.

Jude is born into a society already in a state of transformation caused by industrialisation and Jude's development as a one dimensional man is presented particularly after his decision to receive higher education. Hence, it is also possible "to interpret the novel as an indictment of society that made it impossible for a working-class man to obtain higher education and that punished any deviation from conventional norms of sexual behaviour" (Lodge 193). Jude is just a young boy in his village Marygreen without knowledge beyond its borders at the end of the Victorian era. Jude's world is a changing one and he witnesses transformation in his environment like the new village church constructed according to Gothic design in line with the bourgeois taste, which is still "unfamiliar" for the English countryside even in the 1890s: "Above all, the original church, hump-backed, wood-turreted, and quaintly hipped, had been taken down. […] In place of it, a tall new building of modern Gothic design, unfamiliar to English eyes, had been erected on a piece of ground by a certain obliterator of historic records who had run down from London and back in a day" (*Jude the Obscure* 7). This account shows that there is a process of change in this remote village at the end of the nineteenth century, although industrialisation does not affect Jude's village as much as a larger town or an industrial city. In this social setting, Jude can work only for the farmer Troutham to protect his farm and harvest from the birds:

> The end of his spare time had now arrived, and emerging from the garden by getting over the hedge at the back he pursued a path northward, till he came to a wide and lonely depression in the general level of the upland, which was sown as a corn-field. This vast concave was the scene of his labours for Mr Troutham the farmer and he descended into the midst of it. (*Jude the Obscure* 9)

Clearly, Jude is employed as an errand boy in the village, and he has no dreams for his future like going to the great town, attending university to move upward on the social scale and becoming a respectable member of the bourgeoisie. However, his embourgeoisement begins soon after he meets Phillotson. Even as a little boy, Jude learns injustice in the bourgeois social order when he sympathises with the birds and

feeds them with corn on the farm, whereas he is expected to scare them away: "'Poor little dears!' said Jude, aloud. 'You *shall* have some dinner – you shall. There is enough for us all. Farmer Troutham can afford to let you have some. Eat, then, my dear little birdies, and make a good meal!" (*Jude the Obscure* 10). However, Jude is beaten for not working efficiently despite his attempt to feed the birds (*Jude the Obscure* 10). As Hassett argues "as a boy, Jude is keenly aware of life's inequities" (432). As the rest of the Victorian society, Jude's village, too, begins to change from an agricultural and rural place towards an industrial place. As Merryn Williams states "in 1840 agriculture was the most important of all industries, absorbing over twenty percent of the labour force. By 1900 it employed less than ten percent and it was widely believed that if the present trends went on, the countryside would soon be depopulated" (1). Moreover, the larger towns and especially cities became centres of attraction for ambitious young people: "The growth of industrial towns had offered them better-paid jobs; railways had given them a means of leaving their native villages, and education – it was claimed – had made them dissatisfied with their conditions" (Merryn Williams 1). Especially, Forster's Education Act in 1870 made "schooling compulsory" for all children between the ages of five and thirteen in England (Merryn Williams 1). Jude, too, attends the elementary school in his village at the beginning of the novel (*Jude the Obscure* 6) and it becomes possible for him to go to university especially after the schoolmaster advises him to become a scholar (*Jude the Obscure* 7). Indeed, Jude's world is already an industrial one. Due to rapid industrialisation, the city becomes a centre of attraction for the protagonist, and the railways also enable him and other characters to wander easily between distant towns in the later chapters of the novel. As a result of the passing of the Reform Act, the repeal of the Corn Laws, the New Poor Law and the growth and collapse of the Chartist Movement in the 1830s and 1840s that Hardy observed in his teens, "the entire British social order was being vigorously politicised following the industrial and agricultural revolutions which left their mark even in a remote county like Dorset [where Hardy's Wessex novels like *Jude the Obscure* are modelled after]" (Ebbatson 111). For the purpose of protecting bourgeois status quo,

> England remained a society constituted by complicated hierarchies of status in which nuances of accent, deportment and rank were crucial but ever-changing signifiers. […] In any case, the simplistic contrast between the rich and the poor remained perhaps more visible in the bourgeoning industrial centres than in the

> countryside. […] At this historical moment [of transformation towards a bourgeois industrial order], society was seen as a series of social gradations or pyramidal ranks, but much ink was devoted to the issues of ascending such a pyramid. (Ebbatson 112)

Accordingly, middle-class values dominated as the process of embourgeoisement continued rapidly especially in the industrial and urban areas. The hierarchical social structure, however, made it difficult to rise on the social scale, unless one adopted the middle-class values and benefits as his own. Nevertheless, Jude's education in the village school, his relationship with Phillotson and the instructor's social status suggest that education could be the best way for social mobility. In other words, the hegemonic effect of bourgeois industrial society on the individual is exercised through education. So, Jude's attention concentrates on Christminster as the place for university education. By moving to Christminster for education, Jude subjects himself to the power of the bourgeois society. This is perhaps the first significant change in Jude's life which is effected by his move from the country to the city.

In this context, the schoolmaster Richard Phillotson is a highly important character in *Jude the Obscure* in that he is the one who introduces bourgeois aspiration of becoming a respectable member of society through education. Indeed, through this process, the bourgeois society starts to construct the one dimensional man that will serve benefits of the established social order. Thus, Jude's social construction begins and, then, Jude lets himself be controlled by the normative values of the bourgeois society. Significantly, the schoolmaster Phillotson creates a lifelong change in the protagonist's worldview and life. In Jude's childhood, Phillotson is the symbol of bourgeois industrial society through education. At the beginning of the novel, Phillotson leaves Marygreen for a new career in Christminster: "The schoolmaster was leaving the village and everybody seemed sorry. The miller at Cresscombe lent him the small white tilted cart and horse to carry his goods to the city of his destination, about twenty miles off, such a vehicle proving of quite sufficient size for the departing teacher's effects" (*Jude the Obscure* 5). The schoolmaster is a surprising man for the villagers due to his possessions which "in addition to the packing-case of books, was a cottage piano that he had bought at an auction during the year in which he thought of learning instrumental music" (*Jude the Obscure* 5). For the rural community, Phillotson is a man of improvement with his

books and desire to learn to play the piano. For Phillotson, on the other hand, Christminster is full of hope and expectation, because he aims to have a successful career in the university. His attempt is quite challenging for his current status, while it is definitely groundbreaking for the country boy, Jude, who has yet no purpose for his future. Since Jude considers Phillotson as a role model, he yearns for becoming like him and he feels sorry for his leaving the village as Phillotson's farewell illustrates:

> Tears rose into the boy's eyes, for he was not among the regular day scholars, who came unromantically close to the schoolmaster's life, but one who had attended the night school only during the present teacher's term of office. The regular scholars, if the truth must be told, stood at the present moment afar off, like certain historic disciples, indisposed to any enthusiastic volunteering of aid. The boy awkwardly opened the book he held in his hand, which Mr Phillotson had bestowed on him as a parting gift. (*Jude the Obscure* 6)

This eleven-year-old boy is different from other children attending the school because of his commitment to learning with the help of his teacher. He does not care about other children, and comes to help Phillotson pack his belongings. Moreover, Jude enquires the reason for Phillotson's leaving the village, which Phillotson explains as follows:

> Well – don't speak of this anywhere. You know what a university is, and a university degree? It is the necessary hall-mark of a man who wants to do anything in teaching. My scheme, or dream, is to be a university graduate, and then to be ordained. By going to live at Christminster, or near it, I shall be at headquarters, so to speak, and if my scheme is practicable at all, I consider that being on the spot will afford me a better chance of carrying it out than I should have elsewhere. (*Jude the Obscure* 6)

Clearly, Phillotson aims to have a respectable status in the bourgeois society through university education. As stated, Jude is thus acquainted with the bourgeois worldview in Christminster with the help of Phillotson. According to Schwarz, "Phillotson is a prototype of Jude as a hopeful, aspiring man trying to improve himself" (32). As Jude idealises both Phillotson, as a guide to follow, and Christminster as a place to go ultimately for a university education. As a sort of advice, Phillotson tells Jude that "I shan't forget you, Jude, […] be a good boy, remember; and be kind to animals and birds, and read all you can. And if ever you come to Christminster, remember you hunt me out for old acquaintance' sake" (*Jude the Obscure* 6). Jude considers this as encouragement to pursue ideals like Phillotson's. Jude is preoccupied by this idea and

he thinks that this experience is necessary to be acceptable in a superior social order. Jude's aunt Drusilla also says "Jude, Jude, why didstn't [*sic*] go off with that schoolmaster of thine to Christminster or somewhere? But, oh no – poor or'nary child – there never was any sprawl on thy side of the family, and never will be!" (*Jude the Obscure* 12). It appears that Jude as an individual is entrapped by the idea that Christminster is superior to the countryside and that he can reach this superior place through social ideals exemplified by Phillotson. While Jude begins to wonder this city narrated by his elders, university education and becoming a part of the bourgeois urban community in Christminster are gradually embedded in the individual's mind as absolute needs in life, as in Jude's attempts to have a glimpse of the city (*Jude the Obscure* 13). It seems that there is only one dimension of being successful and respectable, and Jude is determined to follow it, which leads to his becoming a one dimensional man.

Furthermore, Jude questions the social response in his environment towards Christminster and the idea of going to this town to live there permanently. Jude finds out that the bourgeois urban society in the town is considered by his aunt to refer to a higher social status, when aunt Drusilla says "Lord! You ought to know where the city of Christminster is. Near a score of miles from here. It is a place much too good for you ever to have much to do with, poor boy" (*Jude the Obscure* 12). For Jude's aunt, an ordinary country woman, the city is beyond the reach of Jude, which actually emphasises class consciousness in the late Victorian society. Furthermore, the rural community define themselves by their rural background: "You didn't grow up hereabout, or you wouldn't ask [whether you could go to the city]. We've never had anything to do with folk in Christminster, nor folk in Christminster with we" (*Jude the Obscure* 12). Jude gradually comes to realise the bourgeois society as superior. He learns that the lower-class rural community that he belongs to does not have anything to do with the lifestyle in Christminster. As Schwarz states that "the first four chapters of *Jude the Obscure* are among the great openings in the English novel. In these chapters, Hardy dramatises a young boy's discovery of the moral and metaphysical geography of the hostile world in which he lives" (31). As a result of Phillotson's and aunt Drusilla's

comments, Jude is introduced to Christminster and the idea of social mobility ascending the hierarchical social structure.

Jude is curious about the city and how it looks like, since the comments by Phillotson and his aunt are not adequate for Jude to visualise the city. Christminster is like a myth for him. So, he decides to have a glimpse of the city and, after a difficult journey, he comes to the top of Brown House, an old barn out of the village, and he is amazed by what he sees across the mist for the first time in his life:

> Some way within the limits of the stretch of landscape, points of light like the topaz gleamed. The air increased in transparency with the lapse of minutes, till the topaz points showed themselves to be the vanes, windows, wet roof slates, and other shining spots upon the spires, domes, freestone-work, and varied outlines that were faintly revealed. It was Christminster, unquestionably; either directly seen, or miraged in the peculiar atmosphere. (*Jude the Obscure* 15-16)

For the young protagonist, even this indistinct view of Christminster is amazing with its grandeur. Jude is so impressed by what he sees that he calls it

> the new Jerusalem […] that acquired a tangibility, a permanence, a hold in his life, mainly from the one nucleus of fact that the man for whose knowledge and purposes he had so much reverence was actually living there; not only so, but living among the more thoughtful and mentally shining one therein. (*Jude the Obscure* 16)

Jude believes that the urban community is full of intelligent and learned people different from the people in the village. He finds a kind of purpose to be achieved in Christminster. He knows that he has to go to this urban centre to improve himself and join the thoughtful and shining people who are definitely respectable in the bourgeois community. In other words, Jude is ready to comply with the requirements of the bourgeois society that captures the individual's consciousness.

There is a great difference in terms of lifestyle between Jude's village and Christminster as the accounts below narrated by Jude's two countrymen, whom Jude meets out of his village and asks about the city, illustrate quite clearly. These two men are coming back from Christminster and they have the first hand experience of the city. The ordinary countryman depicts Christminster as follows:

> Ah young man, you'd have to get your head screwed on t'other way before you could read what they read there. […] Oh, they never look anything that folks like we can understand. […] On'y foreign tongues used in the days of the Tower of Babel, when no two families spoke alike. They read that sort of thing as fast as a night-hawk will whir. 'Tis learning all there – nothing but learning, except religion. And that's learning too, for I never could understand it. Yes, 'tis a serious-minded place. Not but there's wenches in the streets o' nights. You know, I suppose, that they raise pa'sons there like radishes in a bed? And though it do take […] five years to turn a lirruping hobble-de-hoy [*sic*] chap into a solemn preaching man with no corrupt passions, they'll do it, if it can be done, and polish un [one] off like the workmen they be, and turn un out wi' a long face, and a long black coat and waistcoat, and a religious collar and hat, same as they used to wear in the Scriptures, so that his own mother wouldn't know un sometimes. There, 'tis their business, like anybody else's. (*Jude the Obscure* 18)

Clearly, Christminster is characterised by a sophisticated atmosphere of learning and the inhabitants of the city are depicted as highly intelligent people. Furthermore, people in Christminster are aware of and able to interpret complicated issues, unlike the simple people in the country. Christminster is portrayed as a centre of fashion and culture. The scholars are educated in subjects that Jude's countrymen do not understand. Moreover, lifestyle is quite different as women, for instance, can wander around in the streets at nights. The inhabitants, or scholars, in Christminster speak languages that the villagers do not understand, and they are educated and have respectable positions in the university and the Church. However, from a critical perspective, the problem in the bourgeois society stems from this point. The young country boy has no opportunity and alternative other than going to the city and adopting bourgeois values for respectability. Although he begins to consider entering the university as an ideal for himself, it is actually a need created by the bourgeois society. University education and a sophisticated form of living are prerequisites for respectability. Moreover, Jude is not properly trained for university education. Although the ideal seems to be available, it is also beyond his reach. Jude's countryman depicts the intellectual level of Christminster as follows:

> You must mind that I be a-talking of the college life. 'Em lives on a lofty level; there's no gainsaying it, though I myself med not think much of 'em. As we be here in our bodies on this high ground, so be they in their minds – noble-minded men enough, no doubt – some on 'em – able to earn hundred by thinking out loud. And some on 'em be strong young fellows that can earn a'most as much in silver cups. (*Jude the Obscure* 18)

Under the influence of these accounts, Jude is ready to devote himself to the plan of rising to a respectable social status in Christminster since the bourgeois industrial society and its ideals are impressed into Jude's mind in a slow and gradual process. Jude is systematically accustomed to the idea of superiority in the bourgeois social environment and to the need of becoming a part of that community at all costs. Respectability in the bourgeois society of Christminster turns out to be the sole purpose in Jude's life. As Marcuse states, "the cognitive costs include the loss of an ability to perceive another dimension of possibilities that transcend the one-dimensional thought and society" (*One Dimensional Man* xxviii). Jude begins to be captured by the social order without realising this process. At the same time, he develops a false consciousness. Jude Fawley's imagination and individuality are, thus, controlled by society.

Respectability plays a very important role in Jude's development as a one dimensional man. He supposes that the social status of the learned man, due to both knowledge and income, brings respectability in Christminster. Jude's relationship with the physician Vilbert illustrates the one dimensional thought that dominates and canalises his efforts to achieve respectability. Vilbert, a local doctor who wanders among villages, promises to bring new books for Jude to study like the scholars in Christminster. In exchange for his books, Vilbert expects Jude to convince more people in the country to become his patients. Jude's commitment to his task is so strong that he is completely disappointed when Vilbert does not keep his promise:

> Jude controlled himself sufficiently long to make sure of the truth; and he repeated, in a voice of dry misery, 'You haven't brought 'em!' […] Jude dropped behind. He was an unsophisticated boy, but the gift of sudden insight which is sometimes vouchsafed to children showed him all at once what shoddy humanity the quack was made of. There was to be no intellectual light from this source. The leaves dropped from his imaginary crown of laurel; he turned to a gate, leant against it, and cried bitterly. (*Jude the Obscure* 22)

Despite this great disappointment, Jude is not easily dissuaded from his future expectations and remembers Phillotson in Christminster. He asks for the schoolmaster's help by a letter, which he sends secretly in his piano. This scheme is also dangerous for

the protagonist, because "to tell his aunt of his intention would be to defeat it. It was necessary to act alone" (*Jude the Obscure* 23). Jude's request is returned by two books in Latin sent by Phillotson for him to study. Jude is motivated towards his goal:

> Ever since his first ecstasy or vision of Christminster and its possibilities, Jude had meditated much and more curiously on the probable sort of process that was involved in turning the expressions of one language into those of another. He concluded that a grammar of the required tongue would contain, primarily a rule, prescription, or clue of the nature of a secret cipher, which, once known, would enable him, by merely applying it, to change at will all words of his own speech into those of the foreign one. (*Jude the Obscure* 23)

Nevertheless, Jude realises the difficulty of mastering these languages as soon as he closely looks into the books: "[Jude] learnt for the first time that there was no law of transmutation, as in his innocence he had supposed, […] but that every word in both Latin and Greek was to be individually committed to the memory at the cost of years of plodding" (*Jude the Obscure* 24). Jude's discovery of the process of learning these languages makes him "an utterly miserable boy" in his "grand delusion" (*Jude the Obscure* 24). The need to learn Latin and Greek might also be considered as a part of the education system that shapes the individual's identity for the benefits of the system. However, in *Jude the Obscure*, there is no other detail as regards the impact of public education on the individual except for the fact that learning these ancient languages is a criterion to attend the university in Christminster. Just like Jude's disappointment by the physician when the latter did not keep his promise of bringing his Latin books, Jude is alone in his desolation of being stuck into the village in the late nineteenth-century England when the possibility of rising on the social scale towards respectability in Christminster lies quite far away. Although Jude can lead a life of a mason in the country, he is actually looking for respectability in the bourgeois society through education.

The hope for upward mobility in the Victorian society draws the young boy Jude to the city stronger than ever. Initially, however, he has to study on his own and teach himself basic Latin and Greek. In the next few years after acquiring his books, Jude continues his studies in the most inappropriate conditions. Preparing for his future in the city, he lives in the village and helps his old aunt in her bakery. His task is "thrice a week to

carry loaves of bread to the villagers and solitary cotters immediately around Marygreen" (*Jude the Obscure* 25). However, the determined boy actually "would slip the reins over his arm, ingenuously fix open, by means of a strap attached to the tilt, the volume he was reading, spread the dictionary on his knees, and plunge into the simpler passages of Caesar, Virgil, or Horace, as the case might be, in his purblind stumbling way, […] yet somehow getting at the meaning of what he read" (*Jude the Obscure* 25). Peter Casagrande states that "Jude dreams, with all the poignancy of a dreamer of impossible dreams, of becoming a man of learning, a university don, perhaps a clergyman, and he sets for himself the Herculean task of self-instruction, which he carries on, with touching dedication, while driving a delivery cart around the countryside" (29). Nonetheless, Jude has his doubts in his studies due to the rivalry with other scholars in Christminster too: "The more he thought of [the works he read], the more he was convinced of his inconsistency. He began to wonder whether he could be reading quite the right books for his object in life" (*Jude the Obscure* 27). Since Jude is a poor lower-class boy, he does not have the opportunities of the wealthy middle-class boys in Christminster in terms of his education. Due to this hierarchical social structure, Jude suffers from social inequality as his self teaching illustrates. Jude has to study alone, but he is not sure whether he is studying the correct material. According to Marcuse, Jude's condition might be explained as "the regulation of free competition among unequally equipped economic subjects" (*One Dimensional Man* 3). Jude is clearly disadvantaged by the bourgeois and capitalist social order. Jude, nevertheless, makes progress:

> I have read two books of the Iliad, besides being pretty familiar with passages such as the speech of Phoenix in the ninth book, the fight of Hector and Ajax in the fourteenth, the appearance of Achilles unarmed and his heavenly armour in the eighteenth, and the funeral games in the twenty-third. I have also done some Hesiod, a little scrap of Thucydides, and a lot of the Greek Testament… I wish there was only one dialect, all the same. I have done some mathematics, including the first six and the eleventh and twelve books of Euclid; and algebra as far as simple equations. I know something of the Fathers, and something of Roman and English history. These things are only a beginning. (*Jude the Obscure* 29)

As stated above, education is clearly presented as a means of constructing the one dimensional man in *Jude the Obscure*. Jude's study of these texts for a university career is a demand of the industrial society to shape the individual's identity for social

interests. As Marcuse states, this process of identity construction towards a one dimensional man is rewarded by a higher and respectable social status. Accordingly, Jude believes that he will be "living comfortably in Christminster in the course of a year or two" (*Jude the Obscure* 28). Furthermore, Jude contemplates that

> these things are only a beginning. But I shall not make much further advance here [in Marygreen], from the difficulty of getting books. Hence I must next concentrate all my energies on settling in Christminster. Once there I shall so advance, with the assistance I shall there get, that my present knowledge will appear to me but as childish ignorance. I must save money, and I will; and one of those colleges shall open its doors to me – shall welcome whom now it would spurn. (*Jude the Obscure* 29)

As Jude continues to dream about his prospects through university education, he sees that the bourgeois social order provides the individual with an endless list of possibilities as long as one conforms to the established social order: "And then he continued to dream, and thought he might become even a bishop by leading a pure, energetic, wise, Christian life. And what an example he would set!" (*Jude the Obscure* 29). As a result of the example he will set possibly in the future, Jude as a one dimensional actually reproduces the social context that produces his submission in the first place.

The socially constructed role of a respectable scholar in the university is strengthened by a higher income than an ordinary stonemason, or a farmer in the country can ever earn. Evidently, Jude is inspired for his academic career because of this economic aspect, too. Therefore, he thinks that

> if his income were £5000 a year, he would give away £4500 in one form and another, and live sumptuously (for him) on the remainder. Well, on second thoughts, a bishop was absurd. He would draw the line at an archdeacon. Perhaps a man could be as good and as learned and as useful in the capacity of archdeacon as in that of bishop. Yet he thought of the bishop again. (*Jude the Obscure* 29)

Jude is inspired by economic and social opportunities of moving to Christminster. In this respect, Marcuse states that "if in one's economic and social life one […] conforms to dominant social norms, one is losing one's potentialities of self-determination and individuality" (*One Dimensional Man* xxviii). So, Jude is losing his individuality as his

needs are determined by society. Jude's dream of going to Christminster following the path of Phillotson is a matter of conformity to the norms of the bourgeois social order. Jude intends to change his lifestyle in line with the social values of the urban community, dominated by the middle-class values.

The change that Jude plans necessitates employment. Hence, he has to work to provide his basic needs for survival like "food, clothing and shelter" before he reaches a respectable status (*Jude the Obscure* 27). City life, however, has only a limited number of options for a country boy. Following the example of his unknown uncle, Jude decides that "somehow medieval art in any material was a trade for which he had rather a fancy" (*Jude the Obscure* 27). Therefore, Jude initially obtains a few blocks of freestone to copy the heads in the parish church, and then he is apprenticed by a stone-mason in Alfredston, a nearby town. Eventually, the protagonist begins to work for a church-builder, and becomes a good and exemplary worker "handy at restoring the dilapidated masonries of several village churches round about" (*Jude the Obscure* 28). Jude's attitude towards this job shows that he only looks for economic means to survive in the bourgeois society on the way to a higher status: "Not forgetting that he was only following up this handicraft as a prop to lean on while he prepared those greater engines which he flattered himself would be better fitted for him, he yet was interested in his pursuit on his own account" (*Jude the Obscure* 28). In an attempt to find economic sources for his plans, Jude becomes a stonemason in the country at the age of nineteen. Jude is reminded of his lower-class origins and disadvantages in society. Besides his intellectual plans, Jude has his doubts on the matter of survival surrounded by economic difficulties, since he does not have a benefactor to support him in his quest for respectability. The question "but how live in that city?" lurks behind his optimism that results from his studies for the university (*Jude the Obscure* 27). From this point onwards, Jude is a member of the working class – as a stonemason – till the end of his life. The lack of social and economic means condemns him to a status in society that he never appreciates due to his dreams of rising on the social scale.

Jude's aspirations for respectability are both encouraged and thwarted by the system. In *Jude the Obscure*, Jude's self-study in a period of eight years actually reflects his

willingness to adopt bourgeois values and to be a member of the bourgeoisie at the end of this process. At the beginning of the novel, Jude Fawley is an eleven-year-old boy looking after the schoolmaster in admiration for his plans in the city. In a few chapters, the nineteen-year-old protagonist follows his dreams studying on his own and earning money for his survival in the city. In other words, he has spent his entire life particularly for the purpose of rising on the social scale. However, his long struggle is interrupted by a country girl, Arabella, who meets him in the country on his way back from the town to his home and diverts his attention from his objective to receive university education in Christminster (*Jude the Obscure* 31). Jude as a young man who has never interacted with other people except for his future plans is deeply impressed by the femininity of this girl. Jude's acquaintance with Arabella culminating in their marriage exemplifies the significance of social environment and status in the bourgeois society, because this simple country girl hinders Jude's upward social mobility. Jude has to wait to go to Christminster for a few years due to Arabella who sees Jude only as a proper husband in their cosy domestic environment in the country (*Jude the Obscure* 43). In *Jude the Obscure*, it is quite clear that Jude is confined to his lower-class status by his social environment no matter how hard he tries to move upward. As John Butler states

> *Jude the Obscure* is an allegory, a sociological novel and a psychological study, but its importance is that it is an allegory about the fate of man as he is caught between two worlds, a sociological novel about a man caught between classes (and stages of social development), and a psychological novel about the traumatic lives of two people [Jude and Sue] caught between desire and duty. (121)

It might be stated that Jude's condition as a man caught between the lower class and the middle class is presented as the greatest problem in the protagonist's life. This inbetweenness is strengthened by Arabella, who causes Jude the loss of a few years that he spends as her husband as a lower-class family man. Casagrande believes that "Jude is too loving for the harsh world he inhabits, especially the world of sexual struggle. Jude is a victim of lust, but of his own lust as well as that of another person. […] Jude's dream comes to a steamy end when he meets a young woman of his own age who sees in him a sexual conquest and a means thereby to security in marriage" (29). Jude is squeezed between his sense of desire for a happy life and duty in the form of social ideals.

Jude gives away his study of years for this marriage, which he repents in a short time. Jude remembers his lifelong quest for a higher and respectable status. He realises Arabella's social status and his condition stuck in the country. Moreover, he is constrained by economic difficulties to a cottage between his village and the town, definitely far away from his dreams (*Jude the Obscure* 52). Casagrande claims that "Arabella's wakening of Jude's sexuality and the marriage she exacts of him destroys Jude's dream of a university education. To support his wife and supposed child he must – out of humane principle – set aside his books and go to work as a stonemason" (30). Jude has to take care of himself and Arabella in order to survive, while it becomes even more difficult to carry on his studies. For him, adaptation to urban lifestyle and bourgeois values are more important than anything in the country. While his marriage comes to an end due to Arabella's lack of understanding and sensitivity towards his ambitions, feelings and attributions, Jude begins to struggle once again for a higher social status in the bourgeois industrial society and he decides to go to Christminster. As the first part of the novel concludes, an individual is repressed by the established social order to become a one dimensional man in the late Victorian society by complying with the social norms. As Marcuse states, "one dimensional thought is not able to make the distinction [between appearance and reality] and thus submits to the power of existing society, deriving its view of the world and mode of behaviour from existing practices and modes of thought" (*One Dimensional Man* xxviii). Clearly, Jude as one dimensional man submits to the authority of the system. Despite the brief intervention of his marriage with a country girl, Jude is still determined to go to university for a higher social status.

Indeed, Jude's journey towards the city and his arrival at his dreamland mark the beginning of the actual interaction between the protagonist and the bourgeois society. Although Jude has been struggling for a successful career in the university by means of his self-studies all these years, he learned about the scholars and urban lifestyle only through the accounts he listened from country people who have been to Christminster. Jude comes to Christminster as an ambitious young man for the difficult task of rising on the social scale:

> The next noteworthy move in Jude's life was that in which he appeared gliding steadily onward […]. He was walking towards Christminster City, at a point a mile or two to the south-west of it. He had at last found himself clear of Marygreen and Alfredston: he was out of his apprenticeship, and with his tools at his back seemed to be in the way of making a new start – the start to which, barring the interruption involved in his intimacy and married experience with Arabella, he had been looking forward for about ten years. (*Jude the Obscure* 65)

Jude finally walks into the city that will enable his upward social movement. His lifelong dream is about to come true after all these years. Before Jude is acquainted with new people in Christminster, he walks in the streets alone at night. Draper explains the relationship between Jude and Christminster as follows: "What Christminster represents for Jude is an overriding compulsion to find his home in an ideal community of learning – a university town in the true sense of the word, where he could find a proper role by virtue of his innate worth and dedication" (251). Jude is amazed by the number of colleges that line up one after another in the city. Although he has been struggling to study ancient texts on his own in the village, there are many colleges that seem to be available to study in Christminster: "After many turnings he came up to the first ancient medieval pile that he had encountered. It was a college, as he could see by the gateway. […] Close to this college was another; and a little further on another; and then he began to be encircled as it were with the breath and sentiment of the venerable city" (*Jude the Obscure* 66). Jude feels himself in a dream as he wanders in the streets of Christminster. His attitude reflects the superiority around him, while he is burdened by a sense of inferiority that characterises Jude's condition in this urban setting. Jude's wonder in the face of the venerable city reflects, at the same time, his readiness to be subservient to the grandeur of this urban environment.

The major problem in Jude's attitude is that he does not evaluate his surroundings objectively because of his false consciousness developed over years. Jude, as a one dimensional man and in a state of false consciousness, wants to find perfection in Christminster, which is almost a dreamland for Jude at this stage. So, Jude does not accept that there could be a deficiency in the city. Jude's thoughts illustrate this point: "When he passed objects out of harmony with its general expression he allowed his eyes to slip over them as if he did not see them" (*Jude the Obscure* 66). Likewise, in a

few steps more, he heard "a bell clanging, and listened till a hundred-and-one strokes had sounded. He must have made a mistake, he thought: it was meant for a hundred" (*Jude the Obscure* 67). Jude imagines himself to be in a land of perfection, so that he does not want to see imperfection in the city. He is in a state of transition under control of a superior existence, which is actually a construct of the bourgeois society:

> When the gates were shut, and he could no longer get into the quadrangles, he rambled under the walls and doorways, feeling with his fingers the contours of their mouldings and carving. The minutes passed, fewer and fewer people were visible, and still he serpentined among the shadows, for had he not imagined these scenes through ten bygone years, and what mattered a night's rest for once? (*Jude the Obscure* 67)

Jude is impatient to feel the physical existence of this urban setting, and lack of sleep cannot prevent him from touching the city walls. This account of Jude's walk illustrates his obsession with the city and its cultural superiority.

On his first day in Christminster, Jude is almost disillusioned by his experience in the city, which reminds him of the hierarchical social structure. Despite his dedication to a scholarly pursuit, he realises that he is only a simple stonemason, a member of the working class in this bourgeois industrial and urban society. Instead of scholarly issues, Jude's daily occupation is to survive as a worker: "Necessary meditations on the actual, including the mean bread-and-cheese question, dissipated the phantasmal for a while, and compelled Jude to smother high thinkings under immediate needs. He had to get up, and seek work, manual work; the only kind deemed by man of its professors to be work at all" (*Jude the Obscure* 71). In the light of his experiences since his childhood, Jude, now in his twenties, is aware of the fact that daily routine of a worker is absolutely different from that of a scholar. For years, he has struggled to survive economically working for other people in manual jobs including his own aunt for a long time. The first day in Christminster, therefore, has an awakening influence on Jude in terms of his social status.

In this urban setting, Jude's existence does not matter to the academic circles and the urban community as it is clear in his daily rush and anxiety. Jude gradually begins to understand the hierarchical social structure that allocates the working-class member an

appropriate status in society. Jude's thoughts also reflect his awakening about the system:

> For a moment there fell on Jude a true illumination; that here in the stone yard was a centre of effort as worthy as that dignified by the name of scholarly study within the noblest of colleges. But he lost it under stress of his old idea. He would accept any employment which might be offered him […]; but he would accept it as a provisional thing only. This was his form of the modern vice of unrest. (*Jude the Obscure* 72)

Jude's view shows that he considers these jobs as provisional; however, Jude cannot overcome the hierarchical structure and remains a worker throughout the novel. His rural background and lower-class status do not leave him alone even if he has succeeded in coming to Christminster. At this stage, survival turns into a priority before his dreams. The working-class member is not allowed to think about the university scholars due to his daily matters of finding employment and survival in the city.

Moreover, Jude decides to find his old schoolmaster Phillotson who, in Jude's opinion, is the ultimate solution to Jude's problem of upward social movement. Jude's ideas about finding Phillotson reflect his status in society and his feeling of inferiority resulting from his lower-class status: "There remained the schoolmaster – probably now a reverend parson. But he could not possibly hunt up such a respectable man just yet; so raw and unpolished was his condition, so precarious were his fortunes. Thus he remained in loneliness. Although people moved round him, he virtually saw none" (*Jude the Obscure* 72). In accordance with Jude's perspective, he is not suitable for the respectable community settled in Christminster. This point of view leads to his isolation from the middle and upper strata of society. Still, he believes that

> the future lay ahead after all; and if he could only be so fortunate as to get into good employment he would put up with the inevitable. So he thanked God for his health and strength, and took courage. For the present he was outside the gates of everything, colleges included: perhaps some day he would be inside. Those palaces of light and leading; he might some day look down on the world through their panes. (*Jude the Obscure* 73)

The wall of the college that separates Jude from other young scholars is a symbol of social hierarchy that condemns Jude to his present desolation as a worker. Although he

tries to catch up with these university members through his intellectual development, his social status does not allow him to do so.

Eventually, Jude begins to accept his lower-class position and incapability to rise on the social scale despite his efforts. The fairly established social divisions leave Jude among the lower circles of society. Jude cannot reach middle-class respectability among the scholars in the university. In this bourgeois industrial society, Jude is a stonemason, rather than a university scholar in view of Jude's intellectual, social and economic conditions. Jude contemplates that "he was far from [the scholars] as if he had been at the antipodes. Of course he was. He was a young workman in a white blouse, and with stone-dust in the creases of his clothes; and in passing him they did not even see him, or hear him, rather saw through him as through a pane of glass at their familiars beyond" (*Jude the Obscure* 73). Jude aspires to be a university member, but he does not even exist for them. Nevertheless, in a state of false consciousness, he continues to study in his poverty in the city: "After buying a book or two he could not even afford himself a fire; and when the nights reeked with the raw and cold air from the meadows he sat over his lamp in a great-coat, hat and woollen gloves" (*Jude the Obscure* 74). Clearly, Jude Fawley struggles for an ideal he cannot reach due to his lack of economic and social means. In other words, he aims to improve his social status which seems to be possible only through submission to the established social order. Although Jude tries to accomplish his task by studying more and more, he cannot overcome hierarchical social boundaries established through the limits on social classes. The individual is, thus, conditioned to comply with the social norms and serve the benefits of the bourgeois society, while he gets almost no substantial benefit in this quest.

The final stage of Jude's dreams for a higher social status results in Jude's questioning the established social order when he finds out that his dreams are not possible to realise. Jude's dreams, which were created in the first place by means of public education, come to an end through a series of events that start by his meeting with Phillotson again in Christminster. Jude meets his former schoolmaster in Christminster who is still working in an insignificant school as the schoolmaster. Jude is utterly disappointed as he finds the old man in desolation that gives an impression of bleak and dismal emptiness: "That

after all these years the meeting with Mr Phillotson should be of this homely complexion destroyed at one stroke the halo which had surrounded the schoolmaster's figure in Jude's imagination ever since their parting. It created in him at the same time a sympathy with Phillotson as an obviously much chastened and disappointed man" (*Jude the Obscure* 86). Although Jude has recognised this man as an ideal all throughout these years and expected to meet him in a respectable status at the university, Phillotson's current status destroys Jude's hopes of rising out of the lower class, because Jude associates his own desperate condition with that of Phillotson. The schoolmaster does not even remember Jude who has idealised him since their parting at the village and looked for the day they would meet again (*Jude the Obscure* 85). Jude reminds Phillotson that "it was you who first started me on that course. On the morning you left Marygreen, […] you said your scheme was to be a University man and enter the church – that a degree was the necessary hall-mark of one who wanted to do anything as a theologian or teacher" (*Jude the Obscure* 86). Phillotson retorts Jude's comment in a brief and discouraging manner: "I remember I thought all that privately; but I wonder I did not keep my own counsel. The idea was given up years ago" (*Jude the Obscure* 87). During their brief meeting, Jude learns that even his lifelong ideal man has given up the quest for a higher and respectable social status in society. Apparently, Phillotson could not overcome social boundaries established by the bourgeois industrial society in this urban environment. As a man that is already "comfortable in his present position," Phillotson seems to be quite content with what the Victorian society offers him economically and socially as a schoolmaster (*Jude the Obscure* 87). Clearly, Phillotson has accepted his social status appropriate for him in society, but his acquiescence is destructive for Jude who has considered Phillotson as an ideal scholar all these years. Marcuse states that "the optimal goal is the replacement of false needs by true ones, the abandonment of repressive satisfaction" (*One Dimensional Man* 9). Clearly, Phillotson is a conformist in his current status as an ordinary schoolmaster in Christminster. He is aware that he could not overcome the hierarchical social order for a career in the university. Phillotson's case is obviously discouraging for Jude.

Under the destructive influence of Phillotson's failure, Jude's visit to his aunt in the village increases Jude's doubts about whether he will be successful in his attempts to go

to university. An ordinary man in Jude's village says that "just what we thought! Such places be not for such as you – only for them with plenty o' money" (*Jude the Obscure* 96). Clearly, the people in Jude's village believe that he will definitely fail, because Christminster is not for the country people and it is out of their reach. This comment is akin to what Jude listened as a little child about the unattainable Christminster. Despite his attempt to retort in bitterness, "there you are wrong, […] they are for such ones," Jude gradually goes through an awakening as regards the reality he lives in and the imaginary world he seems to struggle for (*Jude the Obscure* 96). Jude's self questioning process is directed at his uncertain quest from now on:

> Still, the remark was sufficient to withdraw Jude's attention from the imaginative world he had lately inhabited, in which an abstract figure, more or less himself, was steeping his mind in a sublimation of the arts and sciences, and making his calling and election sure to a seat in the paradise of the learned. He had lately felt that he could not quite satisfy himself in Greek – in the Greek of the dramatists particularly. […] It was decidedly necessary to consider facts a little more closely than he had done of late. What was the good, after all, of using up his spare hours in a vague labour called 'private study' without giving an outlook on practicabilities? (*Jude the Obscure* 96)

Clearly, Jude's attitude changes towards his dream of studying for a better future after he contemplates alone. He feels that he has wasted his time for an unreasonable purpose. Without appropriate economic means, it does not seem possible for Jude to make his dreams real. In a final attempt, Jude decides to apply to the university as he still hopes that someone could answer his call for help. Although Jude sends letters to the universities, he is aware of the fact that economic and social difficulties underlie his current disappointment:

> The young man was thrown back entirely on himself, as formerly, with the added gloom of a weakened hope. By indirect inquiries he soon perceived clearly, what he had long uneasily suspected, that to qualify himself for certain open scholarships and exhibitions was the only brilliant course. But to do this a good deal of coaching would be necessary, and much natural ability. It was next to impossible that a man reading on his own system, however widely and thoroughly, even over the prolonged period of ten years, should be able to compete with those who had passed their lives under trained teachers and had worked to ordained lines. (*Jude the Obscure* 97-98)

Jude Fawley realises that, as a man that comes from the country and lives in the city as a stonemason, he cannot compete against the scholars in the university who spend their

lives studying for the difficult task under the guidance of tutors. In this hierarchical social order, Jude lacks the means to equip himself with the knowledge necessary for the rivalry against others. Just as Marcuse points to "the unequal rivalry" between "unequally equipped individuals," Jude is destined to lose from the very beginning because of inequalities of the system (*One Dimensional Man* 3). His own studies that lasted for more than ten years do not help him get into these academic circles. Although Jude's lifelong dream has been to come to the city and "to move among the churches and halls and become imbued with the *genius loci*," he wishes that he had made a much more reasonable choice for his life than trying to overcome social hierarchies:

> It would have been far better for him in every way if he had never come within sight and sound of the delusive precincts, had gone to some busy commercial town with the sole object of making money by his wits, and thence surveyed his plan in true perspective. Well, all that was clear to him amounted to this, that the whole scheme had burst up, like an iridescent soap-bubble, under the touch of a reasoned inquiry. (*Jude the Obscure* 98)

Although he always thought that he would be successful in becoming a scholar once he reaches and begins to live in the city, these current circumstances do not seem to be hopeful for Jude. At this point in his life, he finds out that it is impossible for a lower-class country boy to rise upward in society through university education. Free education provided by the education acts in the 1870s and 1880s, as discussed above, only means secondary education for all, so that Jude's attempt to go to university is not supported by the system. Goodheart emphasises the significance of Hardy's approach towards the relationship between the individuals and society as follows: "Hardy's story-telling is midway between […] the affirmation of the individual personality […] and the subsuming of the individual men and women as constituents of a social entity" (220). Jude's struggle for survival in the Victorian society continues between these two ends, namely his individual self and his role as a constituent part of society to serve the benefits of the system. In view of his economic and social means, Jude Fawley is destined to remain a stonemason in the bourgeois social order in *Jude the Obscure*.

In this respect, the final blow to the protagonist's dreams comes from a scholar at the university, after Jude asks for help in his further studies and he is rejected. This response reflects the attitude of the bourgeois Victorian society towards a lower-class

character like Jude in the established hierarchical social order. This formal document makes it clear that it is actually not possible for people like Jude Fawley to move upward on the social scale and that there is no place for a self-made man. In fact, the scholar who sends him a letter of rejection stands for the social system as he advises Jude to remain a stonemason appropriate for his condition:

> SIR – I have read your letter with interest; and, by judging from your description of yourself as a working-man, I venture to think that you will have a much better chance of success in life by remaining in your own sphere and sticking to your trade than by adopting any other course. That, therefore, is what I advise you to do. (*Jude the Obscure* 99)

The bourgeois social order depends on materialistic principles, and Jude's idealisation of this society seems to be quite illusionary as he perceives that he cannot overcome social hierarchy without economic and social means. Actually, economic means, or having enough money to finance his social mobility, would enable university education and a more respectable status in society. Moreover, he would be earning more money as he figured out above. Hoopes states that "Jude went in quest of this illusory being [his idealisation] and found the corporeal man, who was primarily concerned with money. […] This scene hints at the larger picture of Jude's final, total disillusionment with Christminster and with all of life" (157). Although Jude has aimed to comply with the norms of the bourgeois society, his attempts are inadequate to make him a respectable man in the bourgeois community. Similarly, Lodge asserts that "there were very real social and economic forces working against a man in his position and with his aspirations, but they are only portrayed in the margins, so to speak, of the story; Jude never puts them seriously to the test" (193). Merryn Williams observes that "this official and former Christminster is an extension of ruling class consciousness; the place where its children are sent to absorb its own values of class exclusiveness, bookish scholasticism and a neurotic awareness of sin. To Hardy its rituals are empty, and its codes so narrow as to become often actively cruel" (184). The division between the scholars and the workers is most effectively depicted through Jude's exclusion from the university circles. Ebbatson states that

> *Jude the Obscure* shows how the church underpins and manages class distinctions, and the conventions of the period connive in this attempted restriction of

> opportunity. The principle of advancement which was such an evident motivation in Victorian society is blocked and traduced here not only by economics but also by the traditional classics-based educational curriculum. (122)

Jude eventually learns that the hierarchical social structure benefits from his work as a stonemason. Although scholars in the university depend on the labour of ordinary people like Jude, they do not want them in their class: "[Jude] saw that his destiny lay not with these [university scholar], but among the manual toilers in the shabby purlieu which he himself occupied, unrecognized as part of the city at all by its visitors and panegyrists, yet without whose denizens the hard readers could not read nor the high thinkers live" (*Jude the Obscure* 99). After his hope of upward social movement is destroyed by the rigid social hierarchy, he says that "I don't regret the collapse of my university hopes one jot. I wouldn't begin again if I were sure to succeed. I don't care for social success any more at all. But I feel I should like to do some good thing" (*Jude the Obscure* 106). Lodge claims that "Jude recognises that his destiny lies among the ordinary working people of Christminster, and there is some suggestion that this could be a valuable and fulfilling life – more so than the lives of scholars and students" (194). Similarly, Sprechman points out that "Jude is meek and unassertive and continually skirts the margins of recognition and accomplishment which could give him heroic stature. […] Because of his humble background he never gains admission to the famous university" (102). In the bourgeois late Victorian society represented in *Jude the Obscure*, the worker may serve the benefits of the middle class if he continues his life as a member of the working class. Therefore, Jude's progress as a stonemason is strongly advised and encouraged by the social system. Despite the opportunity of going to university apparently available for all people, the university as an institution also expects respectable qualities that the simple stonemason does not have at all. Sue Bridehead, Jude's soul mate in *Jude the Obscure*, explains the reason for Jude's failure as follows:

> [Christminster] is an ignorant place, except as to the townspeople, artisans, drunkards and paupers. […] They see life as it is, of course; but few of the people in the colleges do. You prove it in your own person. You are one of the very men Christminster was intended for when the colleges were founded; a man with a passion for learning, but no money, or opportunities, or friends. But you were elbowed off the pavement by the millionaire's sons. (*Jude the Obscure* 129)

Sue's remarks give a full account of the social system in the bourgeois society that depends on middle-class values and capitalist economic doctrines. Since Jude has neither the economic means, nor the social means like acquaintances among the scholars and respectability as a middle-class person, he is simply assigned a proper condition by society to remain a worker among the lower class. The one dimensional thought in this bourgeois industrial society produces only one dimensional man, and Jude is allowed to serve this social order only as a stonemason.

Accordingly, Jude's attitude towards the established social order is transformed into a questioning and challenging point of view which increases his consciousness about the social system as an individual. In fact, Jude's understanding of the superiority of the bourgeois urban society is gradually transformed as his writing on a university wall illustrates: "I have understanding as well as you; I am not inferior to you: yea, who knoweth not such things as these" (*Jude the Obscure* 101). As a result of the conflict between Jude, the individual, who aims to rise upward and the oppressive bourgeois society with a strict class consciousness, it must be stated that

> Jude is obscure both in that he is a mere working man of no social position and in that he does not understand himself or the forces at work in his life. Jude's obscurity, then, would be only his. […] Jude asks meaning and purpose from a world that denies him both. […] Jude embraces society and the visions that are leading to his destruction. […] He is the little man. […] Hardy saw in Victorian industrial England the apparition of twentieth century technological society; its bigness, its materialism, its institutional organisation, its unprincipled doublethink, its particular destructiveness. (Schwartz 801-802)

Clearly, it might be suggested that Jude as a lower-class individual is oppressed by the bourgeois society to maintain his service to society in his current social status as a stonemason. Jude cannot make any meaning in this social system, because society does not even care about his existence. According to the Frankfurt School critical theory, the individual is destroyed by the "materialist" and "institutionalised" benefits of the bourgeois industrial society in the age of the Industrial Revolution (Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man* 15). Jude's false social aspirations in a great social system destructive for the individual result from the one dimensional society. As Marcuse states:

> One dimensional thought is systematically promoted by the makers of politics and their purveyors of mass information. Their universe of discourse is populated by self-validating hypotheses which, incessantly and monopolistically repeated, become hypnotic definitions or dictations. (*One Dimensional Man*, 16)

The dominant social order puts the individuals under the burden of such repeated dictations like self-improvement, upward social movement, individual enterprise and contribution to the social interests through self improvement. Moreover, these hypnotic social norms only lead to misconception in the one dimensional man, and the social system depends on this mechanism to protect the benefits of society. Jude is disadvantageous against others in the rivalry for social mobility due to his lack of economic means. The conflict between the individual and society results in the creation of one dimensional people that serve bourgeois interests. Jude's lack of social and economic means put him in an impossible position in the industrial society as long as his aspirations are concerned. The social institutions, values, norms and doctrines that create the bourgeois status quo destroy the individuals who try to exceed social limits and boundaries in this hierarchical social structure.

In *Jude the Obscure*, bourgeois oppression on the individuals to create a one dimensional character is still observed while Jude continues his life as a stonemason. The young man has to become a useful member of society in line with bourgeois interests. As discussed in Chapter II within the context of self help in Dickens's *Great Expectations*, the members of bourgeois industrial society in the Victorian era are expected to improve themselves to contribute to society without creating a burden on the system, which is an indicator of respectability in the public sphere. Accordingly, bourgeois norms of respectability and morality control Jude's behaviours in the public sphere even as a member of the working class. So, he is never free as an individual. Jude Fawley is strictly constrained by the social norms, which could be observed especially in his relationship with his cousin Sue Bridehead. Sue's portrayal as a challenger of social norms is an indicator of her individuality, whereas the bourgeois industrial society aims to submit Sue, along with Jude, to the established social order. Hence, Jude and Sue's relationship as an opposition to the normative bourgeois values needs further investigation. Ted Spivey states that "Hardy's Jude and Sue strive in much the same way. The two lovers are separated and driven by an inner compulsion to

become one. […] Those heroes who were seeking greater personal development were often doing so through some kind of union with another person" (186). So, Sue accompanies Jude in his struggle against the oppression of the bourgeois society. Hence, she actually enables a challenging perspective for the protagonist towards becoming an individual. For such portrayal of Sue in the novel, Robert Heilman asserts that "Sue takes the book away from the title character, because she is stronger, more complex, and more significant, and because her contradictory impulses, creating a spontaneous air of the inexplicable and even the mysterious, are dramatised with extraordinary fullness and concreteness" (209). Due to this strong characterisation, Sue emerges "as a free spirit against an oppressive society, the ethereal against commonplace and material" (Heilman 210). Kathleen Blake emphasises "the conflict between Sue's desire to be an individual and the femaleness that breaks her but sets the struggle in rather narrowly personal terms so that her feminism remains disconnected from a wider Victorian framework" (704). Accordingly, Hardy aimed to create a heroine who challenged bourgeois values of the Victorian society. Sue illustrates the extent of social oppression on the individual. As Harvey states "Hardy draws on the contemporary phenomenon of the New Woman, who had been denied an autonomous existence and was asserting her claim to independence of thought and action" (88). Cedric Watts rightly argues that Sue is "the proto-feminist, the young woman who is educated, intelligent, emancipated in ideas and in morality, and who is resistant to the conventional notion that marriage and maternity should be the goal of any female's progress" (41). In this respect, Jude and Sue's challenging attitude against social norms illustrates their attempt to be individuals rather than one dimensional characters in the bourgeois industrial society. Marcuse states that "the distinguishing features of [an individual] are free and creative subjectivity" (*One Dimensional Man* xxviii). In fact, individuality depends on this freedom and subjectivity that oppose the restrictive social order. Therefore, Jude and Sue's relationship increases their sense of individuality in the oppressive bourgeois industrial society.

A closer look into their relationship shows that Jude has known about his beautiful cousin for a very long time. Although Sue learns about Jude quite late, Jude is already

in love with her. The first time he sees Sue's picture in his old aunt's house is depicted as follows:

> One day while in lodgings at Alfredston he had gone to Marygreen to see his old aunt, and had observed between the brass candlesticks on her mantelpiece the photograph of a pretty girlish face, in a broad hat with radiating folds under the brim like the rays of a halo. […] She was his cousin Sue Bridehead, of the inimical branch of the family. […] His aunt would not give him the photograph. But it haunted him; and ultimately formed a quickening ingredient in his latent intent of [going to Christminster for university education]. (*Jude the Obscure* 65-66)

This young lady draws Jude's attention from the very beginning of his adventure in Christminster, and he follows her secretly in Christminster. After Jude is defeated in his quest for the university, he begins to idealise Sue as an ideal woman, especially in comparison to Arabella he married in his village. Sue might be likened to Christminster from Jude's point of view in terms of the way he treats his ideals (*Jude the Obscure* 67). Barbara Hardy suggests that "Jude's construction of the Christminster story in Christminster only becomes pleasurable when academic ambition is joined by desire for Sue. Like Christminster, she is imagined and loved before she is seen, then she is merely seen. Jude's fancy prepares her image, then constructs their story" (68). Jude is interested in Sue's stories narrated by his elders – aunt Drusilla and Mrs. Edlin in the village – who try to keep him away and narrate stories about Sue's unusual character. Actually, the stories on Sue's childhood that Jude hears from his aunt prove that she was an unusual child in the village as a little girl, too. Jude's aunt says that "I never cared much about her. A pert little thing, that's what she was too often, with her tight-strained nerves. Many's the time I've smacked her for her impertinence. Why, one day when she was walking into the pond with her shoes and stockings off, and her petticoats pulled above her knees" (*Jude the Obscure* 94). Just as aunt Drusilla could cry out for her shameful action, Sue would acknowledge her difference: "Move on, aunty! This is no sight for modest eyes" (*Jude the Obscure* 94). This twelve-year-old girl challenges social norms of morality which is symbolised by the aunt's cry for proper behaviour. Furthermore, Mrs Edlin in the novel reports that "'[Sue] was not exactly a tomboy, you know; but she could do things that only boys do, as a rule. I've seen her hit in and steer down the long slide on your pond, with her little curls blowing, one of a file of twenty moving along against the sky like shapes painted on glass, and up the back slide without

stopping'" (*Jude the Obscure* 95). It is clear that Sue as a little girl did not like to be constrained by the established norms that imposed acceptable behaviours on the individuals. Blake asserts that "she defies the limits placed on girls" (708). In accordance with the Victorian morality, the little girls were controlled by bourgeois rules of propriety exemplified by these stories. However, Sue explicitly challenges these social norms through her disobedient attitude that the system tried to control.

Such a challenging and individualistic attitude is observed in Sue's decisions during her relationship with Jude, too. When Jude meets Sue in person, she is a young woman living alone in the city. She is accustomed to the urban lifestyle as Jude "perceived that though she was a country-girl at bottom, a latter girlhood of some years in London, and a womanhood here [in Christminster], had taken all rawness out of her" (*Jude the Obscure* 76). Clearly, her manners are different from country girls. Moreover, she is "an artist or designer of some sort in what was called an ecclesiastical warehouse, which was a perfect seed-bed of idolatry, and she was abandoned to mummeries on that account" (*Jude the Obscure* 74). Moreover, she stays in the lodgings provided by this ecclesiastical establishment where she works as "an artist" designing religious works in metal for sale (*Jude the Obscure* 75). Sue's artistic designs might be considered as a sign of her creativity which affects Jude in terms of her individualistic traits. The first detailed account of Sue when she is depicted as she buys statues of "mythological pagan figures" demonstrates that she is quite an unusual girl in the moral and devout late Victorian bourgeois society (*Jude the Obscure* 79). Sue as an independent girl is astounding for Jude, especially when she buys small statues of antique pagan gods and goddesses to ornament her room at a time she works for a religious institution to the detriment of being fired. Still, Sue buys her statues regardless of social reactions:

> [A] number of plaster statuettes, some of them bronzed, […] were reduced copies of ancient marbles, and comprised divinities of a very different character from those the girl was accustomed to see portrayed, among them being a Venus of standard pattern, a Diana, and, of the other sex, Apollo, Bacchus, and Mars. […] [B]eing almost in a line between herself and the church towers of the city they awoke in her an oddly foreign and contrasting set of ideas by comparison. (*Jude the Obscure* 79)

Clearly, Sue disregards religious authority as a part of the established social order. Despite the contrast between these pagan statues and religiosity in the late Victorian society, she purchases the statues of Apollo and Venus "clasp[ing] them as treasures" (*Jude the Obscure* 80). Although they seem so "large" and "naked" after she purchases them, she decides to take these images to her dwelling as souvenirs, while she suspects that they will cause a problem in the religious place that she works and stays (*Jude the Obscure* 80). Later, these statues are broken down into pieces by one of the partners Sue works with: "She found it in my room, and though it was my property she threw it on the floor and stamped on it […] ground the arms and the head of one of the figures all to bits with her heel – a horrid thing" (*Jude the Obscure* 88). This incident shows that Sue does not want to be limited and controlled in her actions by the norms of society. Neither the punishment of aunt Drusilla, nor the breaking down of her statues by a co-worker can make her submit to social norms. For her, individual freedom is important above all. Thus, Sue's sense of freedom and individuality bring her into conflict with the bourgeois social norms. As a result of the incident above, she says "I resolved not to stay, but to get into an occupation in which I shall be more independent" (*Jude the Obscure* 88). As Marcuse states, "economic freedom would mean freedom from the economy – from being controlled by economic forces and relationships; freedom from the daily struggle for existence" (*One Dimensional Man* 6). In this bourgeois and capitalist society, Sue does not depend on someone to support her economically. As she works as an artist, she makes her own living with the help of her creativity. Even her being an artist as she produces religious accessories indicates her unique nature. As Marcuse further states, "for any consciousness and conscience, for any experience which does not accept the prevailing societal interest as the supreme law of thought and behaviour, the established universe of needs and satisfactions is a fact to be questioned – questioned in terms of truth and falsehood" (*One Dimensional Man* 8). Accordingly, Sue's consciousness does not readily accept bourgeois social interests as unquestionable norms that control her behaviours. She questions her social environment from her childhood onwards, and, in particular, as a young woman. Sue's economic and social freedom enables her to question social values in the late Victorian society. In a one dimensional society based on bourgeois norms and interests, she tries to stand alone as an individual. Sue chooses to get married to Phillotson while trying to be employed in a

school for economic freedom, then decides to live together with Jude without getting married and divorces Phillotson, and finally she is forced to go back to Phillotson blaming herself for the catastrophic death of her children, as discussed below. Sue's individualistic traits are replaced towards the end of the novel by a submissive character that conforms to the norms of morality and respectability in the late Victorian society in *Jude the Obscure*.

Jude and Sue's relationship is not considered to be appropriate by the bourgeois society and these two characters turn into social outcasts because they do not marry but live together, which is obviously an immoral action against bourgeois social norms. After Sue's departure from the ecclesiastical establishment due to the restrictions on her taste of art, she begins to work with Phillotson in his school as a pupil teacher upon Jude's advice. In order to continue this job to sustain herself, she also "enter[s] a Training College at Melchester to complete herself for the vocation [of teaching] she had chosen" (*Jude the Obscure* 112). Actually, Sue finds this college too oppressive in terms of education policies. While she tries to improve herself to find employment in the late Victorian society for her economic freedom, she at the same time deals with Jude and Phillotson who court her towards marriage in a sort of rivalry against each other. Under the influence of Phillotson's promise to help her for a bright future as a teacher, Sue gets married to Phillotson, which opens the way for discussion in terms of Sue's condition as an individual in the bourgeois society. This free spirited young girl gets married to Phillotson, but she still loves Jude Fawley and, in a short time, she decides to go back to Jude since she considers her marriage to Phillotson to be a mistake: "[…] I am so cold, or devoid of gratitude, or so something, that even this generosity hasn't made me love him [Phillotson], or repent, want to stay with his as his wife" (*Jude the Obscure* 208). Nonetheless, for the enactment of this decision of living with Jude, Sue has to leave her husband, divorce him and, then, get married to Jude. Sue's determination to leave Phillotson for another man reflects her freedom in her decisions, yet this freedom creates a problem from the perspective of the bourgeois society.

Furthermore, in addition to Jude and Sue, this relationship affects the old schoolmaster Phillotson severely because of his unacceptable condition in the bourgeois society as a

husband that lets his wife go with a man. As Phillotson talks about his wife's leaving him for another man, his friend Gillingham responds in a way that actually reflects the attitude of society towards this situation:

> [Did she fulfil her engagement] loving the other? […] She'll get over it, good-now? […] What – you'll let her go? And with her lover? […] But – you see, there's the question of neighbours and society – what will happen if everybody –. […] I am quite amazed, to tell the truth, that such a sedate, plodding fellow as you should have entertained such a craze for a moment. […] Well, I could admit some excuse for letting her leave you, provided she kept to herself. But to go attended by a cavalier – that makes a difference. (*Jude the Obscure* 201-202)

Although old Gillingham tries to understand his friend Phillotson in this difficult situation, his answers to Phillotson's explanations prove that this decision is unacceptable in the bourgeois social order. Even if Sue and Phillotson have problems as a married couple, Gillingham believes that they will find a solution to continue their marriage as required by Victorian morality and respectability. In this respect, Phillotson's decision is a great problem, especially considering the attitude of the late Victorian bourgeois society. This action of letting Sue leave with a lover is inappropriate and intolerable for society. It is simply an immoral and unrespectable behaviour that society cannot accept. Still, Phillotson tries to do the right thing from his point of view for their happiness:

> my wretched state is that I've a wife I love, who not only does not love me, but – but – Well, I won't say. I know her feeling! I should prefer hatred from her! […] And the sad part of it is that she is not so much to blame as I. She was a pupil-teacher under me, and I took advantage of her inexperience, and toled her out for walks, and got her to agree to a long engagement before she well knew her own mind. (*Jude the Obscure* 200-201)

Sue's lack of love towards Phillotson as she says "that even [his] generosity hasn't made me love [Phillotson]" (*Jude the Obscure* 208) and Phillotson's explanation for their breaking up do not alter social response towards this relationship according to the middle-class values of morality and respectability. On the one hand, Phillotson aims to make sense of his difficult condition in which he is not loved and he is obviously rejected by his wife; on the other hand, Gillingham, as the spokesperson for society, rejects his explanations on the grounds that society does not approve of such things.

Gillingham has no stronger argument than saying that "[Sue] ought to be smacked, and brought to her senses – that's what I think!" (*Jude the Obscure* 203). Gillingham's opinion shows that the free individual, in the form of a disobedient wife who asks for a new life according to her own will in this instance, needs to be controlled, restricted and made to behave in submission to the authority symbolised by her husband. Moreover, use of violence is justified in order to bring her to her senses. According to Victorian bourgeois norms that aim to create one dimensional characters, Sue constitutes an oppositional figure that needs to be controlled and repressed by society.

The social concern about morality is initially reflected through Phillotson's affiliation with Victorian institutions. The social response to Phillotson's situation disapproves immorality: "When a month passed, and Phillotson casually admitted to acquaintance that he did not know where his wife was staying, curiosity began to be aroused; till, jumping to conclusions, people ventured to affirm that Sue had played him false and run away from him" (*Jude the Obscure* 215). In relation to the social disturbance, the school committee questions Phillotson, which illustrates bourgeois oppression and interference explicitly. The chairman of the committee interrogates Phillotson on the matter of his wife's absence. In other words, the Victorian social norms control the individuals even though they make personal decisions in their private lives. As a reply to the chairman's confusion, Phillotson says that "she asked leave to go away with her lover, and I let her. Why shouldn't I? A woman of full age, it was a question for her own conscience – not for me. I was not her gaoler. I can't explain any further. I don't wish to be questioned" (*Jude the Obscure* 216). Phillotson's simple defence seems to be explanatory for him, however the chairman and the committee continue their investigation as they consider this incident to be a public issue. The school committee, as a social institution, aims to punish Phillotson for his immorality and asks him to resign from his office. Phillotson says that "they have requested me to send in my resignation on account of my scandalous conduct in giving my tortured wife her liberty – or, as they call it, condoning her adultery. But I shan't resign" (*Jude the Obscure* 216). In this institutional pressure on Phillotson, Victorian morality is demonstrated as a form of repressive norm on the individuals. The bourgeois social institution regulates individual's behaviour, which they call adultery, on behalf of social interests in line with norms of morality. This, as

argued by the Frankfurt School critical theory, undermines individuality because of bourgeois repression on the individual. The bourgeois industrial society interferes in the decisions of these characters to regulate their actions so that the one dimensional thought becomes dominant in this one dimensional society. The social oppression on the individuals is reflected through the rumours in society and the resolution of the committee for Phillotson's resignation. Although Phillotson does not want to resign, Gillingham warns him about the effects of such attitude: "If you make a fuss it will get into the papers, and you'll never get appointed to another school. You see, they have to consider what you did as done by a teacher of youth – and its effects as such upon the morals of the town; and, to ordinary opinion, your position is indefensible" (*Jude the Obscure* 216). Since the decision of the committee reflects social hegemony, Phillotson cannot have a respectable position in society when he tries to disobey their decision. The established social order triumphs over the individual.

Despite his friend's advice, Phillotson insists on his decision, upon which he receives a letter informing his dismissal. Nonetheless, Phillotson calls for a public meeting to defend his case and argues that "the matter was a domestic theory which did not concern [the public]" (*Jude the Obscure* 217). The committee, as a representative of Victorian morality and social hegemony, overrules his argument and concludes that "the private eccentricities of a teacher came quite within their sphere of control, as it touched the morals of those he taught" (*Jude the Obscure* 217). Although a small group of people try to support him, "all the respectable inhabitants and well-to-do fellow-natives of the town were against Phillotson" (*Jude the Obscure* 217). So, Phillotson is forced to leave his position in the school and goes to the countryside in a sort of isolation from the bourgeois industrial society. Clearly, Phillotson's case illustrates that Victorian values like respectability and morality play a very important role in controlling the individuals. Through the repression of the individuals by society, as in the case of Phillotson after he lets Sue go to Jude, the bourgeois society aims to create social harmony by means of one dimensional characters that conform to the established bourgeois social order. For this reason, Phillotson is labelled as the other, and he is sent away from society as a disobedient person who does not serve the benefits of society.

Similarly, Jude and Sue experience social repression because of their lifestyle which is not congruous with respectability and morality. The lack of holy vows to sanctify their marriage turns their relationship into a case of adultery in the eyes of the late Victorian society. Due to their immoral lifestyle, they are not regarded as a respectable couple, either. The main reason for the conflict between the individuals and society in this case results from their attitude towards marriage as a social institution that restricts their individuality. Kramer states that they "are able to secure divorces with neither trouble nor undue delay, based on the wives' adultery, a principal justification under the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857, the first significant modification of British marriage law" (170). For their independence from their first marriages, Jude says that "now then, Sue, at any rate, you can do what you like!" as a sign of their freedom (*Jude the Obscure* 225). In a state of uncertainty, Sue asks whether "are we – you and I – just as free now as if we had never married at all?" (*Jude the Obscure* 225). Although Jude wants to get married to Sue immediately after they are granted divorce, Sue considers it quite problematic in terms of submission to social norms. Heilman argues that "through all the sensitiveness, fragility and caprice there appears an impulse for power, for retaining control of a situation, very delicately or even overtly, in [Sue's] own terms. The Victorian acceptance of woman's pedestal implies a superiority to be acknowledged" (213). Sue's attempt to be dominant in these relationships shows that she actually wants to be more powerful against social restrictions. Through all her actions and decisions, Sue is a woman that aims to control her social environment, like her husband Phillotson and, later, Jude. Sue is a young woman with a sense of freedom that shapes her decisions both as a little girl in the village and as a wife to Phillotson and Jude. Harvey states that "as a determined individualist who fears marriage as a degrading form of social prostitution, [Sue] is deeply narcissistic and neurotically insecure, which results in a farcical vacillation" (90). After the divorce, Sue's fear from marriage is actually refreshed contrary to Jude's happiness, and this concern constitutes a great problem from this moment onwards as she says that "I think I should begin to be afraid of you, Jude, the moment you had contracted to cherish me under a Government stamp, and I was licensed to be loved on the premises by you – Ugh, how terrible and sordid! Although, as you are, free, I trust you more than any other man in the world" (*Jude the Obscure* 227). Sue cannot tolerate marriage even if she is to be married to

Jude. In addition to this comment on marriage, Sue believes that "I am not so exceptional a woman as you think. Fewer women like marriage than you suppose, only they enter into it for the dignity it assumed to confer, and the social advantages it gains them sometimes – a dignity and advantage that I am quite willing to do without" (*Jude the Obscure* 228). Sue's comment emphasises the condition of women in the bourgeois industrial society as they are seen as objects that need to be protected by men through marriage which brings morality and respectability into their lives. Sue claims that most women do not enjoy the idea of getting married. For Sue, marriage serves the social order in order to maintain appearances for social harmony. Moreover, it is a threat against the individual's freedom, because the individual is expected to conform to the requirements of this social institution. The purpose is to create a one dimensional society, in which one dimensional people do not question the social order.

Due to Sue's questioning attitude towards marriage as an institution that makes women obey the authority of their husband, Jude and Sue cannot get married in *Jude the Obscure*. In various instances, they come to the point of getting married in a church to have social approval. Nevertheless, Sue changes her mind over and over again, so that they do not get married. In one instance, she makes a remarkable comparison for another bride in the church: "The flowers in the bride's hand are sadly like the garland which decked the heifers of sacrifice in old times" (*Jude the Obscure* 253). Sue's opinion about marriage shows that she interprets it as a form of social control and sacrifice of the women for conventions. Marriage as a social institution is against her sense of freedom and individuality. Individual freedom matters for Sue as she is determined to reject social oppression. Sue does not want to be a repressed individual in the bourgeois industrial society. Nevertheless, the social status of being married entails dignity and, actually, respectability for a woman since it is considered to be appropriate by the bourgeois society. In the bourgeois social order, social propriety of marriage is undeniable for a woman who depends on her husband economically and socially for survival. However, Sue is able to reject this respectable and moral position in society because of economic freedom and her sense of independence from social restrictions, which makes her an individual. Arabella resembles marriage to a trap to catch men, an idea unacceptable to Sue: "What Arabella has been saying to me has made me feel more

than ever how hopelessly vulgar an institution legal marriage is – a sort of trap to catch a man – I can't bear to think of it. I wish I hadn't promised to let you put up the banns [announcing their marriage] this morning" (*Jude the Obscure* 237). This comment proves that Sue is worried about their relationship if they get married, since marriage as a social institution will probably ruin their mutual trust.

Furthermore, Jude does not impose this social restriction on Sue, especially after his quest for respectability in the university abruptly comes to an end, leading to a deep hatred towards the bourgeois social order. He says that

> don't mind me. Any time will do for me. I thought you might like to get it over quickly, now. […] Sue, you seem, when you are like this, to be one of the women of some great civilisation, whom I used to read about in my bygone, wasted, classical days, rather than a denizen of a mere Christian country. I almost expect you to say at these times that you have just been talking to some friend whom you met in the Via Sacra. (*Jude the Obscure* 237)

Clearly, Sue's decision against marriage reminds Jude of "some great civilisation," he studied when he tried to go to university (*Jude the Obscure* 237), and he compares the grandeur of these ancient civilisations to the Christian society they live in, which is a criticism of the restrictive middle-class religiosity in the bourgeois late Victorian society. In contempt for the bourgeois society they live in, he both gratifies those ancient civilisations, and expresses his admiration towards the grandeur and individuality in Sue's words. Despite Jude's idea of getting married at the beginning, they continue their lives as a couple without marriage. From the perspective of Marcuse, their decision in opposition to the social hegemony illustrates intellectual freedom which "would mean the restoration of individual thought now absorbed by […] indoctrination, abolition of 'public opinion' together with its makers" (*One Dimensional Man* 6). This intellectual freedom protects the couple from Victorian values of respectability and morality.

Still, their freedom as individuals does not last as the conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois society in Aldbrickham turns into the oppression of individuals by society:

> The unnoticed lives that the pair had hitherto led began, from the day of the suspended wedding onwards, to be observed and discussed by other persons. Society of Spring Street and the neighbourhood generally did not understand, and probably could not have been made to understand, Sue and Jude's private minds, emotions, positions, and fears. The curious facts of a child coming to them unexpectedly, who called Jude father, and Sue mother, and a hitch in a marriage ceremony intended for quietness to be performed at a registrar's office, together with rumours of the undefended cases in the law-courts, bore only one translation to plain minds. (*Jude the Obscure* 262)

The incidents like the delayed marriage and a child of unknown origins brings morality back on the agenda of the people of Aldbrickham. No matter how independent Jude and Sue try to be from social control, society manages to regulate their life. In this respect, it is clear that the social surveillance is carried out through inquiries directed at Jude's son at school: "Little Time […] would come home from school in the evening, and repeat inquiries and remarks that had been made to him by the other boys; and cause Sue, and Jude when he heard them, a great deal of pain and sadness" (*Jude the Obscure* 262). Such inquiries and social pressure increase especially after Jude and Sue leave the town and come back in a few days claiming that they have been married. This fake marriage increases social suspense and interest in their relationship. Their immoral lifestyle is intolerable for the bourgeois society: "The baker's lad and the grocer's boy, who at first had used to lift their hats gallantly to Sue, when they came to execute their errands, in these days no longer took trouble to render her than homage, and the neighbouring artisans' wives looked straight along the pavement when they encountered her" (*Jude the Obscure* 262). Thus, the moral questioning of society creates an oppressive atmosphere for the couple:

> Nobody molested them, it is true; but an oppressive atmosphere began to encircle their souls. And their temperaments were precisely of a kind to suffer from this atmosphere, and to be indisposed to lighten it by vigorous and open statements. Their apparent attempt at reparation had come too late to be effective. The headstone and epitaph orders fell off: and two or three months later, when autumn came, Jude perceived that he would have to return to journey-work again, a course all the more unfortunate just now, in that he had not yet cleared off the debt. (*Jude the Obscure* 263)

The social oppression on the individual is clearly exercised in the case of Jude and Sue. Society examines Jude's son Father Time, creates an oppressive atmosphere and leaves the couple desperate in terms of their economic sources. The moral values of the

Victorian society require Jude and Sue to lead their lives as a married couple, which is the socially appropriate way of living. As long as they refrain from submitting to the dominant norms and maintain their individualistic traits, the social system continues to oppress them.

The bourgeois industrial society in the late Victorian period becomes even more oppressive to control Jude and Sue for the purpose of protecting homogenous social order as discussed below. When Jude is offered a job to renovate the Ten Commandments in a nearby church, it initially seems like an opportunity to be integrated into the community (*Jude the Obscure* 263), although Jude and Sue cannot predict the level of social oppression they will experience. As Michael Millgate states, "they never wholly grasp what social pressures they are likely to encounter, the effect they will have upon other people, the amount of attention their way of life must inevitably attract: they are slow to recognise, for example, that there could be any inappropriateness in their contracting to repaint the Ten Commandments in the church" (319). Since Jude and Sue consider their relationship as a matter of personal life, they assume that the bourgeois society will not interfere in their lifestyle. For this reason, while Jude works in the church, Sue helps him finish the job. Nevertheless, the women who recognise them begin to gossip explicitly about Jude and Sue. After one of these women asks whether Sue is Jude's wife, another one answers as follows: "Not? Then she ought to be, or somebody's – that's very clear! They've only been married a very few weeks, whether or no" (*Jude the Obscure* 265). Since Jude and Sue work in the church, a sacred place for the middle-class religiosity and morality, they are exposed to public gaze even more than before. Another woman at the church comments that this couple is "a strange pair to be painting the Two Tables! I wonder Biles and Willis could think of such a thing as hiring these" (*Jude the Obscure* 265). This explicit social criticism seems to be an infinite torture for Jude and Sue as the churchwarden comes in and tells a story to the waiting group of women about an event in the past when a similar renovation of the commandments was conducted by a group of drunk men, inappropriate just like Jude and Sue, and "when the people came and service began, all saw that the Ten Commandments wez [*sic*] painted with 'Nots' left out. Decent people wouldn't attend service there for a long time, and the Bishop had to be sent for to re-

consecrate the church" (*Jude the Obscure* 266). He concludes his story by stating that "you must take it for it is wo'th, but this case today has reminded me o't, as I say" (*Jude the Obscure* 266). Although after the warden's story, the group leaves the church and the couple is left alone, the attitude of the people and the warden is devastating for Jude and Sue.

Society clearly attacks the couple for their immoral and unacceptable behaviour. The Church as a religious institution also contributes to this oppression against them. Religion is presented as a means of conveying Victorian morality as this incident illustrates. To live under these oppressive circumstances is unbearable for these individuals. Sue says that "I can't bear that they, and everybody, should think people wicked because they may have chosen to live their own way! It is really these opinions that make the best intentioned people reckless, and actually become immoral!" (*Jude the Obscure* 266). From her perspective, their way of living without interfering with other people in the town needs to be respected since there is no malevolence in their intentions. The Victorian society labels such people as immoral, but it is actually society that makes them immoral according to the social values. Jude also emphasises his decision to disregard the community because of their attitude: "I don't think whether they think [that we are married] or not, […] I shan't take any more trouble to make them [believe it]" (*Jude the Obscure* 267). As a man who detests the hypocrisy of the bourgeois Victorian society, Jude firmly believes in their individuality to resist social oppression.

Social oppression takes further forms, as Jude and Sue remain unchanged in the nonconformist attitude. Jude is fired from this job, for instance. The contractor Willis says that "here – I've just had a complaint about this, […] I don't wish to go into the matter – as of course I didn't know what was going on – but I am afraid I must ask you and her to leave off, and let somebody else finish this! It is best, to avoid all unpleasantness. I'll pay you for the week, all the same" (*Jude the Obscure* 267). Jude's attempts to fight society and maintain attitude fail, too. He decides to ask for the help of Artisans' Mutual Improvement Society, which, apparently, he joined when he first came to the town. Nonetheless, the attitude of his colleagues is not different from what he

experienced in the church. Jude immediately realises that "as he entered, [the committee] looked dubiously at him, and hardly uttered a word of greeting. He guessed that something bearing on himself had been either discussed or mooted" (*Jude the Obscure* 268). Upon the loss of subscriptions for an ordinary business in the union, a member exclaims that "it behoved them to look well into their constitution; for if the committee were not respected, and had not at least, in their differences, a common standard of *conduct* [*sic*], they would bring the institution to the ground" (*Jude the Obscure* 268). This is a good example of how social pressure operates. The common standard in the Victorian society is to act like moral and respectable members of the community. Those who are not respectable according to this social standard are immediately labelled and forced to leave.

Consequently, in *Jude the Obscure*, the nonconformist couple has to leave, too. Jude decides to work as a free mason and wander around the towns in the country in order not to avoid any further pressure. Before they leave the town, they are compelled to have an auction to sell their furniture, since they need money to pay off their debts. The auction day turns out to be another awful incident when the couple comes across the hypocrisy of society. As Jude and Sue stay in one of the rooms locked out for the bidders in the auction, they listen to the conversations of the local people in their home. The townsmen gossip about the family and their inappropriate condition:

> They soon found out that, instead of the furniture, their own personal histories and past conduct began to be discussed to an unexpected and intolerable extent by the intending bidders. It was not till now that they really discovered what a fools' paradise of supposed unrecognition they had been living in of late. Sue silently took her companion's hand, and with eyes on each other they heard these passing remarks – the quaint and mysterious personality of Father Time being a subject which formed a large ingredient in the hints and innuendos. (*Jude the Obscure* 268-269)

Clearly, the case of Jude and Sue illustrates an extreme form of conflict between the individual and society. As their case demonstrates, the Victorian bourgeois hegemony controls the individuals in all aspects of life, be it public or private. Jude and Sue's personal relationship is scrutinised by society on the grounds that this immoral situation is harmful for the social harmony. Just as Phillotson was previously accused of being a

bad example to the children at the school, Jude and Sue are also considered to be a bad example to society. As people of wrong morals even their work in the church is not accepted and Jude's membership in a local union of workers is ended for similar reasons. However, in this case, Jude and Sue are not actually defeated or forced into submission. Jude says that "people don't understand us, […] I am glad we have decided to go" (*Jude the Obscure* 269). Since it is not possible to lead an individualistic life free from bourgeois social norms in the late nineteenth century, Jude and Sue silently leave the town. During the next two years, Jude lives a nomadic life as he works in different towns and villages (*Jude the Obscure* 270). As Draper asserts, "Jude and Sue's nomadic life dramatises their separation from the conformist world of their day. It is their refusal to abide by the conventions of marriage that leads to Jude's loss of employment and to the gossip that subsequently drives him and his family away from Aldbrickham" (250-251). In the course of this period, Jude and Sue continue their lives as before, without taking into account society. Schwarz claims that "Hardy's novels show that when one moves from place to place, one cannot leave one's self behind" (33). Just as Jude's rural and lower-class origins followed him into Christminster as a young boy and their relationship was scrutinised in Aldbrickham, Jude and Sue carry their problematic relationship wherever they go. Clearly, they have to escape from the oppressive Victorian norms in order to be free individuals.

Jude and Sue's return to Christminster shows that the bourgeois industrial society does not accept them as appropriate people on account of morality. Their attempt to find suitable lodgings in Christminster brings about the worst calamity for the couple in *Jude the Obscure*. When Jude and Sue try to rent a house to stay with their children, they realise that the landlords do not want to take them in, because they are not married and live together in an immoral way: "The householder scrutinised Sue's figure for a moment. 'We haven't any [lodgings] to let,' said she, shutting the door" (*Jude the Obscure* 291). Since Sue understands the reason for the responses of the landlords, she says that "I'll pull my cloak more round me… Leaving Kennetbridge for this place is like coming from Caiphas to Pilate" (*Jude the Obscure* 291). In other words, Sue resembles their arrival in Christminster to "moving from the condemnation of the Jewish high priest to the sentence of crucifixion which could only be pronounced by the

Roman Governor" (Vance, "Notes to the Text," 374). Their treatment proves that morality is a regulatory force in the bourgeois society and the individuals are excluded from society due to their inappropriate lives. After Jude and Sue are rejected by two landlords, an amiable woman agrees to let them in except for Jude who has to find another place to settle (*Jude the Obscure* 291). Nevertheless, Sue tells their story to this woman following Jude's departure, which creates a great problem since "the housewife look[s] embarrassed" upon hearing their past and immoral relationship according to bourgeois social values (*Jude the Obscure* 292). As the husband of the landlady arrives, he does not want Sue and her children to accommodate in this house because of morality: "His voice rose in sudden anger. 'Now who wants such a woman here? And perhaps a confinement! […] You must have known all was not straight with them – coming like that" (*Jude the Obscure* 292). The phrase 'such a woman' needs to be emphasised because of the reference to immorality in Sue's condition from the perspective of this ordinary man, which actually reflect bourgeois norms of morality. This ordinary man easily judges Sue on account of his moralistic views. The social prejudice works against them immediately when they are exposed to social examination. Accordingly, the woman informs Sue about what she has overheard, and that they have to leave the next morning (*Jude the Obscure* 293). When Sue goes out with Father Time to find a new place to stay, "[e]very householder looked askance at such a woman and child inquiring for accommodation in the gloom" (*Jude the Obscure* 292). In such condition as a lonely women walking around with a child late in the evening in Christminster, Sue is not considered as an appropriate woman by society. So, the individual is forced to conform to social norms. if Jude and Sue aims to be accepted by the bourgeois industrial society, they must conform to the norms of morality and lead socially appropriate lives.

Furthermore, social pressure follows unceasingly, when Little Father Time begins to be troubled by their condition. In an attempt to find a solution to their despair, he initially questions Sue as they look for a new house in Christminster. Upon hearing the news of Sue's pregnancy, this child with the attitude of an old man bursts out: "How *ever* [*sic*] could you, mother, be so wicked and cruel as this, when you needn't have done it till we was [*sic*] better off, and father well! To bring us all into more trouble! No room for us,

and father a-forced to go away, and we turned out tomorrow; and yet you be going to have another of us soon!" (*Jude the Obscure* 296). Jude and Sue find their children dead on the next morning; two of them killed by Father Time, who finally hung himself in the closet leaving the note: "Done because we are too menny" (*Jude the Obscure* 298). The dead children symbolise the extent of social oppression. There is no place for such a couple and children in this society. This catastrophe, accompanied by Sue's miscarriage some time later, leaves a devastating influence on Jude and, in particular, Sue. From this point onwards, these characters, more prominently Sue, are questioning their condition in society. As outcast characters in the bourgeois urban community, Sue believes that they are punished by God due to their immorality. Since immorality is a form of opposition against social order, she only thinks about conforming to the established social order to repent for her sins. As Merryn Williams states, "in a sense it is the official Christminster, the microcosm of a false society, which kills them; just as it kills the children" (187). Society kills the children by denying them shelter and food for their unconventional lifestyle. Furthermore, society kills the couple as well and makes them submit to the authority of the social norms.

As a result of the conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society, Jude and Sue begin to question their position as opposed to the established social order, which leads to their subjection by the dominant social values. Hence, Jude and Sue conform to the bourgeois norms. Sue states that "we must conform! […] All the ancient wrath of the Power above us has been vented upon us […] and we must submit. There is no choice. We must!" (*Jude the Obscure* 303). Despite her initial claim, Jude corrects her exclamation saying that "it is only against man and senseless circumstance" that they submit (*Jude the Obscure* 303). Therefore, Sue says that "whoever or whatever our foe may be, I am cowed into submission. I have no more fighting strength left; no more enterprise. I am beaten, beaten! … 'We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men!' I am always saying that now" (*Jude the Obscure* 303). Jude also blames himself for their misery. He thinks that he

> belong[s] to that vast band of men shunned by the virtuous – the men called seducers. It amazes me when I think of it! I have not been conscious of it, or of any wrong-doing towards you, whom I love more than myself. Yet I am one of these men! I wonder if any other of them are the same purblind, simple creatures as I? …

> Yes, Sue – that's what I am. I seduced you … You were a distinct type – a refined creature, intended by Nature to be left intact. But I couldn't leave you alone! (*Jude the Obscure* 304)

In *Jude the Obscure*, Hardy makes society win and the individuals repent. Sue believes that "[they] have been selfish, careless, even impious, in [their] courses. [Their] life has been a vain attempt at self-delight. […] I want a humble heart; and a chastened mind; and I have never had them yet" (*Jude the Obscure* 305). Their nonconformity appears to be their great mistake. Sue still feels herself to be Phillotson's wife as "the thought comes to her" in a way she cannot explain (*Jude the Obscure* 304). In this respect, Jude belongs to Arabella according to Sue and the killing of their children by Arabella's son is a justified "judgement" against their disobedience (*Jude the Obscure* 310). Jude is amazed at the change in Sue "can this be the girl who brought the pagan deities into this most Christian city? – who mimicked Miss Fontover when she crushed them with her heel? – quoted Gibbon and Shelley, and Mill? Where are your Apollo, and dear Venus now!" (*Jude the Obscure* 311). Despite all his efforts, Jude cannot change Sue's mind who is now heavily burdened by the sense of guilt. Kramer points out that "the novel's characterising tone is bitterness, seemingly unmediated because the narrator shares the characters' sense of outrage that society censures both their unconventional sexual relations and their idealism" (164). Similarly, Ronald Draper claims that "Sue begins as the sceptic and disbeliever, Arnoldian Hellenist and opponent of convention, respectability and puritanical duty, but after the deaths of her children she undergoes a nervous collapse that is followed by reaction towards the conformity she had previously despised" (246). Draper further suggests that "[Hardy's heroine was] not at war with God or the ultimate power of the universe, only with Society. […] What destroys Hardy's protagonists […] is their inability to adjust to the world in which they live" (248). Sue's terrible experience with her children teaches her how to improve her ability in complying with society. It might be argued that Sue's individuality at the beginning of the novel enabled her challenging attitude against social impositions in the form of oppressive and regulating bourgeois social norms of respectability and morality. However, Sue feels so weak and vulnerable after the death of her children that she sees submission to society as the only possible relief from her misery. These feelings result from the oppressive social order. Barbara Hardy states that

> at the end it is Sue Bridehead, the free spirit and free thinker who re-constructs the Providence novel, imposing a terrible restriction and law on her behaviour and her body. […] We mostly learn about her mind and imagination through her conversations with Jude. […] Sue's experience of poverty and social injustice is part of what drives her back to Christian and conservative law and order. (71)

In this respect, poverty and social injustice are particular problems created by the industrial society. Jude and Sue are brought to submission by means of these economic facts. Within the context of the conflict between the individual and the industrial society, it must be reiterated once again that "in a society whose totality was determined by economic relations to the extent that the uncontrolled economy controlled all human relations, even the noneconomic was contained in the economy" (Marcuse, "Philosophy and Critical Theory" 64). Jude and Sue's economic conditions have a great influence on their noneconomic, or social, relations. Therefore, Sue finds that she was at fault according to the social norms and she chooses to punish herself to prevent any possibility of further catastrophe. She becomes a submissive and conformist woman who only cares about obeying social rules, illustrating the oppressive norms of the bourgeois industrial society. As Harvey argues, "Jude, the sensitive, idealistic tragic hero, in striving to overcome the social obstacles to his vision and his need for love, brings upon himself his own nemesis, but through suffering he gains a tragic understanding of his identity, and also of the forces that have shaped his experience" (92). Similarly, Butler states that

> when [Sue] breaks and collapses at the end of the novel she falls back into an extreme pietistic spiritual self-abasement before God and an extreme physical self-abasement before her husband. […] Her mind quickly catches at notions of personal liberty that immediately put her in a position where she should logically feel sexually free: her freethinking derives from her early environment and from a reaction against the excessive piety of Christminster. (121-122)

It is quite clear the sense of liberty in an oppressive social environment is replaced by a sense of duty. As stated, according to the perspective of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Sue's submission signals the end of individuality and that Sue becomes the submissive wife in the domestic sphere provided by her husband Phillotson, which exemplifies utmost submission to the power of bourgeois society. The individual, thus, turns into the one dimensional man under bourgeois hegemony.

Similarly, Jude fails to survive as an individual, too. While Sue decides to return to her husband Phillotson in a hysterical mood, the protagonist Jude, left by his ideal woman Sue and ideal city Christminster, is deceived by his first wife Arabella to marry her again when he is drunk, and he dies alone in despair as the graduation ceremonies continue outside (*Jude the Obscure* 359). At the end of the novel, these individuals, Jude and Sue, are victimised and eventually forced into submission by the restrictive social norms. In their attempt to live as individuals, both of them are defeated. Draper believes that "Sue and Jude are characters who in some respects may be regarded as neo-Ibsenites, seeking to live by a new individualistic code that put them at odds with the insistent demands for conformity made on them by their Victorian world, and that keeps them in a state of perpetual tension with society" (248). Actually, society does not approve their individualistic code from the very beginning, so that they need to live like fugitives in the late nineteenth-century England. As Jude states at the end,

> As for Sue and me when we were at our own best, long ago—when our minds were clear, and our love of truth fearless—the time was not ripe for us! Our ideas were fifty years too soon to be any good to us. And so the resistance they met with brought reaction in her, and recklessness and ruin on me! (*Jude the Obscure* 355)

Jude is aware of the conflict they have with the bourgeois industrial society. However, the established social order does not allow their individuality, and resistance leads to their ruin. Although he thinks that their ideas and lifestyle would be acceptable in fifty years, the critical arguments developed by the Frankfurt School theorists suggest that there is still a conflict between the individuals and the industrial society. Sprechman asserts that

> it would be difficult to find another book of that time which brings to light so many important issues of the day, among them social problems that arose out of the changing urban-rural scene – including the class system, inequality of educational opportunity, sexual morality, and the question of marriage. *Jude the Obscure* does have a declared social purpose: to criticise a system which could, for mainly snobbish reasons, keep out of the universities a poor but highly motivated scholar. (Sprechman 102)

Against the rigid class structure and normative values of the late Victorian bourgeois and industrial society, Jude presents a heroic struggle together with Sue. However, their

struggle shows that the individual is entrapped by the bourgeois society for absolute submission to social hegemony. The middle-class normative values oppress the individuals in such a way that the individuals are never allowed to think, act and live free from social restrictions.

In conclusion, it is clear that the late Victorian society is a firmly established industrial, bourgeois and capitalist society in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*. As an industrial society, the late Victorian society of *Jude the Obscure* exercises institutional control on the individuals through education, religion and marriage. In this form of an organised capitalism, the individual cannot exist as a free entity. As Marcuse states, "thus emerges a pattern of one dimensional thought and behaviour in which ideas, aspirations and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action [in the industrial society] are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe. They are redefined by the rationality of the given system" (*One Dimensional Man*, 14). Despite their attempts to challenge the social order and live their lives as individuals, Jude and Sue are eventually forced into submission by the system. They are forced to accept the terms and rules established by the dominant bourgeois norms. Therefore, the individual is defeated in *Jude the Obscure*. The condition of the individuals like Jude and Sue in this social environment is highly problematic, because their attempts to conduct an individualistic lifestyle are thwarted by society. As a bourgeois industrial society, the late Victorian society guarantees social harmony and homogenous order by a one dimensional society. The one dimensional society requires one dimensional characters (one dimensional man) for its existence and maintenance. As the end of *Jude the Obscure* shows, the condition of the individual is not hopeful at all in the conflict with the status quo.

# CONCLUSION

According to the Frankfurt School dialectical criticism, social oppression on the individuals results from the hegemonic social structure constructed by the bourgeois society. Viewed from the perspective of the Frankfurt School theorists Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse, there is a conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society produced by the oppressive norms of the hegemonic social order in Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South*, Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Thomas Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*. In their representations of the nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society, these novels depict the social panorama in which the social, cultural and economic norms restrict individuality, as the individuals are forced to redefine themselves according to dominant norms and ideals. This dissertation has argued that Margaret Hale, John Thornton and Nicholas Higgins in *North and South*, Pip and Abel Magwitch in *Great Expectations*, and Jude Fawley, Sue Bridehead and Richard Phillotson in *Jude the Obscure* are repressed individuals disempowered by the bourgeois social order in the Victorian era. These individuals are repressed so that they reproduce the system and maintain the status quo that favours middle-class benefits.

Furthermore, the authors' attitude to the hegemony of the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society and their representations of hegemony differ according to the time they represent society in the nineteenth century. While there is clash between the individuals and the bourgeois society in all of the novels studied, the extent of social oppression on the individuals changes relative to the systematic regulation of the established social order. Social hegemony on the individuals increases towards the end of the Victorian era and socially constructed ideals create more restricting roles for Victorian individuals. In addition, the bourgeois industrial society defines these ideals for the individuals even before they begin their struggles to achieve them. When this social order is formed as a more restrictive system towards the end of the nineteenth century, these ideals are also defined through more absolute concepts. For instance, as an individual in the early nineteenth century depicted in *Great Expectations*, Pip is a representation of a young man who aims to become a gentleman, yet the idea of a

gentleman is not clearly defined by society. Since the normative bourgeois norms are still formed in the early nineteenth century, Pip is only taught bourgeois manners to appear like a gentleman, but it is not an absolute concept to shape Pip's identity. However, the representation of the mid-Victorian society in *North and South* reveals that social ideals are defined more distinctly than *Great Expectations*. In this respect, John Thornton is imposed on a clear notion of respectability that requires being a successful mill owner and Margaret Hale is educated to adopt bourgeois manners so that she learns appropriate public behaviour and finds herself a suitable husband to take care of her property. On the other hand, in the late-Victorian society represented in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*, the country boy Jude is given public education and introduced the possibility of a respectable lifestyle among the scholars in the university. The socially constructed respectable status is prepared by the system, yet economic, social and cultural incapability of the individual prevents him from rising on the social scale. Although Jude is imposed on social ideals through the education system from his childhood onwards and is ready to conform to social demands, the hierarchical social structure denies him social mobility only because he is a lower-class stonemason and he is beneficial for the system in that position. Therefore, he is denied social mobility for lack of social, cultural and economic means.

There is a difference between the representations of the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society, studied from Horkheimer's, Adorno's and Marcuse's points of view, when the endings of the novels are examined, too. In Dickens's *Great Expectations,* the early nineteenth-century bourgeois industrial society is depicted from a mid-Victorian perspective in line with the novel's date of publication in 1861. Dickens presents a social panorama and social structure which forces Pip to leave his village and go to London for a better life offered by the bourgeoisie. In the novel, the rigid social structure is presented as the source of the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois society. Both Dickens's praise of the blacksmith Joe due to his lack of interest in bourgeois lifestyle and Herbert Pocket's emphasis on the true qualities of a gentleman at heart rather than economic circumstances suggest that there is a critical approach towards the established social order. Especially during Magwitch's trials, at the end of the novel, bourgeois understanding of respectability is disapproved

through a critical assessment of the social hierarchy created by this social norm. Pip's decision to find employment in an overseas company suggests that the ending of *Great Expectations* is a development for Pip as it provides a hopeful future for Pip and Estella. However, when viewed from the perspective of the Frankfurt School dialectical social criticism, it becomes clear that these characters are still oppressed by the social norm of respectability since Pip actually does not have the opportunity to make a choice to continue his life in another way. So, the characters in *Great Expectations* reproduce the system as they submit to the social norms. As Horkheimer points out, they become repressed individuals who serve and maintain the system in their oppressed condition. Similarly, Estella finds a respectable young man to take care of her as a suitable husband. Pip decides to follow a respectable career that would make him a gentleman in the bourgeois society. The clash between the individual and the bourgeois society continues since Pip conforms to the ideals created by the system.

On the other hand, Gaskell's *North and South* negotiates class conflicts as Thornton and Higgins shake hands, which brings peace to the industrial strife between the working class and the manufacturing middle class. In this negotiation between social classes, Thornton's attitude is especially important, because he disregards middle-class social concerns and treats the working class as equal. Thornton's attitude also means that his decisions and actions are no more regulated by bourgeois respectability. Furthermore, Margaret Hale's attitude illustrates a critical stance towards bourgeois understanding of education and propriety for a respectable middle-class young woman. Starting from her education with her relatives in London, who represent the old middle class, and her criticism of the mill owners in Milton, who stand for the new manufacturing middle class, Margaret almost always favours a simplistic lifestyle associated with Helstone and does not approve middle-class lifestyle. The bourgeois norm of respectability is presented as an oppressive force both on Thornton and Margaret. The ending of *North and South* shows that the old middle class and the new manufacturing middle class come together through the marriage of Thornton and Margaret. These two social classes are reconciled on a new level symbolised by mutual understanding of Margaret and Thornton just as peace is established between the working class and the middle class when Thornton and Higgins shake hands. In this respect, there is a sign of hope about

the individual's struggle against social norms in Gaskell's *North and South* just as in Dickens's *Great Expectations*. This marriage is a sign of hope for the future as Thornton still looks for success in industry and economic prosperity, while Margaret finds a suitable husband to take care of her property. Nevertheless, dialectical social criticism developed by Horkheimer and Adorno shows that these characters are actually made to conform to the socially acceptable roles according to middle-class respectability. In this regard, Thornton chooses to become a successful mill owner and Margaret chooses to become a submissive wife at the end of *North and South*. In other words, the clash between the individual and the bourgeois society results from more clearly defined social roles than those in *Great Expectations*. Hence, in *North and South*, the social order is more systematic in designing the individuals, and social oppression increases in *North and South* in comparison to *Great Expectations*.

The representation of the late Victorian society in Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* reveals that bourgeois hegemony reaches its peak at the end of the nineteenth century as the bourgeois values of respectability and morality become unquestionable norms in a hierarchical social structure, which is reflected through the individual's status predetermined by these norms in this hierarchy. Hardy does not seem to have any illusions about the system. Completely different from *Great Expectations* and *North and South* in terms of the representation of social oppression, *Jude the Obscure* does not present any kind of optimism for Jude and Sue who are made to conform to social norms and thus oppressed by the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society. The situation of these characters at the end of *Jude the Obscure* reveals that individuality is not acceptable in this social structure since social harmony is threatened by individualistic claims. In Marcuse's point of view, individuality is entirely destroyed in the late Victorian society represented in *Jude the Obscure*. When Jude and Sue try to resist the system through individualistic attempts, the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society outcasts them and turns them into others. So, Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* illustrates that social hegemony on the individuals has increased so much that the individuals have to lead their lives according to strict social norms, and they do not have any freedom or self determination. This dissertation has argued in the light of the dialectical social criticism of the Frankfurt School that this oppression is enabled by a

state of false consciousness. For instance, the villagers and neighbours in *Jude the Obscure* who judge Jude and Sue's behaviours as immoral and a threat to the social order are living in a state of false consciousness. They perpetuate the oppressive system that subjects them. In other words, they reproduce the system that subjects them in the first place and force the nonconformists, like Jude and Sue, to comply with the dominant norms. Therefore, a one dimensional society is produced by one dimensional people as Marcuse argues. As a result, the individuals, Jude and Sue, are forced by the society to conform to established norms. These individuals in the studied novels are forced to accept these one dimensional, hypnotic and dictated definitions in the form of unquestionable social values.

In conclusion, Gaskell, Dickens and Hardy present a world in which the conflict between the individuals and the bourgeois industrial society suppresses individuality to create a harmonious social order. Their novels, *North and South*, *Great Expectations* and *Jude the Obscure*, respectively, demonstrate that social oppression on the individuals increases at a continual rate throughout the nineteenth century as the middle-class authority is established along with economic, political and social developments. Despite Gaskell's and Dickens's representations of individuals who attempt to challenge the system, Hardy shows that from the beginning the individuals are destined to be subjected by the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society. So, the social order in the nineteenth-century England becomes more oppressive and restrictive for the individuals as the system is firmly established towards the end of the century. This increasing hegemony is a result of embourgeoisement in society, capitalisation in economy and industrialisation in production. The outcome of this embourgeoisement in the industrial society of the nineteenth-century England is "one dimensional man" who cannot challenge the social system, because he/she is produced by the system. Hence, viewed from the Frankfurt School critical perspective, the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois industrial society continues in Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure* as the social system aims to produce individuals in accordance with the benefits of the system.

# Notes

[1] Particularly in such works as *Oliver Twist* (1837) and *David Copperfield* (1850) by Charles Dickens, *Michael Armstrong: Factory Boy* (1840) by Frances Trollope, *Vanity Fair* (1848) by William Thackeray, *Jane Eyre* (1847) by Charlotte Brontë, *Coningsby, or the New Generation* (1844) and *Sybil, or the Two Nations* (1845) by Benjamin Disraeli, *Alton Locke* (1850) by Charles Kingsley and *Mary Barton* (1848) by Elizabeth Gaskell among many others, the bourgeois industrial society can be observed in conflict with the individual.

[2] In Trollope's *The Chronicles of Barsetshire*, the relationship between the clergy and the gentry is handled along with political issues and religious views. Especially, degeneration among the clergymen and growing influence of the media are questioned in the series that consists of six novels published between 1855 and 1867. Furthermore, in *Palliser Novels*, another series of six novels published between 1864 and 1879, Trollope continues to question the political struggles in the parliament based on the experiences of the character Plantagenet Palliser, a wealthy aristocrat and a politician, and his family. George Eliot, on the other hand, wrote novels that mostly took place in English countryside and depicted the experiences of socially outcast characters with psychological depth. Among her socially concerned novels, *Adam Bede* (1859) is the first novel which depicts the lives of four rural characters in the late eighteenth century along with intrigues developed around love affairs of these characters. Similarly, *The Mill on the Floss* (1860) narrates the lives of Tom and Maggie Tulliver in a fictional village before the Reform Bill of 1832. The plotline focuses on private relationships of the siblings in the countryside. Different from these two earlier novels, Eliot's *Felix Holt, the Radical* (1866) is a social novel that narrates political tension in a small town when the Reform Act of 1832 was enacted. As the novel revolves around the political tension between a local landowner Transome and the politically radical Felix Holt, a subplot is developed around the relationships in Transome's family. Eliot's *Middlemarch: A Study of Provincial Life* (1871) has many themes like the condition of women, marriage, religion, politics and education in the early 1830s. Mostly in Dorothea, Lydgate and Rosemund's relationships, marriage as a social institution is questioned in addition to a woman's role in marriage. A few complicated relationships among many characters are presented in a provincial setting in an early nineteenth-century setting. *Daniel Deronda* (1876) is the last novel written by Eliot and it takes place in the Eliot's contemporary period focusing on moralistic issues around the characters Daniel and Gwendolen.

[3] For the analysis of the conflict between the individual and society, critical arguments developed by the Frankfurt School theorists Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and Herbert Marcuse will be widely used, while their contemporaries Erich Fromm and Friedrich Pollock are not included in this study. Despite their great contributions to the formation of the Frankfurt School critical theory, Fromm and Pollock divert from the discussion of the individual's conflict with the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society, which is the focal point in this study in terms of the representations in the selected Victorian novels. Erich Fromm is an eminent German social psychologist and psychoanalyst for his works that deal with psychoanalytical theory, along with interpretations of Sigmund Freud's arguments, and the effects of the Nazi regime in Germany as a threat to individual freedom. Among his works in English, *The Fear of Freedom* (1941), *Man For Himself: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Ethics* (1947), *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (1950), *The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths* (1951), *The Sane Society* (1955), *Sigmund Freud's Mission: An Analysis of His Personality and Influence* (1959), *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis* (1960), *The Dogma of Christ and Other Essays on Religion, Psychology and Culture* (1963), *The Crisis of Psychoanalysis* (1970), *Social Character in a Mexican Village: A*

*Sociopsychoanalytic Study* (1970) and *Greatness and Limitation of Freud's Thought* (1979) are quite eminent and they show Fromm's interest in Freudian approach in the analysis of the contemporary society. In his *The Fear of Freedom*, Fromm criticises the development of civilisation towards a restrictive form of living despite earlier improvements. Especially, Fromm deals with the question of freedom as it is destroyed by society while the individual struggles for his/her freedom. Fromm initially states that

> the full expression of man's potentialities seemed to be the goal towards which social development was rapidly approaching. The principles of economic liberalism, political democracy, religious autonomy, and individualism in personal life, gave expression to the longing for freedom. […] The abolition of external domination seemed to be not only a necessary but also a sufficient condition to attain the cherished goal: freedom of the individual. (2)

Although Fromm deals with the individual as an entity that developed as a result of the struggles for freedom over centuries, he actually addresses the developments after the World War I and the rise of the Nazi regime in Germany. Despite various attempts to explain the failure of Western democracies and civilisation to develop individual's freedom, Fromm criticises the consequences of fascism on individual's freedom. Fromm adopts a psychoanalytical approach to analyse the question of freedom in the Nazi regime. Although Fromm draws attention to the state of false consciousness dominant in the whole German society, he focuses on the despotic government. Fromm criticises the social conditions in Nazi Germany as follows:

> Another common illusion, perhaps the most dangerous of all, was that men like Hitler had gained power over the vast apparatus of the state through nothing but cunning and trickery, that they ruled merely by sheer force; that the whole population was only the object of betrayal and terror. […] We have been compelled to recognise that millions in Germany were as eager to surrender their freedom as their fathers were to fight for it; that instead of wanting freedom, they sought for ways to escape it; that other millions were indifferent and did not believe the defence of freedom to be worth fighting and dying for. (*The Fear of Freedom* 3)

As Fromm handles the question of freedom in Germany after World War I, he approaches the debate from a psychological perspective, especially in the sixth chapter entitled "Psychology of Nazism" (*The Fear of Freedom* 178). Nevertheless, Fromm turns back to the discussion about the individual towards the end and presents a psychoanalytical perspective once again as he compares the idea of freedom in the US and Nazi Germany. Fromm argues that

> in discussing the two aspects of freedom for modern man, we have pointed out the economic conditions that make for increasing isolation and powerlessness of the individual in our era; in discussing the psychological results we have shown that this powerlessness leads either to the kind of escape that we find in the authoritarian character. (*The Fear of Freedom* 208)

Evidently, such comparison between social conditions in terms of the rise of authoritarian regimes in the West from a psychoanalytical perspective presents a definition of the individual. However, this perspective is not eligible for the discussion of the conflict between the individual and the bourgeois, industrial and capitalist society such as the Victorian society represented in the selected novels for this study.

Erich Fromm's contemporary Frankfurt School theorist Friedrich Pollock is also a social scientist and philosopher. Pollock is one of the founding members of the Institute for Social

Research and the second director of the institute between 1928 and 1930. Pollock also contributed to the development of the Frankfurt School critical theory, especially through his works on the capitalist economy and economic relationships in the industrial capitalist society. His ideas on capitalist economy inspired Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse for the analysis of the relationship between the economic and the non-economic in the bourgeois industrial society. In fact, some of Pollock's works reveal his main interest in economy*: Attempts at Planned Economy in the Soviet Union* (1929), *State Capitalism: Its Possibilities and Limitations Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* (1941), *Automation: Materials for the Evaluation of the Economic and Social Consequences* (1957) and *Possibilities and Borders of Social Planning in Capitalism* (1973). In the introduction to one of his late works, *Automation*, Pollock states:

> This book is one of a series of enquiries into the changes in the structure of society which are being undertaken by the *Institut für Sozialforschung*. […] This study is concerned mainly with the economic and social consequences of the advent of automation. It has, however, been necessary to describe also the technical methods and devices used in the automatic process of industrial production. (i)

Clearly, Pollock is interested in the capitalist economy in the contemporary times, the second half of the twentieth century, characterised by automation in industrial production and its consequences in society through the effects on the workers, the labour force and social hierarchy. Despite Pollock's significance among the theorists of the Frankfurt School, this dissertation focuses on the individual's position in the bourgeois industrial society and social oppression on the individual created by the system in line with Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse's theoretical arguments.

# WORKS CITED

## PRIMARY SOURCES

Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. London: Penguin Books, 1994. Print.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *North and South*. London: Wordsworth, 2002. Print.

Hardy, Thomas. *Jude the Obscure*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000. Print.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

Adorno, Theodor. "Society." *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader.* Eds. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas Mackay Kellner. New York and London: Routledge, 1989. 267-275. Print.

- - - . *Negative Dialectics.* London and New York: Routledge, 1973. Print.

Armytage, W. H. G. "The 1870 Education Act." *British Journal of Education Studies*. 18. 2. (June, 1970): 121-133. *JSTOR*. 12 October 2011. Web.

Ausubel, Herman. *The Late Victorians: A Short History*. New York: Van Nostrand, 1955. Print.

Bentham, Jeremy. *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. 1781. Reprint. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001. Print.

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

Betensky, Carolyn. *Feeling for the Poor: Bourgeois Compassion, Social Action & The Victorian Novel*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2010. Print.

Black, Jeremy and Donald M. MacRaild. *Nineteenth-Century Britain*. New York: Macmillan, 2003. Print.

Blake, Kathleen. "The Woman of the Feminist Movement." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 18. 4. (Autumn, 1978): 703-726. *JSTOR*. 20 April 2014. Web.

Booth, Charles. *Labour and Life of the People in London*. Vol. 9. London and New York: MacMillan, 1902. Print.

Brodetsky, Tessa. *Elizabeth Gaskell*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. Print.

Bronner, Stephen Eric and Douglas MacKay Kellner, eds. "Introduction." *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Butler, John Lance. *Thomas Hardy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. Print.

Carlyle, Thomas. *Chartism*. New York: John W. Lowell Company, 1855. Print.

- - - . *Sartor Resartus*. New York: Odyssey P, 1937. Print.

Casagrande, Peter. "'Something More To Be Said': Hardy's Creative Process and the Case of *Tess* and *Jude*. *New Perspectives on Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Charles Pettit. Hampshire and London: Macmillan, 1994. 16-38. Print.

Cazamian, Louis. *The Social Novel in England 1830-1850: Dickens, Disraeli, Mrs Gaskell Kingsley*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. Print.

Cheadle, Brian. "The Late Novels: *Great Expectations* and *Our Mutual Friend*." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 78-91. Print.

Chesterton, G. K. *Criticism and Appreciation of the Works of Charles Dickens*. Yorkshire: House of Strauss, 2001. Print.

Childers, Joseph W. "Industrial Culture and the Victorian Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Deirdre David. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Chrisp, Peter. *A History of Fashion and Costume: The Victorian Age*. Hong Kong: Bailey, 2005. Print.

Clark, G. Kitson. *The Making of Victorian England.* Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1986. Print.

Cordery, Simon. "Friendly Societies and the Discourse of Respectability in Britain, 1825-1875." *Journal of British Studies.* 34.1. (Jan., 1995): 35-58. *JSTOR*. 12 May 2012. Web.

Crone, Rosalind. *Violent Victorians: Popular Entertainment in Nineteenth-Century London*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2012. Print.

Cunningham, Hugh. *The Challenge of Democracy: Britain 1832-1918*. Dorchester: Longman, 2001. Print.

Curtin, Michael. *Propriety and Position: A Study of Victorian Manners.* London: Garland, 1987. Print.

D'Albertis, Deirdre. *Dissembling Fictions: Elizabeth Gaskell and the Victorian Social Text*. London: Macmillan, 1997. Print.

Davidoff, Leonore. *Worlds Between: Historical Perspectives on Gender and Class.* Cornwall: Polity, 1995. Print.

Davis, John. "Enfranchisement of the Urban Poor." *Politics and Culture in Victorian Britain*. Eds. Peter Ghosh and Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 95-117. Print.

Davis, Philip. *Why Victorian Literature Still Matters*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008. Print.

Draper, Ronald. "Hardy's Comic Tragedy: *Jude the Obscure*." *Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels*. Ed. Dale Kramer. Boston and Massachusetts: G. K. Hall, 1990. 243-254. Print.

Duthie, Enid. *The Themes of Elizabeth Gaskell*. London: Macmillan, 1990. Print.

Dyson, Anthony E. *The Inimitable Dickens*. London: Macmillan, 1970. Print.

Ebbatson, Roger. *Heidegger's Bicycle: Interfering with Victorian Texts.* Portland: Sussex Academic P, 2006. Print.

Ebbatson, Roger. "Hardy and Class." *Palgrave Advances in Thomas Hardy Studies*. Ed. Philip Mallett. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 111-134. Print.

Engels, Friedrich. "London, July 14, 1893." *Marx and Engels Correspondence*. Letter to Franz Mehring. Trans. Donna Torr. London: International Publishers, 1968. Print.

Ermarth, Elizabeth Deeds. *The English Novel in History 1840-1895.* London: Routledge, 1997. Print.

Felski, Rita. "Nothing to Declare: Identity, Shame and the Lower Middle Class." *PMLA*. 115. 1. (Jan., 2000): 33-45. *JSTOR*. 11 July 2011. Web.

Flint, Kate. *Elizabeth Gaskell.* Exeter: Northcote House, 1995. Print.

Fromm, Erich. *The Fear of Freedom*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941. Print.

Frost, Lucy. "Taming to Improve: Dickens and the Women in *Great Expectations*." *New Casebooks: Great Expectations.* Ed. Roger D. Sell. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1994. 60-78. Print.

Gallagher, Catherine and Stephen Greenblatt. *Practising New Historicism*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 2000. Print.

Gallagher, Catherine. *The Body Economic: Life, Death and Sensation in Political Economy and The Victorian Novel*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006. Print.

Gardner, John. *The Victorians: An Age in Retrospect.* London: Hambledon Continuum, 2007. Print.

Garson, Marjorie. *Moral Taste: Aesthetics, Subjectivity and Social Power in the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2007. Print.

Gilmour, Robin. "Pip and the Victorian Idea of the Gentleman." *New Casebooks: Great Expectations.* Ed. Roger D. Sell. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1994. 110-122. Print.

- - - . *The Victorian Period: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature 1830-1890.* Essex: Longman, 1993. Print.

Girouard, Mark. "Victorian Values and the Upper Classes." *Proceedings of the British Academy: Victorian Values*. Ed. T. C. Smout. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990. 61-80. Print.

Glancy, Ruth. *A Companion to Charles Dickens*. Connecticut: Greenwood P, 1999. Print.

Goldman, Lawrence. *Science, Reform and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Social Science Association 1857-1886.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Goodheart, Eugene. "Thomas Hardy and The Lyrical Novel." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 12. 3. (Dec., 1957): 215-225. *JSTOR*. 18 March 2014. Web.

Goodlad, Lauren M. E.. *Victorian Literature and the Victorian State: Character and Governance in a Liberal Society.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2003. Print.

Guerard, Albert. *Thomas Hardy*. New York: New Directions, 1964. Print.

Guy, M. Josephine. *The Victorian Social-Problem Novel*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996. Print.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Massachusetts: MIT, 1989. Print.

Hagan, John H. "The Poor Labyrinth: The Theme of Social Injustice in Dickens's *Great Expectations*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction.* 9. 3. (Dec., 1954): 169-178. *JSTOR*. 4 December 2013. Web.

Hall, Catherine, Keith McClelland and Jane Rendall. *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender and the Reform Act of 1867*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

Hall, Catherine. *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and Middle Class*. Cornwall: Polity, 1992. Print.

Hardy, Barbara. *The Moral Art of Dickens*. London: Athlone, 1970. Print.

- - - . *Thomas Hardy: Imagining Imagination Hardy's Poetry and Fiction*. London and New Brunswick: The Athlone P, 2000. Print.

Hardy, Emily Flowence. *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy*. New York: Macmillan, 1930. Print.

Harrison, J. F. C. *Late Victorian Britain 1875-1901*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.

Harvey, Geoffrey. *The Complete Critical Guide to Thomas Hardy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Hassett, Michael. "Compromised Romanticism in *Jude the Obscure*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 25. 4. (Mar., 1971): 432-443. *JSTOR*. 16 March 2014. Web.

Hawes, Donald. *Charles Dickens*. London: Continuum, 2007. Print.

Hazlitt, William. *The Complete Works of William Hazlitt, Vol. 12: The Plain Speaker, Opinions on Books, Men and Things*. Ed. P.P. Howe. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1931. 11 March 2012. Web.

Heilman, Robert. "Hardy's Sue Bridehead." *Hardy: The Tragic Novels*. Ed. R. P. Draper. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1975. 209-226. Print.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The De-Moralisation of Society*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1995. Print.

Hobsbaum, Philip. *A Reader's Guide to Charles Dickens*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1988. Print.

Hoopes, Kathleen. "Illusion and Reality in *Jude the Obscure*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 12. 2. (Sep., 1957): 154-157. *JSTOR*. 2 May 2014. Web.

Horkheimer, Max and Theodor Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments.* Ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2002. Print.

Horkheimer, Max. "Formulation of Critical Theory." *Introduction to Critical Theory*. Ed. David Held. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1980. 175-199. Print.

- - - . "Notes on Science and the Crisis." *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader.* Eds. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas Mackay Kellner. New York and London: Routledge, 1989. 52-57. Print.

- - - . *Eclipse of Reason.* New York: Oxford UP, 1947. Print.

Houghton, Walter E. *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1985. Print.

Huggins, Mike J.. "More Sinful Pleasures? Leisure, Respectability and the Male Middle Classes in Victorian England." *Journal of Social History*. 33.3. (Spring, 2000): 585-600. *JSTOR*. 8 October 2013. Web.

Hughes, Linda K. *Victorian Publishing and Mrs. Gaskell's Work*. Chalottesville, UP of Virginia, 1999. Print.

Hull, Isabel V.. "The Bourgeoisie and its Discontens: Reflections on 'Nationalism and Respectability'." *Journal of Contemporary History*. 17. 2. (Apr., 1982): 247-268. *JSTOR*. 20 January 2012. Web.

Jarrell, Richard. "The Department of Science and Art and Control of Irish Science, 1853-1905." *Irish Historical Studies*. 23. 92. (Nov., 1983): 330-347. *JSTOR*. 11 February 2014. Web.

Kent, Raymond A. *A History of British Empirical Sociology.* London and Oxford: Gower, 1981. Print.

Kramer, Dale, ed. "Hardy and Reader: *Jude the Obscure*." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 164-182. Print.

Langland, Elizabeth. "Nobody's Angels: Domestic Ideology and Middle-Class Women in the Victorian Novel." *PMLA.* 107.2. (Mar., 1992): 290-304. *JSTOR*. 4 July 2011. Web.

Lindberg, John. "Individual Conscience and Social Injustice in *Great Expectations*." *College English*. 23. 2. (Nov., 1961): 118-122. 3 July 2011. Web.

Lodge, David. "*Jude the Obscure*: Pessimism and Fictional Form." *Critical Approaches to The Fiction of Thomas Hardy.* Ed. Dale Kramer. London: Macmillan, 1979. 193-202. Print.

Lucas, John. *The Literature of Analysis*. Sussex: Harvester, 1980. Print.

Majumbar, Madhumita. "The Reconstruction of Identity of the Gentleman in *Great Expectations*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*. 4.1 (2012): 100–107. 27 October 2012. Web.

Malay, Jessica. "Industrial Heroes: Elizabeth Gaskell and Charlotte Bronte's Constructions of the Masculine." *Performing Masculinity*. Eds. Rainer Emig and Antony Rowland. Hampshire: Macmillan, 2010. Print.

Marcuse, Herbert. "Liberation from the Affluent Society." *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*. Eds. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas MacKay Kellner. New York and London: Routledge, 1989. 276-287. Print.

- - - . "Philosophy and Critical Theory." *Critical Theory and Society: A Reader*. Eds. Stephen Eric Bronner and Douglas Mackay Kellner. New York and London: Routledge, 1989. 58-74. Print.

- - - . *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. 1955. 2nd ed. Boston: Beacon P, 1966. Print.

- - - . *One Dimensional Man.* 1964. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. I. *Book One: The Process of Production of Capital*. 1867. Reprint. Ed. Friedrich Engels. Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Awelling. Moscow: Progress P, 2010. Print.

McCann, W. P. "Trade Unions, Artisans and the 1870 Education Act." *British Journal of Education Studies*. 18. 2. (June, 1970): 134-150. *JSTOR*. 1 September 2011. Web.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. 1859. Reprint. Ontario: Batoche Books, 2001. Print.

- - - . *Utilitarianism*. 1863. Reprint. Ontario: Batoche Books, 2001. Print.

Miller, J. Hillis. *Charles Dickens: The World of His Novels.* Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1970. Print.

Millgate, Michael. *Thomas Hardy: His Career as a Novelist*. Hampshire and London: Macmillan, 1994. Print.

Mitchell, Sally. *Daily Life in Victorian England*. Westport: Greenwood, 2009. Print.

Moran, Maureen. *Victorian Literature and Culture*. London: Continuum, 2011. Print.

O'Farrell, Mary Ann. "Gaskell's Blunders: *North and South*." *Telling Complexions: The Nineteenth-Century English Novel and the Blush*. London: Duke UP, 1997. Print.

Paterson, Michael. *A Brief History of Life in Britain: A Social History of Queen Victoria's Reign*. Philadelphia and London: Running P, 2008. Print.

Phelps, William Lyon. "The Novels of Thomas Hardy." *The North American Review*. 190. 647. (Oct., 1909): 502-514. *JSTOR*. 14 January 2014. Web.

Pollock, Friedrich. *Automation: A Study of its Economic and Social Consequences*. Trans. W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1957. Print.

Pool, Daniel. *What Jane Austen Ate and Charles Dickens Knew: From Fox Hunting to Whist – The Daily Facts of Life in the 19th Century England*. New York: Touchstone, 1994. Print.

Purchase, Sean. *Key Concepts in Victorian Literature.* Hampshire: Palgrave, 2006. Print.

Rawlins, Jack. "Great Expiations: Dickens and the Betrayal of the Child." *New Casebooks: Great Expectations.* Ed. Roger D. Sell. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1994. 79-109. Print.

Rimmer, Mary. "Hardy, Victorian Culture and Provinciality." *Palgrave Advances in Thomas Hardy Studies*. Ed. Philip Mallett. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 135-155. Print.

Roper, Michael and John Tosh, eds. "Introduction: Historians and the Politics of Masculinity." *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain Since 1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.

Sadoff, Dianne. "Language Engender: *David Copperfield* and *Great Expectations*." *Modern Critical Views: Charles Dickens.* Ed. Harold Bloom. New York and New Haven, Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 181-195. Print.

Sanders, Andrew. "Great Expectations." *A Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. David Paroissien. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008. 422–432. Print.

Schirmacher, Wolfgang. *German 20th Century Philosophy*. New York: Continuum, 2000. Print.

Schwartz, Barry. "*Jude the Obscure* in the Age of Anxiety." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 10. 4. (Autumn, 1970): 793-804. *JSTOR*. 5 March 2014. Web.

Schwarz, Daniel. "Beginnings and Endings in Hardy's Major Fiction." *Critical Approaches to The Fiction of Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Dale Kramer. London: Macmillan, 1979. 17-35. Print.

Shires, Linda M. "The Aesthetics of the Victorian Novel: Form, Subjectivity, Ideology." *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Deirdre David. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

Simmons, James Richard. "Industrial and 'Condition of England' Novels." *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Eds. Patrick Brantlinger and William Thesing. Cornwall: Blackwell, 2005. 336-352. Print.

Slack, Robert. "The Text of Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 11. 4. (Mar., 1957): 261-275. *JSTOR*. 5 March 2014. Web.

Smiles, Samuel. *Character*. London: John Murray, 1871. Print.

- - - . *Self Help; With Illustrations of Character and Conduct*. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1859. Print.

Spector, Stephen J. "Monsters and Metonymy: *Hard Times* and Knowing the Working Class." Ed. Harold Bloom. New York and New Haven, Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 229-244. Print.

Spivey, Ted. "Thomas Hardy's Tragic Hero." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 9. 3. (Dec., 1954): 179-191. *JSTOR*. 5 March 2014. Web.

Sprechman, Ellen Lew. *Seeing Women as Men: Role Reversal in the Novels of Thomas Hardy.* Lanham: U P of America, 1995.

Stamps, Judith. *Unthinking Modernity: Innis, McLuhan and the Frankfurt School*. Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's UP, 1994. Print.

Stevenson, Catherine Barnes. "Romance and the Self-Made Man: Gaskell Rewrites Bronte." *Victorian Newsletter*. 91 (1997): 10-16. *JSTOR*. 3 June 2013. Web.

Stoneman, Patsy. *Elizabeth Gaskell*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2006. Print.

Sussman, Herbert. "Industrial." *A Companion to Victorian Literature & Culture.* Ed. Herbert F. Tucker. Cornwall: Blackwell, 1999. 244-257. Print.

Tambling, Jeremy. "Prison-Bound: Dickens and Foucault." *New Casebooks: Great Expectations.* Ed. Roger D. Sell. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1994. 123-142. Print.

Trilling, Lionel. "Manners, Morals and the Novel." *The Kenyon Review*. 10. 1. (Winter, 1948): 11-27. *JSTOR*. 5 August 2011. Web.

Vance, Norman. Introduction. *Jude the Obscure*. By Thomas Hardy. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000. v-xxi. Print.

- - - . Notes to the Text. *Jude the Obscure*. By Thomas Hardy. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000. 363-376. Print.

Warwick, Alexandra and Martin Willis. *The Victorian Literature Handbook*. London: Continuum, 2008. Print.

Waters, Catherine. *Dickens and Politics of the Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Watts, Cedric. *Thomas Hardy: Jude the Obscure*. London: Penguin Books, 1992. Print.

Wheeler, Michael. *English Fiction of the Victorian Period*. London: Longman, 1994. Print.

Williams, Merryn. *Thomas Hardy and Rural England*. New York: Columbia UP, 1972. Print.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. New York: Harper&Row, 1958. Print.

# APPENDIX 1: ORIGINALITY REPORT

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY**
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
**THESIS/DISSERTATION ORIGINALITY REPORT**

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY**
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
**TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

Date: 15/06/2015

Thesis Title: Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*: A Dialectical Social Criticism

According to the originality report obtained by myself/my thesis advisor by using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software and by applying the filtering options stated below on 08/05/2015 for the total of 216 pages including the a) Title Page, b) Introduction, c) Main Chapters, and d) Conclusion sections of my thesis entitled as above, the similarity index of my thesis is 2 %.

Filtering options applied:

1. Approval and Decleration sections excluded
2. Bibliography/Works Cited excluded
3. Quotes excluded
4. Match size up to 5 words excluded

I declare that I have carefully read Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences Guidelines for Obtaining and Using Thesis Originality Reports; that according to the maximum similarity index values specified in the Guidelines, my thesis does not include any form of plagiarism; that in any future detection of possible infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility; and that all the information I have provided is correct to the best of my knowledge.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

15.06.2015

**Name Surname:** Ömer Öğünç
**Student No:** H08141733
**Department:** English Language and Literature
**Program:** English Language and Literature PhD. Program
**Status:** ☐ Masters ☐ Ph.D. ☒ Integrated Ph.D.

**ADVISOR APPROVAL**

APPROVED.

Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis

# APPENDIX 2: ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY**
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
**ETHICS BOARD WAIVER FORM FOR THESIS WORK**

**HACETTEPE UNIVERSITY**
**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
**TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

Date: 15./06./2015

Thesis Title: Gaskell's *North and South*, Dickens's *Great Expectations* and Hardy's *Jude the Obscure*: A Dialectical Social Criticism

My thesis work related to the title/topic above:

1. Does not perform experimentation on animals or people.
2. Does not necessitate the use of biological material (blood, urine, biological fluids and samples, etc.).
3. Does not involve any interference of the body's integrity.
4. Is not based on observational and descriptive research (survey, measures/scales, data scanning, system-model development).

I declare, I have carefully read Hacettepe University's Ethics Regulations and the Commission's Guidelines, and in order to proceed with my thesis according to these regulations I do not have to get permission from the Ethics Board for anything; in any infringement of the regulations I accept all legal responsibility and I declare that all the information I have provided is true.

I respectfully submit this for approval.

15.06.2015

**Name Surname:** Ömer Öğünç
**Student No:** H08141733
**Department:** English Language and Literature
**Program:** English Language and Literature PhD Program
**Status:** ☐ Masters ☐ Ph.D. ☒ Integrated Ph.D.

**ADVISER COMMENTS AND APPROVAL**

APPROVED.

Prof. Dr. Huriye Reis