8-6-2014

Love, Labor and Knowledge: How Informal Social Groups Disseminate and Enforce Dominant Ideologies in Select Victorian Novels

Brett Robert Wallen
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

LOVE, LABOR AND KNOWLEDGE: HOW INFORMAL SOCIAL GROUPS DISSEMINATE AND ENFORCE DOMINANT IDEOLOGIES IN SELECT VICTORIAN NOVELS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Brett Robert Wallen

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 2014

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Brett Robert Wallen

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____ _____
Christopher Orchard, D. Phil.
Professor of English, Advisor

_____ _____
Kenneth Sherwood, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of English

_____ _____
Christopher M. Kuipers, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of English

ACCEPTED

_____ _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Love, Labor and Knowledge: How Informal Social Groups Disseminate and Enforce Dominant Ideologies in Select Victorian Novels

Author: Brett Robert Wallen

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Christopher Orchard

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Kenneth Sherwood
Dr. Christopher M. Kuipers

This dissertation examines the ideological power of informal social groups in the Victorian novel. It fills a gap in scholarship on the period, created by the considerable which focuses on official institutions and relationships.

Informal ties have gone largely undiscussed in terms of their ideological activity. This project demonstrates how these relationships perpetuate and apply dominant ideologies. It examines three types of relationship. First, it looks at close emotional ties and how they work to remind the individuals involved of class identities and positions. Next, work connections are looked at. These bonds shape personal consciousness and hide the contradiction of capitalist social relations. Finally, how knowledge in informal relationships becomes a tool used to protect class boundaries and privilege is examined.

This analysis frames the social groups examined using sociological theory. Close ties are looked at using sociologist Charles Horton Cooley's concept of "primary groups". Robert K. Merton, who developed the sociological concept "professional associations", is employed to analyze work relationships. His idea of Insiders and Outsiders clarifies how dispensing and withholding knowledge preserves class delineations.

Theorists Louis Althusser, Göran Therborn and Antonio Gramsci are used to understand ideology and how primary relationships help it gain power. Althusser's work provides a definition of ideology and a basic analysis of the apparatuses that spread it. Therborn expands on Althusser, introducing the concepts of "qualification" and "alter-ideology". Alter-ideology explains how informal social groups understand non-members and how these understandings exert ideological power. Qualification illuminates how the assignment of social roles acts as a mechanism of ideological enforcement. Here, the concept of qualification is extended to its implied inverse, disqualification, to further understand this process.

Raymond Williams' theory of "the structure of feeling" sheds light on the ideological work of "professional associations". It describes how working relationships bring individual consciousness into ideological conformity. Antonio Gramsci's analysis of organic intellectuals and hegemony offer critical understanding of how knowledge and explanation garner ideological power.

The conclusion of this project briefly examines the ideological action of informal groups in works of the twentieth century along with the challenges involved in studying them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the help and patience of many people. First among them is my wife, Michele, whose belief and encouragement never faltered, even in the face of my own doubts. I owe her an incalculable debt for the extra work she added to an already packed schedule that allowed me the precious time needed to write this dissertation.

I would also like to acknowledge my daughter Rainey. She reminds me every day, with pure her love of reading, what something like this is really all about. I thank my committee, Dr. Christopher Orchard, Dr. Kenneth Sherwood and Dr. Christopher Kuipers provided a clarity and analysis without which this dissertation would never have amounted to more than a muddled idea.

Lastly, I would like to thank Dale and Ensley Guffey. Not only are they best friends and godparents anyone could ask for, our discussions over the years how fun it can be to think about anything and everything.

Chapter Page

INTRODUCTION……1

ONE PRIMARY GROUPS AS IDEOLOGICAL AGENTS……26

TWO PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AS IDEOLOGICAL AGENTS……101

THREE INSIDERS AND OUTSIDERS AS ORGANIC INTELLECTUALS……157

CONCLUSION…….....208

WORKS CITED……222

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The topics of marriage and domestic life obsessed Victorian writers. In the fiction of the time, marriage serves important social purposes. In its more benevolent manifestations, it provided a space where spouses could "create a private realm of comfort and happiness" (Phegley 6). Other works of the period take the ideal of settled family life and portray it as a nightmarish set of relationships where men ruled domestic life with an iron hand and "women and children were virtual slaves or extensions of the head of the household . . ." (Fee 25).

The regular appearance of marriage in the plots of nineteenth century British novels has understandably led to a substantial body of scholarship on the topic. Critics have probed virtually every facet of marriage and the family as they appear in Victorian fiction. Studies have examined everything from gender roles in marital relationships to portrayals of middle class childhood. Penny Kane's *Victorian Families in Fact and Fiction*, for example, attempts to personalize abstract demographic data. The author accounts for the gradual reduction of family size beginning in the nineteenth century. Kane's study incorporates personal narratives found in letters as well as fictional accounts of Victorian life to reconstruct how people of the era understood their world and lived their lives. She describes her work as "an attempt to listen" to Victorians and their experiences of family life (xiii). Similarly, Karen Chase and Michael Levenson look at public perceptions of family life in *The Spectacle of Intimacy: A Public Life for the Victorian Family*. They analyze the ways Victorians separated public and private life. For

the authors, “[t]he great domestic epoch was at the same time the first great age of information” (Chase and Levenson 7). They argue that this created a constant tension between the secrecy of domestic life and the threat of public scandal.

Lisa Surridge’s book *Bleak Houses: Marital Violence in Victorian Fiction* focuses on the novelistic engagement with Victorian discourses regarding spousal and child abuse. She ties discussions of domestic violence to the era’s interests in other types of violence like animal abuse. Surridge’s primary assertion is that “. . . the newspaper played a role in mediating between two . . . separate discourses” of fiction and news (10).

These projects all agree on one thing. They acknowledge the family’s importance and social power. To Victorians, the family was the foundation of civilized life. It was held up as the key to happiness and contentment. Claudia Nelson, in *Family Ties in Victorian England*, describes the family’s power as a transcendent institutional force stating: “. . . home and family were potent forces, amounting, at least in the abstract, to a secular religion” (Nelson 7).

The prominence of marriage and family as concepts gave them a significant ideological cachet. They were seen as the “essence of morality, stability, and comfort” (Mitchell 146). Matrimonial and familial bonds were clearly acknowledged on both the institutional and personal levels. A traditional marriage began with official, state recognition in the form of licensure. Law codified “domestic ideals” and “the range of expectations, grievances, and attitudes” and so provided formal backing for the institution of marriage and the family bonds it gave rise to (Hammerton 270). Similarly, if a marriage dissolved because of death or divorce, the event was not a private matter. It

too became an issue for the courts to litigate. From its inception to its end, marriage and its resultant family life were supported and regulated by apparatuses of the state.

Supplementing the State's approval of marriage was the endorsement of the Church. The Church enjoyed "a uniquely privileged relationship with the State, in which it was closely bound up with the political and legal system" and gave the ostensibly secular State theological support (Knight 1). It ritually maintained a marriage and offered divine approval for the arrangement. A religious ceremony marked the beginning of a married couple's life together. Any children resulting from the union received baptism and weekly services reinforced the value systems that shaped familial connections.

In private social life, events like dinner parties and dances provided social situations where unmarried people could meet prospective mates. More informally, friends and acquaintances encouraged one another to find an appropriate mate and often worked on each other's behalf to arrange romantic pairings. For even the most jaundiced Victorian observer, the idea of marriage "persisted as an institution cherished, tolerated, or accepted by the vast majority in all classes of society" (Thompson 86).

Marriage's prominence in Victorian narratives has provided an understandably compelling subject of critical inquiry. However, the critical attention it has received has left a gap in scholarship concerning the ideological power of groups that existed outside the formalized parameters of marriage and family. Relationships, like those involving unmarried romantic partners, friends and people brought together by casual economic connections have been insufficiently studied and theorized. My project marks a step toward correcting this deficiency.

Admittedly, critics have not completely ignored informal social connections. For example, Pauline Nestor in *Female Friendships and Communities: Charlotte Bronte, George Eliot, Elizabeth Gaskell* examines the ways women lived out close friendships. She sees relationships between women as nurturing with "their supportive presence at the scenes of birth and death...perform[ing] the basic tasks of caring for others" (Nestor 69). Nestor frames same-sex friendships in the context of industrialized society, claiming that women become nearly universal caregivers and act as "custodians of humanity" (69). Similarly, Eve Sedgwick looks at close same-sex connections between men in *Between Men: English Literature and Homosocial Desire.* She talks about how the dynamics of friendships between men were often "causally bound up with . . . other more visible changes" such as class position and relationships with women (Sedgwick 1). Sedgwick intends her work to complete a "very pointedly complicating, anti-separatist, and antihomophobic contribution" to gender studies in the Victorian novel (vii).

Equally important in these critical analyses is their emphasis on the ways in which informal groups were affected by Victorian ideologies. Critics rightly observe that no group is immune from the influence of external ideology. Every social formation exists in a larger ideological context that inevitably shapes their actions and interactions. To some degree, the attitudes and understandings of even the most marginalized groups result from prevailing ideologies.

However, what these studies of informal groups have overlooked is how ideology functions *within* a group among its members. They have missed the opportunity to study informal relationships within novels in which ideology exerts as much power over them

as formalized institutions like the family. Institutions such as marriage and the Church do not have a monopoly on the dissemination and enforcement of the dominant ideology. Informal groups perform the same task since the interpersonal relationships among members work to spread and enforce the dominant ideology. Therefore, I intend this project to act as a corrective to this critical neglect. I contend that informal groups, through their internal relationships, assist the dominant ideology in the achievement of asserting various hegemonies. Just as more formal apparatuses, like the family act as conduits for the dominant ideology, so too do groups that lack official recognition. Through interactions among members, informal social groups promote and enforce the dominant modes of their culture.

All social formations have the power to shape the attitudes and actions of their constituent members. Institutions carry out the action overtly. The State lays out explicit laws and regulations that govern the conduct of its subjects. Additionally, the family inculcates values in its members through lived social roles and explicit instruction while schools transmit the dominant ideology to students by picking and choosing lesson content deemed important. None of these formalized structures leaves any doubt as to their purpose. All of them overtly promote specific values systems and advocate specific behaviors for those that fall under their jurisdictions.

Formalized relationships do not account for all of an individual's social relations. Outside the organs of government and religion, people have countless social connections. Some of these involve close emotional ties. Others are pragmatic. Whatever their nature, informal bonds form a significant part of everyone's life.

Because they lie outside the channels of official power, it is tempting to see these connections as free from the exertions of ideological influence. But even the most casual and brief acquaintanceship constitutes a social formation. As such, it acts ideologically to mold actions and attitudes, just like more formal organizations do. The lack of overt structure in informal groups often makes their ideological function invisible. It exists nevertheless and at times surpasses the power of more official institutions.

A brief look at two novels illustrates this point. In Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, the title character falls madly in love with Mr. Rochester. Her passion motivates her actions. Because of her connection to Rochester, she turns down another man's marriage proposal. When Rochester finally asks for Jane's hand, she decides to marry him despite his appalling treatment of his first wife. All of these actions spring from the relationship Jane has with him. So, the connection clearly exerts power. Yet, it receives no formal acknowledgement until the couple actually marry.

George DuMaurier's fin-de-siècle novel *Trilby* tells the story of Little Billee, The Laird and Taffy. The three share a deep bond of friendship. They share an apartment in Paris. Most of their time is spent together. They regularly tour the city together, arm in arm and enjoy its many entertainments. None of them has any significant bond outside the friendship. The relationship enforces and affirms dominant ideologies and brings the friends' behavior into line with them.

Little Billee has great talent as an artist. Taffy and The Laird are painters as well. But, they both know that Billee's abilities surpass their own. Paintings by Little Billee receive praise from every quarter. Not only do The Laird and Taffy acknowledge Billee's

greatness as an artist, so too does the teacher at the art school Billee attends. At the novel's conclusion, Billee has achieved fame and fortune for his work.

The arc of Little Billee's career reflects the ideological action that took place through his relationships with his two good friends. Taffy and the Laird constantly marvel at Billee's work. Doing this has the effect of endorsing ideologies that prescribe the form and content of art. Praise gives Billee incentive to continue using the techniques and painting the subjects that earn compliments. The Laird and Taffy adore Billee. They genuinely respect his talent and acknowledge its superiority to their own. Even so, their actions bring Billee in line with dominant ideologies. No one in the group sees the coercive nature of their close relationship. It proves effective still.

Besides bringing Little Billee in line with dominant aesthetic ideologies, the close friendship he has with Taffy and the Laird also orients him to the economic ideologies of capitalism. The compliments Billee received as an amateur give him the confidence to pursue art professionally. It turns out well for him. His work sells far and wide, earning him a large amount of money. Billee reaps the rewards of putting his paintings into the marketplace. He evolves from a much praised unpaid artist to a seeker of the profits being a respected artist brings.

THE PROBLEMATIC NATURE OF THIS STUDY

A study like this one has inherent difficulties. Formal groups have an obvious existence. Someone is either married or not. They have a specific religious affiliation or do not. Institutions make their values and social position overt. No one can doubt where they stand.

Clarity, like that demonstrated by officially recognized groups, makes examining them easy. They have clear boundaries. Participation in them is obvious. A study of institutions or formalized relations is made even simpler because they are sharply delineated. These clear boundaries leave no doubt as to who belongs to certain social formations and who does not.

Informal bonds have a high degree of fluidity. They vary immensely in terms of their levels of intimacy, as well as their duration across time and purpose for existence. Best friends, for example, have a relationship marked by a high degree of affection and mutual concern. Workers laboring at a task together do not require mutual good will to form a group. They come together out of a pragmatic need to get a specific job done. Both of these groups differ substantially from casual acquaintances whose relationship may consist of nothing more than a brief exchange of greeting as they pass one another in the street.

Another problem presented by work of this type is the duration of informal relationships. Formal bonds have definite beginnings and endings. Marriages begin the day the license is signed by the bride and groom. When the signatories of a business contract put their names on the document, their tie lasts the amount of time the deed stipulates.

Casual connections also have an enormous variance in duration. A close friendship can last a lifetime. A daily economic transaction could last only a few minutes. Yet, both constitute definite relationships that engage with dominant ideologies.

Informal bonds come into being and dissolve without needing official recognition to do so. Participants in a weekly card game could have a falling out over money. As a consequence, the group might dissolve or break into factions. An engaged couple can discover they are incompatible and call off the wedding. If the reverse happens, lovers can just as easily decide to deepen their romance by pledging their undying love for each other and planning to one day marry. All of these scenarios have one thing in common. None of them have official sanction or condemnation. At the same time, they constitute social interactions that exert a powerful influence on those involved in them and so provide a venue for the operations of ideology.

Undertaking an examination like this one requires some important stipulations. First, it is important to note that I do not assert that a group's existence outside legal recognition automatically connotes criminality or subversion. Lack of approval from official bodies such as the Church or State does not equate to active disapproval. Many social groups, knowingly or not, work to further the interests of formal apparatuses. For purposes of this study, existence outside official sanction simply indicates that interactions among group members, whether positive or negative, do not fit into any formally identified category of relationship.

Take, for instance, a devout churchgoer who shares his faith in casual conversation with co-workers. He would do so without the express permission of the Church. The Church would doubtless be quite pleased by the behavior, but does not compel it. When a religious person evangelizes they do not do so as an ordained minister, and so lack official recognition for what they do. The Church cannot control the theological ideas the congregant shares in the world outside the church doors. At the

same time, the Church would certainly not discourage such activities. In this instance, the devout person trying to win an individual soul does to through a social connection unregulated by the institution of the Church. So while the Church may tacitly approve the advocacy of a zealous person, it does not bestow any official endorsement on it.

With any discussion of ideological power, like the one undertaken here, the question naturally arises about the possibility of dissent. The nature of informal groups can make it appear as though they have the potential to challenge the sway of the dominant ideology. Such a view is illusory but understandable. Informal groups' lack of official status can give rise to the idea that casual social connections offer relational provide an opportunity for the individuals involved to stand outside the exercise of institutional power altogether. Close friendships provide emotional support and companionable downtime away from the impersonal economic forces and institutions of capitalism. Co-workers can share a sense of accomplishment when they complete a task and feel secure in knowing they can feed their families with their pay. It appears, at first glance, that these interactions are only personal in nature. They lack the imprint of coercion from any formalized apparatuses. So, it stands to reason that these relationships, severed from any overt institutional ties, create social spaces where the dominant ideology could face real challenge. However, when looked at more clearly, it becomes apparent that even casual social groups that make plain their dissent ultimately fall under the influence of the dominant ideology.

For example, In Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*, Fagin's gang of thieves exists completely outside the law and polite society. Their thievery marks a definite rebellion against prevailing standards. However, despite their flagrant violations of the law,

Fagin's gang never poses any real danger to the dominant ideology. In fact, the values under which they operate conform to it. The children in the gang steal for survival and Fagin's personal enrichment. He gets a portion of their crimes' proceeds but rarely participates himself. Fagin's underlings do the majority of the dangerous work while he stays in the background. In this, way Fagin's actions and values parallel that of a legitimate capitalist. Just as the owner of a factory might, he exploits the labor of those who work for him in the name of profit.

Fagin also operates under the same basic value system as the capitalist. In Fagin's thinking, money is the supreme value. He lives out this creed by trying to obtain it regardless of the cost. The capitalist and Fagin share the same financial motive for their actions. Capitalist economic relations are even mimicked in the gang. Fagin has essentially recreated a social formation where the "apparent equality and the underlying inequality between the capitalist who owns the means of production and the worker who has nothing but her or his own labour-power" (Callinicos 132). So, underneath the crimes Fagin and his gang commit, they still live in compliance with the foundational capitalist value of pursuing profit.

I assert, then, that any dominant ideology is ultimately inescapable. Informal groups assist in creating this circumstance. The lack of any official standing allows these social formations to quash dissent and purvey the dominant ideology while seeming to exist outside of ideology altogether. With this study, I will show that ideological hegemony is exerted in every social connection, regardless of its characteristics. This will open up new approaches to analyzing how ideology affects its subjects. First, it will illustrate how ideology works in social connections, which up until

now, have been understood only in terms of ideology as an external phenomenon. Secondly, it will show that ideological power has an active presence in realms of social life previously thought of as apolitical or standing outside ideology altogether.

METHODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF THE IDEOLOGIES OF INFORMAL SOCIAL GROUPS

To resolve the complications of this analysis, clear categorization is needed. The immense variety of possible ideological actions within informal groups is matched by many different relationship "types". For example, even the seemingly simple category of "friendship" presents problems. The term can encompass a vast array of relationships that differ from one another in intensity, duration and any number of other variables.

In contrast to structured and formalized institutions, which have a relatively high degree of durability across time and identify themselves with explicit boundaries, groups that lack the approval of such bodies often lack clear parameters. They come into and fade out of being through the briefest of interactions. Whereas institutional membership or affiliation is usually overt and conscious, members of informal social groups may be unaware of their membership in a given group. Finally, while an individual might participate in relatively few formal groups during their lifetime, involvements in informal social entities are numerous, occurring in multiple settings and contexts. Sometimes they operate singly and at other times together. Because of this, the ideological action of informal groups differs from time to time and place to place.

The variability of these groups can be illustrated by Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island*. Long John Silver leads the mutineers on the Hispaniola. He

enthusiastically plans the demise of Captain Smollett, Jim and others aboard ship once he has learned the location of the treasure. When the violent clash ensues between the mutineers and those loyal to the ship's captain, it appears at first as if the rebellious crew will win. Eventually, the tables turn and Silver ends up on the losing side. Silver realizes that he will hang for mutiny if returned to England; so he tries to ingratiate himself with Captain Smollett and his party. He tells anyone who will listen that he has always been a loyal and dutiful sailor. Silver accommodates every wish of Smollett and the others in an attempt to mitigate the situation he finds himself in. The incident indicates that Silver has changed his social affiliations. He supported the sailors' uprising when its success appeared inevitable. In motivating them to seek the wealth the treasure offered, Stevenson shows how the mutineers embraced the essential values of capitalist adventurism even in their quest to overturn existing power structures on the ship. As a member of the mutineers, Silver supported the attack on Captain Smollett and those loyal to him. However, when Silver realizes his luck has changed, he modifies his behavior accordingly. He exhibits nothing but the utmost courtesy to Smollett and those that remain loyal to the captain. Silver's turnabout reveals that he accepts the class ideologies that make Smollett his superior. The old pirate knows full well the high degree of social power Smollett possesses. Captain Smollett holds Silver's life in the balance because he can have him hanged upon their return to England. Silver knows whom to kowtow to and acts accordingly. Even if Silver does not internally accept Smollett's superior ship and social rank, he responds to the ideology at work in his interaction with the captain. Silver recognizes his own social status and acts in line with it. Far removed from the society where these class ideologies arose, ideologies

exert power over their subjects by shaping actions thousands of miles away where no official apparatuses exist for their enforcement. The two social groups Silver moves in are quite different from one another. Members of the respective formations hold drastically different class positions. In addition, they have different motives for finding the treasure. Finally, both the mutineers and those loyal to Smollett conform to completely different moral and ethical systems. Silver's crossing over and the rapid shifting of social groups illustrate the permeability of such formations. They also illustrate the difficulties in classifying the permutations associated with them.

The first type of social group that will be used is a 'Primary Group'. Members of primary groups share a high degree of emotional closeness and intimacy. Genuine care for the well-being of others in the group is exhibited by members. Additionally, individuals in primary groups value how others in the group see and judge them. Professional groups are the second category. Its members do not share strong emotional bonds as they see their relationship in terms of a task to complete. This type of group forms in work environments and the shared values of a profession.

Finally, the concept of Insiders and Outsiders will help examine informal relationships. This framework classifies groups in terms of knowledge rather than the type of social bond they share. The idea of Insiders and Outsiders describes the ways groups relate to knowledge. The terms 'Insider' and 'Outsider' refer to possession of important information or ideas thought to be true. Members of these groups use their knowledge to justify to themselves their possession of the truth regarding their group's true nature. Knowledge becomes a tool of management and exclusion. The corollary of a group having the truth is that only those outside of it can properly understand it. Those

outside a group, who claim knowledge of that group, do so to impose a new understanding on it. This externally imposed knowledge overrides that of the group that gets explained. So it becomes a device that truly transforms knowledge into power. Ideologically created and imposed ideology gains influence from outside a group by displacing the group's understanding of itself.

It is important to note that this categorical scheme is not absolute. The very nature of the groups looked at here prevents totalizing. Since informal groups, by definition, do not have the clear cut outlines of formalized institutions, some overlap of categories becomes inevitable. For example, a relationship between individuals may start out on a solely professional basis. But, as they work together, their connection can evolve into a primary connection. Their interactions would fit the schemes of both a primary group and a professional association.

Setting plays an important role in determining which type of relationship predominates. Sociologist Erving Goffman describes setting as "any place that is bounded to some degree by barriers to perception" (106). In an office setting, the perception of connected individuals focuses on the work they need to get done. The contexts makes their relationship a professional association. When the same two people dine together after working hours and open up to each other about the day's stresses, the primary nature of their relationship comes to the fore. In both situations, the relationship is ideologically active; but the specific environment in which it gets enacted determines its classification at any specific point in time.

Some of the groups discussed in this study could, at different times, meet the criteria for multiple classifications. But the purpose of this examination is not to provide

an exhaustive account of all possible permutations of a given group across its entire existence. Rather, this work focuses on illuminating the ideological action of informal groups. It is a task best accomplished by analyzing the traits a group exhibits in the majority of its interactions, even though it may, at times, meet the standards of another classification.

Just as a study like this necessitates a paradigm of classification, it also requires a theoretical framework. The ideas of Louis Althusser, Göran Therborn, Antonio Gramsci and Raymond Williams meet this need. Althusser's concepts of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA's) and Repressive State Apparatuses (RSA's) provide models of formal organizations that work to enforce and maintain dominant ideologies.

Althusser developed the concept of Repressive State Apparatuses and Ideological State Apparatuses. The former is charged with maintenance of existing social relations through the application of overt force. Althusser identifies the army and police force as examples of this type of apparatus. Ideological State Apparatuses on the other hand are those institutions tasked with the dissemination of the dominant ideology. These organs ensure that the prevailing ideas, beliefs and understandings of the world needed to sustain capitalism continue their existence from generation to generation. Althusser points to the educational system as an example of an Ideological State Apparatus. He argues that it teaches everything from manners to management techniques. For Althusser, this knowledge gets applied in ways that preserve existing hierarchies and the capitalist system of relations as a whole.

Similar to Althusser, theorist Antonio Gramsci provides a model for understanding the ways ideological power gets exercised under capitalism. To an

extent, Gramsci, like Althusser, focuses on the institutional level. But, his concept of ‘hegemony’, and its model of diffused ideological power, offers clarification of how informal social groups exercise ideological power outside of any relationship to a specific ideological apparatus. Hegemony explains the ways dominant ideologies find their way into the most casual of social relationships, permeating both the public and private lives of individuals. At any given time, an individual finds themselves subject to a number of methods employed to bring about conformity and shape understandings. These methods range from the overtly repressive to the gently persuasive.

In addition, Gramsci’s concept of hegemony explains how informal social bodies work to manufacture consent. That is, informal social groups work in such a way that the dominance of acceptable ideologies gets sustained through the tacit permission of all members. By gaining permission from their ranks, informal groups maintain an illusion of freedom from hegemonic practices while ensuring that the possibility of meaningful dissent is stifled, all without the appearance of overt oppression.

Another concept developed by Gramsci is that of the “organic intellectual”. The organic intellectual is someone who has expertise in a specific area. They create a group’s understanding of itself. Organic intellectuals also serve an organizing purpose. They use their knowledge to justify a group’s existence. Within informal groups, organic intellectuals use the dispensing and withholding of knowledge to include those who submit to the dominant ideology and exclude those who threaten to defy it.

In addition, I will be using the work of Raymond Williams, particularly his concept of the structure of feeling that describes the ways in which dominant ideologies infiltrate the individual consciousness and normalize individual experience in line with ideology.

Through informal group interactions, members are assisted in understanding the nature of the world and their position in it. Through the immediate experience of life, and its filtration through the structure of feeling, ideology gains a subtle but powerful hold over the individual's subjectivity.

Finally, I will look at the work of Therborn who supplements the works of these authors. He develops the concepts of apparatuses and ideological action that had their genesis with Althusser. Specifically, Therborn developed the concept of alter-ideology and qualification. Therborn argues that there exists beside a dominant ideology, what he terms 'alter-ideology'. In his thinking, ideology often is the way a group views themselves. Alter-ideology is an ideology created by a group that describes for them a group external to them. For instance, those in power have an ideology with which they create their own identity. Alter-ideology would be a structure of beliefs about the world that the ruling class would create to describe those over which they rule.

Another important concept contributed by Therborn is that of 'qualification'. He extends Althusser's discussion of how ideology works. Therborn asserts that ideology does not just identify, it bestows competence. Receiving ideological qualification allows an individual to fill a particular social role. Qualification extends beyond mere technical know-how. It encompasses formal and informal certification. A qualified individual can receive their qualification formally via an institutional credential. They can also receive it from the social status they hold. For instance, an aristocrat gets born into privilege. This qualifies them to have a position in the ruling class.

Informal groups use qualification. Through it, they deem an individual fit to occupy a specific social role. When an individual receives recognition as competent,

they do not always benefit from the designation. Qualification can take positive form. Someone deemed able to fill a social role of wealth and power naturally enjoys all the perks of their elevated position. On the other hand, an individual deemed qualified to toil in industrial drudgery, would find little joy in ideological acknowledgement of their abilities. In this context, qualification does not bring happiness. It instead traps the qualified person in a position of permanent servitude and oppression. Whichever way that qualification is applied by an unofficial group, it works for the dominant ideology by placing people in defined and accepted social positions.

The concept of ideology is a broad one. There is a virtually endless variety of specific ideologies and their respective contents. The different spheres of an individual's existence differ substantially from one another in how they are experienced and what they represent to those involved. In some realms, certain ideologies take prominence whereas those same ideologies may be downplayed in other contexts. The bonds in primary groups, professional organizations and among Insiders and Outsiders differ substantially since ideology takes on a slightly different meaning for each formation.

As a result, I will employ broad definitions of ideology for this project. At its most basic level, ideology always works in the interest "of the 'ruling class'", regardless of its specific content (Althusser 98). Whether a given ideology prescribes gender roles or the virtues of the free market, it does so to maintain the status quo in terms of social relations. Ultimately, every ideology works to subject individuals under its sway to the existing schema of social and economic connections, performs the task of cementing and justifying a given set of social relations, always exerts power and always exerts influence.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

The chapters here will examine the ideological action of informal groups through the prism of the Victorian novel. Neither the period chosen nor the medium are random choices. Victorians lived at a time in which capitalism existed in perhaps its purest state. Later eras, while undoubtedly capitalist, did not have absolutely free markets. Attempts at reform brought increased regulations and so an inseparable bond between the State and the economy. In contrast, the Victorian era was distinguished by little or no political interference in economic activity. As Philip Harling describes it, government in nineteenth-century England worked to achieve the "neutrality of the state" and "absolve it of virtually all responsibility for the direction of the economy" (114). Consequently, the pursuit of profit, and its attendant social relations, gave rise to ideologies that most accurately reflected the true nature of the capitalist economy. This unique historical clarity allows for a powerful illustration of how dominant ideology permeates elements of individuals' social lives previously thought immune to its influence.

Like the Victorian period itself, the novels it produced offer the best form for carrying out a study like this. Victorians had a wide variety of media available to them. They had access to "many forms of printed communication . . . which included formats as diverse as ballads, broadsides, chapbooks, newspapers . . . [and] magazines "(Jones 369). But, as Terry Eagleton argues in *The English Novel: An Introduction*, the novel is a unique form. He asserts that its realism "returned the world to the common people who had created it through their labour, and who could . . . contemplate their own faces in it" (Eagleton, *Novel* 19). So, as readers, Victorians saw in the works they read the realities of their own social existences reflected. This effectively "created a

community . . . of shared interests and ideals among . . . authors and readers" not matched by other forms of writing (Mays 21).

Examining ideology using novels requires a final caveat. I share Eagleton's position that ". . . realism and the novel are not the same thing" (9). Clearly they are not. Nevertheless, Victorian novels paint a picture of the world from which they came that is accurate in its broad contours. Together, the works looked at here provide a representative sample of the period's fiction. The books focused on have a variety of settings and portray a wide diversity of informal social groups. Additionally, they provide a chronological cross section of the period. This allows the analysis here to present a reasonably complete picture as a result.

The first chapter will focus on Primary Social Groups that consist of relationships and associations of great intimacy. Many novels of the Victorian era explore themes of friendship and romance outside of institutionalized family life. This initial section will argue that such social connections provide powerful reinforcements of hegemonic ideas about class and social relations. In primary groups, the bonds of affection work ideologically to engineer acceptance of dominant paradigms of social class and identity. Furthermore, the chapter will discuss how primary groups determine an individual's competence for holding social roles.

The chapter will focus on novels from the Victorian fin-de-siècle. I will discuss how Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* portrays primary groups that remind members of their class positions and enforce those positions. George Moore's *A Mummer's Wife* will be examined to show how informal groups create alter-ideologies. These alter-ideologies give their creators the illusion of freedom but actually perpetuate

submission to the dominant ideology. Oscar Wilde's novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray* will be examined in terms of how it illustrates Therborn's concepts of qualification and disqualification. The narrative demonstrates the ways in which primary groups use qualification to place people in rigidly prescribed social roles. Conversely, the same groups use disqualification to disempower those perceived as being of lower social status. The chapter will conclude with an analysis of Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. I will show how primary groups in the novel perform an enforcement role. They use their disciplinary power to enforce class position. Through their actions, the primary groups in Hardy's novel foreclose on the possibility of upward class mobility.

In Chapter Two, I will discuss professional organizations. The works analyzed in this section feature relationships that center around work. Through the lens of Raymond Williams' Structures of Feeling, I will talk about how the connections formed in work environments shape the individual consciousness of individuals in this type of group. Discussion in this chapter will demonstrate how relationships centered on tasks reinforce the dominant ideology by normalizing it and making it part of ordinary experience. Another contribution from Williams' theory comes from his idea of the 'official consciousness' in which the personal consciousness is aligned with the dominant ideology's understanding of the world. Williams' idea clarifies how potentially subversive subjectivity is displaced with the perspective of the dominant ideology.

Elizabeth Gaskell's novel *Mary Barton* demonstrates the transformative power inherent in Raymond Williams's concept of the structure of feeling. Frustration and anger, felt by workers in the novel toward their poor working conditions, get transformed. The structure of feeling turns these potentially revolutionary emotions into

ethical demands appropriate to capitalism. Through their change, the feelings of the workers allow them to live under capitalism and accept its structures and relations as inevitable.

I shall also discuss *Hard Times*, Charles Dickens' bleak portrait of industrial life that shows how the structure of feeling is used to correct ideologically suspect understandings of the world. The novel depicts many situations in which characters risk understanding the true nature of the economic relations under which they live. Ideology 'corrects' these understandings through it infiltration into the individual consciousness. The structure of feeling provides a more ideologically acceptable viewpoint that prevents the development of potentially revolutionary understanding.

I conclude the second chapter with an analysis of Charlotte Bronte's *Villette* and the book *Agnes Grey* written by her sister Ann. *Villette* shows how the structure of feeling works to eliminate an internal subjectivity. Through work relationships in the novel, the dominant ideology achieves power by forcefully reorienting the interior and subjective to the exterior and social. In Ann Bronte's *Agnes Grey*, I look at working relationships through the lens of Raymond Williams' idea of 'official consciousness'. In *Agnes Grey*, the title character has continual conflict between her personal consciousness and the official one. Ideology exerts its influence through Agnes's work connections. Through these bonds her personal consciousness is moved away from a critical view of class relations to one in line with accepted ideological explanations.

Chapter three looks at four texts and illustrates how the works portray Gramsci's notion of organic intellectuals. Organic intellectuals use knowledge to reinforce the dominant ideology. They offer explanations for the world and the place individuals

occupy in it. Knowledge becomes a tool by which organic intellectuals use understanding or lack of it to exert hegemony.

I will begin the chapter by showing how informal groups in George Eliot's *Middlemarch* use Insider knowledge to gain submission to the dominant ideology. In the book the knowledge of Insiders is used to bring potentially rebellious individuals into the ideological fold. Sharing of knowledge is transformative in the text, working to make sure that nobody strays outside prescribed understandings of the world.

The second novel I discuss in the second chapter is Anthony Trollope's *The American Senator*. Organic intellectuals in this book work to solidify class identity. I will look at how class affiliations are solidified through the possession or lack of ideologically approved knowledge.

After discussing Trollope's novel, I will offer a contrast to its portrayal of organic intellectuals who work to fix class identities. Margaret Oliphant's *Miss Marjoribanks* depicts organic intellectuals who use knowledge to cause shifts in identity. Specifically, the intellectuals in the novel use knowledge to move individuals into affiliation with formalized institutions and relationships.

I conclude Chapter Three with an examination of Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *The Doctor's Wife*. Organic intellectuals in this novel use understanding as a tool of repression. Knowledge becomes a tool for explanation. Explanation, in turn, enforces prevailing ideology by offering a false reality for the object of study. The manufactured false reality enforces subjection and ensures that social reality remains unseen.

This work concludes with a discussion of how informal groups act ideologically in works after the Victorian era. Specifically, I examine the changing nature of informal

groups' portrayal that began at the start of the twentieth century with Modernism and continues to the present day. My conclusion demonstrates that the nature of unsanctioned groups fundamentally changed after the Victorian era and that change altered their role in supporting the dominant ideology. Finally, the conclusion points to the ways in which this area of scholarship might be extended.

CHAPTER ONE

PRIMARY GROUPS AS IDEOLOGICAL AGENTS

INTRODUCTION

The hearth and home signify the locus of strong marital bonds. But they do not constitute the only relationships in which individuals engage nor are they indicative of the only place where lasting bonds are formed. A great deal of social activity takes place outside these formal arrangements and in locations where its inhabitants enjoy a high degree of intimacy. In contrast to formal, contractual relationships like marriage, informal groups with close ties do not seek or require any official sanction. And whereas formal arrangements receive special recognition through legal action and ritual, intimate relationships are not recipients of such elaborately visible social customs. Instead, they get lived out in the casualness of everyday life and become integral parts of a quotidian experience.

Through their structures, formalized connections are clearly subjected to the prevailing ideology. Marriage assigns specific roles to partners and has a clear hierarchy. People know their place in the relationship and the tasks they are expected to do. In contrast, informal connections, even if they are close, would seem to escape the effects of the dominant ideology due to their flexibility and existence outside of officially recognized relations. They get lived out in what is perceived as the private realm of life, free from the influence of more obvious ideological social structures. But just as the bonds within informal groups can match those of the marriage and family in their level of intimacy, they can also parallel them in the realm of ideological power. For individuals

with strong emotional connections to others, these relationships are arenas in which the dominant ideology is bolstered and enforced.

Both formal and informal relationships are framed by dominant ideologies. In the Victorian novel, those ideologies are part and parcel of the capitalist economic base and its resultant superstructures. Dominant ideologies take many forms and address different areas of lived experience. Their content prescribes virtually every aspect of an individual's life from table manners to the driving desire to pursue profit. Regardless of any specific situation though, dominant ideologies require tools by which they can be disseminated and enforced.

Theorist Louis Althusser provides a description and analysis of these tools in his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Toward an Investigation". He discusses the ways in which ideologies gain and hold power through what he calls 'apparatuses'. Althusser argues that ideology in the social milieu of capitalism has a practical function. It acts to suppress rebellion and maintain the status quo in terms of economic relations. To achieve this, capitalism must not only reproduce commodities but also reproduce labor. For Althusser real labor reproduction transcends mere biology. The ". . . reproduction of labor power requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also, at the same time a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order. . . " (Althusser 89). According to Althusser's analysis, capitalism could not continue its existence without such a relational reproduction. Dominant ideologies play a crucial role in this process and rely on various social formations to carry it out.

The State ensures that dominant ideologies remain so. Althusser goes so far as to assert that: “[t]he whole of the political class structure revolves around the State” (94). Through the capitalist State, the divided class system is bolstered and sustained. The State does this by employing two types of apparatus to gain the acquiescence of its subjects. The first of these Althusser terms ‘Repressive State Apparatuses’ such as the Army and Police that rely on overt force to back up government mandates and enforce the law. These embodiments of State power impose at least the outward appearance of social cohesion and peace.

For Althusser, a monopoly on the use of physical force cannot alone impose the State’s will on its subjects. Force must be supplemented by another tool which he identifies as ‘Ideological State Apparatuses’. These institutions differ from Repressive Apparatuses because they do not use physical might to achieve their dominance, relying instead on ideology and its effective transmission to support state power.

Large social bodies like the Church and the educational system serve as Althusser’s examples of Ideological State Apparatuses. Their existence and activities facilitate acceptance and internalization of dominant ideologies. Ideological Apparatuses provide social instruction in a variety of ways. The Educational Apparatus provides students with the knowledge necessary to function in capitalism. The Church gives parishioners an understanding of their place in both the divine scheme and earthly society. Ideological Apparatuses combine their social power with the physical power of Repressive Apparatuses and in so doing create a powerful, all-encompassing ideological net that permeates virtually every aspect of individuals’ lives.

Althusser makes other important distinctions in his explorations of Ideological and Repressive Apparatuses. He notes that neither type of apparatus functions solely by force or ideology. Each depends on both but does so to varying degrees. Repressive apparatuses require ideology to ensure their own “cohesion and reproduction” (Althusser 98). Similarly, institutions outside the overtly political sphere have the power to repress. Althusser notes: “Schools and Churches use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to ‘discipline’ not only their shepherds, but also their flocks” (98).

At first glance, individuals involved in close, informal relationships do not appear to create social formations with either the rigid structure or power of the apparatuses Althusser identifies. His idea that ideological apparatuses “ present themselves to observers in the form of distinct and specialized institutions” furthers such a view (Althusser 96). A closer look, though, reveals that intimate personal relationships and larger, more formal social organizations share important commonalities in which intimate bonds also come to meet Althusser’s standards for defining an apparatus.

Both institutions and informal groups have structures. Institutions tend to be organized in terms of specific roles and functions. Individuals that make up an institution have specific tasks assigned to them. Additionally, everyone within an institutional body has an explicitly defined relationship with others in the organization. For instance, a parish priest knows that they have the responsibility of ministering to a single congregation. They also know that they occupy a lower place in the Church hierarchy than the bishop who oversees them. The priest, his congregants and the bishop all know exactly where they fit in the context of intra-institutional relationships.

Individuals with close emotional ties have definite structures too; although they appear in a more subtle form. In friendship, one individual might exert power over the other without their position being explicitly defined. Other friendly attachments get lived out as a rivalry. In this instance one person in the formation occupies a place of superiority based on their achievement. Shared interests also create close bonds. People who connect over an activity they enjoy may develop a hierarchical structure based on skill level, or degree of devotion to the activity. Every type of close relationship has a definite structure. Unlike formal social bodies though, structures in informal groups have a relatively high degree of fluidity. The structures of close casual connections can change from interaction to interaction. Consequently, members can fill a variety of roles and perform many different functions as they participate in informal social groups.

Structural positioning in close social bonds involves the acting out of roles. Although the roles taken on in friendship have more flexibility and less clear categorization than their institutional parallels, the roles nevertheless play an essential part in the relationship's success. Like a highly formalized organization functions well only if the individuals within it understand what part they play in the larger whole; a friendship can exist only if the parties involved clearly understand their delegated tasks within it.

If someone understands their place in a given context, they must also be aware of the expectations that come with that position. Just as the priest knows his position relative to others in the Church, without being overtly reminded of it, friends know where they stand relative to their companions without regular, explicit cues. If a person finds

their friend in a sad state, they know to take on the role of a consoler. If their friend falls in love, the person becomes co-celebrant of the resultant joy.

People in intimate ties share tacit understandings about things like behavior and reciprocity. For example, closely associated individuals know not to say or do things to purposely cause offense or sadness for their partners. Lovers and friends may have been connected for decades without such a prescription ever having been spoken aloud. But, the continuation of the relationship shows that it has been obeyed. Though such rules remain unspoken, in terms of the relationships they regulate they have no less force than codified law.

With organization and regulation comes power. Organization exerts influence with its ability to classify and rank. Regulation governs behaviors within an institution through both sanction and approval. Since informal groups demonstrate both traits, they too must have the clout to exercise control over members. Organizational characteristics such as size or prominence make little difference to the presence of this underlying constant.

For ideological apparatuses, their structures provide the channel for the dominant ideology to spread and achieve power. Schools have classrooms full of students eager to learn. The legal system has an array of major and minor courts to hear and pass judgment in various cases. Though more flexible than those of explicitly ideological apparatuses, informal groups also use their structures for the dissemination of the dominant ideology. The first of these is the affection that defines close social bonds. Emotional intimacy opens those who experience it to vulnerability. Typically, this

vulnerability is thought of in terms of psychological openness. For ideology, the openness of intimate social formations allows the entrance of ideology into even the most personal of relationships.

In similar ways to formalized organizations, unsanctioned groups have a hierarchy and structure. Within the group, members fill specific roles. These roles have more flexibility than those found in institutions. But just as they do in formalized institutions, these roles define an individual's position in a group's hierarchy. For example, Mary Elizabeth Braddon's sensation novel *Lady Audley's Secret*, tells the story of two good friends, Robert Audley and George Talboys who set out to find out what happened to George's wife. George believes his wife to be dead. He consequently experiences devastating grief. Robert offers comfort to his friend and tries to cheer him up. Eventually he succeeds and George is able to begin their quest.

Robert and George have precise roles in their relationship. At its start, Robert plays a supportive role. His primary task is to help his friend through his grief. Robert's consolation of George puts the latter in a dependent position. Robert has the power while George is distraught. When George's sadness eventually lifts, the roles change. George no longer needs Robert's consolation. He moves from the status of an emotional dependent to that of an equal. George, because he can assist Robert rather than depend on him, moves into the role of partner and equal. Power in their relationship has changed along with the respective roles of the two men.

With the change in power between George and Robert, the basic structure of their relationship changes as well. In his grief and responses to Robert's attempts at comfort, the structure of the relationship disseminates ideologies about manhood.

Robert tries to get George out of his poor mood by taking him to pursue the most masculine of sports, hunting. Upon his recovery, new ideologies become part of the men's interaction. As the two get closer to solving the mystery of George's wife, ideologies of patriarchy and the nature of femininity become part of how they relate to one another.

It is important to note that groups of closely connected individuals also qualify as Repressive Apparatuses. Of course, a group of drinking buddies does not have armies or a police force through which to control its members. As previously noted however, Althusser does not limit ideological enforcement to the use of violence. Punishment in a more casual context takes many forms. It can range from gentle critiques to complete ostracism. Penalties such as these cause no physical harm. Yet the threat of their imposition is enough to make most people toe the social line. Informal sanction has the same effect as the harsher, more overt mechanisms of courts and prisons. They all work in their own ways to compel conformity to dominant norms and quash actions deemed deviant.

In "Ideology", Althusser stipulates that neither type of apparatus functions in one mode alone. Ideological State Apparatuses do not work solely by ideology and the function of Repressive State Apparatuses does not rest on violence alone. As Althusser states, both entities sustain themselves through a combination of ideology and repression. Which mode predominates in a given apparatus serves to define it. An overtly Repressive Apparatus, such as the police, functions mostly through the use of physical force. They have the power to imprison and even kill in the interest of enforcing the law. This power is the repressive and predominant facet of the apparatuses'

existence. To do their job, police must believe in the laws and social structure they protect. Without embracing the ideology that supports their work, those working for the apparatus could not justify what they do. Ideology provides this justification. Although it does not represent the most important aspect of the role the police apparatus plays, nevertheless, the ideological aspect of the institution is essential to its function.

In contrast, the relationship between and employer and employee takes shape primarily through ideology. It is true that repression does play a small but significant role in the relationship. On his whim, the employer can dismiss an employee from their job. Doing this is repressive in that it affects the body of the worker. Without work, eating and sustaining life are made more difficult.

While the connection between employer and worker has the potential to employ overt repression in certain circumstances, how the employer and worker see themselves and each other is largely the product of the dominant ideology. A factory supervisor embraces his superior position to that of the worker. His job duties require him to take on such an attitude. Even if the factory supervisor does not personally see himself as the better of those whom he oversees, he must act the part to preserve his own position. Ideology displaces personal perception and attitudes. It forces the manager enact a position of power over subordinates whether he wants to or not.

Ideologies that prescribe labor relations take their toll on workers as well. To keep his job, the worker must acknowledge and submit must accept the position of the manager. The worker's acceptance of the manager's superiority puts him in an inferior position automatically. To keep his role, the worker must continue to live out his

subservience. Worker and supervisor live out and perpetuate the prescriptions of the dominant ideology every time they interact.

I began this chapter with my study of Althusser's basic concept of an apparatus. This provides a general conceptualization with which to explain how informal groups mirror repressive and ideological apparatuses. But, Althusser's concept is limited. He admits as much himself in "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" where he provides examples of entities he identifies as apparatuses. Althusser acknowledges the incompleteness of his list saying it needs to "be examined in detail, tested, corrected and reorganized" and has room for expansion (96).

In his book, *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*, Göran Therborn develops the ideas discussed by Althusser in more detail. He argues that ideology does more than function to support a ruling system or keep individuals in a delusional state. While he agrees with Althusser's argument that ideology seeks to establish subjection of those it affects, Therborn does differ somewhat with Althusser's findings. Therborn believes that in shaping an individual, ideologies at the same time 'qualify them'. He asserts: "The formation of humans by every ideology . . . involves a process simultaneously of subjection and qualification" (Therborn 17). The 'qualification' to which Therborn refers works two ways. Ideology qualifies individuals for certain positions, roles and functions. In turn, individuals qualify ideology. They do this by "specifying them and modifying their range of application" (Therborn 17).

The flexibility in the range of application Therborn refers to does not connote a freedom from a dominant ideology. When making choices in regards to how ideology gets applied, an individual remains firmly in its sway. Elizabeth Gaskell illustrates how

this works in her novel *North and South*. At the opening of the story, Reverend Hale has decided to resign his post as a minister in the Church of England. He has found that he cannot honestly agree with their doctrine. When Reverend Hale and his family move to Milton, he earns his income tutoring mill workers. He of course qualifies as a tutor because of his university and seminary education. The schools constitute Ideological State Apparatuses and the knowledge Mr. Hale has is a product of their active advocacy for prevailing ideologies. As a tutor, Mr. Hale utilizes the same knowledge he used when serving as a minister. When he decides to leave the Church because he cannot intellectually accept its teachings, he is choosing to disregard part of the ideology in which he received instruction. However, as a tutor he accesses that same learning to earn a living. In other words, his knowledge base is the same in his roles as pastor and tutor. Mr. Hale has simply chosen a different way to use his training and simply engages in a new application of the same ideology.

Close-knit groups employ qualification for a number of reasons. Often it comes in handy when a group shifts its role from an Ideological Apparatus to a Repressive one. Conveying qualification on a group member can motivate them to conformity. Refusing to grant it, or withdrawing it once given, can serve as an effective punishment in the same way. Althusser's description of the two types of apparatus serves to describe what individuals, as participants in close groups, do. Therborn's ideas about qualification explain how they do it.

As a tangible example, in *An Outcast of the Islands*, Joseph Conrad tells the tale of the immoral Willems and his friend Lingard. After stealing from his employer, Willems is banished. He has nowhere to go; so Lingard takes him in. Eventually, Willems

betrays Lingard's trust and ends up living the life of an exile. At the novel's conclusion, Willems dies at the hands of a local girl whom he is about to desert. Lingard and Willems have a close personal bond. Lingard feels ethically obligated to save his old friend. As friends, they affirm the capitalist system through their interactions. When Lingard employs Willems in his trading company they uphold capitalist ideology. Lingard's offer and Willems' acceptance affirm the value of profit. Willems sees the opportunity to make money by working for his friend and Lingard sees the possibility of prospering with Willems' assistance. The men's relationship becomes repressive when Willems betrays Lingard and tries to usurp his economic dominance. Willems' actions violate both the friendship and employment ties he had with Lingard. For this violation, Lingard banishes Willems to a remote local village and threatens to kill him if he leaves. Their friendship confirmed the values of capitalism. As enemies, that close bond becomes a tool by which Willems' ideologically deviant behavior can be corrected.

Therborn further extends the work of Althusser with the idea of 'Alter-Ideology' which is positional in terms of explaining to adherents the nature of those who live outside their immediate social milieu. Through ideologies of this type, individuals are made "aware of the difference between oneself and the others" (Therborn 27). Not only does this difference explain those outside an informal social group, its contrast can also create an identity for those within it. Sometimes, intimate associations support existing social relations by clarifying what they are not. By doing so, they delineate between privileged group members and non-members of lower social status.

With Althusser's definitions of ideology and its apparatuses paired with Therborn's development of the ideological qualification model, one important task

remains. Before looking at close social connections through the lens of the two theorists, the specific nature of the relationships studied should be established. The term, ‘close informal relationships’, has a vagueness that is nearly meaningless. Even with the foundation of a theoretical base firmly planted, refusing to make such a phrase more concrete runs the risk of creating a classification which could apply to any type of social bond.

The groups focused on in this chapter are best described by what sociologist Charles Horton Cooley labeled a ‘primary group’, “those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation” (Cooley 179). According to Cooley, primary groups provide a collective yet personal identity for those involved. He says: “. . . it is a ‘we’; it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which ‘we’ is the natural expression” (Cooley 179).

Another important factor Cooley builds into his concept addresses the ways primary group members shape their actions in relation to their fellows. Those in groups of this type may spend considerable energy on individual pursuits and betterment. No matter the level of egoism a person in a primary group exhibits, the way their intimate peers perceive them carries great weight. As Cooley says: “The individual will be ambitious, but the chief object of his ambition will be some desired place in the thought of others, and he will feel allegiance to common standards of service and fair play” (179).

In the novels looked at in this chapter, all the groups that fit this primary classification share relatively the same immediate environment. They exhibit some

degree of cooperation with and sympathy for each other as well, and so fit well into Cooley's category. His ideas further lend themselves to this chapter's study because they have direct ties to the Victorian era. Cooley "read Herbert Spencer's sociology, the idea that societies were like biological organisms appealing to his interest" (Scott 27). At the same time he felt that ". . . such models neglected the more personal and experiential side of social life . . . "(27). The combination of his historical understanding of the period combined with his emphasis on the immediate experience of social existence create a solid theoretical frame through which to explore the close bonds portrayed in the books this chapter discusses.

The work of Cooley and Althusser intersect in how one is viewed by those with whom a primary relationship is shared. The real or perceived impact of judgment by a cherished friend or romantic interest has undeniable power to shape the actions of those subject to them. As apparatuses, primary groups make use of that power to instill and sanction dominant ideologies within their ranks. Althusser's thinking allows for description of primary groups as apparatuses whereas Cooley's understanding that those in primary relationships care how their close companions see them provides a way to clarify how they act as such.

This chapter focuses on the Victorian fin-de-siècle. Informal social groups play prominent roles in novels of the period. They often represent the major venues of characters' social interaction. Because of this, literature at the end of the Victorian age provides good illustrations of how primary groups act ideologically.

Primary groups talked about here inhabit all variety of environments and contexts. While each broadly works to uphold the unitary, ruling ideology they go about the task in different ways. Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* and George Moore's *A Mummer's Wife* show how close relationships apply prescriptive ideologies of identity to compel submission from members. In Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, and Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, close connections serve as devices that act to qualify and disqualify individuals for rigidly delineated social roles. Looking at the uses to which the ruling ideology puts the relationships in these four novels will illustrate specifically how it achieves its dominance. Once this is established, the connections between specific ideologies, that dictate the many realms of human life in these novels, and the comprehensive, organic ideological system that subsumes them all can be made. As a result, a thorough account of the way in which ideology acts and influences every level of individual and social existence within informal groups will emerge.

CLASS QUALIFICATION IN ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON'S *TREASURE ISLAND*

Althusser asserts in "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" that ideology itself cannot exist without individual subjects to conform to it. According to Althusser, the subject of any ideology is regularly reminded of their status as such. He refers to this process as 'interpellation'. Through it, individuals come to understand both their world and themselves.

The idea that certain things are ‘obvious’ forms the basis of Althusser’s idea. He says about ideology that: “It is indeed a peculiarity of ideology that it imposes . . . obviousnesses as obviousnesses, which we cannot fail to recognize and before which we have the inevitable and natural reaction of crying out . . . ‘That’s obvious! That’s right! That’s true!’” (116). For the subject of ideology, that which is deemed obvious could not be otherwise. In this way, Althusser argues, dominant ideology gains power and “imposes without appearing to do so” (Althusser 116).

Primary groups exert ideological power by affirming what seems obvious. They assure members, through relationships within the group that their social existence could not be other than it is. This happens particularly with identity. Repeatedly close ties support both personal and social identification. Groups with close bonds create identity through ideology. Identity so formed always conforms to the dominant ideology. Simultaneously, these close groups quell the questioning of identities. By not interrogating identity, whether class or economically based, socially approved positions and understandings get cemented in the minds of those in primary bonds.

Robert Louis Stevenson’s novel, *Treasure Island* illustrates how this process works. The book tells the story of a young boy, Jim Hawkins, undertakes a quest for treasure accompanied by two well-to-do friends from his seaside village, Squire Trelawney and Doctor Livesey. Violence interrupts their search when the crew, many of whom are former pirates, hired to get them to the island where the treasure is buried mutinies. Led by the ship’s cook, Long John Silver, the mutineers try to kill Jim along with the doctor and squire. At the end of the story, the rebellious sailors are defeated, the treasure found and Jim returned safely to England to write his narrative.

Effective suppression occurs in Stevenson's novel by making existence and identity obvious and unassailable. Through the bonds in *Treasure Island,* characters have their understandings and identities naturalized that, in turn, makes their social situation seem the obvious natural order. Viewed as such, they hold the facts of their material existence as given and unalterable. As a result, they do not rebel against their circumstances or their place in them. This naturalization occurs despite two observations: first, Stevenson's novel describes informal relationships as exhibiting a high degree of dynamism in which loyalty shifts based on momentary advantage, connections form and dissolve rapidly, and all of the relationships have high stakes; second, the isolated, titular island provides a space where it seems anarchy can reign. No legal bodies exist to enforce laws. No religious institutions are around to decry the terrible violence that unfolds. Treasure Island could not be more different from the quiet, community-stable English fishing village where the novel opens. And yet, dominant ideologies persist. Even though the actors in *Treasure Island* do what they do without any formalized restraint in sight, they nevertheless conform broadly to the dominant ideologies of the world they left behind. While the long arm of the law cannot reach to Treasure Island to enforce its edicts, dominant ideologies are sustained by the close, informal groups that form in the quest for treasure who remind members of who they are by way of group interactions.

Circumstance also dictates that those seeking the titular treasure share close quarters. People of all social levels, from street criminals to minor nobility, are forced to interact regularly in the tight confines of life aboard a sailing ship. At times, these contacts are essential. For those involved, survival itself can often be at stake. As such,

it would seem that such life or death situations involving people far away from the comforts of home would provide a catalyst for developing relationships that transcend conventional boundaries of social class. They do not. Instead, social interactions throughout *Treasure Island* maintain strict delineations between the various social and economic classes represented on the adventure.

Such a situation could only result from the influence of ideology. No large social institutions are immediately present as Jim Hawkins, his friends and the pirates search for treasure. Nor is there any formal apparatus to enforce ideologies of class. Yet, everyone in the story has a clear awareness of exactly where they fit in a rigid hierarchy, the origins and physical support of which lie thousands of miles distant from the novel's central action.

Class order remains strong for the characters in Stevenson's book through acts of interpellation. Repeatedly, individuals receive reminders, both subtle and not, of their class position. The reminders work to shape the identity of the targeted subjects as they come to define themselves and see who they are in relation to those with whom they interact. As Althusser says, this process unfolds in such a way that it appears to not be at all ideological. In the end though, interpellation provides for its subjects "an absolute guarantee that everything really is so, and that on condition that the subjects recognize what they are and behave accordingly, everything will be all right" (Althusser 123).

Interpellation occurs through the mechanisms of qualification and disqualification described by Göran Therborn. He asserts that qualification is the way in which individuals are deemed able to fill specific roles. *Treasure Island* features primary

groups who qualify and disqualify themselves and others to preserve the power of the ruling class. These events occur when existing class structures are challenged during the course of ordinary social interaction. Qualification and disqualification makes sure that nobody forgets their designated place in the class structure.

An early example of interpellation comes in the book's opening scenes with the arrival of the old sailor, Billy Bones. When Bones takes up residence at the inn owned by narrator Jim Hawkins' parents, the adventure begins. Bones holds court every evening in the bar. He tells harrowing stories of pirates and murder. He terrorizes his fellow tavern patrons by forcing them to "bear a chorus to his singing" of ribald songs (R. Stevenson 5). Bones' actions keep Jim's family and their guests in a state of constant fear.

Bones' presence threatens and excites the residents of Jim's town. The sailor's stories simultaneously shock and titillate them. When the Admiral Benbow's clientele gather, they act afraid of the harrowing tales Bones tells. Jim notes in his narrative however that besides the shock and fear the locals evidenced, that ". . . his presence did us good" and that in hindsight "[p]eople were frightened at the time, but on looking back they rather liked it; it was a fine excitement in a quiet country life . . . " (R. Stevenson 6). In fact, Bones gets rehabilitated over the years. Jim tells how those that viewed Bones as frightening have come, over time, to see him in different terms. They view him less as a criminal and more as a patriot. Jim notes that in retrospect people in the town said of Bones that he "was the sort of man that made England terrible at sea" (R. Stevenson 5-6).

Jim's description of Bones' brief stay in the town illustrates both how informal groups can mirror formal apparatuses and in that capacity use qualification and disqualification to suppress any potential dissent. The stories Bones tells while staying in the tavern describe a life viewed by the locals as evil. Patrons of the Admiral Benbow get the impression of Bones as someone who "lived his life among some of the wickedest men that God ever allowed upon the sea" (R. Stevenson 5). The repeated descriptions Jim inserts of the residents of his hometown as quiet and unsophisticated indicate that the adventures Bones describes stand well outside their day-to-day lives. Because ". . . the norms people believe in and live by will be powerfully influenced by the nature of their society . . ." Bones' anarchic biography threatens the traditional values of the people who hear it (Geras 227). It describes a life lived free from the constraints of law and acceptable behavior. By making Bones a clear other through their shocked reaction, Jim's neighbors become more solidly entrenched in the belief in their own virtue. Their affirmation brings them more into the fold of the dominant ideology by identifying Bones as outside it. The dominant ideology, which explains what life should be, appears safe and normal. What Bones describes appears the exact opposite. Discrepancy between the values evinced by Bones bring the values of the townspeople into sharp relief. Because of this, they can reassure themselves of the correctness of those values. By qualifying themselves and virtuous and disqualifying Bones as such, the residents of the village are assured of their own righteousness and so are less likely to question or challenge it.

The fact that those who were appalled at the tales told by Bones years later remember his presence somewhat fondly illustrate how the dominant ideology cements

its power over its subjects. In retrospect, the locals reframe Bones. In their memory, they view what he did not as subversive but as patriotic. They proudly describe him as an embodiment of the British navy's greatness. By doing this, the dominant ideology changes Bones from a person who posed a legitimate danger to the ideological status quo into a person who displays all the traits that contribute to the country's martial greatness.

Through this transformation, Bones' danger to the prevailing ideology gets blunted. The chaos he lived has been appropriated into a more acceptable ideological framework. Bones has been re-qualified but in a different, safer role. In his new role he becomes acceptable, even virtuous. Through initial disqualification followed by re-qualification, the dominant ideology has incorporated a potential threat and transformed it into an asset.

A later confrontation between Bones and Dr. Livesey also illustrates how an informal group can act as an informal apparatus. In the encounter between the doctor and pirate, class power is asserted with the fully power of repressive apparatuses behind it. Through the event, Livesey qualifies his position of power and privilege. Simultaneously, the Benbow's patrons and Bones are qualified in their inferior social status.

Livesey and Bones do not form a primary group. But, the rest of the patrons at the Admiral Benbow do. As locals they know one another. Additionally, Dr. Livesey is a well-known presence as evidenced by the fact that he knows Jim's parents and treats the boy's father when he falls ill. Jim's narrative makes mention of the fact that just prior

to the confrontation between Livesey and Bones, the doctor is chatting with “old Taylor, the gardener, on a new cure for the rheumatics” and during the conversation the physician ignores Bones’ obvious anger and goes “on as before, speaking clear and kind, and drawing briskly at his pipe between every word or two” (R. Stevenson 7). Jim’s observations reveals both Livesey’s common touch as well as the disdain the doctor feels toward Bones.

When Bones asks for silence and Livesey ignores the command, the sailor flies into a rage. Dr. Livesey loses no composure and calls Bones a scoundrel, adding that if Bones continues drinking rum “. . . the world will soon be quit of a very dirty scoundrel” (R. Stevenson 7). At this Bones flies into a murderous anger, drawing a knife and threatening to kill Livesey. Again, the doctor shows no reaction. Instead he declares to Bones and the others present that: “I’m not a doctor only; I’m a magistrate; and if I catch a breath of complaint against you, even if it’s only for a piece of incivility like to-night’s, I’ll take effectual means to have you hunted down and routed out of this. Let that suffice.” (R. Stevenson 8). At the chastisement, Bones promptly takes his seat again and “held his peace that evening, and for many evenings to come”, clearly indicating the effect the berating had on him (8).

Bones’ threat is not just a threat to Livesey personally. It also presents a challenge to the doctor’s social class and so must be quashed immediately. The doctor’s statement makes explicit his class position relative not just to Bones but the others present as well. The doctor’s statement makes explicit his class position relative not just to Bones but the others present as well. Livesey qualifies himself for the social position he holds. His statement does this for not only Bones but the others present as

well. As a physician, he has the prestige of practicing medicine and the specialized knowledge available only to those who get the proper training. His mentioning of it reminds Bones and the other guests where they stand relative to the doctor.

The fact that Dr. Livesey adds that he holds the position of magistrate as well as physician bolsters the qualification of his class superiority. Though the interaction with the others at the Admiral Benbow does not take place within the apparatus of the legal system, what Dr. Livesey says reminds every one of its governing presence and power to punish. He invokes the power of qualification and disqualification over those who witness the conflict with Bones. Livesey reminds everyone in earshot that not only does he have the power of high social class on his side, but the repressive apparatus that sustains that position. He has effectively qualified himself as Bones' superior and made sure that his class position is not challenged, either physically nor socially.

Dr. Livesey disqualifies the Benbow's patrons in terms of social status too. The reminder of the class and repressive power Livesey has effects on the audience at the tavern who take no direct role in the argument. Nevertheless, they are left with little doubt that Livesey has more social power and access to greater physical force than they do. The lack of equal access to that of the doctor disqualifies those who hear what the doctor says from a position of superiority or empowerment. While not directed at them, Livesey's statement reminds them of their place in the existing class hierarchy and so leads them to acceptance of class ideologies and their place in them.

On Bones' part, he too is disqualified from any power. Bones has the power of physical violence at his disposal. He shows his knife to the doctor and becomes threatening. But, when he sits down without attacking Livesey, he shows that he

accepts his inferior role in relation to the doctor as well as the local villagers. Livesey's declaration disqualifies Bones from carrying out a subversive act. To murder the doctor would be an attack on the class hierarchy itself, a revolution in microcosm.

Bones refrains from doing so. He has been disqualified as a member of acceptable society without a drop of blood getting spilled. The only interaction with the larger society Livesey offers is through the gallows. Calling Bones a 'scoundrel' further disqualifies the seaman. It puts him beneath contempt and therefore makes him unworthy of real social acknowledgement. His status as a scoundrel disqualifies Bones because it places him outside the social pale with his only interaction taking place through the material presence of a Repressive State Apparatus, the courts and the gallows.

Suppression to class threats does not just happen during conflict. Before the confrontation with Bones, Livesey sits in a room of the Admiral Benbow smoking a pipe. Jim secretly observes him. He talks about the doctor in gushing terms saying, ". . . I remember the contrast the neat, bright doctor, with his powder as white as snow, and his bright, black eyes and pleasant manners, made with the coltish country folk, and above all, with that filthy, heavy, bleared scarecrow of a pirate of ours . . ." and drawing a clear line of demarcation between Livesey and the pirate boarding at the Admiral Benbow (R. Stevenson 6).

The relationship between Jim, his family and Livesey forms a primary group. All involved show kindness and consideration to one another. Yet class positions remain intact. Jim's description of Livesey borders on the mystical. Jim accepts the identity Livesey projects without question. Through his acceptance of Livesey's identity, Jim

knows himself. He understands that he and those in his immediate social environment are not the same as the prestigious doctor. As they lack the sophistication and refinement Livesey has, so they are inferior. Jim acknowledges his lesser status without question. In his thinking, things could be no other way. Jim's interactions with Livesey hide the ideological components of their relationship. Consequently, their connection appears as simply natural and so immune to questioning.

Interacting with Dr. Livesey causes Jim to perform an act of self-disqualification as well as a disqualification of his family and the other patrons of the tavern. Jim's respect for the manners shown by the doctor when dealing with "coltish country folk" tacitly acknowledges Dr. Livesey's superior class position. In Jim's eyes, the qualification is external. It comes from the way the doctor dresses and the way he carries himself when interacting with those whom Jim sees as his inferiors.

Shortly after his run-in with Livesey, Bones dies. Jim and his mother, along with the doctor search through Bones' personal effects in hope of finding money to pay the large debt the seaman accrued during his stay at the Admiral Benbow. They come across a map, the one that ultimately leads the way to Treasure Island. Soon thereafter, some of Bones' old associates attack Jim and his mother in an attempt to retrieve the map. The ruffians are eventually driven off empty handed. Jim and his mother decide to give Dr. Livesey the map for safe-keeping. Jim sets off for the doctor's house, arriving to find Livesey and his good friend, Squire Trelawney, eating dinner. After handing over the map, Jim observes an exchange the two have. The squire and Livesey discuss mounting an expedition to find the treasure pointed to on the map. Trelawney grows more animated as the conversation progresses. In frustration at one point, Livesey

interjects: ". . . you are so confoundedly hot-headed and exclamatory that I cannot get a word in" (R. Stevenson 32).

The fact that Livesey makes the statement shows that his relationship with the squire is a close one. Otherwise, such candor would be out of the question. Feeling comfortable enough to honestly voice his frustration shows not only that Livesey has a primary connection to Trelawney but also reveals and affirms their shared class identity. The familiarity the squire and Livesey exhibit has its basis not just in mutual fondness. It rests on unspoken assumptions of social equality as well. Through casual banter and the omission of honorifics, Livesey and Trelawney identify each other as fellow members of the privileged upper class. Their interaction makes manifests the qualification for their superior social positions.

The casual and honest exchange Jim observes between the squire and Livesey illustrates the permeation of class ideologies into even the most ordinary aspects of social existence. Dr. Livesey and the Squire use qualification to justify their social superiority. They justify it to one another in the way they interact so comfortably. Jim understands and accepts their qualification too. By not having the ability to address either Dr. Livesey or the squire in any other way than by their titles, he knows that he does not belong to their social group.

None of those involved in the scene make specific declarations regarding power or status. In fact, the squire shows great hospitality to Jim, offering him room and board for the night. Even so, everyone present knows their status in relation to the others. The emotionally charged events of the night that might lead to a breach of decorum because

of a dropped guard get kept in check by the most trivial of actions. After ruffians have tried to murder Jim and his mother and the criminals chased from town, Jim still remembers where he stands on the social scale. The event illustrates how deeply the dominant ideology can penetrate into the most ordinary aspects of life and the social "universe is predominantly class-determined, by class practices, class experiences, class ideologies and class power" (Therborn 41)

When the decision is made to undertake the journey to Treasure Island, Jim, the squire and Dr. Livesey head to the seaport of Bristol. There they charter a ship under the command of Captain Smollett. Before the ship heads out, the captain expresses some concerns to Squire Trelawney about the rest of the crew. Smollett worries that the ship's mate, Mr. Arrow, is too familiar with the crew to be an effective officer. He suggests Trelawney and his companions should berth near the ship's arsenal so that they can be ready in case of a mutiny. But Smollett admits he has no concrete proof and that "No captain, sir, would be justified in going to sea at all if he had ground enough to say that" (R. Stevenson 49).

Embedded in Smollett's discussion of the crew's unreliability are clear qualifications and disqualifications. Expressing his concerns openly to the squire and his friends reflects an assumption of equality, just like the dinner scene Jim walked into at Trelawney's house. Captain Smollett offers no solid proof of his suspicions because he has none. His judgment arises from the qualification his social status gives to render it. The crew warrants Smollett's misgivings because of their proletarian status, as do the sympathies Arrow holds toward them. Because of this, distrust is a necessity, regardless of any evidence to justify it.

Smollett effectively establishes a class hierarchy with his remarks. They clearly relegate the crew to an undifferentiated rabble. The captain qualifies himself and those privy to the conversation as inherently superior to the rest of the crew. Smollett, in his honesty, indicates the squire and others as sharing equality with him. He also identifies the group as potential victims of untrustworthy working class men. The element of danger further identifies the captain's audience. As potential objects of mutinous violence, they must become defenders of their class interests, and, if necessary, risking their lives to take on the role. Lorain Fletcher offers a similar reading. She sees the Hispaniola as a "ship of state whose cabin party and alarming crew represent respectively Britain's ruling class and an underclass of workers" (Fletcher 34). In the microcosm aboard ship, societal conditions get replicated. Those with wealth and power fight to preserve their economic interests from those in the working class who might take them from them through violence. Airing his fears of mutiny reminds the captain and those whom he has chosen to trust of their upper-class identity. It further makes them feel the urgency of protecting that identity at all costs.

At the lower end of the shipboard hierarchy another act of collective self-interpellation occurs. During the trip to Treasure Island, Jim chats with the ship's coxswain, Israel Hands. The pilot tells Jim a little bit of Long John Silver's history. He tells the boy that Silver is different from the other sailors on the Hispaniola. Hands describes Silver as intelligent and well educated. Hands says of Silver: "He's no common man, Barbecue . . . [h]e had good schooling in his young days, and can speak like a book when so minded . . . "(R. Stevenson 54). To Hands, Silver's schooling sets

him apart from his peers. That, plus Silver's formidable physical strength gives the cook a higher status than the other, ordinary seamen on the Hispaniola, even Hands himself.

By opening up to Jim and sharing his knowledge of Silver's past, Hands forms a bond with the young narrator. It makes Jim a social equal like a similar intimate conversation did for Trelawney and Livesey. Hands would surely not talk about Silver's ability to prevail against four men in a brawl with the likes of Captain Smollett or either of Jim's wealthy friends. Not keeping the facts of Silver's life secret from Jim shows that Hands trusts the boy as a peer. But the interaction serves an opposite purpose from the interpellations that occur in the relationships among representatives of the upper class. The expression, by Hands, of respect for Silver provides a mode by which an Ideological State Apparatus can attain submission to its power far beyond its physical confines.

Hands' praise for Silver's schooling shows that the coxswain places a high value on education. This positivity necessarily carries with it an admiration for the institutions that provide it. Silver's learning cannot be seen as a positive trait if the schools that provide it lack credibility. Althusser specifically mentions schools as examples of Ideological State Apparatuses. He declares: "I believe that the ideological State apparatus which has been installed in the dominant position in mature capitalist formations . . . is the educational ideological apparatus" (103).

The apparatus's power to control goes far beyond those under its direct supervision. In school, Silver would have received instruction that trained him "to act consistently with the values of society" (Belsey 658). Despite his often decidedly anti-

social actions, Silver retains those values to a degree. He urges his men to respect his leadership and authority. Silver also pays lip-service to concepts like fairness from time to time. Silver's embrace of these values, combined with the high opinion people like Hands hold of his schooling, give Silver the power to propagate the same ideology in which he received instruction, even without being conscious of doing so. The conversation between Jim and Hands illustrates the formidable power of this process.

The ideological power of knowledge to interpellate social status is illustrated later in the novel as well. Jim, when searching for an apple, finds himself completely inside the barrel containing them. The gentle swaying of the ship puts the boy to sleep. When he wakes up, he overhears Long John Silver and other crewmembers discussing their past as pirates. Jim listens as they also lay out plans for a mutiny. Part of the pirates' plan involves forcing Captain Smollett to navigate the ship most of the way back to England before staging their takeover. Dick, a younger member of the group, advocates killing Smollett as soon as possible. Silver chastens him immediately, retorting: "We can sail a course, but who's to set one?" (R. Stevenson 60).

Here Silver makes a simple but powerful statement. He points out that he and his men lack essential knowledge. Lacking this qualification could put all of the mutineers at mortal risk. By pointing out the group's shortcomings, Silver has at the same time made sure that they stay acquiescent to the dominant ideology. He ideologically disqualifies himself and his accomplices. Even in the midst of plotting the deaths of Smollett and rest of the squire's party, the pirates remain inescapably trapped within the rigid, tenacious class system of their homeland. Silver's statement points to a weakness he and his friends have. Smollett can fill the gap. This fact gives the captain power over the

mutineers. He remains safe because of his privileged position and qualifying knowledge. Underlying Silver's criticism of Dick's plan is the underlying acknowledgement of Smollett's authority. In a strange way, the person whom the planned mutiny is to be directed against has the ability to determine its success or failure, even though he has no involvement in the plan.

Conversely, Silver's point reminds everyone in the group of pirates that they remain dependent on the actions of a perceived social superior. So, the plotters necessarily accept their lesser social positions. Long John Silver and his fellow mutineers are "heavily influenced by . . . notions of order, authority and status" (Cain and Hopkins 87). The primary relationship between Silver and his men acts to preserve the same system that oppresses them. The system achieves this with an ironic twist. It gets an endorsement from the same people actively involved in its attempted overthrow.

Eventually, Silver and his compatriots carry out their plans. Trelawney, Captain Smollett, along with a number of loyal sailors form a group that holes up in an abandoned stockade for protection. A life and death struggle ensues when the mutineers surround the stronghold. After a brief, but vicious gun battle Silver and his men are driven off but not without inflicting casualties on those making a stand in the stockade. One of the mortally wounded is Redruth, Trelawney's long-time servant. The two clearly show a bond stronger than that between employer and employee. The squire kneels by the stricken man's side, weeping. Trelawney, feeling responsible for Redruth's demise, begs for forgiveness from his dying servant. With his final words, Redruth questions the propriety of someone in his position bestowing forgiveness on a

person like squire asking: “Would that be respectful like, from me to you, squire? “However, so be it, amen!” (R. Stevenson 96).

The interaction of Redruth and Trelawney shows that class qualification endures until the very end of life. In his last moments, the servant reminds the squire of their differences in terms of relative class position. Redruth accepts and affirms the status he lived out in life, a person whose identity derived from servitude. He takes the material, economic relationship he has shared with Trelawney, and converts it into his own essence. Redruth sees himself not merely as an employee of the squire. In his eyes he fundamentally is a servant, a role that stands decontextualized outside of specific social conditions. Such transcendence connotes the eternal. For Redruth, making his job stand outside the specifics of material existence means that the economic and class relations it entails are everlasting as well. Trelawney’s faithful servant sees his work in idealist terms. This illusion makes servitude acceptable to Redruth. It hides the inherently exploitative connection between master and servant in the realm of the abstract and other-worldly.

Trelawney’s request for forgiveness also serves an ideological purpose. The squire wants absolution for an act he sees solely in terms of individual responsibility. He blames himself for Redruth’s predicament, seeing his own hand in Redruth’s death as an act of personal moral failure. From that perspective, Trelawney views his specific relationship to Redruth as what requires reconciliation. The squire’s guilt, just like Redruth’s servile essence serves an ideological purpose. It interpellates Trelawney not as a specifically classed individual but an individual in general. Trelawney’s remorse is personal. He does not consider larger social factors as playing a part in what has

happened. Because the guilt belongs to him alone, he identifies himself as an individual actor, having agency and not connected to a larger social whole. The maintenance of capitalist social relations depends on acceptance on the ideology of individualism.

When conscience convinces Trelawney that he alone is culpable for Redruth's death, the social factors that lead to the tragedy are not questioned. Guilt, supplemented by the idea that he exists in a separate, asocial sphere, prevents the squire from seeing the bigger picture. As long as he believes in personal guilt, and the accompanying idea of individualism, questions regarding class, social position and economics stay conveniently unasked. When those like Redruth and Trelawney identify themselves only as individuals, they lose sight of the fact that their existence is fundamentally social. And, as Terry Eagleton argues: ". . . by ceasing to appear as a totality, the capitalist order renders itself less vulnerable to political critique" (*Ideology* 85).

ALTER-IDEOLOGY IN GEORGE MOORE'S *A MUMMER'S WIFE*

Primary groups in *Treasure Island* convey and affirm the dominant ideology. They do so by creating identities that reinforce the marginal status of those who hold them. Close ties remind individuals involved that their status is natural and inevitable. These identities consequently become beyond questioning and thus affirmed, they remain fixed and unchallenged.

Althusser's work on interpellation explains how this identity is taken on. It tells individuals who they are and where they fit in the social hierarchy. When solidified, these identities make an individual's role unquestionable. Close relationships make

social positions inevitable. Intimate ties also make those positions seem natural and fixed.

Göran Therborn expands on Althusser's work in his 1999 book, *The Power of Ideology and the Ideology of Power*. He argues that ideology does not just show a person who they are: it also explains others. Therborn claims that a group's ties do not just facilitate self-explanatory ideology, which connotes the group's individual and collective identity. Groups, according to his theory, also create ideologies. These ideologies create identities for those outside the group.

Therborn terms ideologies created to identify non-group members 'alter-ideologies'. Alter-ideologies can validate identity just as the dominant ideology does. Alter-ideologies can bolster or suppress power. The wealthy and powerful create alter-ideologies of the poor. They create those who live in poverty as lacking in character and motivation. The alter-ideological image creates a justification for the continued oppression and suffering of the proletariat. They are seen as deserving of their situation. This leads to bolstering the power of the upper-class. An alter-ideology that justifies poverty equally rationalizes wealth and power. Through its lens, not only do the impoverished become morally deficient, the rich are made virtuous.

Alter-ideology does not have to come from a dominant social group to disempower those outside it. Oppressed groups create their own alter-ideologies. Just as the wealthy might view the poor as undeserving the poor in turn may view the rich as occupying a natural social position. An oppressed group can create their oppressors through alter-ideology. The identity of the other they generate can prove just as successful at repressing revolution as the most brutal apparatus of dictatorial power.

In George Moore's *A Mummer's Wife*, characters identify themselves through what Therborn terms 'alter-ideologies' that refer to the ideological dimension of the form in which one relates to the Other: to perceptions of the other and of one's relationship to him/her" (Therborn 28). Therborn further argues that alter-ideologies determine attitudes and behavior toward designated others. For socially dominant groups, alter-ideologies justify existing power structures. For those over whom power is exerted, alter-ideology forms "the basis for their resistance to the exploiters" (Therborn 61).

A Mummer's Wife begins by describing the ordinary, and dull life of Kate Ede, the wife of an asthmatic shopkeeper who shares her home with a contentious and critical mother-in-law. Kate finds relief from her boredom in the company of Dick Lennox, the head of a travelling theater troupe who rents a room in her house while performing at the local playhouse. Lennox's bohemian lifestyle appeal to Kate and she eventually decides to leave her husband and take up life as an itinerant actor. Things do not go as planned though. Kate never officially divorces her husband and so can never actually marry Dick. Being an actor subjects Kate and her friends to withering scorn from those living in the communities where they perform. She ends up living a tragic, marginal existence and ultimately succumbs to alcoholism and early death.

Marginal groups, like the theater troupe in Moore's novel, use alter-ideology to confirm their status to themselves. Aware of their position as outsiders, these formations often embrace their ostracism. Members use alter-ideology to frame what they do as acts of conscious rebellion. Like those who affirm their propriety through alter-ideology, individuals in marginal social formations use alter-ideological construction of the society that has made them outcasts to view themselves as real forces of dissent.

Groups who do not use alter-ideology disempower themselves by seeing those who oppress them as omnipotent. Construction of the other through alter-ideology can weaken those who create it by explaining those outside the group as inferior to the group itself. This happens in *A Mummer's Wife*.

The actors at the center of the novel live their lives outside social acceptability. Their profession marginalizes them. Moore makes it clear that proper society views the work and lifestyle of actors as immoral. As the theater troupe travels, they get large audiences in the towns where they stop. Individuals that make up these audiences, however, resent the presence of the actors in their community. Only reluctantly do they provide them with room and board. Townsfolk always seem to feel relief when the play goes dark and the performers leave town.

Marginalization deprives the actors of any real social power. When trying to support themselves, they sometimes struggle. Only with reluctance do members of the towns where they stop engage with the performers economically. Sometimes the troupe has to revert to outright theft to feed themselves. The experiences the actors have outside their group forms their views of non-members. Citizens of the towns where they stop look stodgy to the actors. Members of the troupe behave in ways that go against traditional mores. This causes their audiences to look askance at them when not performing.

The view they have of the townspeople constitutes an alter-ideology. The actors see themselves ideologically. They view themselves as happier than those who make up their audiences. Because the actors see themselves as living life to the fullest, they

view themselves as superior to those for whom they perform. In actuality, the troupe capitulates to the dominant ideology as much as the bourgeoisie they despise. Constructing an alter-ideology prevents the actors from seeing this fact. They differentiate between themselves and those that exclude them. The actors believe that they live outside the dominant ideology. They believe they live lives that rebel against its influence. It is a false belief. Its falsity arises from alter-ideology. The others the actors create through ideology perpetuate this delusion. The travelling troupe believes it lives a life free of the restraint of convention, a belief that imprisons them under the dominant ideology.

Kate Ede finds comfort in an alter-ideology after her first interaction with future lover Dick Lennox. He comes by Kate's house to ask after a room to rent. After Lennox leaves, Kate has a conversation with her friend Hender. In the work-room, as the two sew for extra money, Lennox's visit becomes the main topic of conversation. Hender excitedly fills Kate in on the latest gossip regarding Lennox's theater group. She tells Kate that Lennox is slated to play the "low comedy part" in the play being performed (Moore 31). Hender further states: ". . . I could see Mr. Lennox between the wings; he had his arm around Miss Leslie's shoulder. I'm sure he's sweet on her" (Moore 31). Kate does not like this news, finding that "The announcement that Mr. Lennox was the funny man was disappointing, but to hear that he was a woman's lover turned her against him" (Moore 31).

The discussion transforms Kate and Hender's friendship into a means by which conventional ideological sentiments can be asserted. The conversation with Hender allows Kate to identify herself through the recognition of an alter-ideology. Her negative

reaction to the news means that she can affirm the virtue of her solid, middle-class life by contrasting it with the life Lennox lives. Hender's information provides Kate with a tool to justify categorizing Lennox. It allows her to see him and all actors as low and lecherous. Kate generalizes from what she believes about Lennox's behavior to acting as a profession. It constructs those who work in the world of the theater as socially undesirable and morally suspect. Their outcast status then becomes justified.

In order for Kate to condemn Lennox and his friends, she must have equal confidence in her own righteousness. Alter-ideology provides the necessary assurance. Kate sees in the actors what she is not. By passing harsh judgment on them, she implicitly asserts the superior social status that allows her to do so. Kate's alter-ideology creates actors as a class rather than as discrete individuals.

Reality gets distorted both for Kate and the actors. Through alter-ideology, the theater troupe is classed in terms of their moral failings. This hides the real ideological cause of the difference that has resulted from economic conditions. Kate cannot see the economic forces that have positioned her above the actors in status, nor can she understand how those same forces dictate that she take on extra work to make ends meet. Kate's blindness to economic relations extends to her evaluation of the theater troupe too. For her, turpitude is the defining trait of the class to which people who work as dramatic performers belong. Kate's focus on morality elides the fact that economics have created the actors' social positions more than personal behaviors. For Kate and Hender to recognize the part capitalism itself plays in the actors' situation opens the system up to possible criticism and destruction. This analysis of the work of capital is

prevented though by framing the actors' status as outsiders who are perceived to engage in moral transgressions.

Another workplace conversation between Kate and Hender mollifies them into accepting a patriarchal ideology. When Lennox is due to arrive back in town for a second run of performances, the friends excitedly discuss the fact. Hender repeatedly states that Lennox has a romantic interest in Kate. Hender justifies her ideas by citing behaviors men exhibit and expectations they have when in love. She tells Kate: "I know he likes you; I could see it in his eyes. You can always see if a man likes you by his eyes" (Moore 113). Hender follows the statements with "[a] man always expects a girl to be able to go out with him" (113).

Hender's ideas articulate an alter-ideology of gender. In it, she constructs masculinity. The construct is a contradictory one though. Belief in the ability to look into a man's eyes and discern romantic intentions posits masculinity as controllable. Hender's view of women attributes to them a power over men that prevents men from hiding their true feelings. The idea of a manhood unable to keep its secrets when subjected to feminine intuition hides the contradiction embedded in Hender's second declaration. Saying that men expect women to be ready for them is posited as an absolute, unqualified declarative statement. It lacks the vagueness of a numinous capability to read hidden feelings and more accurately describes Kate and Hender's social reality. Alter-ideology draws their attention away from this fact. Hender's construction of masculinity offers the illusory consolation that women have a modicum of control over the relations that make up the capitalist nature of patriarchy that frames their existence. Through this false idea of feminine agency, the material realities of

gender oppression and its foundational ideology go unnoticed by Hender and Kate. Unobserved and hidden behind this faith in an emotive talent women alone possess a ". . . system of benevolent male hegemony is reaffirmed energetically" (Hall 31).

Alter-ideology also acts to soften the harsh realities of capitalism itself. *A Mummer's Wife* takes place in Hanley, a town where the manufacture of pottery is the main industry. Visitors to the area often tour the factories to view the process first hand. As Lennox and Kate begin to grow closer, they decide to take the tour together. As the pair is guided through the pottery works, they come across workers performing various tasks. The works are described as an environment filled with dust and heat where employees work long, brutal hours. Lennox and Kate take a particular interest in one worker, a man who sits at a wheel sculpting jam-pots by hand. The narrative describes him as "covered with clay; his forehead and beard were plastered with it, and before him was an iron plate, kept continually whirling by steam . . . [h]e had been at work since seven in the morning and the shelves round him were encumbered with the result of his labours " (Moore 69). The fascination with the pot sculptor does not last long. The tour moves on and the man is soon forgotten.

When Lennox, Kate and the others on the tour make their brief stop in front of the worker at the pottery wheel "[e]veryone marveled at his dexterity . . . " (Moore 69). Here, the primary group formed by Kate and Lennox develops an alter-ideology in tandem with those who take the tour with them. The alter-ideology makes the real, flesh and blood worker before them invisible. The focus of Lennox and Kate shifts from the person of the potter to the process he carries out and the product that results. The potter becomes indistinguishable from what he makes. For those on the tour who see him, he

loses his humanity. They look at the pot-maker through the lens of an alter-ideology that reduces him to one essential trait, his ability to produce jam-pots efficiently. Melding the potter with what he produces decontextualizes him. The alter-ideology of the group removes him from the realities of exploitation and oppression since he cannot be separated from the industrial environment in which Kate and Lennox encounter him. Alter-ideology, which for the couple pictures workers and products as identical, supplements the most basic tenets of the dominant ideology. Kate and Lennox's understanding of the labor they witness facilitates a mystification. Their viewing of the potter allows them to remove the pots produced from their "presence in time and space . . . [and] . . . unique existence . . ."as material objects infused with exploited labor (Benjamin 220). Consequently, the realities of capitalism's brutal impact on workers vanishes in mystification.

This is not to say that the alter-ideological process goes unchallenged. Some primary groups in Moore's novel see themselves as fighting against the prevailing ideology. For them, alter-ideology creates the target of their dissent. The construction confirms for its creators that they are in a justifiable struggle against an oppressive social system. It further conveys the perception that rebellion itself is effective and meaningful. But, just as like their comfort seeking counterparts, these outliers are victims of ideological delusion. Primary groups on the social margins become subjects of the dominant ideology through the false belief that true defiance is possible and that their acts of subversion have significance. Imagining that what they do has an impact on society keeps those who live on the social periphery firmly under the control of the ideas they see themselves as rising against. Illusory revolt effectively hides the fact that even

the most excluded, defiant groups, are, at root, restrained by traditional institutions and beliefs.

The first interaction of Dick Lennox and Kate Ede provides an early illustration of alter-ideology's power. They first meet when she shows him the room she has to rent. Lennox immediately notices that the room's walls are plastered with religious quotations put up by Kate's mother-in-law. This makes him somewhat uneasy. Kate assures Lennox that the decorations do not express her piety but that of her mother-in-law, Mrs. Ede. Relieved, Lennox states that ". . . old people are very pious generally" and then changes the subject promptly (Moore 28). Lennox's droll comment on the wall decorations suggest explicitly his rejection of religious faith. He sees the quotes and Mrs. Ede through the prism of an alter-ideology. He sees Mrs. Ede as religious and simultaneously identifies himself as not. Outwardly, it appears as an act of rebellion. Lennox has declared that he stands outside of traditional religious belief and therefore rejects the powerful apparatus of the Church and its ideology.

Lennox's overt dismissal of Church ideologies masks the internal power they exert over him. His first sight of the scriptural wall decorations brings on "a certain uneasiness" despite his admission of unbelief (Moore 27). The ability of the wall-hangings to elicit discomfort in Lennox shows that religious doctrines still hold some sway over him, even as he denies them. Just as internalization of Church ideologies might lead the believer to a rapturous, mystical experience, the same beliefs, in their negation, can generate strong reactions. While Lennox does not subscribe to the ideas set out in the quotes, he does ascribe to them a degree of power. If his renunciation of faith were complete, the presence of the Bible passages would have no effect. But, the

uneasiness Lennox experiences show that he has at least an unarticulated idea that his lack of religiosity is inappropriate or wrong in some way. The Church still has a hold over Lennox in its ability to prick his conscience. Conscience, of course, results from the values imposed on an individual by the dominant ideology. As Judith Butler writes about the process of interpellation: ". . . guilt and conscience operate implicitly in relation to an ideological demand, an animating reprimand, in the account of subject formation" (12). Lennox has set himself apart from the middle-class piety exhibited by Mrs. Ede and discussed with Kate. In Mrs. Ede, he sees a conservative other, defined by a strong religious belief he does not hold. The alter-ideology through which Lennox assigns Kate's mother-in-law an identity hides the fact that he too is a subject of dominant religious ideologies. The apparatus of the Church achieves hegemony over both Lennox and Mrs. Ede. The only real difference between them is how that hegemony manifests itself in their lives.

Similar to Lennox's questioning of the hegemony of the church, Kate's decision to leave her husband appears as an equally decisive subverting act that undermines her traditional life. Her choice stems from the visions of exotic locales and exciting adventures Lennox has promised await her if she leaves with him. Kate imagines the "hearth of pleasure and comfort awaiting her in some distant country" (Moore 146). The fantasy energizes her to make a break with her past and pursue what she sees as a happier life just beyond the hills on the edge of Hanley.

Initially, Kate views Lennox and his fellow actors through the prism of a bourgeois alter-ideology that that surrounded her and husband's life as small-scale merchants. When she abandons that life to take on the life of a travelling actor, the

ideology that surrounds that life is different. Kate has not only removed herself physically from her married life, she has also distanced herself ideologically. In her new life with the theater troupe, she comes under the sway of a different alter-ideology. Kate's new role recasts the wandering life of Lennox and his friends as liberating. Adopting this new perspective through her lifestyle leads to Kate buying into the alter-ideology of her new associates. However, it is still an alter-ideology and neither brings liberation. The influence of the dominant ideology is always present even though for Kate, as a subject, her perspective has changed radically.

Prior to leaving with Lennox, Kate led a respectable life that enjoyed social approval. She filled the role of dutiful wife and seamstress. She provided her mother-in-law a place to live and participated in the capitalist economy by way of tending her husband's shop. In these capacities, Kate had a limited number of choices. Her options were narrowed by prevailing bourgeois ideologies that dictated everything from manners to the desire to pursue profit.

In contrast, Lennox and his fellow actors live outside middle-class niceties. They have no roots and flaunt sexual mores. But Kate's understanding of this way of living keeps her from seeing that it too is subject to the ruling ideology. The theater group has freed themselves from accepted norms. At the same time their ostracism assures that they remain broadly within acceptable social boundaries. Living on society's margins, Kate and the actors can indulge in activities frowned on or forbidden by conventional morality. This freedom comes with a heavy price. It disempowers members of the troupe, denying them social relevance and preventing them from ever exerting any real influence. For example, the performers often find themselves without money and on the

verge of starvation. Often the troupe has little money. In this situation, they are forced to seek help from the residents of the towns they visit. Consistently, locals refuse to do business with the actors whom they see as immoral. The rejection cements the group's alter-ideology and keeps them in submission to the larger, ruling ideology. When locals ostracize them, they confirm the actors' biases. Lennox and the others see themselves as liberated outsiders, living in a larger society that does not enjoy the same freedoms. Townspeople behave toward the performers in the way they are expected to and so confirm the actors' alter-ideology of the larger society as uptight and judgmental. As their own alter-ideology is affirmed, seeing the reality of the social and economic realities that mold their lives becomes an ever more remote possibility.

Kate's alter-ideology of actors has successfully hidden the new control she submits to by abandoning her old life. As a member of Lennox's staple of actors she remains as firmly grounded in the ruling ideology as when she helped in her husband's shop. Things only appear to have changed. Kate's new primary group just shifts the locus of control. Her alter-ideology created the illusion of freedom by seeming to provide a sharp contrast between the provincial world of Hanley and the possibilities offered by the world beyond its borders. However, beneath the apparent difference, the effects of the dominant ideology remain unchanged. It prevails over Kate and her new friends because ". . . the system both cultivates disparate interests and stabilizes its workings by means of their mutual checks and balances" thus eliminating dissent regardless of where it originates (McKee 50).

When Kate begins her new life with Lennox's performers, she experiences a change in alter-ideology. As she sits on the train leaving Hanley, she falls into a reverie.

She wonders what will happen to her husband, mother-in-law and old friend Hender who remain in her hometown. Kate begins to worry. She becomes concerned that the shop and sewing business will fail without her. Kate ends up feeling guilty and finds that ". . . the tedium of her life in Hanley was forgotten and she remembered only the quiet, certain life she might have lead . . ." (Moore 159).

Kate's nostalgia shows the speed with which alter-ideologies can change. The sudden shift in perspective causes Kate to see her former domestic existence as something positive. This indicates that the alter-ideology has brought about a negative social transition. As she becomes a provisional member of the actors' community through her connection with Lennox, she now views her former, quiet life as secure and stable. It no longer appears to Kate as a suffocating and oppressive world but one that becomes desirable in its absence.

When she leaves Hanley, Kate takes on the status of outsider, an identity she shares with everyone else in the actors' primary group. But what Kate used to be maintains a hold on her still. Embedded in her memories of her old life is the underlying moral ideology that supported it. Kate's roles as wife and daughter-in-law, while boring, enjoyed respectability. It enjoyed both official and informal approval. The act of abandoning everything she knew ostensibly represents a rebuke of the morality and affirmations Kate once embraced. Missing the moral ideologies that governed her former life, she internalizes them.

While taking up with Lennox's troupe indicates that Kate has embraced a new set of ethical mandates, far different from the ones she knew, her break with the old mores is far from complete. Even at a far psychic and physical remove from bourgeois values,

they still have the power to instill remorse in Kate. Fond remembrance of how she used to live, as filtered through alter-ideology, enforces the correctness of the middle-class standards she leaves behind. The prevailing ideology that governed her former life thus enters and shapes her new one. This happens because the molding power of the ruling ideology has not diminished. It still compels Kate. The only difference between her two situations is one of viewpoint. As Kate the wife and seamstress, the ruling ideology exerts control through the regulations that control daily life. For Kate, the newly minted outcast, bourgeois rules no longer apply. But the regret she experiences at abandoning them shows the power of middle-class ideology.

Kate accepts them in their breach. Her guilt shows that while she has removed herself from the material circumstances where the ideology prevailed, she has nonetheless internalized it. When Kate lived as a proper wife in a traditional domestic situation, her conscience was clear. She had behaved in “accordance with the dictates of ideological discourse” and the impact of ideology on her life remained hidden but no less powerful (Therborn 34). In her new life, the same ideology influences her to the same degree. It has just become more overt in its action.

Prior to leaving Hanley for good, Kate and Lennox spend some time making plans for the future. Kate expresses her desperate desire to escape Hanley. Lennox promises to love her forever. He assures her of his good intentions and fidelity. As he allays Kate’s fears, Lennox experiences some trepidation about their future together. He worries a little when he gets “a distinct vision of the Divorce Court in his mind” (Moore 144).

The plan Lennox and Kate makes goes against conventional ideologies of morality and threatens some of the most important institutions of the capitalist system. Lennox's seduction of Kate and the subsequent leaving of her husband undermine the traditional, patriarchal family. As travelling actors, the couple lives a life that violates dominant ideologies of stability. When later Kate bears a child, she exhibits "a generalised deviant femininity which . . . transcend[s] class boundaries" and undercuts the ideal of motherhood (Liggins 19).

Furthermore, the legal mechanisms of the legitimate familial institution that will evaluate Kate's behavior as deviant is always present just underneath their relationship. Through Lennox's alter-ideology of the society that has rejected him, a quite conventional moral ideology still exerts regulatory power over his actions. Lennox sees himself as a person who consciously lives counter to prevailing standards of behavior. He has rejected religious faith and he has blatantly pursued the affections of a married woman. However, Lennox's contrary mode of living has its definite limits. Law builds the first of these boundaries. Divorce court, as a repressive apparatus gives him pause. As much as Lennox may perceive himself as a rebel, the possibility of running afoul of the legal system as a consequence of his affair with Kate frightens him slightly. Much as the apparatus of the Church made Lennox uncomfortable in his irreligion, the power of the court influences his thinking as he plans to leave with Kate. His hesitation shows that at some level he feels the need to submit to the law. Law reflects and formally enforces the dominant ideology and class system. Lennox's consideration of legal force in his preparations with Kate acknowledges his subjection to it. Along with his acknowledgement of legal authority, comes a tacit yielding to the larger system it

upholds. As Soviet legal theorist I. Podvoloski states: “In a capitalist society the bourgeois system of law, which is created and protected by the power of the capitalist class, regulates and consolidates capitalist relationships and the domination of the capitalist class” (111).

Lennox understands that appearing in the Divorce Court brings condemnation and embarrassment. He thinks about these potential consequences as well as the legal trouble he could find himself in. The thought appears almost reflexively. It indicates that Lennox associates appearing in the court as a scandal. Lennox wants to avoid the disgrace associated with such an appellation. By sundering Kate’s marriage, Lennox attacks an institution deemed foundational by society. While he feels no shame in doing so, at the same he wants to avoid public humiliation. Marriage as a dominant ideological construction does not dictate or restrain Lennox’s actions. Embarrassment does. That he could suffer ignominy does not finally cause Lennox to change his mind and not run off with Kate. The lovers follow through with their plan and Lennox does not give any more thought to legal difficulties or possible humiliation. But by fearfully contemplating the possibility of a damaged reputation, he shows that he accepts the values advocated by the society he so often mocks.

Lennox’s alter-ideology of society validates its standards. If he did not confirm them, embarrassment would be impossible. Lennox’s certification of prevailing norms brings with it acceptance of the ideology that underlies them. This way the dominant ideology exerts its power. Though Lennox tries to assert himself in rebellious ways, his acts of subversion stay well within acceptable limits and therefore under tight control. Evidence of the dominant ideology’s ultimate triumph appears at the conclusion of the

book. Lennox and Kate have taken up residence in a shabby room. Kate takes to drink and Lennox grows weary of her company. He abandons the relationship and Kate dies alone, full of regret at abandoning her husband.

Therborn's concept of alter-ideology provides a useful tool for analysis as it allows for an explanation of how primary groups create ideologies of non-members. It shows that not only do members of closely bonded groups acquiesce to the dominant ideology through self –identification, but they can also yield to its authority in the ways they view those outside their intimate social circles.

ROLE QUALIFICATION IN OSCAR WILDE'S *THE PICTURE OF DORIAN GRAY*

Primary groups also use acts of qualification and disqualification to ensure compliance with the dominant ideology through the assignment of and removal from prescribed social roles. In *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*, Göran Therborn asserts that preparation for specific social roles begin early in the individual's life. He traces the ideological work of assigning social positions back to infancy saying even "The amorphous libido and manifold potentialities of human infants are subjected to a particular order that allows or favours certain drives and capacities, and prohibits or disfavours others" (Therborn 17). He further states: ". . . through the same process, new members become qualified to take up and perform (a particular part of) the repertoire of roles given in the society into which they are born . . . (17).

Qualifying takes many forms and occurs through many mechanisms. Individuals become qualified through the formal system of schools, technical training and degrees. In private social life, people earn qualification for their status as a spouse, a friend or

enemy. Whether public or personal, the ability to designate competence carries with it great power. Qualified by society, those in positions of wealth and privilege can retain their status unchallenged. At the lower end of the social scale, those deemed qualified to perform the most menial, exploitative work find that their defined skill set keeps them forever members of the underclass.

In terms of interpellation, Therborn claims that once a role is designated, the person assigned to that role has the ability to qualify their given identity. An individual exerts control over their various social identities by "specifying them and modifying their range of application" (Therborn 17). But this takes place within the larger context of the ruling ideology and is not intended to be understood as indicating the potential of escaping its dominance.

Hence, the flexibility and freedom of which Therborn speaks has limits. Its boundaries are the parameters of the assigned role. For example, a factory owner occupies a definite social position. His position embodies the ideology of capitalism and he lives it out in his activities in the free market and his relationships with employees. As a factory owner, the individual has the freedom to hire or dismiss anyone they please. This lies well within the freedom accorded by the dominant ideology. However, if he chooses to sell the factory and become an agitator for workers' rights, he would fall outside his prescribed role and so be disqualified from it. His role would shift from that of capitalist to that of an agitator. So the freedom to choose the range and application of an ideology only exists as long as the person exercising the freedom submits to the ruling ideology's prescriptive requirements for their designated role. The dynamics of identification therefore allow for both an active ideology and active subject.

Therborn does not say that qualification has a reverse process, specifically, although such an idea is a logical extension of his work. In fact, the dynamism of qualification and disqualification necessitates that the qualification that underlies that identity is fluid too. Once someone is qualified for a specific role, nothing points to the qualification's inevitable permanence. If a group chooses a leader, they have deemed the chosen person qualified for that position. If subsequently that leader loses credibility among followers, they have been disqualified from their position of power. Granting qualification means that it can be withdrawn either by the qualified individual themselves or by some outside agency.

Oscar Wilde's novel, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* illustrates the ideological significance qualification and disqualification have. The title character is a very handsome young man who moves in the most elite social circles. He and his friends pursue pleasure and beauty for their own sake. They attend plays and elegant parties. As the story progresses, Dorian is mysteriously able to hold onto his youthful appearance. Only at the end of the story is it revealed that he has engaged in unspeakably evil deeds to hold on to his looks. The final pages reveal that Dorian maintained his outward appearance at the expense of an inner decay which is captured in a portrait of himself he stored away from public view.

Primary associations in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* carry out and reverse Therborn's processes. Close connections in the novel grant, withhold and deny competency to take up social roles. In particular, qualification works to impose ideological blindness. When close relationships become arenas of endorsement or exclusion, the goal is the intentional obfuscation of the dominant ideology. In contrast to

the ostracized actors of George Moore's *A Mummer's Wife* though, closely bound groups in Wilde's book are part of society's privileged strata. They are wealthy and young. Material comfort and indulgence are readily available to them. Consequently, they spend much of their time in the pursuit of de-materialized beauty and pleasure. For them, life is purely aesthetic.

Living their lives in the realm of pure aestheticism allows the close friends portrayed in Wilde's novel to remain enmeshed in and subjugated to the dominant ideology. By remaining so, they keep their elevated social status and the privilege it conveys and do not question this fact. Framing themselves and their relationships solely as aesthetic, immaterial realities, the ideologies that deem them qualified to occupy the upper strata of society remain unquestioned.

Imagining their lives as separate from material reality, Dorian and his primary group inevitably believe themselves to be untouched by the ruling ideology that material reality gives rise to. But denying the existence of the dominant ideology does not free Dorian and his friends from its power and they remain firmly under its control. Believing that they live in an immaterial realm, the aesthetes do their part to support the dominant class structure. Ignoring the economic and social realities that place Dorian and his close associates in their class position means those realities and their resulting ideology remain unquestioned.

An early example of qualification in *Dorian Gray* appears in the narrative when Lord Henry pays a visit to the artist Basil Hallward's house. The title character of Dorian himself has not made an appearance at this point in the plot. But the two men discuss

him. Hallward describes how Dorian has given his art new life and taken it to a new level of skill. When the conversation turns to matters of social class, Henry makes mention of the proletariat's disgust with upper class vice. Henry says: "I sympathize with the rage of the English democracy against what they call the vices of the upper orders. The masses feel that drunkenness, stupidity, and immorality should be their own special property . . . "(Wilde 11). Through his statement Lord Henry qualifies himself as an expert on the working class and its moral character. Such an understanding does not arise from any concern for the situation of the poor. It contains a harsh judgment. Henry's claimed knowledge enforces his own superiority. He acknowledges the failings of the upper class. But he does not condemn them. Henry uses his feigned sympathy to justify his social superiority. Saying that the poor want a monopoly on vice does not deny that they have the faults Henry mentions. It actually reinforces the idea of their fundamental inferiority. Henry has both qualified himself as a member of the upper class and at the same time certified that the proletariat should remain in their position of submission. Henry's statement of qualification relegates the poor to the status of "an alien, superfluous body" that require governance and lack a level of morality sufficient to occupy any other social position than they do (Therborn 26).

Henry advocates and lives by a moral code that makes the quest for pleasure and beauty the central purpose of life. When he meets Dorian, Henry discusses this worldview with the young man. Henry argues to his new friend that if only humans would live lives of feeling then life would have meaning and depth. He tells Dorian "I believe that if one man were to live out his life fully and completely, were to give form to every feeling, expression to every thought, reality to every dream---I believe that the

world would gain such a fresh impulse of joy that we would forget all the maladies of mediaevalism . . .” (Wilde 20). Henry’s secrets of the good life rest on the assumption that existence boils down to the subjective and mental. Advocacy for the pursuit of worldly pleasure appears to be a solidly materialist value. But Henry actually sets up a false materialism. The materialist approach Henry develops does not critically examine the material, economic and social conditions of real existence. It distorts true materialism because it only looks at the surface of reality. Henry’s approach to life encourages the pursuit of enjoyment. Furthermore, another part of is ideology includes the primacy of the mental and imaginative over the real. The internal sensation of pleasure matters more than the concrete interactions that provide that pleasure. For Henry, feelings exist “for their own sake, and are not attached to a goal or aim beyond themselves” (Cohen 111).

The discussion between Henry and Dorian qualifies them both to live the aesthetic life. The qualification separates them from a clear view of reality. Following the philosophy of disconnected enjoyment turns the material into the fount of pleasure and nothing else. Henry demonstrates this by his refusal to acknowledge the historical. Saying that the Middle Ages can be rolled back simply by personal expression shows that Henry qualifies the individual with the ability to undo history. The qualification carries with it an imaginary power of the individual consciousness to shape history. Henry’s qualification of himself and others with this ability enables them to deny reality. Consequently adherents of his philosophy can avoid “making visible certain sordid facts of economic and social life” (Danson 67).

Henry again qualifies himself as an expert on the situation of the working class at a party with friends. He qualifies himself as someone who understands suffering. At the event, guests talk about the problems of London's East End, an area Drew Gray describes as representative for many Victorians of the depths to which humanity could sink "because of its high rate of crime and poverty"(3). The guests talk about the problems in the East End of London and their need of resolution. Henry states: "I can sympathize with everything except suffering. . . . It is too ugly, too horrible, too distressing" (Wilde 43). He goes on to declare "One should sympathize with the color, the beauty, the joy of life. The less said about life's sores the better" (43). Sir Thomas, a politician, demands to know what Henry thinks should be done about the issue. Henry replies that he wishes to change nothing but the weather and that "I am quite content with philosophic contemplation" (43).

The interactions with his close friends cause Henry to reveal his 'expertise'. He declares himself qualified to reject the economic and the political. With this self-certification he again justifies his idea that he stands outside of such mundane concerns. Furthermore, his retort to Sir Thomas that he has no interest in politics expresses a belief in his own qualification to not only reject the suffering of the poor but also the state apparatus as a solution. Rejecting the governmental approach mentioned by Sir Thomas does not come from a desire on Henry's part to seek a revolutionary solution to the problem outside the political. Rather, Henry says what he does to remove himself from the political completely. Henry's self-qualification as someone who lives above poverty and politics means that he does not have to engage either. In this way, neither the problem of economic suffering nor its relationship to power and the political

system requires examination. Both can remain as they do not necessitate either questions or interference.

Henry's qualification extends to some of the other guests too. When hearing his proclamations, the Duchess of Harley agrees. She tells Henry "You are rather comforting . . . I have always felt rather guilty when I came to see your dear aunt, for I take no interest at all in the East End. For the future I shall be able to look her in the face without a blush" (Wilde 44). Convinced by Henry's statement, the Duchess feels qualified to be indifferent to the problems of the East End. So qualified, the economic and class elements that contribute to the difficulties of East End residents require no further discussion. The Duchess has rid herself of guilt about the matter and can now live out her privileged life without hindrance. What Henry says qualifies those who believe him for their class positions. But Henry does not see his philosophy in such crass terms. He sees the rejection of suffering as proof of his purely aesthetic life. The ideas that guide this life provide "an alternative to naturalist sense-making of the world" and so allow the dominant ideology and system of economic relations to stay in place (Therborn 37). Those, like Lord Henry and Duchess who benefit from the existing system continue to enjoy its perks without pangs of conscience. The problems of the working class, who suffer because of capitalism, get written off as irrelevant while their difficulties continue without any hope of real change in sight.

Henry's aesthetic philosophy has a powerful hold on him. He believes it so strongly that he can maintain its principles even in the midst of direct engagement in economic activity. In one scene he comes in from a day of shopping for antiques in the city. He returns home where his wife and Dorian are discussing matters of artistic taste.

Henry expresses frustration at his inability to find a good bargain while shopping. He explains the situation by declaring, “Nowadays people know the price of everything, and the value of nothing” (Wilde 50). Here Henry uses his qualification as an aesthete to declare the ideal superior to the real. He makes his statement after direct participation in the capitalist marketplace. Henry enmeshed himself in its material realities by haggling over price a quest to acquire commodities, but he cannot acknowledge this reality. Henry’s denial stems from the fact that he places greater importance on a product’s abstract ‘value’. Vulgarities such as price remove idealized traits like pleasure and beauty from an object. The vagueness of value removes commodities from the realm of real economic connections. The commodity, once removed, takes on an unreal aesthetic nature and acquires a meaning outside of economic existence. This meaning allows Henry to engage in a “sublimation of brute facts . . . and believe that economic life is “a matter of ideas” (Brown 64). Transforming the realities of economic relations shows how the ruling ideology has subjugated Henry. It has made “representation . . . an effect of ideological domination” and so penetrated into his most basic perception of the world (Therborn 96). Consequently, his understanding of social relationships gets mystified.

Lord Henry does not limit his acts of qualification to himself. He qualifies Dorian Gray by making him a disciple of the life of indulgence. As Dorian begins to live according to Henry’s advice he find himself frequenting the theater where he falls in love with the actress Sybil Vane. The two decide to marry. When Dorian announces this to Henry and Basil Hallward, Henry is shocked. He questions the validity of Dorian’s love. Dorian defends his feelings, saying that Sybil is a genius, and a gifted actress with

immense talent. Lord Henry counters this assertion saying “My boy, no woman is a genius. Women are a decorative sex . . . “(Wilde 51). Qualification as decorations makes women objects. Their lifeless beauty as such incorporates them into the other-worldly realm of Henry’s worldview. In his declaration to Dorian, Henry qualifies women for a traditional role that matches that prescribed by prevailing patriarchal ideologies. Relegating them to the role of decoration affirms the idea of female passivity. Even though Henry has expressed his dislike for marriage and has minimal interaction with his own wife, his qualification affirms the submissive role of women in patriarchal marriage. Henry just puts the expectation in aesthetic rather than sexist terms. He becomes subject to dominant ideology by believing in the inherent inferiority of women. Not only does he accept the truth of patriarchal thinking, he advocates it. He argues for the correctness of existing gender hierarchies but does so while seeing himself as having no direct involvement with them.

Henry further marginalizes women through his statement that women represent the victory of the material over the mental. This statement justifies his qualification of women as mere decoration. Henry’s belief that women privilege matter over mind places them in direct opposition to his aesthetic beliefs. In Henry’s thinking, material life holds an inferior position to that of the mind. As ‘enemies’, women therefore deserve the objectified position Henry has assigned them to. Seeing women in such terms strips their very existence of meaning. While Henry disdains the reality of patriarchal marriage, he defends its rigid assignment of roles. Instead of qualifying women as only mothers and domestic workers though, he turns them into art, an ideological move which supports already present gender restrictions. Henry has employed his idealist

philosophy as a tool of the dominant ideology. His abstract notions have very real impact by acting as a mechanism that restricts “the possibilities of ideological interrelationship and of ideological change” (Therborn 39).

Taking Henry’s lessons to heart, Dorian lives out the tenets of his friend’s philosophy. In his relationship with Sybil Vane, Dorian takes on the role of qualifier. When he describes his feelings for the actress, Dorian says he is in love with the roles she plays. He claims that “She is all the great heroines of the world in one” (Wilde 59). Dorian’s feelings run so deep that he does not even want to know Sybil’s personal history. But in talking about his feelings for Sybil, Dorian reveals a seamier side to Sybil’s work in the theater. He tells of how she is bound to the theater manager for a contractual period of almost three more years. To get her out of her agreement, Dorian acknowledges “I shall have to pay something of course” after which time he plans to “take a West end theater and bring her out properly” (Wilde 59).

Dorian’s attitude shows that he has internalized the lessons of his aesthetic mentor, Lord Henry. His love for Sybil stems not from affection for her real personhood but is based on conflating her with her profession. To Dorian, Sybil herself is inseparable from the performances she gives. In his eyes she has no reality beyond the dramatic part she happens to play. As he embraces Lord Henry’s aesthetic teachings, Dorian also falls into their ideological distortions. Confusing Sybil with the roles she plays makes her a purely aesthetic being. She exists only as a work of art. Seeing her in this manner, Dorian has qualified her as a commodity. His desire to free Sybil from the theater troupe shows that Dorian’s plans involve employment rather than romance. He sees her as her job. Dorian wants her to do the same thing she does in the seedy

theater, the only difference being that the environment in which she works will be an improvement over her current situation. Dorian to some degree has an awareness of the exploitation Sybil suffers at the hands of her manager, but because he too objectifies her, he does not see his own contribution to its continuation.

Like Henry, Dorian's idealization of Sybil allows him to ignore the economic foundation of their relationship. Dorian pays scant attention to the fact that he must 'purchase' Sybil from the theater's manager in order to live out his visions for her. He also does not see that he connects to her only through her labor as an actress. This blindness removes both Dorian and Sybil from the cruelty of economic realities that shape their romance. Dorian's vision of the actress qualifies them both for imaginary existences outside of reality. It is an existence of pure beauty above the meanness of labor and the need to earn a livelihood. Dorian's ideological delusion facilitates the foundation of capitalism, the free market. Dorian "act[s] in accordance with the ideological discourse" of the commodity centered view of social relations. He justifies this by allowing himself to see its reality in another way. Dorian sees his relationship as the culmination of his pursuit of beauty. Dorian's inability to see the financial origins of the relationship bolster "the ideological dominance of economic liberalism and individualism" (Ledger and McCracken 7).

In his final encounter with Sybil, Dorian bestows another qualification on her. It has tragic consequences. After the show, Dorian goes backstage to see his fiancé. He is concerned after what he saw as her poor acting during the performance. He finds Sybil exuberant. She is excited at the prospect of their upcoming wedding and the opportunity it provides for her to leave acting for good. Sybil tells Dorian that her love for

him has given her a new grounding in real life. She says “I have grown sick of shadows” (Wilde 90). Dorian flies into a rage. He declares his love is dead, callously informing her that “. . . you don’t even stir my curiosity. You simply produce no effect” (91).

Sybil has chosen the real over the illusory whereas Dorian cannot accept Sybil as a flesh and blood person. The decision she makes marks an attempt to escape the role Dorian has prescribed for her. This threatens Dorian aestheticism and dedication the world of the ideal. He must therefore qualify her for a new role which does not challenge his ideological position. Designated as an ordinary person, she no longer justifies his affections. She becomes, in her material reality, an abstraction. Since Sybil no longer qualifies as an art object, she cannot be incorporated into Dorian’s aesthetic ideal. Consequently, her engagement with reality cannot threaten those ideals. Re-qualifying Sybil as a person beneath notice, Dorian can preserve his own qualification as a pure aesthete. Not engaging with his former fiancé keeps him at an ideological remove from the realities of social class and exploited labor. As Donald Erickson argues: “To Dorian, Sybil exists only as an artist who takes what is ‘coarse and brutal . . . in reality and spiritualizes it in the form of art” (108). No longer able to fill this role due to her decision, Dorian qualifies her as a non-entity and preserves his ideologically pristine outlook.

Oscar Wilde’s novel demonstrates the power inherent in Therborn’s concept of qualification. Its power to grant certification and designate social roles works to effectively facilitate the pre-eminence of the dominant ideology. It blinds those who have the power to qualify from ever becoming aware of their ideological perspectives and roles in enforcing existing class and economic relations.

TOEING THE IDEOLOGICAL LINE IN THOMAS HARDY'S *TESS OF THE D'URBERVILLES*

Therborn does not explicitly discuss the idea of disqualification. But its existence stands to reason in light of his ideas of qualification. Although a person might get designated as competent for a certain role, nothing in that attribution guarantees the permanence of the qualification. As social relations have a great deal of dynamism and change constantly, so, it makes sense that in many cases qualification, once given, can also be revoked.

Competency might get withdrawn for any number reasons. In an industrial environment, it could happen when a machine replaces a worker. The worker loses qualification because they lack the ability to do the task at the same rate as their replacement. Socially, someone can lose qualification and suffer dire consequence for doing so. An individual who loses their qualification as a law abiding citizen can forfeit their freedom or even their life. Similarly a member of the upper class who experiences disgrace or impoverishment loses their competency to maintain their position in the eyes of their peers.

Sometimes disqualification is imposed as a punishment. When this happens, it can catastrophically impact the life of the person punished. They can receive public humiliation or become an outcast. For the person or people doing the qualification, its imposition can reinforce their power. A church for instance that excommunicates a congregant does so to remind the person and others in the institution that it has ultimate control. So, while Therborn does not specifically discuss disqualification, he does say

that: “The material matrix of any ideology can be analysed as operating through affirmations and sanctions . . .” (34).

Thomas Hardy spins a tragic tale in his novel *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. Its main character, Tess, finds herself oppressed at every turn. When he finds a potential kinship with a local family believed to come from nobility, Tess’s lazy father sends her to seek money from the newly discovered relations. From that point on, Tess’s life spirals downward. She ends up pregnant as a result of a rape, gets abandoned by her one true love and works a series of brutal jobs to support herself. Tess’s story ends when she kills her rapist and gets hanged as a result.

Tess of the D’Urbervilles illustrates the power of disqualification. The process repeatedly gets used to enforce class positions. It provides a tool through which class boundaries can be rigidly enforced. Disqualification works to prevent upward and facilitate downward inter-class mobility. Sometimes an individual is kept in their lower class position by not being deemed qualified for a given role. In other instances, a person is identified as unqualified and suffers a loss of status as a result.

Disqualification is an effective social punishment. Its specific applications vary widely however. Disqualification has a variety of temporal and physical manifestations. It can be permanent, stripping the punished individual of a desirable social position for their entire lives. For lesser offenses, the sanction might last only moments. In such cases it can be removed almost as quickly as it was imposed. Regardless of disqualification’s existence across time or degree of severity, it always serves the same

function, either telling someone where they should be in terms of a social position, or putting them there when they wander from their assigned roles.

The world of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* has very rigid class boundaries. Each character is aware of their place in society. Both those who are oppressed by the boundaries as well as those who benefit from them have no doubts about social parameters. Preservation of these boundaries is a task of great ideological importance while crossing class lines puts the whole social and economic system in jeopardy. For people at both ends of the class spectrum, such a possibility is unthinkable. The wealthy feel a threat to their wealth and privilege while those at the lower end of the hierarchy fear the violation of class boundaries because they know that those in the working class who cross those lines will receive swift social punishment.

An early example of disqualification appears in the novel's opening scenes. Tess and her friends enjoy an outdoor dance. Neither Tess nor most of her friends have male partners with whom to dance though. Three travelling college students happen by. One of the students, Angel, asks his companions to stop and have a dance with the girls. His friends decline, fearing embarrassment. The fear arises from the possibility that engaging with the girls would disqualify the college students from their superior social status. One of Angel's friends says as much. When asked to stay behind and enjoy the company of Tess and her girlfriends, he replies in disgust saying that he cannot get caught "[d]ancing in public with a troop of country hoydens—suppose we should be seen!" (Hardy 11). By making his statement, Angel's friend disqualifies himself from the girls' social class. He makes it clear that the mingling of the two groups violates propriety, specifically to the social detriment of himself, Angel and the third person with

them. Disqualifying himself means that Angel's friend asserts his lack of desire to fill the role of the girls' social or dance partners. In this context though, lack of the required skills is not seen as a deficiency by the man. For Angel's friend, the missing competency provides a badge of honor in terms of his social class. It assures him that he occupies a higher status than Tess and her companions.

Not only does Angel's friend disqualify himself from equality with the girls, he disqualifies them from acquiring or matching his social status. He mentions to Angel that ". . . we must get through another chapter of *A Counterblast to Agnosticism* before we turn in . . . "(Hardy 11). The declaration draws a clear class divide. The book's intellectual-sounding title connotes affiliation with the university and his training for the exclusively male priesthood. For someone like Tess, higher education would be the exclusive domain of the wealthy male elite. Angel's friend, by talking about their required reading, identifies himself a member of that elite. He does have the necessary competencies to fill the social role of dance partner because of his certification. This reinforces the fact that the country girls lack the same qualifications. The statement of Angel's travelling companion establishes clear lines of class power and privilege that neither he nor the girls can cross.

Angel however chooses to remain behind, receiving a temporary disqualification as a result. Angel's friends clearly have a strong class consciousness. To them the impossibility of classes intermingling at a country dance appears obvious. Angel's participation in the event though indicates to his friends that he no longer has the competence to hold himself as their equal. The two college students impose the penalty on Angel by resuming their trip. They leave Angel behind to catch up later. When

Angel's friends continue their journey, it serves as a mild sanction for him. Resuming their trip and leaving Angel with Tess denies him their companionship. For the moment, he is disqualified as their equal. The disqualification, while brief and mild, is clearly spelled out. Angel's choice to fraternize with those beneath him on the class scale deprives him of equal status in the eyes of his friends and violates their class based "rigid categorization of good and bad behavior" (Chapman 142).

Disqualification and its effects become more serious later in the novel's narrative. When, at the behest of her father, Tess visits the home of the d'Urbervilles, whom her father believes to be distant but wealthy relations, she meets Alec. He is taken by Tess' appearance but does not really care for her. He manipulates and flatters her, never coming clean about the fact that the two families share no connection at all. Alec simply wants to seduce Tess and so views her as no more than a potential conquest. When Tess departs for home after meeting Alec for the first time, he laughs at her, saying to himself that Tess is a "crumby girl" (Hardy 39). Alec's evaluation disqualifies Tess as a social equal. He has a clear awareness of the class differences between him and Tess. He makes it known when first meeting her. When Tess declares they come from the same family, Alec blurts out "Ho! Poor relations?" (Hardy 35). He has immediately established the difference between himself and Tess. He has money and she does not. Whether the two actually share kinships becomes irrelevant at this moment. No matter whom Tess turns out to be, Alec has identified her by her poverty. His declaration, especially in the context of the clear material wealth he enjoys shows Tess that she does not share Alec's importance or wealth. Having these things give competence to

earn equality with Alec. Since Tess has neither, she can never rise to Alec's status level.

More tragically, Alec's view of Tess as his inferior leads to his disqualification of her basic humanity. From the very beginning of their relationship, Alec objectifies Tess. He makes her a passive recipient of his largesse. As they walk around the Durbeyfield grounds, Alec heaps flowers and fruit on her. Hardy writes: "When she could consume no more of the strawberries, he filled her little basket with them. . . .he gathered blossoms . . . and when she could affix no more, he himself tucked a bud or two into her hat and heaped her basket with others in the prodigality of his bounty" (37). Alec's actions may have the appearance of generosity, whereas they really signify the process of stripping Tess of her personhood.

When Alec piles on the fruits and flowers beyond Tess's capacity to hold them, he denies her ability to make choices. During their walk, it is Alec who decides how much is enough, no matter what Tess might want. Preventing Tess from having control over her life, even in such a trivial interaction takes from her one of the most basic human qualities, free will. Alec does not allow her to exercise it and when she tries to, he does not respect it. She becomes little more than something on which to hang ornamentation. Alec's bending of Tess to his will takes away her competence to be human. In his eyes, Tess's "individual life seems secondary . . ." and therefore of no real significance (Mallett 168).

Virtually every interaction Tess and Alec share after their initial meeting serves as a reminder of Tess's lack of class competence. These reminders increase in brutality

each time. After one meeting, Alec offers to drive Tess home in his carriage. As they come to a hill, Alec intentionally tries to scare Tess by feigning the wagon and horses losing control on their descent. Tess becomes terrified. The incident finally comes to an end and Alec asks Tess to kiss him. When she refuses, he kisses her anyway. In shock, Tess reflexively wipes her face where he kissed her. Incensed, Alec says: “[y]ou are mighty sensitive for a cottage girl” (Hardy 51).

Like the college student at the book’s beginning, Alec reacts in embarrassment. Tess has rebuffed him and in his eyes should receive punishment for doing so. He issues the penalty in his statement. It explicitly reveals the truth of class relations and where Alec and Tess stand in that hierarchy. Alec’s disqualification of Tess as an equal is made forceful in his outburst. He effectively puts her in her place of social inferiority. Reminding Tess of her lower class role further disqualifies her humanity. Alec once again deems her desires and wants irrelevant. He makes clear that as his social inferior she is allowed no compunctions about his advances. Instead, since she has become disqualified as a human being, the only competence she has is as Alec’s plaything.

Disqualification as a punishment not only works vertically from one class to another; it also gets administered horizontally among members of the same class and takes the form of “extremity and violence” (Boumelha139). Tess experiences this first-hand one night while walking home when she falls in among farm workers who are also heading home after a day’s work in the fields. The women coming out of the farms are a rough lot. They tease one another mercilessly and laugh when one of them spill syrup on herself, ruining her dress. In an attempt to escape the mockery of her companions,

she flees into a field and rolls on the ground in order to try and remove the treacle that covers her. At the sight, her fellow farm workers erupt in hoots of laughter.

Without realizing it, Tess finds herself joining in with others, making fun of the girl's gyrations. When the victim of the teasing hears Tess laughing, she becomes enraged. She attacks Tess for spending time with Alec. The angry woman says that Tess sees herself as better than the other women "because th' beest first favorite with He just now" (Hardy 65). The women Tess comes across on her way home share her class position. They all have in common a rugged rural existence that depends on agriculture. Yet, the humiliated woman attacks Tess for her connection to Alec. Spending time with the son of a socially prominent family violates class expectations on both ends of the social spectrum. Alec punishes Tess's transgression by reminding her of her inferiority. For her fellow members of the working class, the relationship is seen no less favorably. What Tess has done in associating with Alec, even though she lacks romantic interest in him, violates what her social equals see as the natural order. The woman's statement indicates that she believes Alec to lack genuine affection for Tess. She also thinks that he will soon tire of Tess, only to move on to another local girl. At the same time, she seems to see some type of justice in this outcome. Pointing out this fact becomes for Tess a disqualification from her own social group.

The attack by the farm worker carries with it the implication that Tess has done wrong by trying to carry on a relationship with someone from a higher social position. By doing this, Tess has not done what was expected of her and others from her economic and social background. She has violated the expectations of her class and so deserves punishment by getting stripped of competency to hold membership in the working class.

The caustic attack on her relationship with Alec shows that her attempt to cross social boundaries deviated from acceptable standards of behavior. Consequently she must lose her credentials as a true member of the rural proletariat. Tess's perceived violation brings the threat of a punishment more severe than simple embarrassment. She is threatened with a beating for wrong-doing.

Class boundaries remain strong thanks to the round condemnation of Tess by her peers. All of the women involved in the incident suffer the oppression of the rigid capitalist class system. But even as its victims, they are still tasked with its enforcement. Being perceived as moving beyond her assigned class alerts those around Tess that the class structure as a whole is in danger. To preserve it, social mobility must be stopped. Alec stops it by reminding Tess of her inferiority. The women on the road do it by mocking the very possibility of such a cross-class relationship existing at all. For Tess the pressure from both ends of the class divide does its job. She gets disqualified from the realm of the wealthy and powerful and cannot find solace by simply resuming her regular class position. Her equals also deride Tess's attempt to cross class boundaries by disqualifying her to hold a place with them. The double disqualification places Tess in a new, quite undesirable role, that of someone who lacks any firm social existence at all.

When Tess gives birth to her child by Alec, she decides to go back to work in the fields. She brings her baby with her, and one day while feeding it, some women that work with her observe Tess and comment on her situation. They express pity for her and acknowledge her rape at the hands of Alec. One of the women indicates that had Alec been discovered in the act it might have "gone hard . . . if folks had come along"

(Hardy 90). This comment suggests the radical possibility of vigilante justice. But soon enough, attention gets diverted to the specifics of Tess's situation as the women discuss her individual suffering. Studiously avoided is an elaboration of how Tess's circumstances resulted from class affiliations. Keeping their attention away from the larger context that led to Tess's troubles disqualifies her from connectedness. If the women talking about Tess were to acknowledge and explore how both Tess's and their own social situation played into the tragedy, the dominant ideology would be laid bare. Framing Tess as an isolated individual though keeps these considerations at bay. As long as Tess lacks the qualification to be seen as part of an organic, social whole, she becomes the target of specific concern and pity. As such, her existence serves to quash potentially revolutionary thinking. Kind attention directed at Tess's sad situation makes sure that such dangerous thinking "never expresses itself in unregulated form" (Nemesvari 96). The larger ideological significance of Tess's life stays invisible. The class structure remains intact and any challenge to its existence is deferred.

Later in the book, Tess takes work on a dairy farm. There she becomes friends with a number of girls her own age. They all work on the farm during the day and sleep in a common room at night. Before they go to sleep, the young women gossip avidly. Angel Clare, the farm owner's son, is the frequent subject of their conversation. Tess and her co-workers adore him and imagine one day marrying him. They all know though that such thoughts are mere fantasy.

During one such discussion, talk turns to whom Angel might really marry. One of the girls comes to the conclusion that he will inevitably end up getting married to "a young lady of his own rank, chosen by his family" and Tess and the others have no

chance at winning his love (Hardy 148).The girls' conversation provides another example of how disqualification can work horizontally within a class as well as vertically along the class structure. Tess and the other girls share affection for each other and fit the standards for a primary group.

In instances like the conversation about Angel, the intimate bonds can serve as a mechanism for ideological disqualification. When discussing marriage to Angel, the women draw a clear line between fantasy and reality. They understand the fact of class existence and the difficulties of escaping it. Stating that Angel will not really marry any of them but rather a social equal shows that Tess and her friends at the dairy farm acknowledge and accept their status as the inferiors of Angel and his family. The acceptance leads to a self-disqualification. Everyone in the conversation realizes that they lack the social competence required to marry the man they all feel such an attraction for. In the end, they settle without resistance into their assigned economic and social positions. The girls come to understand that there disqualification means that all their talk is "a delusive process based on a subjective dream" (Irwin 126). Disqualification in this example has a decidedly softer edge than some of its other applications in the book. It proves no less effective though. The women at the dairy farm understand that they can never really be Angel Clare's spouse because they do not meet the ideological requirements of class position. The social structure and its constituent relations remain intact. Although social sanctions for Tess and the others has been administered without hostility, the effective social mechanism of disqualification has again been performed clinically.

The tragic life Tess leads in Hardy's novel provides a good illustration of how disqualification can be applied to preserving class relations. Repeatedly she finds herself excluded from the upper classes and even from humanity itself. While many of the acts that disqualify her serve a penal role for Tess's perceived violation of ideological role assignments, not all of the instances of disqualification are done with the intention of punishing her. Whatever intent lies behind an act of disqualification though, they always have a negative impact on Tess's life. Because of being subject to numerous acts that end up placing her in the final role of wife to her rapist, she loses control and murders Alec. This results in book's heart-rending final scene. In it Angel and Tess's sister Liza Lu, wait together atop a hill above the prison where Tess is executed for the murder of Alec. In the end, Tess has suffered the ultimate qualification. Her one decisive act of rebellion has deemed her unfit to live. She is deprived of every role and the rigid social structure that oppressed her goes on handing out sanctions for those who violate its boundaries.

Primary groups exert a powerful influence over their members. The bonds within them can have a strong pull, capable of shaping behaviors and attitudes. Close connections provide a mechanism thorough which the dominant ideology gains power since their intimacy works to ensure that ideology permeates the most intimate spheres of life.

Strong emotional ties do not represent the only influential, informal relationships people participate in outside those of marriage and family. Individuals interact in other significant contexts. One of these is work. Bonds formed in the context of labor act differently than those based on affection and mutual care. They act to shape individual

subjectivity to conform to the dominant ideology. The following chapter delves into how professional relationships accomplish this.

CHAPTER TWO

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AS IDEOLOGICAL AGENTS

INTRODUCTION

Professional associations have a wide variety of structures. They range from the rigid and formalized to the unstructured and casual. Neighbors, for example, who help one of their fellows with a building project may not have a formal hierarchy. But one inevitably forms with some participants taking on leadership roles and others creating a division of labor where each person does tasks for which they have the most skill. This same concept applies equally to the employee of a large corporation. In that environment, job titles and expectations duties are made quite clear. Despite the differences though, both instances fit well into Merton's concept. He says that to qualify for the definition of professional association, ". . . it is not so much its structure as its functions which distinguish the professional organization" ("Functions", 199). The neighborly gathering and workers at a big company both meet this standard.

Another trait of the professional association in Merton's conception is that the group does an important task for workers in the organization. It provides "social and moral support to help them perform their roles" (Merton, "Functions", 202). Thus social relationships formed in the group have a supportive, but not necessarily an emotional quality. Another result of possessing this characteristic is that often connections may result from either the desire to find motivation for one's work or to give motivation to a group member who does not fulfill their obligations. For the groups looked at in this chapter, this trait holds true. However, Merton's definition provides a necessary

adaptability. Nowhere in his theory does he declare the support to be a universal positive. It can reasonably be assumed that the support he describes can take many forms. Rewards may indeed be one of them, but support can also come from punishment or pressure as well. Both provide support in that they assist the worker who finds themselves the beneficiary of a reward or the unfortunate subject of punishment as a means of encouraging them to desire an improved performance.

While professional associations function to bring people together on the basis of a shared work life, like other social groups, they have a definite ideological function too. They serve to make individual subjectivities conform to the dominant ideology by entering the external, social world. Through professional associations, internal, personal experiences and impressions get regularized to conform to the prevailing ideology's view of the world. In this way ideology can shape the individual consciousness and impose on individuals approved modes of understanding themselves and their social world.

Such Ideological impositions are important because they control the chaotic nature of subjectivity that provide individuals with the freedom to interpret life in any way they chose. The fragmentation of society into an infinite number of unique interiorities, each completely locked within its own consciousness, would mean that individuals would become ideologically unreachable and make social existence impossible. In turn, capitalism would be untenable because the social relations that sustain it would never arise. Ideology, therefore, always works toward the end of gaining control over the anarchic aspects of the socially positioned individual.

Theorist Raymond Williams developed a description of precisely how the process works. His concept of ‘Structures of Feeling’ stands in sharp contrast to Althusser’s theories of the ‘apparatus’ which offers a perspective on the institutional rather than the personal which is Williams’ domain. Williams describes how ideology operates in “the specificity of present being” (*Marxism* 128). The structure of feeling illuminates those areas of life that “escape from the fixed and explicit and the known” and which form subjectivity (128). These subjectivities offer up a disorganized picture because much of their content lacks clarity and articulation.

One place where an escape from the dominant ideology would seem possible is personal subjectivity. The interior experiences of immediate perception and emotion appear to lie beyond the reach of ideological apparatuses, both formal and informal. Unchecked subjectivity would pose a threat to the dominant ideology since unfiltered, immediate perception raises the possibility of seeing the contradictions of life under in a capitalist society.

Such potential defiance must be quashed, a task that the dominant ideology performs through what Raymond Williams terms the ‘structure of feeling’. Through the structure, ideology gains control of the individual consciousness. It acts through everyday life “lived specifically and definitely, in singular and developing forms” and uses daily experiences to normalize perception in line with ideological dictates (*Marxism* 129). The structure of feeling prevents excessive interiority by forcing the subjective into the social sphere. Perceptions of inconsistency between consciousness and socio-economic inequalities gets normalized as the individual is brought inescapably under the control of the ruling ideology.

Other important concepts developed by Williams are the ideas of practical and official consciousness. Practical consciousness is a direct, lived consciousness. Official consciousness is the ideologically prescribed mode of understanding. For example, a worker goes to work every day and talks to his co-workers. From them he hears the difficulties they face. The worker understands their position because he shares their living conditions and likely has many of the same experiences as his colleagues. He knows from direct experience the oppression that he and other workers live under. This knowledge would constitute the worker's practical consciousness.

The worker's realization that he and his fellows suffer exploitation poses a danger to the capitalist system. Awareness, if developed, could lead to a break from not only the official consciousness but the entire system of capitalism. If the worker's immediate perception is allowed to be his guide, revolution could result. Dominant ideology steps in in such a situation and reshapes the initial comprehension of oppressive working conditions. Its intervention might take the form of a labor union. A union ostensibly represents the workers and empowers them in negotiating with owners and managers. As such, they represent a powerful advocacy for workers' rights. However, the union also prevents the possibility of revolution by operating in line with the dominant ideology. While unions advocate for change, they do so through accepted institutions already in place under capitalism. This understanding makes it appear as though significant change can be effected through reform rather than revolution. Initial perceptions of oppression get replaced by the view that the workers' status can improve through the existing political and economic structures of capitalism. As a result,

evolutionary fervor is transformed into attempts at incremental reform, allowing the fundamental relations of capitalism protected and unchanged.

Victorian novels offer a number of good examples that illustrate the workings of the structure of feeling. Many have labor as one of their central themes. In this chapter's selections, work gets done in diverse settings, ranging from factories that employ thousands to intimate domestic spaces. However, the contexts in which labor takes place make little difference in the works looked at here. Regardless of specific circumstances, the structure of feeling accomplishes its goal through professional associations. In this respect, the variety of specific settings for labor serves only to illustrate the ubiquity of the structure of feeling.

Each novel explores a different way in which ideological dominance manipulate and order structures of feeling of individual subjects. Sometimes the method employs subtle means, infiltrating the consciousness of those it targets by way of brief remarks or casual observations. The individual shaped by these less overt means often fall under the sway of the dominant ideology without realizing it. They have internalized the viewpoint of the prevailing system so thoroughly that they can no longer distinguish it from their own perspectives. Other ways of exerting ideological power take more overt forms. These methods leave no doubt when they are used. The subject has a clear awareness of the process.

Elizabeth Gaskell's novel *Mary Barton* takes place in the industrial town of Manchester. The characters' live center around their work in a textile mill. Families at the center of the book's plot live in destructive cycles of intense brutal labor, followed by periods of unemployment and near starvation. Naturally, these conditions lead to labor

discontentment and agitation. Structures of feeling work in Gaskell's book through voicing the militant frustration of workers and from it create attitudes more amenable to the interests of the city's capitalist mill owners. Throughout the novel, resentment and frustration get transformed through the structure of feeling into ideologies of 'duty' and a 'strong work ethic'. As result of the structure's operations, workers never really organize or defy the factory owners. Instead they remain in their assigned roles as subservient labor.

In *Hard Times*, Charles Dickens paints a portrait of an industrial world where focus on the practical outweighs all other considerations. Training workers to accept their allotted roles takes on a more overt form than it does in *Mary Barton*. In Coketown, every institution is dedicated to forcing workers to become cogs in the wheel of industrialism. In Dickens' novel, the structure of feeling works to annihilate subjectivity altogether. Those in the city's power structure make every effort to eliminate the emotional experience of workers. Dissent is managed because lived experience becomes secondary to that which is useful. Potentially dangerous understandings of the world get eliminated altogether so that they end up posing no threat all.

Villette tells the story of Lucy Snowe and her work as a governess and teacher. Her labor stands in sharp contrast to that portrayed by Dickens and Gaskell. Lucy's work environments are small and intimate. They usually get acted out in domestic or academic environments. Labor relations and industrialization have no relevance to Lucy's work life. Instead, Charlotte Brönte's novel demonstrates how structures of feeling take the subjective and personal, and orient it to the public and social. In the book Lucy feels many strong emotions and expresses many personal perceptions of the

world around her. The structure of feeling effectively manages these aspects of Lucy's private world by ensuring that her interior life is forcefully oriented to the social sphere. As a result, her feelings get channeled into a sense of social obligation and acquiescence to social institutions.

Ann Brönte's *Agnes Grey* portrays the life of a governess. The title character finds herself repeatedly subjected to various indignities and frustrations. In her work role, Agnes's life is ambiguous. Since she lives with the family for whom she works, she must constantly find a balance between her personal feelings and her designated ideological place. What Agnes goes through illustrates the difference between what Williams terms 'practical consciousness' and 'official consciousness'. Agnes's practical consciousness reminds her continuously of the realities of class division and exploitation. Official consciousness regulates these understandings though by forcing on Agnes an approved understanding of her situation and by sowing doubt about her own perspectives on the world. As a result, Agnes gravitates more toward the ideologically acceptable narratives of her life and downplays the relevance of her own explanations.

In whichever setting structures of feeling operate, industrial or domestic, the purpose is always the same. The structures always work toward the goal of gaining control over the personal and immediate. Structures of feeling minimize the danger that subjectivity poses to the dominant ideology and its power structures by taking the infinite variability of the personal and private and transforming it into an official, accepted version of the world and its meaning.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN *MARY BARTON*

Elizabeth Gaskell's novel *Mary Barton* paints a bleak portrait of working class life in Manchester. At the center of the plot is the title character. She becomes acutely aware of worker exploitation and class boundaries as she finds herself confronted by a steady stream of tragedy. Her mother dies in child birth. Her father becomes radicalized and disillusioned and is driven to murder a mill owner's son, crime for which Mary must prove her true love, Jem innocent. Mary's story concludes on an ambiguous note, with her and a recently acquitted Jem heading for better opportunities in Canada.

Economic life in Manchester centers on the production of textiles. For both the mill workers and mill owners the quality of life rests on the successful production and sale of textiles. When the mill operates at peak capacity, work is readily available. The factory operates twenty-four hours a day and shifts are lengthy. When the textile market experiences a downturn, work slows down or stops altogether. Workers do not get paid and they inevitably slide toward starvation. To deal with their problems the workers forge tight personal bonds. *Mary Barton* describes how neighbors frequently come together to render care for a sick co-worker or provide financial assistance in times of crushing poverty. This means that the novel has a great number of primary relationships. The Barton and Wilson families are examples of this. They are neighbors who also share deep emotional bonds. The two families care genuinely for one another. They spend their time off together and the Barton's daughter Mary ends up marrying the Wilson's son, Jem.

Workers in the novel must not only contend with the volatile cycles of the market, they must also deal with appalling living conditions. Even in the best of times, work in the mill yields little pay. Its employees can only afford the most basic of housing, making do by having to reside in crowded slums. Whatever state the market happens to be in, the living conditions remain constant. Disease and dangerously unsanitary conditions pose daily dangers.

The poor conditions in the novel are ripe for revolutionary action. But real dissent never happens. While occasional, individual acts of resistance take place, they come to naught. Revolution is not prevented through the actions of any Repressive State Apparatus and institutions like the police and courts system rarely appear in the narrative. Nonetheless, the characters readily submit to their circumstances. They accept the harsh realities of their existence as inevitable and make little effort to change them.

What keeps individuals in line in *Mary Barton* is their perception of the world around them. Perception of the inequalities and impoverishment of their lives gets filtered through the structure of feeling which normalizes even the most unjust conditions. In this way, the dominant ideology permeates the subjectivity of lived experience. When the brutalities of life become normalized for their victims, they lose any motivation to criticize or alter them. Consequently, the threat of revolutionary change is blunted.

Early in the book, an incident occurs which illustrates the power of the structure of feeling to overcome the ugliness of real conditions. When John Barton's wife goes

into labor, he flies into a panic when the situation begins to deteriorate. John hurries to get a doctor to tend to the senior Mary. When he and the physician arrive back at the Barton home, it is too late. The doctor declares Mrs. Barton dead. He breaks the news to John telling him “This is a great shock, but bear it like a man” and leaves without further interaction (Gaskell, *Mary Barton* 20). Naturally crushed by the death of his wife, John Barton does not give his full attention to the doctor’s parting words. Gaskell describes the doctor’s message as falling on “unheeding ears, which yet retained his words to ponder on; words not for immediate use in conveying sense, but to be laid by, in the store-house of memory” but absorbed by John Barton just the same (*Mary Barton* 21). The brief encounter between the physician and John Barton makes use of the structure of feeling to prevent the passionate emotions of the new widower from running over and creating real dissent.

The doctor’s parting advice for Barton, urging him not to get too emotional, shows that the structure of feeling has intervened in their relationship. Barton absorbs what the doctor tells him, even in the throes of intense grief. His intense feelings prevent him from critically analyzing the larger context that lead to his wife’s death. As Gaskell points out though, there will come a time when the intense emotions subside and allow for clearer reflection on the event.

In urging the stoic approach, the doctor has set the groundwork for the structure of feeling to later re-frame Barton’s personal tragedy. This effectively keeps focus away from the external and social reasons for his wife’s demise. The tragedy becomes a personal event that needs no larger explanation. If restraining his grief, John cannot provide an example for others. Were John to suffer publicly, he would illustrate the

terrible conditions shared by all the mill workers. Listening to the doctor's advice allows John to achieve "a separation of the social from the personal" he never gains a clear insight into the larger social context in which he lives (Williams, *Marxism 128*). Because John's pain takes "an inward turn away from social representation" it makes Mrs. Barton's death a highly individualized experience for her family (Matus 28).

Another situation with strong emotional potential occurs later in the book. Mary, on her way back home from her job as a seamstress encounters her good friend Margaret. Margaret mentions that she must complete a set of dresses for a funeral the next day. Mary invites her to her house and offers to help complete the project. While working, the girls discuss several things related to the upcoming funeral of an acquaintance who died recently. Margaret mentions that the dead man drank himself to death and left his wife with a shop and a large number of children to tend to. Margaret further expresses doubt about the need for mourning clothes, saying that ". . . if what the Bible tells us be true, we ought not to be sorry when a friend, who's been good, goes to his rest; and as for a bad man, one's glad enough to get shut on him" (Gaskell, *Mary Barton* 47).

The girls' conversation provides another example of how the structure of feeling serve to stifle feelings that threaten the economic and social structure. Margaret' statement specifically has a considerable amount of ideological content that shows potential dissent. Ultimately though, these dangers are extinguished by instilling proper attitudes toward work and labor conditions for the poor. First, the fact that the man who has died drank himself to death gets mentioned alone. Margaret mentions nothing of the larger social conditions that could have led to such a fate. Explanation for his death

relies on “recognition of . . . independent individuals” rather than larger social contexts (Stoneman 136). Adopting this view then makes the shopkeeper’s death a matter of personal responsibility. While Margaret does talk briefly about the economic situation of the bereaved family, she and Mary continue to question his character as their conversation continues.

Margaret also makes mention of religion and its beliefs in an afterlife. She says that anyone who has lived a good life will go to heaven. Again, she places an emphasis on the individual over the social. Talking about the life after death shows that Margaret believes in the concept of a soul. This indicates that she is at least familiar with the doctrines of the Church. The concept of the soul further bolsters the focus on the individual over the social. For Margaret, such a view explains the circumstances of the man’s death but does so in spiritual terms. The death and possible after life of the man who has died keeps attention strictly at the level of the individual. Feelings of grief then cannot look at material reality and contexts to explain the loss. Instead, the emotions the girls feel as it relates to mourning and death center on grief and concern for the dead person and his bereaved family. Margaret and Mary explain the sad situation in terms of “formations and traditions” rather than through a critical examination of their social situations (Williams, *Marxism* 130). The mention of religion transposes inquiry into the larger social whole with a spiritual focus on piety while the institution of the Church obstructs a clear view of Mary and Margaret’s real lives. As physical death is minimized in light of eternal reward, consequently, the real end of life is of little importance and does not warrant scrutiny.

Another way in which the girls have their emotions channeled through structures of feeling is by reducing the expense of a funeral to the sole focus of consideration. Margaret observes that mourning wear "costs a deal of money when people can spare it least" (Gaskell, *Mary Barton* 46-47). Like the doctor who attended the elder Mary Barton's death, Margaret's statement depersonalizes and strips emotional connotations from the work they are engaged in. Margaret initially demonstrates an understanding of the emotional aspects of grief and mourning. Pushed further, that understanding could lead to investigation of the larger social picture surrounding the shop keeper's death. Her feelings however quickly get changed and she begins to perceive the death in strictly monetary terms. The event becomes entirely impersonal and abstract. It does not consider the messiness of economic conditions and how they contribute to alcoholism and family devastation. Focus has now turned to the indifferent exchange at the root of the work they are doing.

The talk of religion happens after Margaret comments on the cost of the funeral and mourning wear. The talk and framing of the event in terms of religious ideology keeps their mind off of the economic nature of the work. Margaret and Mary are involved in the economic ramifications of the shop keeper's death. Of course they have no choice but to be. Their families barely make ends meet and the money they will earn for their work will be very valuable. There are no options but to participate in the market and profit from their work. The girls must depersonalize the realities of impoverished death and view the event simply as a financial transaction, devoid of feelings or personal attachment. Depersonalizing the death shows the imposition of the structure of feeling on them too. To acknowledge that they must dehumanize themselves and their

client, would lead to the realization that the economic system under which they labor makes its participants less than human and distorts true interpersonal relationships. The structure of feelings keeps such perceptions at bay and changes the sewing into an act of pure economy without any personal element present. It turns their attention away from “the ideological conflict at the heart of ideas of social class “(Allen 31).

After the death of his wife, emotional trauma continues to torment John Barton. When he and his friend, George Wilson, tend to the needs of a sick co-worker, Davenport, during a break in administering care, the conversation turns to economics. John Barton has had a political awakening. He explains to Wilson the economic nature of their lives as workers. He talks about exploitation and the workers’ abuse at the hands of the mill owners. George Wilson retorts that he had spoken with the mill owner, Mr. Carson who explained to Wilson that due to a recent fire, expenses would have to be cut. The cuts will naturally affect the workers. Yet Wilson justifies what the mill owner told him and points out to Barton that despite how things may seem, the “masters suffer too” so tough conditions must be endured (Gaskell, *Mary Barton* 66).

Wilson’s statement is an attempt to subsume Barton’s revolutionary talk under a more appropriate topic of conversation. It shows that Wilson’s feelings have gotten caught up in the structure of feelings as well. The opposite mechanism works here from that experienced by Mary and Margaret when they had to control their emotions. Instead of depersonalizing an event or situation, the structure here personalizes and creates empathy for the economic situation. Hence for Wilson, who has just heard John Barton offer a critical analysis of the society and economy in which they live, the structure of feeling causes him to disregard what John has told him. John’s talk has

focused on the larger picture of the economy as a whole. It is abstract and George Wilson himself admits that he cannot really understand what John says. If George Wilson were to engage the ideas John Barton shares with him, his perspective would become more global, enabling him to see the totality of their lives in Manchester. However, the structure of feeling prevents this from happening. The immediate experience Wilson has of hearing John Barton's economic lesson causes him to refer to the realm of the specific and personal for an explanation of how things work. Carson's explanation of cutting costs makes sense to him because he falls back on empathy to understand it. He feels sorry for the managers as well as the workers rather than just the latter. Ideology is most effective here when it causes an individual to invest in the emotional plight of the other, even if they are at the opposite end of the capitalist scale. Suffering could, as it has for John Barton, lead to an analysis of what causes it. This view puts the capitalist system under subversive scrutiny. To avoid this, the feelings structure caused George to see his conversation with Carson in broadly humanist terms. From this perspective, hard times cannot be explained by abstract economic theorems. It can only be explained on the personal level. Economics has no bearing on the situation from such a view. An abstract belief in universal humanity guides Wilson to what he believes to be a correct conclusion. To him, ". . . the doctrine of the individual [is] the soul of industrial culture" (Childers 80). Wilson makes suffering very personal in response to John Barton's economics lecture. By rendering worker/boss relations as personal phenomena, it needs no larger, social explanation. The emphasis Wilson places on the difficulties experienced by the mill owner gives him a personal anecdote to explain the way things are. Effectively this reduces the incident from being a result of

the larger social system to being simply a matter of individual experience. This is similar to when the doctor told John Barton to take his wife's death "like a man" because such terrible events simply happen. The structure of feeling imposes a similar understanding on Wilson. Suffering is a strictly personal and private matter. It requires no further explanation than that and therefore none will be sought by George Wilson.

Another effect the structure of feelings generates is that it has made George Wilson a spokesman for the company. Urging sympathy for Carson equates to sympathy for the company they work for. Carson owns the company and represents it. As a spokesman, Wilson's message could not be more counter-revolutionary. The proper feelings that Wilson expresses makes the company that exploits both him and Barton into an essentially human figure. If Carson and therefore the company suffer it is worthy of sympathy too. The company loses its status as institution through the work of the structure of feelings and then cannot then get blamed for its exploitative ways. It is seen simply as a fellow sufferer along with those it employs.

Eventually, John Barton begins to transform his political passions and understandings into real actions. When the Chartist Convention convenes in London, Barton is elected to represent the workers of Manchester. He and his fellow workers see in the appointment the chance to gain more political rights. Barton feels good about the chance to represent the interests of the workers. He has great hope that the trip to London and attendance at the convention will lead to significant changes in his and the other workers' conditions. As Gaskell writes: ". . . there was the really pure gladness of heart arising from the idea that he was one of those chosen to be instruments in making know the distresses of the people, and consequently in procuring them some grand

relief, by means of which they should never suffer want or care anymore" (*Mary Barton* 86).

When he gets his appointment to attend the convention, John Barton has become quite angry. Circumstances have weighed heavily on him. He has seen others suffer unemployment, starvation and death from disease. His consciousness has largely been transformed into a revolutionary one. In the chance to solicit more rights for workers, he sees the real possibility of change and hope for a better future.

However, the structure of feeling works to re-direct Barton's political rage. Once chosen by his fellow workers to act as their representative, he engages the existing political system to secure the change they desire. Anger changes into hope and belief in the possibility of substantial change. Ironically however, this transformation actually alters his dangerous, revolutionary thinking into an acceptance of the status quo.

The feeling of hope feeds into the dominant ideology. Hope, as felt by John Barton and the others, is an abstraction. It keeps the eyes of the workers constantly on the future and its possibilities while accepting their current conditions. Even if the workers intensely dislike their circumstances, raising the faintest possibility of changing them will make circumstance more endurable in the present.

John succumbs to just such a hope. He imagines that his visit to the capital will effect a transformation in his life and those of the other workers in Manchester. Hope checks his descent into completely revolutionary thinking or agitation. His action can now be addressed to the political system and the securing of piecemeal reforms. Overturning the existing system of relations is forestalled as a result and the

revolutionary is effectively folded into the system. John Barton's radicalism has been "contained, sublimated, and redirected toward a socially acceptable goal" which effectively negates its revolutionary potential (Armstrong 8). Attached to political hope is trust in the efficacy of the political system. Politics as a mode of change gets reaffirmed and social upheaval is forestalled. The structure of feeling has made John Barton have an acceptable attitude toward the society he lives in.

Hope appears again toward the end of *Mary Barton*. Manchester's mill owners agree to negotiate with the workers. Prior to the arrival of the workers' representatives and their list of demands, the owners talk about the labor situation. They discuss how in a nearby town a worker defied striking workers and agreed to work for a very low wage. As a consequence, one of the striking workers beat him senseless. Upon hearing the story, the mill owners express outrage. They express their sympathy toward the injured worker and anger at the strikers. The event becomes justification for not yielding to any of the workers' demands. As one of the owners states: ". . . they're more like wild beasts than human beings" (Gaskell, *Mary Barton* 182).

In their meeting, the mill owners' understanding of the situation shows how the structure of feeling affects all relations in the capitalist system. Were the owners to perceive the workers' situation as well as their own in the larger social context in which it unfolds, they may have come to a different understanding of their own power and roles as capitalists. However, a true understanding such as this jeopardizes the longevity of hierarchical relations that are the foundation of capitalism. Therefore, their explanation must turn the focus back on the workers themselves. This is achieved by seeing the strike and the workers' demands in terms of personal depravity. Anger must

be shifted from the nature of capitalism itself to the evil of the individual workers. The attack on the strike-breaker then has no relevance to larger economic relationships. It instead results from the nature of the workers themselves. Comparing the workers to beasts makes them below contempt or consideration. Focusing outrage for the vicious attack as an action that results from the nature of the workers themselves means that they can never be negotiated with or trusted.

The more ideologically acceptable direction of anger and disgust at the acts of an individual worker justifies both the social positions of the mill owners and the workers. As 'beasts' the workers hardly warrant any thought at all. The perception indicates that they do not even rise to the status of human beings. Their demands are illegitimate and mean nothing. Describing the workers as beasts puts the mill owners alone in the position of humanity. Their feelings of anger at the individual level mean that they do not have to address the social at all. Instead the owners use their outrage to "establish recognizable lines between different social groups and to sustain an idea of hierarchy" (Gunn 158).

Ideology and the structure of feeling take the immediate understandings of the owners and the resultant emotions and make them fit the dominant ideological narrative. That narrative makes social position natural and inevitable. It also makes workers sub-human and the individual action the central determinant in any situation. Internalizing that ideology means that immediate understandings and subjectivities are filtered through it. Consequently, feelings and the internal world of the individual never threaten to break out into and threaten the solidity of the social and economic foundations that dictate the subjugation of subjectivities in the first place.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN *HARD TIMES*

Like *Mary Barton*, Charles Dickens' novel *Hard Times* takes place in a heavily industrialized setting. The characters face many of the same concerns as those in Gaskell's book. Dickens' story documents the horrors of life in the fictional industrial city of Coketown. It focuses on the lives of the working class who live there and describes the insurmountable hurdles they face as a result of the oppression they suffer. The narrative unfolds around several central characters. Sissy Jupe, and her attempts to hold on to her fertile imagination against repeated attacks by the ultra-practical teacher Thomas Gradgrind, are one strand of the story. Another relates the story of Stephen Blackpool a factory worker who wants to marry his true love but cannot because of the stigma divorcing his wife, who has fallen into alcoholism and dissolution, would take too much of a social toll. The book chronicles as well the life cold-hearted factory owner, Josiah Bounderby, whose indifference to the plight of his employees utterly blinds him to their suffering.

Coketown in *Hard Times* and Manchester in *Mary Barton* differ from one another in some important ways. One main difference between towns lies in the fact that the factory owner in Coketown consciously tries to make the factory, its routines and standards, part of every person's life. Mr. Bounderby the factory owner has control over not just the mill but virtually every institution in the town. City architecture has been shaped by utilitarian principles. Schools drill practicality into students as a supreme value and imagination and play are actively discouraged. Even the church shares in the grimness. Its drab edifice displays the same industrial aesthetic.

Another difference between Coketown and Manchester is the way individuals fall under the sway of dominant ideology via the structure of feelings. In Coketown, ideology does not work to transform potentially dangerous emotions and understandings into acceptable ideological modes of thought and behavior. Instead, structures of feeling act to try to obliterate subjectivity completely. For the residents of Coketown the personal and subjective areas of emotion, creativity and enjoyment pose a threat to dominant ideology by their very existence. Throughout the novel characters face having their subjectivity completely erased. The guiding principle of life in Coketown is practicality. Everyone must strive for usefulness and everything must manifest it. Utility provides the final standard for all actions, beliefs and practices. Everything is judged by its rubric.

In the early chapters of the book, Sissy Jupe sits in Coketown's school as Mr. Gradgrind calls roll. He identifies Sissy as "[g]irl number twenty" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 11). When she puts forward her name, Gradgrind becomes angry. He tells Sissy that ". . . Sissy is not a name . . . Don't call yourself Sissy. Call yourself Cecilia" (11). Gradgrind further urges Sissy to pass word along to her father that he has no business calling her Sissy and should stop doing so a once. Sissy's subjectivity is overridden when Gradgrind takes control of her very identity by way of her name. A person's name is a marker of their subjectivity. Gradgrind de-legitimizes Sissy's and assigns her a new one. Taking control of something as basic as the child's name is an assertion of control over one's uniqueness. He makes her take on the more formalized version of her name, one more appropriate for her public interactions. Thus the private gets diminished. Stripped of her nickname she becomes no different than the many other Cecelia's in the world. Mr. Gradgrind has usurped control of the point at which Sissy's subjectivity meets the

world and loses. He has stripped away her distinctive family ties by effectively taking her father's authority over her away. Through the assignation of naming, Gradgrind has worn down Sissy's previously "impermeable individualism" (Schor 65).

When Sissy stands up for her name she shows courage and a strong sense of self in this scene. She throws off a non-descript numerical identity and asserts her unique one by clarifying her name. Giving her nickname shows that she is more distinct than even the name Cecilia. Sissy embodies subjectivity through her actions, strongly asserting herself as different in a school system that emphasizes complete conformity. Sissy gives more markers of her uniqueness when she tells Gradgrind that her father rides horses at the circus, the very folly of enjoyment, and that he gave her the name of Sissy. This information about her family also shows Sissy asserting her subjectivity. Affiliation with familial ties asserts the distinctiveness of an individual just as much as nicknames. However, Gradgrind does not permit such individuality in his classroom. Students get reduced to numbers and their heads passively filled with fact pre-determined definitions and ways of understanding the world.

The teacher continues the assault on Sissy's consciousness by attacking her perceptions of beauty and enjoyment. Gradgrind ultimately succeeds in his quest. Whenever Sissy gives an answer that asserts her personality and experience over dry memorization, he bombards her with the importance of external fact over subjective understanding. Sissy succumbs and ends up "frightened by matter-of-fact prospect the world afforded" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 15). While Sissy may retain an interior life of feelings and love of beauty, the initial encounter with Gradgrind removes it from relevance because it can never have a material expression. Numbering students does

not allow them the subjectivity of their individual names. Filling their heads with fact after fact does not put any importance on how their individual minds relate to those facts. The material environment where instruction occurs kills the individual perception of themselves as such. For all intents and purposes, Sissy's subjectivity has been "generalized and assembled" in a way that keeps focus on neutral, external concrete and away from personal understanding (Williams, *Marxism 129*).

The ideology that dominates the educational institution of Coketown also has a hold on the factory owner, Josiah Bounderby. He is a friend of the utilitarian Gradgrind. Bounderby and Gradgrind do not have the same job. One is an industrialist and the other an educator. However, they both work toward the same goal. Each wants increased efficiency. Gradgrind wants it in the realm of learning whereas Bounderby strives for it to increase productivity. They have the common goal of imposing the factory model of production on all areas of life.

In one scene, Bounderby has stopped by the Gradgrind residence. He chats with the teacher's wife when he arrives. Bounderby tells Mrs. Gradgrind a story he has repeated many times. He relates how hard his childhood was and the great degree of poverty in which he grew up. His doubtless exaggerated details lead him to the conclusion that "[h]ow I fought through it I don't know . . . I was determined I suppose . . . [h]ere I am anyhow, and nobody to thank for being here but myself" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 23). What is interesting about his narrative is that it eliminates subjectivity completely. Bounderby's biography, while a uniquely personal story, becomes impersonal by way of the structure of feelings. Even though he probably exaggerates the details, clearly Bounderby suffered during his childhood. But he sees the suffering

as strictly personal. Bounderby's suffering is grounded in his subjectivity. So too is his escape from it. Bounderby ties no emotion up with his story and so he has no internal reflections on it. All the suffering it depicts is of a strictly physical nature, such as starvation and sickness. Never does he talk about the emotional experience of his childhood. Thus his childhood is not viewed through his own unique perspective on it. Externality determines Bounderby's judgment of his own life. The immediacy of his experience is lost and the outside world and its ideology become the "prism of personality" for him (Baumgarten 112). Forgetting or not mentioning the psychic aspects of what he went through shows that perceptions of his early life have been filtered through the structure of feeling. They have ended up in solely physical terms. The physical form is the outward existence of an individual and Bounderby sees it as the only one. In the narrative of his own life, he is nothing more than a body. As such he has "dragged childhood itself captive to his statistical den" (Newcomb 110).

Another way that Bounderby filters his personal experience ideologically is illustrated by the conclusion of his narrative. He states that he does not really understand how he ended up a wealthy businessman. The only explanation he can offer is an individual one. He claims that he has always had determination which he figures is what got him into his current position. The real reason for his success remains a mystery to him. This fact shows that Bounderby has engaged in little personal reflection on his life. Personal reflection requires engagement with the inner self. Bounderby clearly has not done this. He has paid attention only to the outward and visible. Consequently he does not even have a complete knowledge of his own nature. Only ideology can fill the gap in this type of personal knowledge. Success for Bounderby is

defined strictly in capitalist economic terms. He did not create these standards for himself but absorbed him from the material conditions of his existence. Dominant ideology has done more than shape Bounderby's consciousness: it has become it.

Other professional associations in *Hard Times* portray the connections between industrialists and their workers. In one instance, Stephen Blackpool, a loyal hand at Bounderby's factory, comes to the owner for advice on a personal matter. Blackpool's wife has become an alcoholic and abandoned him. Occasionally she comes back into his life to torment him. Despite still being officially married to his wife, Blackpool loves another worker at the factory, Rachel. He does not know how to handle the situation. So he visits Bounderby to seek his counsel. The encounter shows how powerfully structures of feeling regulate subjectivity.

When Blackpool lays out his impossible situation, he expresses a desperate wish to be free of his wife. He asks Bounderby about the possibility of divorce and its cost. Bounderby offers no comfort. He tells Blackpool that he cannot escape his wedding vows. He emphasizes the fact that "[t]here's a sanctity in this relation of life . . . and---and---it must be kept up" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 80). He shows no sympathy for Blackpool's predicament and sends the worker on his way who is now even more aware of the hopelessness of his situation than when the conversation started.

The encounter denies subjectivity to both men. The structure of feeling mandates a single understanding of the issue. It diminishes to insignificance the individuals' impressions and approach to the problem. More importantly, ideologically assigned roles remain fixed and properly occupied. The personal and immediate get erased from

consideration completely. The fact that Blackpool goes to Bounderby for advice is the first example of how the individual consciousness is diminished in importance. Blackpool knows better than anyone the specifics of his situation and depth of his problems. However he does not try to resolve his difficulties himself. Going to Bounderby indicates that he doubts his "perception of the world and . . . his capacit[y] to deal creatively" with his difficulties (Holbrook 141). He seeks a solution outside of his direct experience. Looking to Bounderby gives the owner permission to make a decision for Blackpool. Blackpool surrenders his own consciousness by deferring to Bounderby. Seeking Bounderby's advice indicates that Blackpool sees the industrialist as having more superior knowledge and wisdom than himself. He has interiorized his lower status in comparison to his employer. The talk between Bounderby and Blackpool further backs up Blackpool's assessment. When Blackpool admits that he has been contemplating divorce, Bounderby becomes angry. He effectively rules out the possibility for his employee. Everything that Blackpool has developed himself loses legitimacy in the talk with Bounderby. His judgment is perceived as faulty and his contemplated action viewed as immoral.

Blackpool's understanding results from the work of ideology. His situation has been relocated from the deeply personal to the public once he visits Bounderby. Doing so shows that Blackpool does not trust himself to make a decision and act. Blackpool's perception of his lack of autonomy to act in a personal matter causes his feelings to fall in line with the larger structure created by capitalist ideology.

As an employee of Bounderby, Blackpool sees him as his superior in the context of work. But consulting him about a personal problem unrelated to work extends the

labor hierarchy into the personal realm. In this situation, Blackpool attributes to Bounderby a higher status because of his belief that Bounderby has mastery of "influential systems of . . . argument" that he himself lacks (Williams, *Marxism* 130). He thus puts himself in an inferior position right away and re-enacts the employer-employee relationship. In this way capitalist ideologies become unavoidable. They transfer from the factory floor into the domestic and romantic spheres. The dependence of the worker on their boss becomes complete. Such a relationship strips the worker of autonomy completely. As a worker, Blackpool has a life regulated by the factory work schedules. Outside of work, his personal existence is regulated by the idea that his employer has greater wisdom than he does and therefore has greater qualification to speak on matters that do not concern him. Subjectivity disappears from Blackpool's life. Both his life as a laborer and his life as a private individual fall under the sway of those he deems his superiors. In doing so, he surrenders his power to make his own choices. Practically speaking, Blackpool ends up having no real subjective or internal existence of his own. The structure of feeling has taken it away and made the dominant ideology the arbiter of Blackpool's life.

However, it is also true to say, that ideological power afflicts all inter-personal relationships, regardless of their location in the capitalist matrix. In the conversation with Blackpool, Bounderby loses his internal life too to the regularizing of the structure of feeling. He does not really offer his own judgment to Blackpool. Instead he refers to the vague notion of 'sanctity' and faith in the legal system. Doing this means that Bounderby has again surrendered subjectivity. He does not advise Blackpool based on his own experience or on the complex personal elements that make up his employee's problem.

To do so would jeopardize the power relationship they have by running the risk of making it too personal. So, Bounderby never brings elements of his personality or emotional state into the situation. He does refer Blackpool to the legal system and the mystical notion of marriage's sanctity and these are completely external referents. They are impersonal as well. The institutions of the Church and legal system get invoked as guides for making Blackpool's difficult decision. Pointing to institutions as places to find help, Bounderby revokes his ability to judge Blackpool's situation. Like his employee, he cannot express or trust his own feelings on the matter. He defers these things to larger impersonal institutions for understanding. The authority of such institutions transcends individual understandings. Bounderby believes them to be better frames through which to understand the subjective than the experiencing individual themselves. This attitude means that Bounderby surrenders to the same institutions he mentions to Blackpool. Any emotions or unique understanding that Bounderby might have are stripped of meaning. The personal and subjective get crushed under the constructions of reality and experience dictated by ideological apparatuses and subsumed into a universal, public way of seeing the world.

Another source of Bounderby's outrage lies in the fact that Blackpool's thoughts on divorce seem to threaten the very institution of marriage. Again, this is an illustration of how Bounderby's subjectivity disappears. He does not see marriage as a relationship between two people. He sees it abstractly as an institution. To see it in personal terms would bring subjectivity and humanity into Bounderby's understandings. It would make marriage a relationship rather than a social form. But Bounderby has no real subjectivity. Reality for him is explained institutionally not personally. In Bounderby's

eyes, people are no more than “quantifiable attributes of identity” (Young 46). His own interiority gets subsumed institutional formations and disappears. A proper structure of feeling has exercised power over him. Through it, consciousness becomes completely public. Understandings are then fundamentally public and can be controlled by the same institutions that structure emotions. The individual consciousness of the world transforms into an institutional consciousness and so becomes synchronized with the dominant ideology.

Such a transformation affects how he perceives his own environment. Later in the book, Bounderby receives a guest to Coketown, James Harthouse. Bounderby is eager to show the visitor around the city. He paints a glowing picture of life in Coketown. Bounderby explains how workers find factory work and get well paid for it. He paints a flattering picture, even going so far as to say about the smoke that permeates Coketown: “That’s meat and drink to us. It’s the healthiest thing in the world in all respects, and particularly for the lungs” (Dickens, *Hard Times* 132).

Here Bounderby again eliminates his own subjectivity. He also tries to get rid of Harthouse’s. Bounderby quashes his own subjectivity by writing off his own direct experience. What he tells Harthouse clearly contradicts the realities of Coketown. What Bounderby presents though is an extreme version of Coketown’s ideological narrative. The city suffers from a degree of pollution so great that the smog blocks out the sun even on the hottest days. This fact is available through direct observation by anyone who lives in Coketown. For Bounderby to trust his empirical observation of the pollution would mean thinking about it, and reflecting on the problem has the potential of tracing it back to its source, the town’s factories. From there, further thinking could lead to an

examination of life in the factories themselves. Eventually, the relationship between owners and workers would become the subject of critique and whole set of economic relations in Coketown would be endangered.

The structure of feeling avoids that possibility. Bounderby's idealized version of Coketown life allows him to deny his own observations and sensory data. He creates a narrative of town life that falls in line with capitalist ideology. Coketown becomes a worker's utopia where wages are high and laborers enjoy their easy work. Ideology has permeated the inner world of Bounderby to such an extent that even his immediate observations cannot be trusted. Their reliability is supplanted by the structure of feeling that substitutes an ideological explanation of the nature of industrial life. Bounderby's subjectivity evaporates as his most immediate and basic comprehension of his world come from a mode of awareness imposed from outside his personal consciousness.

Bounderby's descriptions also act to take away Harthouse's subjectivity. His narrative shores up Harthouse's impression of Coketown and justifies the visitor's enthusiastic endorsement. Bounderby acts for the structure of feeling by overriding Harthouse's immediate sense perceptions. The description Bounderby gives draws Harthouse's attention to the negative characteristics of the city. But these then get re-framed in terms of the ideological narrative Bounderby has accepted. Directing Harthouse as to what to look at commandeers the visitor's subjective perception. It takes away his choice about what to attend to.

Harthouse's focus becomes subject to the influence of the structure of feeling. Once his attention comes under Bounderby's command, Harthouse can explain to

himself the virtues of life in Coketown. This way the conversation with Bounderby becomes the external source that structures Harthouse's experience. Harthouse's direct observations and impressions get displaced. Bounderby's direction of his guest's attention and imposition of the acceptable understandings of Coketown creates complete agreement between the two men. Harthouse indicates his shared understanding when he says: "Mr. Bounderby, I assure you I am entirely and completely of your way of thinking. On conviction" (Dickens, *Hard Times* 132).

Hard Times paints a stark portrait of life in a Victorian industrial town. Its residents' work lives center around the brutality of industrial production. Their private lives offer no respite from industrialization. Coketown's institutions and the interactions of its residents extend the impersonal nature of factory work into every aspect of existence. The goal is to mold every individual into a cog in the larger industrial wheel. To accomplish this, the structure of feeling intervenes. It works to eliminate the individual understanding provided by direct experience. Subjectivity ultimately succumbs to the imposition of an ideological framework that explains and regularizes the interior life of the individual. Consequently, inner perceptions and comprehension of the world are forcefully externalized, thereby allowing the dominant ideology to mold individual subjects in all areas of life.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN *VILLETTE*

Lucy Snowe, the heroine of Charlotte Brontë's *Villette*, must work to survive. At an early age, she is forced to work as a caregiver for an elderly neighbor. Upon her employer's death, she is forced to become a teacher in continental Europe. In that

position, she forms a variety of work-focused relationships, the living out of which, form the bulk of Lucy's story.

Those who labor, Like Lucy, in capitalism come face to face with its harsh realities. Because ". . . consciousness . . . [is] . . . inseparable from material social processes" workers directly experience exploitation, poverty and the potentially devastating vagaries of the free market (Williams, *Marxism 59*). Regular exposure of the worker to the injustices of capitalism could lead to subversive action. Such action could pose a danger to the capitalist system itself. Therefore, to eliminate the possibility of worker defiance, something must change how workers view their world and experiences.

The structure of feeling does this job. It intervenes in the individual consciousness and molds it to line up with capitalist ideology. The structure works in two main ways. First, it hides the economic and political basis of relationships and transforms them in the worker's mind into other, more personal types of connection. The other way the structure of feeling operates on the individual consciousness is through imposing on it a values system compatible with capitalism that, in turn, causes the worker to perceive their immediate reality differently. Consequently, any problems see in the capitalist system disappear and are explained in ways that pose no challenge to the system as a whole.

Villette illustrates both processes. Its main character, Lucy Snowe, labors at a variety of jobs in a variety of settings. She provides a good example of how the consciousness of the individual worker undergoes change to allow them to continue

working without defiance since over the course of the book, Lucy goes from a clear understanding of capitalism's problems to a dutiful worker who experiences her life through the ideological frame of capitalism.

Lucy has an easy childhood. She spends a great deal of time with her godmother. Lucy describes the comfort of her godmother's home. She describes the "large peaceful rooms, the well-arranged furniture, the clear wide windows, the balcony outside, looking down on a fine antique street, where Sundays and holidays seemed always to abide" and how the adults in the home doted on her. Despite her pleasant circumstances, Lucy has some knowledge of what the world outside her childhood paradise is like. Although she has not experienced it directly, she has become aware of the "shocks . . . repulses . . . humiliations and desolations" of life through "books and . . . [her] own reason" (C. Brontë 36). Even before she directly experiences it then, Lucy accurately understands the nature of capitalism. Though not articulated directly in economic terms, the harsh world she refers to is one shaped by capitalism. Many of the generalized difficulties she mentions have their roots in social conditions resulting from the dynamics of the unrestrained free market.

Seeing the harshness of life with some degree of accuracy means that Lucy's consciousness, untainted by direct participation in the capitalist marketplace has the potential to challenge its unfairness. When Lucy inevitably gets forced into the economic marketplace as a laborer, this danger must be minimized and her consciousness must be reoriented. The structure of feeling changes Lucy's perceptions through distorting her personal understandings. Distortion happens in a number of ways. Sometimes it works by imposing a framework of values necessary for functioning under capitalism. In

other instances, it soothes her concerns by effectively hiding the economic nature of her connections.

One of the first jobs Lucy takes involves serving as the caretaker Miss Marchmont. Miss Marchmont is a “woman of fortune” and a “rheumatic cripple” (C. Brontë 38). Realizing the job will prove difficult, Lucy takes it anyway. At their first meeting, Lucy views Miss Marchmont as “grave with solitude, stern with long affliction irritable also, and perhaps exacting”. Her impression leads Lucy to wonder whether she has “strength for the undertaking” and can adequately perform the work required of her (39).

Lucy’s intuition urges her not to take the job offer. She understands that the work will require much exertion and labor. Lucy even tries to talk herself into accepting the work, thinking “. . . it ought to appear tolerable . . . but somehow, by some strange fatality, it would not” and continues to feel that entering into employment with Miss Marchmont is not the best thing to do (C. Brontë 39). One of the obstacles to accepting Miss Marchmont’s offer is her youth. Lucy believes that she “felt life at life’s sources” and is in full flower of her youth (39).

When she looks at herself in the mirror, Lucy catches a glimpse of “a faded, hollow-eyed vision” and a “wan spectacle” (C. Brontë 39). However, Lucy notes that she thought “[t]he blight . . . was chiefly external . . .” and so thought little about her sickly appearance. Lucy’s reverie is broken when Miss Marchmont has a “paroxysm of pain” to which Lucy responds automatically, comforting her charge (39). Lucy ends up working for Miss Marchmont. During her time of employment with the elderly woman, “a close acquaintance” develops, and Lucy comes to like Miss Marchmont personally (40).

The trajectory of Lucy's relationship with Miss Marchmont brings the structure of feeling to bear on Lucy's subjectivity. When she sees the problems she has as existing outside herself, she has made "an extraction from social experience" that is dangerously accurate (Williams, *Marxism* 133). Lucy exhibits an understanding of her experience as socially contingent. This opens up the possibility of a more critical understanding of the world in which she lives. The dominant ideology cannot permit such insight. It has to be altered.

The structure of feeling works two ways to shift Lucy's personal consciousness. Both come from her connection with Miss Marchmont. First, Lucy's relationship with her employer brings out a sense of obligation. Within a relatively short period of time, she comes to believe "[h]er service was my duty . . . "(C. Brontë 40). Seeing her employment as an obligation turns her work into an ethical necessity rather than an economic one. The shift in viewpoint moves Lucy's initial, accurate understanding of difficulties arising from the social world back into her subjectivity. Her new perspective puts things in personal terms. Work is something she is personally obligated to do. Labor then loses its social nature. It changes from something taking place in the context of the larger capitalist economy to a matter of individual, ethical import. As such, Lucy's perception is shifted from the larger external world to the narrower internal one. Consequently, she begins to view her existence in purely individual rather than social terms.

Lucy has her consciousness shaped by the structure of feeling in the relationship she has with Miss Marchmont too. She describes her relationship with the older woman as having a personal dimension. Miss Marchmont gets praised lavishly in Lucy's

description of her. According to Lucy, Miss Marchmont had “steadiness of virtues . . . the power of her passions, to admire [and] . . . the truth of her feelings to trust” (C. Brontë 40). Lucy further states in her narrative that “[i]t was for these things I clung to her” and developed in her a sense of personal obligation (40).

The sense of personal connection and obligation to Miss Marchmont comes to Lucy through the structure of feeling. Every day she performs the hard labor required for Miss Marchmont’s care. But her feelings of mutual affection she shares with her employer make the work easier. Seeing the relationship she has with Miss Marchmont in personal terms hides the pragmatic truth from Lucy. The reality is, her connection to Miss Marchmont is, at root, one of pure economics. When Lucy and Miss Marchmont first meet, this is made plain. Lucy’s initial trepidation at accepting Miss Marchmont’s offer of a job is overcome when the latter inquires: “What else have you—anything?” referring to Lucy’s work possibilities (C. Brontë 39). The question reveals the essence of Miss Marchmont’s connection to Lucy. Lucy needs the work to make a living. She must make her way in the capitalist market or starve. This reality is decidedly unpleasant. If Lucy were to dwell on it, she could act against it by questioning the causes of her circumstances. Instead, the structure of feeling closes “the division between the rigidly defined social self, and the inner impulses which can never be articulated” and transforms a necessary economic bond into one that appears to be based on friendship (Shuttleworth 228). Shifting Lucy’s understanding in this manner prevents her from gaining a critical and potentially subversive view of the social reality in which she lives.

Capitalism, as a system, has intimate ties to politics. Through the state, its economic relations are enforced and maintained. But, if the political nature of labor

became visible, it would open up the possibility of workers exerting political power to change their circumstances. So, for the ruling class, and its dominant ideology, it is important that the reality of "political struggle . . . be dulled in consciousness or altogether lost sight of" (Williams, *Marxism* 78-79).

Nowhere is this truer than when Lucy attends a concert with her godmother and some other friends. It is Lucy's first experience and she finds the evening intoxicating. She relays the events of the night through sensory impressions. Lucy talks about the "snug comfort of the close carriage on a cold though fine night" and "the sight of the stars glinting fitfully through the trees" (C. Brontë 241-242). She further discusses going through the city gates and observing "the guards there posted, the pretense of inspection to which we were there submitted, and which amused us so much" (242). Upon her arrival at the concert, Lucy is awe-struck at the opulence of the theater. What she sees overwhelms her. Lucy climbs a staircase to two large doors but admits that she "hardly noticed by what magic these doors were made to roll back" and she moves through the building "not at all conscious whither", feeling giddy at what she observes (242-243). At the performance, the king and queen make an entrance, much to Lucy's excitement. She is disappointed by what she sees though. Lucy had imagined the king as "seated . . . on a throne, bonneted with a crown" but he turns out to be merely "a middle-aged soldier" (247).

Lucy's evening at the concert puts her in the nexus of politics and economics. When stopped in her carriage and searched by guards, she sees it not as the exertion of state power but a humorous anecdote. At the event itself, one only the wealthy can afford to attend, she does not see things in terms of wealth, but sees things through the

prism of an abstract concept of beauty. Impressions and emotions, rather than critical reflection are Lucy's tools of comprehension. She gets grounded completely in subjectivity and so cannot see the economic forces that shape her direct experiences of the world.

Seeing the king, Lucy is confronted with the embodiment of state power. Her realization that he is an ordinary man of middle-age opens up an opportunity for criticism of the elitist ideology that undergirds monarchy. However, once more, the structure of feeling eliminates that possibility. Lucy concludes her narrative by casting doubt on her reliability in recounting events at the concert. She tells readers that they "would not care to have my impressions . . . it would not be worthwhile to record them, as they were the impressions of an ignorance crasse" (C. Brontë 250). Casting self-doubt on her experience at the theater means that Lucy trusts nothing she saw there, including the mundane reality of the king's appearance. This erases the contradiction she witnessed between the gravitas of royal power and the ordinariness of the monarch. The doubt Lucy expresses reflects the action of the structure of feeling. It has prevented her from seeing or acting on the political realities that exert power over her life.

Eventually Miss Marchmont dies. Lucy finds herself cast out into the world alone. She admits that she feels "a little—a very little, shaken in nerves" about her situation (C. Brontë 46). Lucy must find work. So, she seeks out Mrs. Barrett, a former servant who worked for her family. When Lucy tracks down Mrs. Barrett at her present place of employment, she talks with her about work opportunities. As Lucy and Mrs. Barrett are talking, a child enters the room and jumps on Lucy's lap. The child and Lucy "were not strangers" to each other (C. Brontë 48). Lucy remembers the child and its mother. She

recalls that the child's mother, Mrs. Leigh, was a schoolmate of hers years before. In her narrative, Lucy explains that Mrs. Leigh was "good-looking, but dull—in a lower class than mine (48). Her description is not entirely derogatory though. Lucy also mentions her surprise at the "beautiful and kind-looking woman . . . the good-natured and comely, but unintellectual girl . . ." became (48).

The narrative indicates that Lucy understands the reality of class division. She realizes that her status in the class hierarchy has fallen substantially. Lucy also has a keen awareness of the fact that Mrs. Leigh occupies a higher class position than she does. An insight like this opens up the possibility of subversive reflection on the class-determined base of capitalist society. To prevent this, Lucy must be prevented from thinking about her social position in the context of class division. If permitted, such thinking would open the class structure to of critical scrutiny.

The structure of feeling changes the focus of Lucy's thinking. She does not dwell for long on her new class position relative to Mrs. Leigh. Instead, Lucy discusses their interaction on a strictly individual basis. She shifts her description from the class gap between her and Mrs. Leigh and on to her former companion's individual traits. The dominant ideology, through the structure of feeling, has modified Lucy's consciousness. Her perception has been drawn away from reflecting on social and economic forces that define her relationship with Mrs. Leigh. Lucy's awareness is restricted to the immediate and personal. The structure of feeling has proven effective, not allowing Lucy's understanding to override the psyche's "necessary restraints" and endanger existing class relationships (Ford 146).

Lucy eventually finds employment with a Madame Beck in the continental city of Villette. Madame Beck runs a school and gives Lucy work as her personal governess and servant. Immediately, Lucy takes a liking to her boss. Madame Beck runs a boarding school and Lucy heaps praise on her abilities to do the job. In her narrative, Lucy mentions that Madame makes good arrangements for "the physical well-being of her scholars" and a "liberty of amusement" for her students (C. Brontë 82). Additionally, Madame Beck treats her employees well. Lucy relates that Madame Beck does not discipline her employees too harshly. As evidence she cites the fact that a teacher at the school, Mrs. Sweeney, was not immediately dismissed even though she displayed "tipsiness, disorder, and general neglect" in her work (81). One particularly pleasing trait of Madame Beck noted by Lucy is her boss's inability to be swayed by pleading. Lucy describes how she saw Madame Beck's "*feelings* appealed to, and I have smiled in half-pity, half –scorn. None ever gained her ear through that channel or swayed her purpose by those means" (C. Brontë 83).

The relationship Lucy develops with Madame Beck is the opposite of the one she had with Miss Marchmont. With Miss Marchmont, a personal connection hid the economic reality of their connection. In the case of Madame Beck, the economic becomes the obvious element of the bond with the emotional aspects of the relationship taking a secondary role. Lucy's affection for Madame Beck is couched in terms of how the latter does her job. It does not stem from any of Madame Beck's personal traits like personal kindness or a good sense of humor.

Lucy greatly admires Madame Beck's rationality. She respects her imperviousness to emotional appeals. This results from the intervention of the structure

of feeling in Madame Beck's and Lucy's relationship. The emotions Lucy feels toward her boss do not allow her to separate Madame Beck from her role as supervisor. A personal connection is prevented. As a result, the hierarchy that makes Lucy an underling of Madame Becks still defines their relationship. Lucy's feelings for her employer become inseparable from their work connection. The structure of feeling effectively "obliterate[s] the boundary between what is inside and what is outside" orienting Lucy's subjectivity to the external realities of capitalist labor relations rather than personal experience of emotion (Gezari 142).

The structure of feeling dictates the nature of Lucy's relationships with her co-workers as well. She expresses frustration at her inability to form friendships with her colleagues. At the same time, she points out the flaws in each person she tries to connect with. One of her fellow employees, Lucy describes as "a narrow thinker, a coarse feeler, and an egotist" (C. Brontë 144). Another she criticizes because the woman "mortally hated work, and loved what she called pleasure" (145). Each flaw she points out disqualifies the person for Lucy's friendship.

Lucy's vain attempts to personally engage her co-workers illustrates the influence of the structure of feeling. It causes her to tie personal fondness to a work ethic. The structure of feeling has shaped Lucy's perception. It effectively depersonalizes her experience of other people and causes Lucy to evaluate those she works with in terms of capitalist values. People she encounters are critiqued on traits necessary for the continuation of the capitalist economy. Consequently, the standards of the workplace influence her personal decisions.

The person Lucy points out as hating labor demonstrates no work ethic. She therefore has a diminished value as a laborer. Lucy has another colleague in whom "reigned the love of money for its own sake" (C. Brontë 144). Such a miser cannot contribute to the capitalist economy because they do not engage the market through spending. Yet another person Lucy works with "had a wonderful passion for presents" and so consumes but does not produce (144). A capitalist marketplace requires production and consumption to function effectively. So a person who preferred to only receive commodities without balancing production endangers the dynamics of capitalist economics.

Seeing those she works with keeps Lucy in line with capitalist values. Her condemnation of her co-workers ensures that she sees the world through the lens of capitalist concepts of value. Even when not working, then, Lucy views her daily experiences through the lens of those values that support capitalism's economic activity. Every moment for Lucy becomes a "present cultural process "through the structure of feeling (Williams*, Marxism* 133). Each perception gets filtered through the values of the free market and so capitalism penetrates into all areas of Lucy's life, even if those realms have no direct bearing on her job.

Another effect of Lucy's transformed view is the depersonalization of her interactions with others. Not only does she judge them in terms of their suitability as workers, she starts to see them only as such. Those around Lucy take on an identity strictly bound to labor. She ends up seeing her entire existence, even that time spent outside of her job, in the context of work.

In one of *Villette's* later scenes, Lucy peruses an art exhibit with her close friend Dr. John Graham. She enjoys his company and likes to "hear what he had to say about either pictures or books" (C. Brontë 238). Lucy is also fond of how Graham, "communicated information . . . with a lucid intelligence that left all his words clear graven on the memory" and she commends all he says as unforgettable (239). For her part, Lucy finds "it . . . pleasant also to tell him some things he did not know" noting that Graham "listened so kindly, so teachably" (238).

In talking about her relationship with Dr. Graham, Lucy reveals that she has been shaped by the structure of feeling to such a degree that even her most personal emotions fall under its control. Lucy's praise of Dr. Graham emphasizes his 'teachability'. Discussing him in these terms transforms him into a student. Lucy's feelings of affection get filtered through what she does for a living. Work, then, becomes the defining feature of her every experience. The structure of feeling makes her status as a laborer her most important identifier. Everything becomes work-related because of this. In this sense, Lucy's transformation is complete. She has gone from a childish and subversive insight into the nature of capitalism to a dutiful worker, whose small contribution joins with others to perpetuate its existence.

As the narrator of *Villette,* Lucy Snowe illustrates the power held by the structure of feeling to transform individual consciousness. At the start of her story, she has intuitive knowledge about life in a world created by capitalism. But, this perception is gained before she ever directly experiences the life of a laborer. Once in the market, Lucy's understanding poses a danger to capitalist economic relations. It must be transformed into a consciousness that does not hold the possibility of defying the

dominant ideology. By the end of the novel, the necessary change has taken place. The structure of feeling effectively alters Lucy's subjectivity, turning it into a consciousness completely subjected to the ruling ideology. The structure acts to take the intensity of Lucy's internal understandings and perceptions and orient them, by way of ideology, into a more social framework. In this way, the most subjective parts of the individual personality never escape the influence of a dominant ideology. Through the structure of feeling the strictly internal becomes impossible. It is made through the structure of feeling into a more appropriate form of existence and gets forced into the mold of being more social and ideologically dedicated to acceptable forms of expression, particularly in terms of ideologies that dictate the inherent value of work and its necessity to the maintenance of capitalism.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN *AGNES GREY*

Like her sister Charlotte's novel *Villette*, Anne Brontë's *Agnes Grey* tells the tale of a teacher of young children. The title character grows up in a modest but happy home as the youngest daughter of a clergyman. When a potentially lucrative investment goes bad, the family plunges into dire economic straits. Agnes, against the will of her parents, takes work as a governess to ease the financial strain. She approaches the job filled with idealism but soon finds the children she works with unruly and her employers cruel. Agnes becomes more and more disillusioned, her suffering made worse by her father's death. By the novel's end however, she finds happiness through marriage and motherhood.

Anne Brontë's narrative, like that of *Villette,* centers on work. Throughout the text, the title character, Agnes goes from position to position enduring the indignities of

serving as a governess in wealthy households. In that role, she has an in-between relationship with her employers. According to Cecelia Lecaros, governesses “lived in an intermediate and undefined position” between hired help and family member (20). The liminal role held by the Victorian governess lead to a great deal of tension between them and the families they worked for. She had to discipline often unruly children, but not too harshly less their parents chastise her. If parents limited the ability of the governess to reign in misbehaving kids, they often, at the same time, blamed her when her charges acted out.

Agnes faces all of these challenges in her work. Her narrative unfolds in first person. Readers get a deep insight into her subjectivity. Throughout the book, Agnes interjects her beliefs and judgments of those who inhabit her world. Her perceptions allow her to see the often harsh economic realities she faces in her work. As such, Agnes’s consciousness poses a challenge to the dominant ideology. Her perceptions of her social connections risk raising potentially uncomfortable questions that could jeopardize capitalism. To prevent any real challenge, Agnes’s consciousness must be over-ridden. Doing this allows the dominant ideology to mold her subjectivity in line with approved perspectives on the world. These viewpoints offer ideologically approved explanations for the contradictions and exploitation Agnes witnesses in her world.

Raymond Williams describes the mechanism by which this occurs. He theorizes the existence of two types of this consciousness. The first he labeled ‘official consciousness’ which is made up of ideologically approved methods of understanding and explanation. It offers an ideological repository of conceptual frameworks and ideas that can be drawn upon for a consensual understanding of people and events. Official

consciousness also ties itself to embedded traditions and institutions that act to prescribe correct modes of consciousness and enforce them if need be.

Williams does not posit official consciousness as the only extant type. He argues that there exists a second type that he labels 'practical consciousness' or lived consciousness. He defines practical consciousness as the individual subjectivity that is concerned with immediate experience. It can endanger the official consciousness because it perceives "what is actually being lived, and not only what it is thought is being lived" (Williams, *Marxism* 131).

Poverty can be taken as an example of these two kinds. For example if the official consciousness explains poverty in terms of moral degeneracy, that becomes the approved explanation. Institutions such as school, churches and other prominent bodies discuss poverty only in those terms. The explanation does not get deviated from and enjoys endorsement at all levels of institutional life. In contrast, practical or lived consciousness does not always jive with the official, approved versions. For instance, while a person is subjected to the view of poverty through his interactions with various institutions, at the same time he experiences poverty first hand. That person may live in poverty or be intimately acquainted with others who do. The person also may know perfectly well that they and their friends have fine, strong morals. In light of this experiential knowledge the official version of things loses credibility. As a consequence, a tension arises that needs resolution.

Agnes faces this tension in her daily life. She must deal with the contradictions that fill her experience of the world. At many points in her story, what Agnes perceives

shows her, in its unfiltered form, the exploitative nature of her relationships with employers and rigid hierarchy of capitalist class relations. When Agnes's consciousness threatens to explain or become critical of the existing system of relations, she gets pulled back into the power of the dominant ideology. And it is the work environment that enables this to happen. Agnes's professional associations, in the form of her working relationships with various employers, work to redirect her budding rebelliousness. The connections she forms in these groups work to impose official consciousness on her, thereby bringing her back into the ideological fold.

In one of her positions as governess, Agnes discovers that the little boy she cares for has a cruel streak. When Agnes asks him what he does with birds captured in his garden, he answers with a litany of horrors. He tells her "Sometimes I give them to the cat; sometimes I cut them in pieces with my penknife; but the next, I mean to roast alive", shocking the naïve Agnes who feels repulsed by what she hears and sees first-hand and begs the boy to stop his terrible behaviors (A. Brontë 20). She even invokes religion to try to convince him of the error of his ways. She tells the boy ". . . Tom---you have heard where wicked people go when they die; and if you don't leave off torturing innocent birds, remember, you will have to go there, and suffer just what you have made them suffer" (20).

Agnes's threat of damnation is her attempt to explain to young Tom the eternal suffering that awaits evildoers. When Agnes does this, she falls back into the dominant ideological understanding of class relations. Turning to a spiritual argument means turning away from material reality. To Agnes, Tom's punishment will not come in this life, but in the hereafter. By focusing on an otherworldly sense of justice, she cedes the

possibility of sanctions in the real world. As a result, Tom's class position will protect him from legal proceedings.

The ideological apparatus of the Church has infiltrated into Agnes's initial understanding. Tom's cruelty not only indicts himself, but his entire family. He tells Agnes "Papa knows how I treat them, and he never blames me for it; he says it's just what *he* used to do when *he* was a boy", thereby affirming the legacy of brutality across generations (A. Brontë 20). But it is cruelty that goes unpunished. The evil treatment of the animals in many ways parallels the way that Agnes's employers treat her. To act on the initial repulsion her subjective consciousness arouses, and contemplate the larger meaning of family and class cruelty puts the dominant ideology at risk through exposing harsh economic realities. Such a danger is foreclosed when Agnes offers religious justification for Tom to cease being mean to animals. Explaining what she has seen in theological terms, advocated by the Church, allows for an institutionally acceptable explanation of things. The only way that she can "preserve her intellectual and social integrity" is to "suppress her natural sentiments" and tie them up with the prescribed consciousness of the institution of the Church (Herrera 55). It removes the horrors she sees from the realm of the material and real to an ethereal realm far removed from the realities Agnes sees and intuitively understands.

Later, with the same children, Agnes describes a day when she lost control of them. They refuse to obey her orders and become "utterly impossible to curb" (Lecaros 183). Their rebellion culminates in a frenzied run outdoors without proper clothing or shoes. Agnes follows the children and demands that they come back inside. They refuse, and Agnes feels frustrated. Eventually, the children's father becomes aware of

the situation and, enraged, issues a single, firm command for the kids to come back inside. The father gets angry at Agnes. He tells her ". . . it's very strange, that, when you've the care of 'em, you've no better control over 'em than that" (A. Brontë 35). Agnes clearly has to care for bad children. They repeatedly misbehave and are difficult to control. Agnes does her best though to do her job and offer real care to her charges. She knows though that despite her best efforts she finds it difficult to effectively change their actions. The children's father's anger at her challenges this perception. Although their father rarely intervenes in their discipline, he blames Agnes for their disobedience, and attacks her abilities to do her job.

Agnes's personal consciousness tells her the truth about the situation. The children are very bad and her attempts to curb their disobedience remain largely futile. But her lived consciousness gets challenged by the official one which the father embodies. He has employer power over Agnes and is the head of a patriarchal family. He represents an approved and powerful social institution. His explanation of the children's behavior places blame on Agnes. Therefore, her consciousness has been diminished in importance. Her immediate perceptions of the situation succumb to the official, patriarchal explanation. The reason for the problem, poor parenting or parental indifference, is pushed into the background. The father's official consciousness places blame squarely on Agnes as the cause for what has gone wrong. Agnes's consciousness gets diminished through the power exerted over her by her employer. Her immediate and accurate understanding of the situation gets minimized and cast as inaccurate. The situation is translated as a matter of individual failing on Agnes's part. Although the problem lies with the children and their actions, to attribute it so and trace

its cause to the indifference and lack of interaction on the part of parents would challenge the official consciousness. It would put the institution of family and its internal relations under scrutiny and under serious critique. If Agnes's consciousness gets trusted, it would challenge the dominant narrative that places the parents as the most important members of the family. The official consciousness must prevail. It does so through the relationship between Agnes and her employer. Through it Agnes begins to doubt her own perceptions and move more toward the official version of events than her own.

As a result, Agnes leaves and finds a new job with a different family, the Murrays. In getting oriented to her new position, she finds out the she is expected to address her pupils as Master and Miss. Agnes finds this requirement ridiculous. She says that "[i]t seemed to me, a chilling an unnatural piece of punctilio . . ." (A. Brontë 58). Despite her reservations however, Agnes decides to "be wiser, and begin at once with as much form and ceremony as any member of the family would be likely to require" (59). Here again, an official consciousness overrides Agnes's personal consciousness. She perceives the nature of the class relationships between her and the children she teaches. This is shown by her disdain for the use of formal titles which she sees as a useless formality. But she ultimately makes the decision to use them anyway. She reflects back on her previous employer, the Bloomfields, remembering that "calling the little Bloomfields by their simple names had been regarded as an offensive liberty" (58). Agnes's self-awareness of the futility of resistance shows that she has allowed the official consciousness to serve as her guide instead of her own, more accurate perceptions.

Deciding to agree with the requirement to address the children by formal titles shows that she trusts the approved version of her relations with the children she cares for. She submits to the class structure. Agreeing to employ formal titles for those over whom she presumably should have control means the reality of class relationship takes precedence over the reality as Agnes understands it. Though Agnes does not like the rule she realizes the practical need for abiding by it. Agnes has not changed her view and her personal consciousness remains unchanged. But that means nothing in material terms. While Agnes has not accepted the official consciousness and its understanding of her relationships with the children and their family, it makes no real difference since she lives out the prescribed consciousness. The dominant ideologies of class prevail and shape Agnes's actions whether she actively believes in them or not. Institutional wisdom overcomes personal conscience as Agnes realizes that it is the best way to behave.

Agnes has another conflict between her own perceptions and consciousness later in the novel. While riding in a coach with her employer, Mrs. Murray, after they have attended a church service, Mrs. Murray asks Agnes what she thought of the new minister. Agnes tells Mrs. Murray that she liked him. She mentions that she particularly liked the way the minister read. She felt that he made his sermons like prayers and they were so compelling that people could not help but pay attention. Another minister however makes a point of coming over and talking to the squire and his wife, Mrs. Murray. This garners favor with Mrs. Murray. Of particular favor in her eyes is the fact that the minister rushed out and helped the family into the carriage. Agnes acknowledges that this indeed happened. However, Agnes reveals that she feels

resentment at Mrs. Murray's evaluation. She adds internally that she felt the minister reduced the dignity of his position and she keenly remembers that when helping the family into the carriage Agnes thinks that ". . . I owe him a grudge for nearly shutting me out of it; for in fact I was standing before his face, close beside the carriage, waiting to get in . . ." (A. Brontë 80).

In this circumstance Agnes's private understanding of class relations buts up against official understanding and institutional explanations. Agnes has a subservient relationship with Mrs. Murray because she works as her employee. So Agnes, in expressing her opinion, does so within the context of that connection. Agnes's opinion is not her own as it has to tie into institutional and class narratives of appropriate social connections. Agnes's lived consciousness tells her that she does not like the minister. That is her subjective, personal judgment, but because it contradicts that expressed by Mrs. Murray, Agnes knows that she cannot express her opinion honestly. She has strong feelings against the minister but does not give them voice. She indicates in the narrative that the elaboration on the minister's ill treatment of her takes place in thought only. And because she never articulates it, so she indicates how she has subsumed her perceptions to the official one. The scene illustrates what Williams says about unspoken social understandings. He states the even though such impressions "are emergent or pre-emergent, they do not have to await definition, classification, or rationalization before they exert palpable pressures" (*Marxism* 132).

Agnes suppresses her lived consciousness in favor of the official version. Her evaluation is tied up in relations of class position and institutional ideology. First of all, her judgment contradicts that of Mrs. Murray which she realizes could jeopardize her

employment. Therefore her personal, subjective understanding of the minister goes unexpressed. Her consciousness cedes ground to the official consciousness. This is evidenced by the fact that their social relationship dictates Mrs. Murray's superiority over Agnes. Even though Agnes differs from Mrs. Murray in her opinion she must substitute the official understanding for her own. The internal thinking of Agnes gives way to material reality. Mrs. Murray is both ideologically and materially in a social superior position to her. Agnes cannot really have her view. It remains internal and therefore not subversive. To challenge Mrs. Murray means that she challenge's the woman's position as both employer and squire's wife. To prevent it from happening Agnes must acknowledge the official perspective that dictates her social position.

Agnes also finds herself and her consciousness having to accommodate the official consciousness in terms of her own perspectives' interaction with the institution of the Church. She condemns the minister's personal behavior. But the minister is more than an individual. He is the representative of the Church and therefore criticizing him personally also attacks the institutional church. Agnes does not have the social standing to critique the institution of the church. So she keeps her opinions to herself. Official ideology dictates that people in the ministry should get respect regardless of their individual character. Dislike for the pastor challenges this ideological view. Even though Agnes does not adopt the official consciousness, she still lives it out by maintaining silence at the validity of Mrs. Murray's opinion.

Official consciousness also prevents Agnes from seeing the reality of class relations. Agnes mocks the idea that one of the reasons that Mrs. Murray did not like the new pastor is because he did not go out of his way to speak to the squire. Mrs. Murray

had become accustomed to having this special greeting and resents the new pastor not following custom. Agnes's mockery slips out in her conversation with Mrs. Murray. Her humor shows that she at least subjectively understands the intermingling of social class and dominant ideological apparatuses. Mrs. Murray's disappointed expectation of a special greeting indicates that she believes that the Church should show deference to class position. Mr. Hatfield, the old pastor meets this idea by making a great effort to get the Murrays into their carriage and ignoring their lowly governess. Agnes clearly has the ability to "interpret . . . people in a pointed way" (W. Stevenson 99). She does so in this situation and clearly sees that religion is bound to the state and its power. Such an insight could prove subversive it were to catch on widely. So Agnes elaborates no further and keeps her thoughts internal and does not share them. Again, she, in the material world, defers to approved authority and its narrative. As she does not elaborate on her connection between social class and religion, so the Church remains safe from criticism. She also does not argue further with Mrs. Murray. She realizes that doing so could put her employment in danger. Agnes lives out the official consciousness by not talking about the matter further. Thus the class hierarchy escapes criticism and subversion as well.

Another way in which the official consciousness imposes itself on Agnes comes from Mrs. Murray's assertion of her competence to judge such things as the minister's quality. Agnes asserts the superiority of the new minister to the old. Mrs. Murray argues back that she has more competence to judge such things. She says: "Oh! I know perfectly well; I'm an excellent judge in such matters" (A. Brontë 79). Mrs. Murray says this to disagree with Agnes's positive assessment of the new minister. The statement

acts as an act of self-qualification. It establishes her perception as superior to that of Agnes. She represents the official consciousness in doing this. She effectively diminishes Agnes's opinion by asserting her ability to judge accurately. This is the official consciousness because it reinforces class position. Overriding Agnes's judgment not only expresses Mrs. Murray's opinion on a trivial matter, it also asserts its superiority over that of Agnes. At the same time it reminds her that she is generally superior to Agnes. The statement reduces Agnes's consciousness and judgment and therefore diminishes the importance of her lived consciousness. If Agnes expressed herself honestly and free from fear, it would endanger class relationships. The idea that Agnes's ideas have equal validity to those of Mrs. Murray must be quashed. When Agnes silences herself she basically adopts the perceived superior position of Mrs. Murray's assertion. Agnes's beliefs have effectively been called into doubt and she has been acculturated to reduce the importance of her own understandings and elevate those of her social superiors.

Raymond Williams offers a good model for studying the subjective experience of individuals. His idea that the structure of feeling takes individual feelings and perceptions and modifies them into more ideologically appropriate forms. Thus re-formed individual ideas get subsumed into a larger, dominant ideology where they have more tolerance for existing economic and social structures. One way that the structure manifests itself is in the form what Williams describes as official consciousness. This consciousness is the approved way of explaining and understanding the world and stands in conflict with the official consciousness, is the personal or lived consciousness. The two must get reconciled but this can only happen when the official consciousness

takes over its lived equivalent. In this way, an individual's subjectivity lines up with approved ways of thinking and ideological understanding. Nowhere does this process appear more clearly than in Anne Brontë's novel *Agnes Grey*.

CHAPTER THREE

INSIDERS AND OUTSIDERS AS ORGANIC INTELLECTUALS

INTRODUCTION

In both primary and secondary social groups, members interact with one another on the basis of some shared value. Those in primary groups have in common mutual affection and concern. Secondary groups bond over work or a mutually desired goal. A trait the groups share is that they are defined by the nature of the relationships that make them up.

However, not all social groups are classified relationally. Sociologist Robert Merton theorizes that possession of knowledge defines groups as well. In his essay "Insiders and Outsiders', Merton asserts that as society becomes more fragmented, ideas of the truth do likewise. Merton states: "At the extreme, an active and reciprocal distrust between groups finds expression in intellectual perspectives that are no longer located within the same universe of discourse" ("Insiders" 241). According to Merton, as viewpoints continue to radically diverge, groups begin to shut out the ideas of those who are not members. Ultimately, such a perspective leads to the belief that only those within a group can truly understand it. According to Merton's theory, participants in a group have a monopoly on the truth about the group. For Merton, a group's belief in its unique and true understanding of itself has the purpose of "achieving an intensified collective consciousness, a deepened solidarity, and a new or renewed primary or total allegiance of their members to certain social identities, statuses, groups or collectivities" ("Insiders" 243). Merton terms this 'Insiderism'. He argues that at its most basic level it

represents “a new credentialism of ascribed status in which understanding becomes accessible only to the fortunate few or fortunate many who are to the manner born” (“Insiders” 246).

The doctrine of the Insider defines Merton’s concept of the ‘Outsider’ too. Adherents of a social group that lives by the Insider doctrine believe that those outside the group can never really understand it. To the Insider, “. . . the Outsider has a structurally imposed incapacity to comprehend alien groups, statuses, cultures, and societies. Unlike the Insider, the Outsider has neither been socialized in the group nor has engaged in the run of experience that makes up its life . . . “(Merton, “Insiders” 247). According to Merton’s theory, the Insider believes they have the truth about a group’s meaning and role. At the same time, Insiders remain firmly convinced that Outsiders can never share in that truth.

Insiders gain ideological power from the perception that they have important knowledge. Their expertise, when shared, encourages compliant behaviors and ways of thinking. The understanding of the Insider works to move others to acceptance of subjection. Making those with whom knowledge is shared Insiders generates this acceptance. Any amount of Insider knowledge makes the person holding it an Insider to some degree. Becoming an Insider in a group means adhering to that group’s ideology. So, achieving Insider status inevitably carries with it the price of subjugation.

Outsider doctrine holds that only non-members can accurately understand a group. As Merton defines it, such a belief entails “. . . that knowledge about groups, unprejudiced by membership in them, is accessible only to outsiders” (“Insiders” 258). In

Outsiderism, having no attachment to a group provides an impartial, dispassionate and true perspective. The Outsider gains ideological efficacy from their status as external observers. From this removed position, Outsiders can identify and explain a group while not being a part of it. This allows a group's identity to be imposed on them from without rather than created internally. Externally assigned identity gives considerable power to those that assign it. Groups defined as acceptable enjoy access to resources and legitimacy. On the other hand, groups labeled as unacceptable end up marginalized and discredited. Through this branding mechanism, the expertise of Insiders and Outsiders becomes a way to guarantee acquiescence to the prevailing ideology.

The concepts of Outsiders and Insiders dovetail well with Antonio Gramsci's idea about the 'organic intellectual'. Gramsci argues that in order to sustain itself, capitalism does not rely only on those who have the technical knowledge to produce commodities. Gramsci theorizes that:

> "[e]very social group coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, organically, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields" (301).

Gramsci's intellectuals are not relegated to the ivory tower. Rather, they form a part of everyday social life. Sometimes an organic intellectual has specialized technical knowledge. In other instances, the organic intellectual acts as an overt apologist for the dominant ideology. Both types appear to stand outside the same ideology to which they

are bound. As Gramsci states: ". . . they thus put themselves forward as autonomous and independent of the dominant social group" (303). As a result, organic intellectuals gain credibility because they appear to convey pure knowledge untouched by the distortions of ideology. Belief in the unadulterated truth conveyed by the organic intellectual means that the dominant ideology remains invisible to those affected by it. Invisibility, in turn, enhances the power of the dominant ideology to shape its subjects without upheaval.

The books discussed in this chapter feature organic intellectuals as both Insiders and Outsiders. As Insiders, intellectuals facilitate the hegemony of the dominant ideology. They use their specialized knowledge to move potentially wayward individuals toward participation in ideological acceptable institutions. Examples of Insider organic intellectuals appear in Margaret Oliphant's novel *Miss Marjoribanks* and Anthony Trollope's *The American Senator*.

Miss Marjoribanks portrays organic intellectuals who target those individuals with potentially dangerous liminal identities. Throughout the narrative, those who threaten to break free from traditional institutions of marriage and Church become the target of those who share knowledge about and believe in these institutions. As such, organic intellectuals in Oliphant's book share their understandings of conventional apparatuses as Insiders. Often, they themselves participate actively in such institutions. What is equally interesting though is how the intellectuals in *Miss Marjoribanks* use their insider knowledge to turn identified outsiders into Insiders and so bring them into the fold of the dominant ideology.

Similarly, Anthony Trollope's *The American Senator* also features organic intellectuals who assist the dominant ideology less through institutions than by advocating the interests of the ruling class. As members of that class and hence Insiders, they use their expertise to explain and advocate for existing class relations. Knowledge becomes the medium to justify the status-quo. The upper class regularly use their membership in the ruling elite to generate self-serving explanations for the reality of the social relations in which they live. By doing so, they provide rationalization for upper-class loyalties and protection for privileged status.

Organic intellectuals have the status of Outsiders in George Eliot's *Middlemarch*. They are not Outsiders in the sense that they stand outside the dominant ideology as rebels. Rather, they represent its interests to those that threaten to deviate from it. As organic intellectuals, Outsiders claim an objectivity those with subversive identities or group affiliations lack. They step in when the possibility arises of someone taking on an identity counter to the one dictated by the dominant ideology. When one character in the novel sees the plight of the poor and desires to correct it, an organic intellectual steps in with an understanding of poverty that overrides a more radical viewpoint. Similarly, if someone lives a life counter to the capitalist value of profit-seeking, Outsiders intervene to correct the wayward person's drift outside capitalist social relations. They accomplish this task by interposing their own, ostensibly more objective and rational understanding of a situation which quells a more subversive perception.

In Mary Elizabeth Braddon's sensation novel, *The Doctor's Wife*, many of the characters live rich fantasy lives. Braddon draws a sharp contrast between characters' real existences and imaginary worlds. Those who retreat from the realities of their

material existences must be brought back to a ‘proper’ understanding of the reality in which they live. Outsiders perform this function on behalf of the dominant ideology. They enhance its hegemony through sharing of their knowledge. Organic intellectuals in *The Doctor’s Wife* use their knowledge to ground in material reality those who are prone to flights of fancy. Knowledge shared is intended to impose more ‘realistic’ and ideologically compatible ways of being in the real world. In this way, subversion is quashed and those who have seen the possibility of things being other than they are, are brought safely back into more proper ways of understanding their lives and worlds.

INSIDERS AND OUTSIDERS IN MARGARET OLIPHANT’S *MISS MARJORIBANKS*

In the book *Miss Marjoribanks* Margaret Oliphant portrays the social life of the economic and social elite in the town of Carlingford, England. Lucilla Marjoribanks, the novel’s protagonist, is the center of this life. She lives with her widowed father and hosts regular dinner parties for Carlingford’s upper class. At these events Lucilla acts as a dutiful host, introducing compatible guests to one another and making sure protocol is observed. Outside of Lucilla’s parties, the townspeople engage in a great deal of social activity as well. They have regular rounds of visiting each other’s houses and having tea.

These social venues provide a place for the town’s organic intellectuals to operate. In Oliphant’s book, they are Insiders who work for “the complacent perpetuation of a . . . middle-class ethic” which includes fidelity to and participation in ideologically approved institutions such as marriage and the Church (Jay, Introduction

xxiii). Organic intellectuals aid these formal apparatuses in achieving domination. Their knowledge brings the power of institutions into social spaces where such organizations exert no visible power.

Early in the book, when Lucilla arrives home from school, she gets excited at the prospect of revolutionizing the life of Carlingford. She hopes to do this by hosting a party every week at her father's house. Lucilla discusses her plans with her father's housekeeper, Nancy. They talk about the need for Carlingford to have a more vibrant social scene. Lucilla, having heard of her father's previous attempts at playing party host, expresses dissatisfaction. She tells Nancy of her grand plans and looks to future parties telling Nancy "[n]ow we are two women to manage everything, we ought to do still better" (Oliphant 31).

Lucilla has power over Nancy as her employer. Additionally, Lucilla has direct experience of the middle-class social life she wishes to improve. The combination of social power and class status make Lucilla an organic intellectual and gives credibility to the knowledge she passes on to Nancy. Lucilla establishes a momentary equality between herself and her domestic by confiding in Nancy and seeing the both of them as participants in the social transformation of the village. The equality rests on gender and transcends traditional boundaries of social class. Establishing the temporary parity, Lucilla makes Nancy an Insider in terms of understanding gender roles. Lucilla's statement reinforces patriarchal ideas of womanhood for both women which in this instance seeks to depict women as party hosts. As such, it moves them both toward acceptance of the dominant patriarchal ideology. Lucilla reinforces an ideologically constructed, essentialized identity for both herself and Nancy. That identity locks them

securely in the domestic sphere where patriarchy says they belong. Lucilla, as an organic intellectual and Insider, makes the traditional female tasks of household management a source of pride. Lucilla's confidence in her and Nancy's superior competence to plan parties rests on their identities as women, assigned to them through patriarchy. The conversation between mistress and servant reinforces an essentialized identity for both participants. Although Lucilla's servitude has the material trappings of middle-class comforts whereas Nancy's is couched in her employment relationship with the Marjoribanks, materially, the effect is the same. They both are restricted ". . . to using. . . [their] . . . talents solely in the domestic and social spheres" (Uglow).

Organic intellectuals frequently appear at the parties held in the Marjoribanks home. At one event Lucilla is confronted by a guest, Mrs. Woodburn, who has legendary skills at mimicry. The woman demonstrates her talent for her host by mocking one of Lucilla's close friends. Lucilla feels offense and refuses to laugh at the portrayal. Instead, she claims to have no sense of humor which blunts the effects of Mrs. Woodburn's mockery. Upset at her friend being made fun of, Lucilla "felt it was her duty to make an example" of the offending guest (Oliphant 41).

The punishment Lucilla hands down through her refusal to laugh makes it clear to everyone at the party that ideological protocol has been broken. Mrs. Woodburn's reaction indicates that Lucilla's sanction has had its desired effect. Everyone present sees that Mrs. Woodburn has been chastened. This is evidenced by her reaction. Mrs. Woodburn "did not answer a word . . . [and] . . . made a most dashing murderous sketch of Lucilla" which was a futile attempt at revenge (Oliphant 41). This brings relief to Lucilla's friends who had up until that time fallen victim to Mrs. Woodburn's toxic

imitations which kept all the good people “in terror of their lives” (41). Things at the Marjoribanks’ house get back to order. Guests are happy that Lucilla snubbed Mrs. Woodburn and shut down her disruptive mimicry.

Prior to her attendance at the party, Mrs. Woodburn kept the residents of Carlingford in terror of her mockery. When Lucilla socially sanctions her, the young hostess’s “prestige rose in consequence” (Oliphant 41). Rejection of Mrs. Woodburn’s attempt at humor cements Lucilla’s esteem in the eyes of Carlingford’s residents. Forcing Mrs. Woodburn into a definite category affirms the truth of existing ideological categories in general. Affirmation brings security to Carlingford’s citizens, by tying them firmly to ruling ideology and their places in it. While Mrs. Woodburn’s caricatures bring uncomfortable ideological contradictions to the fore, the social punishment Lucilla imposes on her makes sure that Carlingford society is no longer aware of them. Lucilla’s use of the knowledge she possesses as an organic intellectual prevents “the constraining ideology of . . . Victorian middle-class gentility” from being challenged (Jay, “Bed” 52).

In another scene, Lucilla receives a visit from her friend, Mrs. Bury. The visitor fears for Lucilla’s spiritual well-being. Mrs. Bury worries that Lucilla has been exposed to Catholicism during her travels abroad. Mrs. Bury asks “. . . whether Lucilla had not seen something soul-degrading and dishonouring to religion in all the mummeries of Popery” (Oliphant 55). Lucilla “who was perfectly orthodox, had replied to the question in the most satisfactory manner” (55). The response reassures Mrs. Bury and their conversation moves on to other topics.

Mrs. Bury's expression of spiritual concern for Lucilla makes her an organic intellectual advocating for Protestantism. Moreover, it makes her an advocate for the capitalist ideology tied to Protestant Christianity. Max Weber asserts that capitalism urges "the earning of money" while Protestantism encourages "strict avoidance of all uninhibited enjoyment "(12). Together, theology and economics create an ideology that upholds the work ethic necessary for the maintenance of capitalism. So, when Mrs. Bury inquires after the condition of Lucilla's soul, the question has meaning beyond adherence to a particular religious dogma. It serves to double-check Lucilla's continued loyalty to capitalism.

At one point, Lucilla declares that she has no interest in meeting a man. Nevertheless, at a party one of Lucilla's friends, Mrs. Chiley, offers to arrange a meeting between Lucilla and a clergyman. Mrs. Chiley speaks highly of the curate. She lists the young man's accomplishments and tells Lucilla of his high station in the Church. Mrs. Chiley rounds out the list of the potential suitor's qualifications by mentioning to Lucilla that he "has a nice property, and he is Rector of Basing, which is a very good living" (Oliphant 127). She further adds that the minister has potential for upward mobility in the Church.

In this instance, Mrs. Chiley takes on the role of the organic intellectual with expertise in arranging romantic pairings. Mrs. Chiley's offer brings into play formidable ideological power that guides Lucilla toward participation in approved social institutions and belief in capitalist economic ideology. Mrs. Chiley's offer, if accepted, carries with it the potential of an eventual marriage. In making the offer, Mrs. Chiley becomes an advocate for the institution of marriage itself and its patriarchal structures. Her advocacy

serves to move Lucilla toward the ideologically approved role of wife and all that it entails. At its base, Mrs. Chiley's attempt to pair Lucilla with the priest is a hegemonic act. It works to exert pressure on Lucilla to conform to officially sanctioned familial arrangements. Folding her into these arrangements would magnify the ideological saturation of every aspect of Lucilla's life and minimize the possibility of subversive behavior or thought. Mrs. Chiley's actions as an organic intellectual reinforce "[t]he fundamental attitude . . . that marriage was an unquestioned goal" (Reed 105).

Not only does Mrs. Chiley become an organic intellectual advocate for patriarchal marriage when talking to Lucilla but she tellingly includes the fact that the clergyman has significant property holdings. This makes Mrs. Chiley an advocate for capitalist economic ideologies as well. Private property provides social status and forms the foundation of capitalism. Underlying Mrs. Chiley's mention of the minister's land ownership is her belief in the value of private property. Contained in her offer to play matchmaker for Lucilla is a confirmation of property's fundamental desirability. Mrs. Chiley makes the institutions of marriage and property ownership appealing to Lucilla. Simultaneously, she exerts a subtle pressure for her host to engage with them.

Never does Mrs. Chiley make these values explicit. Her discussion with Lucilla takes the form of casual chit-chat. Yet, the ruling ideology is the unseen root of the conversation. As such, its power extends into the most private and ordinary interactions without participants ever knowing it. Politeness masks the subtle ideological action. It prevents intrusion by the raw, economic reality of capitalist property ownership but talk of romance and compatibility insidiously masks its controlling presence. The presence of ideological layers of manners and decorum dictate that direct discussion of property

relations are “ejected as undignified calculation” (Rubik). So, unnoticed by Mrs. Chiley or Lucilla, the offer Mrs. Chiley makes is in fact an argument that transcends the immediate relationship of the two friends. It more broadly defends existing property and social structures and attempts to attain their perpetuity.

Lucilla again assumes the role of organic intellectual when her friend, Rose Lake, summons Lucilla to talk over a problem. Rose expresses concern that her sister, Barbara, has been leaving the house at night and secretly meeting a man. It worries Rose that word might get out and the family’s reputation be ruined. She wants to avoid this possibility at all costs. Rose prefaces her request by saying: “. . . we are not great people like you; we are not rich, nor able to have all we like, and everybody to visit us . . .” (Oliphant 236). She further adds that: “The honour of a family is just as precious whether people live . . . in Grove Street or in Grange Lane” (236).

Rose’s admission, combined with her seeking of advice from Lucilla put the young woman immediately in a position of social inferiority to her mentor. Lucilla does not deny Rose’s attribution of inherent greatness in the Marjoribanks family, nor its higher status than the Lakes. Rose’s statement and Lucilla’s corresponding silence mark an ideological agreement between the two. Their actions show that they agree with the class divide between them and their respective places within it. In accepting Rose’s compliment Lucilla indicates she agrees with the assessment. Rose’s view of the Marjoribanks as superior shows that she believes in the lowliness of her own background. When Rose approaches Lucilla for advice, the resulting interaction has both of them living out the class relations of the larger capitalist society in microcosm.

By looking to Lucilla for guidance, Rose immediately diminishes her own relational power. The natural hierarchy present between counselor and advisee parallels the larger hierarchy between the upper and working classes. Lucilla, individually, exerts power over Rose. In seeking counsel, the person looking for help tacitly cedes control to the individual offering the instruction. This is what Rose does by requesting Lucilla's aid. The cession of power from Rose to Lucilla takes place in a classed context. The guidance Lucilla offers and the way Rose applies it are shaped by their respective positions in this context. By all appearances, the exchange between Lucilla and Rose is benevolent. One friend offers advice to another friend who has found themselves in a difficult situation. On a larger scale however, individual discussions like this one act together to build the larger class divisions at the level of society. Combined, the countless such relationships act, in total, to uphold existing class divides and their resulting ideologies.

When Rose goes to Lucilla for assistance, the resulting conversation does not just reinforce existing class relations by living them out. It bolsters them by distorting their real nature for both Lucilla and Rose. Ideology blinds them, preventing an accurate perception of the material economic and social realities at the root of their relationship. Rose sees Lucilla and the Marjoribanks family in idealistic terms. She attributes to them honor and greatness, both abstract concepts. She does not probe into the ideological origins of these vague concepts and the only hint Rose gives about her awareness that the Marjoribanks are more privileged economically than her own is when she says that they can have whatever they want. Even here though, Rose never gets more specific with the idea. In fact, she keeps the idea that the Marjoribanks can have anything they

like at a relatively abstract level. Consequently, Rose cannot see that it is really economic inequality that contributes to the differences between the Lake and Marjoribanks clans rather than the possession of an abstract virtue.

Lucilla falls into a deceiving idealization of her relationship with Rose too. It happens subtly in the realm of Lucilla's own subjectivity. When Rose compliments her, Lucilla does not ponder what her friend has said. Rather, her "imagination leaped forward a long way beyond the reality which her companion talked of so solemnly" (Oliphant 236). Lucilla does not feign modesty or assure Rose that the Lakes are the equals of the Marjoribanks. Since Lucilla does not take time to contemplate or challenge what Rose says, it indicates that Lucilla believes what Rose has told her to be self-evidently true and beyond question. This infers that the same truth informs the ideologies that create that reality.

Lucilla becomes an organic intellectual the moment Rose approaches her. As an intellectual Lucilla gains status which gives her the power to exert control over Rose through the wisdom she shares with her. Just as all organic intellectuals do, Lucilla speaks for the prevailing ideology. She advocates for the correctness of existing class structures. Lucilla does this on one level through the inherent discrepancy in power between advisor and advisee. With Lucilla taking the former role, she attains direct hegemony over Rose. At a different level, Lucilla uses her status as an organic intellectual to remain blind to the ideological trappings of that station. Combined with Rose's giving over of power to Lucilla, their personal relationship transforms them into "cultural mediator[s]" of larger class relations (McIntosh 56).

Later, a certain General Travers visits Carlingford. Mrs. Centum, one of Lucilla's friends, is eager to bring the General into the town's social circles. She believes that he will be a boon to the social scene with the status his high rank brings. Mrs. Centum also sees the General as a potential suitor for Lucilla, so she arranges a meeting between the two. The initial meeting does not go well. Lucilla cares little for the General and believes, in contradiction to Mrs. Centum, that Carlingford society does not need Travers after all. The General's presence, Lucilla fears, will bring young officers to Carlingford's social gatherings. In Lucilla's eyes, these young men will do nothing but flirt with the local young women and not add anything to the local society. Lucilla shows her disgust with Travers and is intent on showing him that Carlingford "could exist perfectly well without him and his officers; . . . [and] . . . Lucilla did not mean that the society she had taken so much pains to form should be condescended to by a mere soldier" (Oliphant 243).

Organic intellectuals in *Miss Marjoribanks* repeatedly draw individuals toward ideologically approved institutions and social arrangements. Most often, they do so by using their specialized knowledge to influence others. In her meeting with the General however, Lucilla's understanding acts to distort her own perspective. Her expertise hides the true nature of the social relations that contextualize her status. When Lucilla feels disgust that a 'mere soldier' would condescend to Carlingford society, it indicates that she feels herself, and the rest of her social class to be socially superior to those that pursue military careers. What results from this attitude is another idealization of social relationships and indeed, society as a whole. Lucilla's ideas about the General draw a sharp line of distinction between the civilian world and that of the military. This

keeps her from seeing the reality that the two are deeply enmeshed with each other. The army supports capitalist social relations with the use of repression. Lucilla, as an organic intellectual, aids it in this function. Since she has made the effort to understand the town's high society, she clearly feels that such knowledge is worthwhile. But, the more Lucilla comprehends Carlingford's elite, the less she sees the fact that the life she enjoys is a highly regulated one. Lucilla fails to realize the entire social structure in which she lives along with her place in it are determined and enforced by institutional bodies such as the one General Travers belongs to. So while she believes herself the General's superior due to her control over local social life, Lucilla in truth becomes a compliant subject thanks to her position as an organic intellectual.

In Margaret Oliphant's novel *Miss Marjoribanks* the social life of Carlingford's elite figures prominently. Their dinner parties and drop-in visits create interactions that allow for the actions of organic intellectuals on behalf of ideologically approved social institutions. Organic intellectuals in the narrative use their knowledge to move those with whom they share it toward taking part in and being supportive of approved ideological apparatuses. Their work facilitates the power of these entities in realms of life where they are not thought to be active.

INSIDERS AND ORGANIC INTELLECTUALS IN *THE AMERICAN SENATOR*

The American Senator looks at the lives of the landed aristocracy in the rural village of Dillsborough. Much of the plot centers around a pending legal case involving a poor local farmer named Goarly. He has filed suit against local nobleman Lord Rufford resulting from damage done to crops during Rufford's fox hunts. The lawsuit, and the

controversy it creates, explore issues of class and privilege, all of which are observed by a visiting Senator from the United States.

The book portrays organic intellectuals who act as protectors of upper class interests and power. They are Insiders by virtue of the fact that they either belong to the elite or work on its behalf. Organic intellectuals in Trollope's novel act to achieve two purposes. First, they use their knowledge to prevent upward class mobility. Knowledge in this case becomes the tool by which those who wish to become part of the upper class are denied access. This keeps the ruling class pure and impenetrable. Another use to which organic intellectuals in *The American Senator* put their knowledge is through deputizing. According to Gramsci, organic intellectuals often disseminate their understandings through the employment of deputies. He describes it by saying, ". . . intellectuals are the dominant group's 'deputies' exercising subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government" (306).

Deputizing occurs often in *The American Senator.* Those deputized become advocates for the interests of the upper classes despite the fact that they cannot claim membership in them. Deputizing serves the power of the ruling class in two ways. First, it increases the reach of their ideological influence without having to create new ideological or repressive apparatuses. Deputies come from outside the ruling class and so carry the message of upper class superiority to their peers in the middle and lower classes. Secondly, deputized intellectuals prevent the crossing of class boundaries not just by sharing the dominant ideology, but by believing in it as well. Organic intellectuals conform to the same ideology they disseminate. They thus tamp down questioning of or conflict with the dominant ideology by taking on the interests of those that oppress

them. Power for the ruling class magnifies yet again through this process. Their use of power becomes so effective that even those they oppress assist in maintaining their own oppression by advocating for the interests of the upper class.

The book opens with a conversation between such a deputy, Larry Twentyman and Mr. Masters. Twentyman is a wealthy local landowner but has no noble title. Mr. Masters is a local attorney who is considering taking on a pending lawsuit. The suit involves Goarly, a poor local farmer, whose crop has been trampled by the local nobleman, Lord Rufford. During a foxhunt, Rufford and his fellow sportsmen, rode over Goarly's crop, destroying it and depriving the farmer of its potential income. Twentyman and Masters discuss the lawsuit.

Larry firmly believes ". . . this threatened action against the nobleman was distasteful" (Trollope 20). This despite the fact that Larry, "[t]hough a keen sportsman himself . . . did not specially personally like Lord Rufford" (Trollope 20). But Larry's concern about the case transcends his personal feelings in the interest of class solidarity. He has been deputized by the ruling class to advocate for their interest. Larry identifies himself as a member of the elite, even though he "had never been asked to fire a gun on the Rufford preserves" (20).

This shows that Larry subjects himself to the ruling ideology that places people like Lord Rufford in a position of social superiority. He acknowledges the privileged status of Lord Rufford and the other members of his social class, even though he finds Lord Rufford personally unlikable. The hold of the dominant ideology is illustrated by this conversation with Masters. Larry has become an organic intellectual through his

expression of sympathy with Lord Rufford's cause. In the conversation with Masters, he affirms his own specialized knowledge of the class system for himself as well as the attorney. For Mr. Masters and Larry, the discussion they have affirms "the myth of nobility and manliness which underwrites the cult of the hunt" and the unquestionable position and power that myth denotes (Trotter 228). Consequently, both men succumb to the dominant ideology of class and their assigned places within it.

Much of the conversation regarding Goarly's case is taken up by members of a local club in the village. The club mirrors the upper class's interest in fox hunting even though its members are not considered part of that class. They come from working and middle-class professions. Nupper, the local doctor and Runciman the owner of the tavern where the group meets are members. At one of their meetings, the topic of Goarly's lawsuit comes up. One of the members is the village attorney, Mr. Masters, who possesses an intimate knowledge of the institutions of the law and legal system and who firmly believes "that the law is the proper and necessary protector of proprietorship" (Cunningham 98). The club's members are eager to find out whether or not Masters will take Goarly on as a client. Masters initially does not commit to take on or decline Goarly's case. However, his friends at the club assume that he has accepted it. This shocks them. Everyone at the meeting agrees that ". . . Goarly is a scoundrel with whom Mr. Master should have nothing to do" and cannot believe the attorney will act as the farmer's advocate (Trollope 25).

Conversation soon turns to discussion of Goarly's character. Members feel the same outrage expressed earlier by Larry Twentyman. They express their beliefs that Goarly has no business suing Lord Rufford. One member, Harry Stubbings, goes so far

as to say that the poor farmer does not even have the right to own property. He states: “Such a chap oughtn’t to be allowed to have land. I’d take it away from him by Act of Parliament. It’s such as him as is destroying the country” (Trollope 26). The gathered group generally agrees with these sentiments.

Masters comes under the pressure of is fellow club members. They urge him not to take up Goarly’s cause. Mr. Botsey, the brewer, ups the pressure, telling Masters “We expect something better from you than that” (Trollope 24). The rest of the club jumps in to back up Botsey. They go over a litany of Goarly’s faults. Additionally, they bring up an offer for compensation Rufford had previously made to Goarly. Mr. Nuppers tells the group “Goarly is a great fool for his pains . . . [h]e has had a very fair offer made him, and, first or last, it’ll cost him forty pounds” which increases the pressure on Mr. Master not to take on Goarly as a client (Trollope 25). Masters eventually gives in and tells his fellow club members that he will not represent Goarly in the suit.

Although none of the club members come from the nobility, they still passionately argue for its interests. Much as Larry Twentyman’s understanding is shaped by a group that rejects him, so too is that of Masters and his fellow club members. The club is transformed into an advocate for Lord Rufford and his status. It creates a knowledge of Goarly in order to justify his inherent irrelevance in the case.

A challenge by Goarly in court would make the aggrieved farmer and nobleman equal legal subjects. Class distinctions would disappear and Goarly would stand a good chance of the case being adjudicated in his favor. To prevent this, members of the club become organic intellectuals who collectively dispense information that they then use to

pressure Masters to re-frame the issues involved in the lawsuit outside the context of social class.

Club members discuss the issue in terms of Goarly's character instead of the content of his complaint. They identify him as fundamentally undeserving. According to Botsey and the rest of Masters' friends, Goarly does not even warrant legal recognition let alone victory in his case. Relegating Goarly to legal non-existence removes him from Masters' area of expertise, thereby suggesting that there cannot be a case. Consequently, any equality between Rufford and Goarly will be rendered moot.

Masters' companions also attempt to simplify the lawsuit to a mere matter of money. By mentioning the monetary settlement offered by Lord Rufford as well as its fairness, the precarious economic existence of Goarly is turned into a meaningless abstraction. The club has done what capitalism does to individuals involved in every financial transaction. It has de-humanized them. No longer does Goarly have a real, material existence. He has become an idea, simply part of a financial calculation. Thus reduced, he loses relevance, as justice for Goarly is made into a matter of price rather than class.

The Goarly case though does attract the interests of those who are strangers to village life. The American Senator, Elias Gotobed, of the book's title, visits England to report to his colleagues on English ways. He arrives when the controversy over the court case between Rufford and Goarly is at its hottest. Gotobed is curious about the parties involved and decides to investigate on his own. He visits Goarly at his farm. The

senator expresses sympathy, declaring his surprise “at seeing so many rich men banded together against one who I suppose is not rich” (Trollope 108).

Senator Gotobed appears to be an Outsider. He frequently criticizes English institutions while simultaneously asserting the superiority of life in his native United States. However, the opposite is true. Gotobed is an Insider. He holds a powerful position in a capitalist country not unlike the England he so often runs down. As an Insider, he advocates for the dominant ideology through his support of the fundamental capitalist institution of private property.

When the senator first encounters Goarly, he introduces himself and declares he is “a Senator for the State of Mikewa”, thus announcing his status (Trollope 106). Even though the political reference to “senatorial honors . . . had been lost upon Goarly” he and his wife still recognize Gotobed’s high social standing (109). Mrs. Goarly proves this when during the conversation with the senator, she interjects “The gentl’man was going to offer to help us a little . . .” referring to her assumption that Gotobed was going to give them money (Trollope 109).

As an organic intellectual, he extols the virtue of private property. When Goarly angrily asserts “It’s my own land you know . . . [n]o one can’t touch me on it as long as the rates is paid” the statement was “. . . the first word spoken by the Goarlys that had pleased the Senator . . .” (108). Goarly’s assertion and the support the senator offers for it reinforce the property relations of capitalism. Gotobed backs up Goarly’s legal argument, but he supports the legal system that will litigate it as well. The senator’s expression of support reinforces the idea that the courts provide the correct venue for seeking redress. Goarly consequently gets moved toward seeing the issue only in terms

of his particular case. As a consequence, he gets moved away from turning his anger into action that challenges existing property relations and their resulting ideology.

This is borne out by the final results of the case. It turns out that Goarly laid out fish laced with strychnine in the woods where Rufford hunted. He did so at the behest of one of Rufford's former tenants, Mr. Scrobby who "would not pay his rent, as was at last ejected, --having caused some considerable amount of trouble" and had a grudge against Rufford (Trollope 476). He hoped to disrupt the nobleman's sport as an act of revenge. When this is revealed, both Scrobby and Goarly are arrested and the case decided in Lord Rufford's favor.

Social circumstances, which contextualize the motives of Scrobby and Goarly, remain unexamined as a result. The suit becomes a matter of personal character instead. This depersonalizes the conflict and removes it from the real conditions in which Scrobby and Goarly live their lives. By not contextualizing the two men, class positions remains unchanged and the overall class structure and the ideology that maintain its dominance stay unchallenged.

While his case is being litigated, Lord Rufford throws a party at his home. In attendance is Arabella Trefoil. Arabella desperately wants to marry. She does not want to do so for love. Rather she hopes to wed so that he financial situation might improve. At the time of the ball, Arabella is engaged. Arabella sees the event as an opportunity to find new, better prospects for marriage than the one she currently has. Over the course of the evening, Arabella brazenly flirts with a number of men. She pays particular attention to the party's host, Lord Rufford. Observing her behavior is the lord's sister Lady Penweather. Lady Penweather notes that Arabella "was conducting herself now as

though she were fettered by no bonds, and it seemed also that the lady was very anxious to contract other bonds" and is scandalized by what she sees (Trollope 159). She knows what Arabella is up to and fears her brother might fall prey to the scheming young woman's wiles. Lady Penweather inquires about Arabella with her fiancé, John Morton. She asks about Arabella's riding skills and interrogates Morton about whether he knows a Lord Augustus. John Morton responds that he does not know about Arabella's riding ability or the lord to which Lady Penweather referred.

Lady Penweather views Arabella's potential success in winning her brother's hand would constitute a disaster. Arabella does not belong to the same social class as Lord Rufford. Her marriage to Lady Penweather's brother would be a breach of class boundaries. Lady Penweather does not object to her brother marrying but she "was by no means anxious that he should take such a one as Arabella Trefoil" (Trollope 159). The statement indicates Lady Penweather's evaluation of Arabella. Sensing that Arabella seeks upward mobility, Lady Penweather steps in as a gatekeeper. For her, the one distinction of upper-class membership is knowledge. A person's skill at the wealthy pastime of horseback riding and who they have in their social circles separate those in the elite strata and those who do not belong.

When Lady Penweather asks John Morton about his fiancé, she is testing. Arabella lacks the requisite knowledge of upper-class membership. This reinforces her inferior class status in the eyes of Lady Penweather. It justifies Arabella's exclusion from the ranks of the social class Lady Penweather occupies. Tied up with Lady Penweather's evaluation is her belief in her own superiority. When John indicates that Arabella does not have the requisite knowledge to belong to upper classes, Lady

Penweather has her class-based knowledge confirmed. Consequently, she simultaneously affirms her own correctness in both knowledge and social position and effectively fends off an incursion by Arabella across class lines.

After the ball at his house, Lord Rufford begins a flirtation with Arabella. He does not take it seriously and enjoys kissing and flattering her, but not much more. Rumors get started regarding the couple. Word spreads that the two intend to marry. Lord Rufford's friend, Surbiton comes for a visit. When he is alone with Lord Rufford, he brings up the fact that he has heard rumors of the burgeoning romance. Surbiton worries that what he has heard may be true. He tells Rufford that if the rumors are true, that he must call off the engagement immediately. Of particular concern to Surbiton is how widespread the knowledge of the engagement has become. He tells Lord Rufford that "The very servants suppose that they know it, and there isn't a groom or horseboy about who isn't in his heart congratulating the young lady on her promotion" and reiterates that his friend must give Arabella up if he has gotten betrothed to her (Trollope 308).

In terms of class, Lord Rufford and Surbiton are equals. They both belong to society's elite echelons. When Surbiton brings up the topic of Arabella, he acts as an intellectual. He conveys two important lessons to his friend. First, he wants to remind Lord Rufford of his identity. Surbiton, does this by mentioning Arabella's inferior social position. Secondly, Surbiton's warning attempts to correct what he sees as an errant view of the class system held by the working and lower classes.

The conversation between Surbiton and Rufford shows the importance of knowledge and how maintaining it holds the key to upper-class dominance. Surbiton transmits the justification of class divisions as truth. But Rufford's acceptance of it is not enough. What the lower classes believe true, must be falsified. This can only happen if Arabella does not become part of the elite. Surbiton acts as an organic intellectual, dispensing the wisdom necessary for defense of upper class power. He is a member of and has understanding of the social position of the wealthy and elite. Surbiton takes it upon himself to prevent upward class mobility. He uses knowledge to block the "danger to social boundaries posed by romantic desire" (Kucich 43). Knowledge must replace affection or lust. Surbiton transmits the necessary understanding that reminds Lord Rufford of his class alliances. He effectively brings clarity to class conflict and enlists knowledge as a weapon to rally Rufford to the defense of class lines.

As the novel's plot unfolds, Larry Twentyman eventually gets his wish. Lord Rufford invites him over for a hunt. The invitation thrills Larry and he blends right in with Lord Rufford's other guests. After the hunt, Larry, Lord Rufford and the other guests at the hunt stop by the Bush tavern. Larry is eager for his friends there to see the new status he has earned. In particular, he wants Mr. Runciman to see the favor he has earned in the eyes of Lord Rufford. Larry gets his chance when Runciman serves soup. Larry gets lucky because ". . . at that moment Lord Rufford put his hand on his shoulder and desired him to sit down,--and Runciman both heard and saw it" (Trollope 331). When Lord Rufford makes this friendly gesture, he creates an object of knowledge. It is not verbal but no less clear than an overt statement. Larry understands this. He realizes that Runciman seeing Lord Rufford's interaction conveys an understanding and

knowledge of Larry's elevated social status. Larry wants everyone to know that those with noble lineage at last have decided to "accept the newly wealthy into is midst" and convey on the previously excluded an equality they had not previously enjoyed (Michie 105).

Trollope's novel provides a number of examples of how organic intellectuals work. In the book, organic intellectuals work in the service of the upper-class. They rationalize the existing power structures that privilege the noble and wealthy. Whether an intellectual in the novel belongs to the upper echelon or not, they always have the positions of Insiders, becoming gatekeepers of specialized, class-based knowledge that they use to fight off infiltration from the working class and the poor such as Goarly.

ORGANIC INTELLECTTUALS IN *MIDDLEMARCH*

Individuals are continually required to form identities that prepare them to take on ideologically assigned social roles. Maintaining these identities is critical to retaining capitalist social relations and structures. Deviant identities, those which do not fit into predetermined ideological categories, pose a danger to the continuation of capitalism. When a person threatens to deviate from their ideologically assigned identity, they put the social system itself in jeopardy.

Organic intellectuals sometimes act to prevent this risk posed to the dominant ideology. They use their Insider knowledge to guide potential deviants back into the ideological fold. This happens in the novel *Middlemarch*. George Eliot's book portrays a number of characters who hang in the balance between ideologically acceptable identities and subversive ones. These threats are always minimized through the

intervention of organic intellectuals who ensure that any potentially dangerous knowledge is replaced by understandings that line up with the prescriptions of the dominant ideology.

Middlemarch has a large cast of characters. It includes Dorothea Brooke, a young woman who wants to make a different in the lives of those less fortunate than she. Unfortunately, her dreams are delayed by an ill-advised marriage to a much older man. Tertius Lydgate, a physician with modern ideas that challenge Middlemarch's medical establishment also plays a role. He winds up in an unhappy marriage as well by marrying Rosamond Vincy, a woman whose spending habits bring the couple to the brink of bankruptcy. Will Ladislaw's story rounds out the narrative. He is the cousin of Dorothea's husband and makes his living as an artist.

Individuals in the book mirror the larger social and economic changes in their environment. Many characters are works in progress. They struggle to form identities and encounter two basic possibilities: one option available conforms to ideological expectations while another reveals individuals who often find themselves facing the possibility of forming identities that challenge the dominant ideology. These possible selves threaten the hegemony of the prevailing ideology since they open the possibility of developing revolutionary understanding which, in turn, puts the existing relations of capitalism at risk of being overturned. However, to counter this possibility, *Middlemarch* portrays organic intellectuals who are Outsiders who provide guidance to individuals who are at risk of drifting into dangerous identities. Repeatedly, experts of various types offer their know-how to nudge individuals away from ideologically risky identities and toward more acceptable ones. Their status as Outsiders gives them credibility since the

body of knowledge they draw from when persuading a targeted person provides a new truth that makes an ideologically prescribed selfhood preferable to one that puts the hegemony of the dominant ideology in jeopardy. In essence, expertise becomes a weapon of ideological power in the guise of wisdom and understanding.

Dorothea Brooke appears nothing if not conventional. She has a strong religious faith and traditional ideas regarding gender roles. Despite her conservative attitudes though, Dorothea has the potential to form a revolutionary identity. Early in the book, she takes up the cause of the poor tenants who rent the land of Middlemarch's wealthier residents. Dorothea is appalled by the conditions of their housing and wants to build cottages to correct the situation. The wretchedness of the tenants' lives disturbs her so much that she feels guilt and anger at her own, economically comfortable situation. When talking to her friend, Sir James Chettam about her plan, she expresses her exasperation saying, "I think we deserve to be beaten out of our beautiful houses with a scourge of small cords—all of us who let tenants live in such sties as we see round us" (Eliot 31).

As a religious believer, Dorothea initially garners social acceptance. Her faith raises no eyebrows. Eliot makes clear in narrative though, that Dorothea's belief differs from traditional conceptions of doctrine. She states that Dorothea's attitudes do not arise from an uncritical acceptance of dogma. Eliot notes of Dorothea's belief that "[t]he intensity of her religious disposition, the coercion it exercised over her life, was but one aspect of a nature altogether ardent, theoretic, and intellectually consequent . . ." (28-29). Accordingly, Dorothea has a difficult time with the pettiness of conventional Church teachings

Dorothea attempts to live out ideologically challenging values. As mere thoughts, these values fit easily into acceptable modes of passive piety. But, as actions, they threaten existing relations. The statement Dorothea makes has real revolutionary potential. She has had direct experience of poverty and its effects because the suffering tenants show Dorothea the harsh realities of the economic system under which they all live. Her experiences and knowledge offer Dorothea the chance of taking on a revolutionary identity. The understanding she has provides the intellectual tools by which she could mount resistance to the capitalist system. However, Sir James steps in to prevent this by acting as an organic intellectual and Outsider. This is achieved when he mentions to Dorothea that he has read a book on the topic of tenant cottages. He also tells her of his support for the project of building new residences.

In the same breath in which he gives his blessing to Dorothea's project however, Sir James mentions the great cost of such an undertaking. He states: "Of course, it is sinking money; that is why people object to it. Labourers can never pay rent to make it answer", after which, he repeats his belief in the endeavor (Eliot 31). Sir James' declaration identifies him as an Outsider. He clearly comes from a background of privilege himself and has no direct experience of poverty. As a result, his remove from the real condition of the tenants does not increase his empathy. Instead, he claims a special understanding of the village's impoverished renters but it is one in which the project will be defeated because he believes that it can never make up for the money spent in carrying it out. The wisdom Sir James shares with Dorothea prevents her from embracing the identity of revolutionary. Mentioning the text he read on the topic brings an acceptable understanding of the tenants' situation and provides a modulated

approach to the situation by codifying the idea of change through reform rather than rebellion. The presence of the text, represented through its validation of the male voice counters and displaces Dorothea's direct and emotional observations of the poor's misery.

Dorothea gets guided toward an ideologically appropriate identity through Sir James' statement about the tenants' inability to repay the expense laid out on their behalf. His statement is certain. It reorients the conversation back to an economic viewpoint of the matter. Sir James uses his understanding of the financial aspects of the plan to show Dorothea that money remains the supreme value, an idea firmly in line with capitalism's guiding ideology. By reminding Dorothea about monetary concerns, Sir James reinforces the desirability of being a reformer rather than a revolutionary. Cost imposes limitations. Limitations in turn provide definite parameters for Dorothea and Sir James' execution of their plan. No matter how good their intentions, the reality of their venture can never transcend the need for money. As a result, it will always remain subservient to the capitalist market and so controlled by it. The conversation between Sir James and Dorothea forms a mechanism that diverts Dorothea from a genuinely revolutionary path. Using an understanding that "is assembled from multiple, fragmented epistemological resources", Sir James supplants Dorothea's more critical perceptions (Paxman 115). Once over-ridden, the critical understanding of social conditions loses its ability to shape identity. Consequently, the possibility of Dorothea transforming her traditional, accepted theological understanding of poverty into a more materialist, revolutionary one is quashed by her interaction with Sir James.

When Dorothea gets engaged to Casaubon, she goes with him to tour their future home. There the couple encounter Will Ladislaw, Casaubon's cousin. Ladislaw lives the life of an artist. He spends his time travelling in Europe and touring its art museums. Casaubon disapproves of his relative's lifestyle. He envisioned a university education and respectable career for the young man. When Dorothea asks about Will, Casaubon expresses his frustration. He tells his bride-to-be that Will "declined to go to an English university, where I would gladly have placed him, and chose what I must consider the anomalous course of studying at Heidelberg" (Eliot 81). As a result, Will does not have any real career plans

When he describes his relationship with Will, Casaubon fills the role of an organic intellectual by creating an identity for Will in the eyes of his guests. Casaubon's revelation is an attempt to make Will's choices questionable. As a wandering artist, Will defies conventional expectations of a virtuous life. He holds no steady employment and lives his life "without any special object, save the vague purpose of what he calls culture" (Eliot 81). Will's choice demands commentary, evaluation and guidance since without it, Will demonstrates the possibility of living outside the categorizations of the dominant ideology.

Although Casaubon is a minister of the Church, his pronouncement about Will has no overt theological content. Even so, he has authority and so constitutes an organic intellectual. Casaubon garners respect outside of his religious title. Mr. Brooke illustrates this fact. He tells Casaubon that "One gets rusty in this part of the country, you know. Not you Casaubon; you stick to your studies . . ." indicating that he sees Casaubon as a discipline and knowledgeable man (Eliot 80). Dorothea respects

Casaubon's intellectual abilities too. She looks forward to marrying Casaubon and giving more "complete devotion to Mr. Casaubon's aims" and hopes to gain "higher knowledge . . . in . . . companionship" with him (78). Like her uncle, Dorothea sees her future husband as a person of authority. So, what Casaubon says about Will carries great weight.

Casaubon conveys the truth about Will from the perspective of an Outsider. The old academic puts himself forward as someone completely other than his cousin. When Casaubon mentions his continuing support of Will, he demonstrates that he has a strong sense of duty. This makes his criticism that Will does not work at a job that is "needful instrumentally" all the more potent (Eliot 82). It frames the young artist as Casaubon's opposite. Through Casaubon's explanation, Will becomes a person without responsibility or sense of social obligation. In sharing his knowledge of Will, Casaubon assures Dorothea and her uncle that their way of life is virtuous and upright by comparison.

The virtue implied by Casaubon's pronouncement is self-sufficiency. He pointedly mentions that Will's line of work does not allow for independence. Casaubon's knowledge of Will's character, which he shares with Dorothea and Mr. Brooke, turns "dependence into a stigmatized character trait" and so makes Will immoral (Morrison 79). Through his expertise, Casaubon equates the bohemian life of the artist with immorality. This results in making such a lifestyle unappealing.

No one with Casaubon threatens to live the life of a wandering artist. But, Casaubon's statement reinforces the dominant ideology by way of contrast. Will's life

differs greatly from the life Dorothea and Casaubon are about to embark on together. Pointing out the negative aspects of Will's free spiritedness emphasizes the virtue of the Casaubon's staid life. Casaubon's critique gives weight to an earlier statement he made. He declared, referring to life on his estate, "Each position has its corresponding duties. Yours, I trust, as mistress of Lowick, will not leave any yearning unfulfilled" (Eliot 78). Pointing out Will's failings allows Casaubon to remind Dorothea of her assigned role under patriarchal ideologies of gender.

Another potential threat to Middlemarch's conservative ideology comes from Tertius Lydgate, the town's new doctor. He brings the latest medical knowledge when he arrives in the town and opens a practice. Lydgate applies new techniques in treating patients. One innovation he implements is to make less use of medicines. By not using the services of the apothecary, Lydgate threatens the financial well-being of not just the town pharmacist but its more traditional doctors as well. His new practice deprives them of money earned through doctors dispensing drugs. This is significant because the apothecary and physicians of the town, before Lydgate arrives, had enjoyed a symbiotic relationship that earned handsome profits for all involved. Previous doctors had been "paid for their work . . . by making out long bills for draughts, boluses, and mixtures" many of which were unnecessary (Eliot 444). The practice of medicine, prior to Lydgate's arrival had centered on making money rather than real patient care

Lydgate's practices even draw the attention of the local grocer, Mr. Mawmsey. During a casual conversation between the grocer and doctor, the issue comes up. Lydgate cannot help but express his strong opinion on the matter telling Mawmsey that prescribing too many medications equates to quackery. According to Lydgate, the

practice “must lower the character of practitioners, and be a constant injury to the public” and is the equivalent of outright quackery (Eliot 444). Word of Mawmsey’s conversation reaches other medical practitioners in the town who are worried because Lydgate’s new-fangled methodology cuts into their large profits. The tactics of the established medical community in Middlemarch is not to directly attack Lydgate on financial grounds but to question instead the new doctor’s knowledge. Local medical practitioners accuse Lydgate of using unproven ideas and being arrogant. It does not take long for Lydgate to earn the enmity of others in Middlemarch’s medical community. Gossip circulates that the new doctor “was one of those hypocrites who try to discredit others by advertising their own honesty, and that it might be worth some people’s while to show him up” (Eliot 447).

The established practitioners in Middlemarch are organic intellectuals. Their expertise lies in the knowledge they have of their field. When they question Lydgate’s capabilities, they do so only to cloak the underlying financial interest they have in practicing medicine the way it had been practiced before Lydgate’s arrival on the scene. They see themselves as having a body of knowledge that rivals that of Lydgate. In judging his new practices, they put themselves in the position of Outsiders since they do not see Lydgate as a legitimate part of their group.

Like Dorothea, and her plan to improve tenant housing, Lydgate has the potential of becoming a revolutionary. He threatens the ideological foundation of capitalism, not only in cutting into the profits of the town doctors and pharmacist but in having direct experience of the effects of poverty. He regularly visits the poor to administer treatment. What is also clear is that he really understands what poverty is like. Eliot writes that

when ordering dietary changes for his more economically deprived patients, he takes into account their financial situation, always “adjusting his prescriptions of diet to their small means” (589).

Using their knowledge, and spreading it around town, the established medical community attempts to marginalize Lydgate. By excluding him from the society he is trying to change, they minimize his revolutionary capability and so diminish the threat he poses to the status quo. In privileging their own knowledge, the pharmacist and the rest of Lydgate’s medical enemies try to create an understanding of the new doctor that isolates him from the larger community and takes away his credibility.

Mr. Wrench, the pharmacist, and his compatriots offer an alternative explanation of Lydgate’s practice in order to interrupt the potentially revolutionary trajectory that Lydgate is on. The knowledge disseminated by the critical medical community do not control Lydgate’s behavior by acting directly on him. Rather, they use their knowledge to explain Lydgate to Middlemarch’s residents. The pharmacist and other members of the established medical community point to Lydgate’s method of practice, identifying him as “incompetent and unscrupulous” because he does not conform to the profit motive in his work (Eliot 449). By explaining Lydgate in this way, his enemies assert that refusing to seek monetary gain when practicing medicine is unnatural. This knowledge of Lydgate then reaffirms the naturalness of the capitalist profit motive.

Later in the novel, organic intellectuals convey knowledge to eliminate the possibility of revolutionary action. A railroad company wants to buy land in Middlemarch. It plans to run part of its route through land that is currently being used for agriculture.

Caleb Garth and Fred Vincy are out to survey a piece of land when they encounter agents for the railroad doing the same. As Caleb and Fred look on, the railroad agents come under attack by farm hands working on an adjacent field. After breaking up the attack, Caleb walks up to the disgruntled workers and tries to reason with them. When he asks the reason for the attempted violence, the farmhands cannot offer an articulate reply. Standing nearby, Timothy Cooper, a farmer who tended his hay throughout the attack, speaks up. He says that the railroad will not offer any benefit to the poor. He labels the proposed line as being "good for the big folks to make money out on" and offering no benefit to Middlemarch's poor residents (Eliot 560). Further, Timothy tells Caleb that ". . . this is the big folks's world and that Caleb himself speaks for the privileged (560).

Here again the circumstances are ripe for the formation of a radical identity. The workers pose an immediate danger to the established power structures in Middlemarch. They have gone beyond idle talk and have taken up arms against those they see as their oppressors and exploiters. As the workers pose an immediate and physical danger to social order, Caleb takes it upon himself to set the workers straight in their views. He does this by correcting their view of the railroad's presence. Caleb tells the angry men that the railroad's arrival is inevitable. He says to them: "Now, my lads, you can't hinder the railroad: it will be made whether you like it or not" and warns the men that they risk arrest if they continue in their resistance (Eliot 559).

Caleb Garth is an Outsider in his interaction with the farmhands. He and they acknowledge the vast class difference between them. The narrative indicates that Mr. Garth understands the fact that he is different from the working men in the field. Eliot

writes that Garth had “rigorous notions about workmen and practical indulgence towards them. To do a good day’s work and do it well, he held to be a part of their welfare . . .” (559). Such condescension could not come from a person who sees himself as the equals of those about whom he speaks. Caleb speaks to them as an Outsider to correct their revolutionary perspective and make the conditions under which they live seem inevitable. The knowledge he shares with them supports the dominant ideology. Caleb replaces their critical analysis of economic relations with ideologically correct knowledge of the railroad and its role. It is intended to pacify the workers and garner their acceptance of their economic conditions. To avoid continued revolutionary action, Caleb steps in with a new understanding of social conditions to avoid “a crisis of command when spontaneous consent has failed” (Gramsci 307). His knowledge becomes the tool by which Caleb makes the “overwhelming social and economic determinism of nineteenth-century working-class poverty” appear natural and inevitable (Young 48).

However this is not to say that the discussion between Caleb Garth and the field hands has been one-way. Eliot provides an arena in which two bodies of knowledge can compete. For the workers do have an unvarnished view of their oppression, conveyed through the knowledge of Timothy Cooper who acts as an organic intellectual for the poor. Cooper’s wisdom provides a dangerous understanding of the world. It accurately reveals the exploitative nature of economic relations in Middlemarch. In opposition, Caleb Garth tries to supplant this knowledge and blunt its potential revolutionary force. He does this by speaking as the Outsider. Caleb gains credibility by offering empathy for the workers’ plight. But, his understanding has an ideological tinge. As a tactic, Caleb acknowledges the deprivation of the poor. He says: “Things may be bad for the

poor man—bad they are; but I want the lads here not to do what will make things worse for themselves", a comment that simultaneously threatens and pities the workers (Eliot 560).

This further emphasizes Caleb's Outsider status. While he evinces sympathy for the poor, he does not identify himself as one of them. Caleb's threat of legal intervention in the matter puts him firmly on the side of entrenched power. He tries, through his statements, to rationalize the suffering of the farmhands. However, Caleb depicts the threat of legal intervention as only making things worse for the angry farm workers. He counsels a wisdom that will keep things as they are. The knowledge Caleb shares simultaneously makes the terrible economic conditions causing the field workers' suffering preferable to any revolutionary alternative since the possibility of change will only make things worse. Caleb fulfills what Gramsci describes as the 'organizational' role of the organic intellectual. The organizational task he performs keeps class divisions intact. By sharing an ideologically preferable truth with the workers, Caleb is effectively "organizing social hegemony and state domination" and suppressing the possibility of an uprising (Gramsci 307).

At another point in the narrative, Fred Vincy, a young man who lacks direction in life, gets involved in a business transaction. He plans to sell a horse and turn a handsome profit. However, things do not go as planned and the deal falls through. Fred ends up in dire financial straits, owing a great deal of money. He does not feel comfortable approaching his father for money so he asks Caleb Garth for a loan. Caleb agrees to give Fred the money, but before signing the note, Caleb realizes that ". . . it was an occasion for a friendly hint as to conduct, and that before giving his signature,

he must give a rather strong admonition" (Eliot 233). Consequently, he tells Fred to be more alert when engaging in future transactions. Caleb concludes the encounter with a reassurance to Fred. He tells the young man "You'll be wiser another time my boy" (233). In the loan negotiation, Caleb takes on the position of an Outsider. While not wealthy, he has earned a solid living. This makes Caleb a more experienced and canny participant in the market economy. More experience and earned wisdom makes him an Outsider in the sense that he has shed the naiveté that the younger Fred has. Caleb has thus earned credibility that qualifies him as an expert and so an organic intellectual. What happens to Fred raises the possibility of disillusionment since getting stung in a financial transaction makes it possible to question the rationale for the free market economy. In turn, a critique of capitalism could result, and, taken to its extreme, critique can lead to the development of a revolutionary consciousness. Fred is at risk for this because he lacks experience as a free trader. In contrast, Caleb accepts the vagaries of the free market without question. He becomes an organic intellectual by virtue of the fact that experience has taught him the 'truth' of capitalist economic relations. By providing a loan to Fred, Garth can provide the opportunity for instruction which in turn solidifies Fred's identity as a participant in the free market. In fact, Garth's advice rests on the assumption that Fred will indeed return to the capitalist marketplace. Caleb offers no opening through which Fred could allow himself to exit the free market system. The assumption that there will be more transactions in Fred's future offers no choice regarding future participation. Through his wisdom and experience, Caleb makes the market a natural and inevitable fact of life.

Organic intellectuals in *Middlemarch* then play an important role in facilitating the efficacy of the dominant ideology. Although the intellectuals speak as Outsiders, they use that status to displace potentially revolutionary knowledge in those whose identity has the potential of developing a challenge to the prevailing ideology.

ORGANIC INTELLECTUALS AS OUTSIDERS IN *THE DOCTOR'S WIFE*

Mary Elizabeth Braddon's sensation novel, *The Doctor's Wife* focuses on Isabel Sleaford, a young woman who spends most of her time reading sensation novels. The books tell sordid stories of fevered romance and noble intrigue. Isabel develops an elaborate fantasy life based on what she reads. As a result, Isabel sees her own, rather dull existence, in sensational terms. Her dream world leads her into an unsatisfying marriage and the inability to find true happiness in life.

Fantasy appears initially as a way through which the dominant ideology could gain hegemony. Maintaining illusion would seem to make ideological subjects more passive and accepting of governance. In *The Doctor's Wife* however alternative worlds actually present a challenge to the effectiveness of the dominant ideology. The mentally created realities dreamed up by the various individuals in the narrative offer an appealing retreat from the realities of class position and irrelevance, and gives those who do it a glimpse of a potentially better way of life. While the imagined alternative life is, of course, strictly fictional, nevertheless, it provides a jarring contrast with the material existence led by those who create these fantastic worlds.

Organic intellectuals in the novel primarily use their knowledge to carry out the task of reorienting and grounding those inclined to idealization in material reality,

defined here as being categorized and participating in the market. Often, intellectuals serve to remind subjects of the reality in which they live. They do this not to emancipate them but to make sure that approved social relations and the capitalist economic market remain the focus for everyone.

Early in the novel, readers get introduced to one of the book's main characters, George Gilbert. His first appearance has him dropping in on a good friend, Sigismund Smith. Smith specializes in the exertion of imagination by making his living as a sensation novelist. The novels Smith writes are cheap and "highly spiced fictions" written for mass consumption (Braddon, *Doctor's* 11). Pages of Smith's torrid novels contain an endless array of passionate love, violence and mystery. His work does not focus on quality and it is written for a general, unsophisticated audience. Books written by the author are "garnished with striking illustrations, in the windows of humble newsvendors in the smaller and dingier thoroughfares of every large town" (13).

Smith's work absorbs him entirely. The sensation writer had "exhausted all that was passionate in his nature in penny numbers, and had nothing left for the affairs of real life" which is decidedly grimmer than that of which he writes. The apartment in which Smith lives differs greatly from the luxurious homes he writes about. His apartment has "nothing more romantic than a waste-paper basket, a litter of old letters and tumbled proofs, and a cracked teapot simmering on the hob" and almost no food (Braddon, *Doctor's* 14).

George's arrival reorients Smith to this reality. By simply being in the apartment, George becomes an organic intellectual. His entrance shakes Smith out of the fantasy

world of his novels. With a guest, present, Smith must engage with his immediate environment. He has to ponder his surroundings and deal with mundane concerns such as having marmalade and bread to offer his visitor. Reorienting Smith's attention takes him out of the rich fantasy world he inhabits and puts him squarely back in "the ensemble of the system of relations" that constitute real life (Gramsci 304).

George's presence alone serves an important ideological purpose. His visit puts him in the unwitting role of an organic intellectual without saying anything of particular profundity. Still, his entrance disrupts Smith's writing. Without intending to, George brings ideology into the room with him. He is very unlike Smith. George has a very concrete view of the world. He "took his life as he found it, and had no wish to make it better", an approach to living far different from the passionate Smith (Braddon, *Doctor's* 7).

Promising to remain quiet while Smith works, George gazes idly out of the apartment window. But, no matter how engaged Smith is with writing and imagining, he must inevitably interact with his guest. George serves as reminder of the outside world and the necessity of returning to it from whatever fantastic realms Smith inhabits. Hosting George brings other realities into Smith's perception. Offering his friend a snack bring to mind how little food he has. As Smith and George talk, the grimy apartment remains always in view.

The knowledge George silently brings with him does not bring out a defiant response from Smith. It rather prompts him toward the free market. Seeing the economic deprivation of his existence shows Smith that he must continue laboring and

so earn money to support himself. The simple visit of a good friend has become a force to draw Smith back into the economic realities of capitalism and its ideological influence.

Later, when George and Smith arrive at the Sleaford's house, they encounter Isabel. It is George's first meeting of his future wife. Isabel is reading a book and barely notice when George and Smith arrive. Smith points out Isabel's lack of attention to George and criticizes her for it. It irritates him that Isabel "wouldn't so much as look up when a gentleman was waiting to be introduced to her" (Braddon, *Doctor's* 23). The introduction turns Smith into the intellectual. He is an Insider by virtue of the fact that he has already knows the Sleafords. Smith is a "partial boarder" at their house (16). George, on the other hand, meets the Sleafords for the first time when he visits.

Smith's shares his Insider knowledge with George. He does so not to draw George to the dominant ideology but to chide Isabel embarrass her into acting differently. Isabel has the possibility of slipping from the grasp of the dominant ideology. Her reading has drawn her into a better interior world than the real one she actually inhabits. It is a world with lives and possibilities that only highlight the dullness of middle-class life Isabel must contend with. It has a strong hold over her. After her chastisement at the hands of Smith she still feels compelled to turn back to the novel she was reading. After briefly engaging George and Smith Isabel "glanced downwards at the book, as much to say that she had finished speaking, and wanted to get back to it" (Braddon, *Doctor's* 24). When she ignores George and Smith, she turns her back on the protocols of etiquette. Consequently, she does not acknowledge their status as gentlemen. This breaks up the mechanisms ideological power present in everyday interactions and so must be stopped. Through the knowledge he conveys Smith

effectively brings Isabel into the "containment and policing . . . by the pressures of social . . . forces" (Thomas 170).

Smith cannot allow this and steps in again to convey an understanding of the fiction she reads to Isabel. Smith's knowledge takes the form of advice. He confronts her about the content of her reading choices. He asks Isabel why she reads sensation novels. Isabel tells Smith that "They are so beautiful!" but articulates little else in her response (Braddon, *Doctor's* 24). The beauty Isabel claims to find in her books concerns Smith. Again he steps forward to offer instruction that attempts to steer Isabel back to her real life commitments.

Smith approaches his instruction as an Outsider. Even though he hypocritically makes a living writing the same kind of book he condemns, he tries to shake Isabel out of her fascination with the texts. Like he conveyed knowledge to George about Isabel by pointing out behavior perceived as rude, he does the same when he interacts with Isabel directly. There is also a personal motive at stake here. As a writer of sensation novels himself, Smith has a behind the scenes look at the mechanics of the books' plots and characters and he feels the passion that he pours into his novels. But Isabel does not read one of his works, choosing instead to read a book by one of Smith's competitors. This fact shifts his position. If Isabel had been reading one of his books, he could have approached her as an Insider because they have an equal emotional involvement with sensation fiction. The book that engrosses Isabel is not one of Smith's. Because it comes from a rival, Smith can achieve emotional distance when offering his commentary. This makes him an Outsider. Because the book is not his, he has the

necessary distance and objectivity to comment on it. Consequently, the knowledge he shares with Isabel has weight and credibility.

The knowledge that Smith possesses grounds Isabel in reality through fear. Smith uses the understanding he seems to have of sensation fiction to frighten her. He ominously warns her that her torrid novels may indeed be beautiful, but are "[d]angerously beautiful, I'm afraid, Isabel . . . beautiful sweet-meats, with opium inside the sugar" (Braddon, *Doctor's* 24). As an emotionally unengaged Outsider, Smith garners credibility and he starts to control Isabel comes through his expression of concern for her well-being.

Smith's dire warning shows that reading of sensation fiction has the possibility of upsetting real, ideologically defined relationships. Romance and exoticism, the staples of sensation fiction, contrast sharply with the drabness of Isabel's real life. In her actual existence, Isabel lives a perfectly ordinary life with a mother described as "a very common little woman" who lacks intelligence and a home that is a "muddle peculiar to a household where the mistress is her own cook" (Braddon, *Doctor's* 26-27). The ordinary nature of Isabel's life contrasts starkly with the fantasy worlds she so often reads about. As a woman, her domain is the domestic sphere. Her consciousness must be grounded there and the alternative universe of sensation novels offers a potential escape, even if only on mental level. She justifies her love of sensation novels by paradoxically saying they make her unhappy. Her odd answer is justified by the fact that she expresses a preference for the unhappiness brought by the fiction she enjoys to what is deemed happiness in the real world. As Isabel confesses to Smith "I like that sort of unhappiness. It's better than eating and drinking and sleeping, and being happy that

way" (Braddon, *Doctor's* 24). This makes Isabel dangerous. She chooses an unbridled, uncontrollable imagination over the confines of a grim domestic role.

Smith must therefore pull Isabel back to where she belongs and he does that with his caution that translate the fanciful content of sensation novels into a real danger, one recognized at the time. Lyn Pykett describes the origins of concern for the genre. She asserts that sensation novels provided "a site in which the contradictions, anxieties and opposing ideologies of Victorian culture converge and are put into play, and as a medium which registered and negotiated (or failed to negotiate) a wide range of cultural anxieties about gender stereotypes, sexuality, class, the family and marriage" (Pykett).

Her explorations of the sensation novel's fantastic worlds put Isabel squarely into these contentious fields. They are unstable and therefore dangerous. Smith dismisses the sensation novels Isabel loves and tries to get her to stop reading them. His concern masks an ulterior, ideological act of coercion. An Isabel firmly grounded in reality, regardless of how depressing that reality may be, can be controlled. She must interact with real people when brought back into reality and therefore comes under the sway of the dominant ideology. As Isabel's internal interactions with her favorite texts cannot be directly regulated, and will produce social anxiety, they must be reined in with admonitory comments. This makes it possible to then force her into accepted and stable social roles. Sensation novels allow for a reprieve from this truth. Their chaos, in the form of violence and shocking deception, give people like Isabel multiple options and views of life's possibilities even though those options may never be lived. She must return to the domestic sphere so she can function in an ideologically appropriate way

and avoid anything but the prevailing ideology. As a dedicated organic intellectual, Smith steps up and performs the required re-orientation.

Isabel is, in fact, the subject of much of the knowledge disseminated by organic intellectuals. After the initial meeting of George and Isabel, Smith chats with George about her. This time, he acts as an organic intellectual for his friend. Again Smith tackles the task of instructing George about Isabel. He expresses his worry at the fact that Isabel reads too many sensation novels. By this point in the story, George has begun to fall for Isabel. He has noticed her attractiveness and mentions it to Smith. Although he agrees with the assertion, Smith qualifies his assent by poking holes in George's perfect picture. He does not outright tell George not to court Isabel, but he alludes to his concern by articulating his worries about Isabel's obsession with sensation novels. Smith does admit a limited benefit from sensation fiction. He declares: "A novel's a splendid thing after a hard day's work, a sharp practical tussle with the real world, a healthy race on the barren moorland of life, a hearty wrestling-match in the universal ring" (Braddon 30). However, when discussing with George what he sees as Isabel's problem, Smith juxtaposes the novel with the market. Although he admits that the novel acts "like the cradle-song that soothes an infant" easing the stress of free market economic activity, it takes a second place to business activity (30). Smith portrays reading novels like Isabel does as of lesser importance than participation in the marketplace. He frames his critique in starkly economic terms, saying Isabel is a person who "wouldn't look at a decent young fellow in a Government office, with three hundred a year and the chance of advancement" (30). Smith's discussion of the realities of the market bring George back from idle dreaming. It reminds him of where his attention

should be. He is shaken out of his dream life and into ideologically imposed priorities. Smith once more plays the role of teacher and organic intellectual well, assisting in the hegemony of the dominant ideology as it transcends the individual's inmost life.

While Smith lives much of his life inwardly, he has no illusions about the nature of his work at the same time. This becomes apparent when George asks about the writing of sensation novels. The question offers Smith the opportunity to draw George into an idealist world. He could mystify his craft, talking about vague concepts like genius and inspiration. He does not dot this. Smith toes the ideological line by disabusing George of any idealized visions he might have of the writer's work.

After their visit to the Sleaford's, George and Smith return to the city. With lots of free time still on his hands, George hangs around in Smith's apartment as the writer works on his latest book. Although not an overly passionate man himself, George's curiosity is piqued as he watches his friend write .He asks Smith about cheap novels. Smith explains the process of composing one. He, as mentioned previously, is a passionate person by nature. So, he is at risk of engaging in wild mental adventures.

George's question gives Smith pause. It jerks him back into the realities of his dingy apartment and impoverished life. Smith answers George's inquiry not by talking about love or romance. He makes no mention of exotic locales and people. His answer is brutally honest. Smith admits that much material he works with, he gets from plagiarism. He tells George that when looking for ideas ". . . the next best thing you can do if you haven't got ideas of your own, is to steal other people's ideas in an impartial manner" (Braddon 45).

Continuing his cynical description of the writing life, Smith talks about knowing what an audience wants and providing it. He tells George ". . . the penny public require excitement . . ." showing both the formulaic nature of his writing and its market driven nature (Braddon 47). Everything Smith tells George steers him away from the specific content of the novels Smith writes. Its emotionally loaded nature is what draws readers away from the obligations of their real lives within a capitalist economy. Therefore, Smith focuses his explanation on the unemotional technical and financial considerations of the art form. He uses selected knowledge to keep George grounded in the realities of the market as the ultimate arbiter of all labor, including his own writing. Both men are forced into reality. Any idealist notions George might have had about Smith's profession get shattered when he asks the question. Smith frames his work in the basest terms possible. He equates it with stealing rather than passion or thought. The dominant ideology retains its hold because Smith's explanation has no sentiment about it.

Another reality George's question reveals to him and Smith is the fundamentally economic nature of their existence. Smith talks about writing in economic terms. He also reduces it not to art, but manipulation. Smith is an organic intellectual because he has a specialized knowledge of writing. He takes the role of teacher again when he explains how penny fiction works. Smith reduces his art to the most mechanistic terms possible, stripping it of any trappings of the idealized artist's life. George learns the cynical way in which sensation novels get produced. Smith reveals the various plot devices he uses. He also talks about knowing his audience rather than his personal creativity. He compiles his narrative not on artistic integrity and personal expression but realistically in terms of how his books function in the readers' market, shaping his writing to

manipulate readers' emotions and maximize financial gain. As Smith de-mystifies the creative process he moves focus away from the subjective world of personal feelings toward the objective, unemotional of the world. Simultaneously he affirms his own presence in the context of capitalist economic relations and how that existence causes "a split . . . between production and personal life" (Vicinus 129).

Mary Elizabeth Braddon's *The Doctor's Wife* contains a stark dichotomy between the freedom of imagination and the realities of life under capitalism. The former inevitably conflicts with the latter. In this conflict, there is the potential for the development of a subversive and critical perspective that arises from the virtually endless alternatives offered by an internal fantasy life. Even though these possibilities may have no correspondence to material reality, they can create new viewpoints that can overflow into real life. If this happens, a contradiction between the dominant ideology and the freedom of the imaginary occurs and must be inhibited. By performing this explanatory function, organic intellectuals draw imaginative individuals away from fantasy and back into the material realities of capitalist life.

Organic intellectuals have an important role to play in informal groups. They aid the dominant ideology in achieving hegemony. Their assistance comes through the power of explanation. Intellectuals use their status as Insiders or Outsiders to claim a monopoly on accurate knowledge that in turn, allows them to shape the understandings of those with whom they share their knowledge to line up with the tenets of the dominant ideology. In this way, organic intellectuals assure that the prevailing ideology gains complete power by displacing any perspectives or knowledge that might challenge its dominance.

CONCLUSION

This project has attempted to fill a void in scholarship. While much work with the Victorian novel focuses on formalized relationships such as marriage, other social connections have unfortunately been neglected. The impact of marriage and family life cannot be denied as they exert powerful influence over participants. Getting married and having children brings about profound changes in identities and roles. Formalized connections have their power bolstered by the support of the legal system and other powerful social institutions. Therefore, it is impossible to ignore the significance of marital and family ties and they deserve the considerable critical attention they have received. Bonds like these shape life outside the domestic sphere. Ideologies that shape the institutions of marriage and family get carried out to the public worlds of work and social interaction. The ever expanding circles of influence mean that familial bonds affect many areas of life. Because of this, study of these relationships will continue. Doubtless, they will also continue to yield useful insights.

However, relationships outside the family have a lot of power too as their bonds shape those who get involved in these associations. Unfortunately, the study of these connections raises difficulties not present when looking at formal institutions like the family.

It is relatively easy to study marriages and families in novels because they have clear contours. Spouses, parents and extended relatives know their kin. Blood ties and legal bonds make these arrangements obvious. The explicit nature of this type of connection facilitate study. They share common traits. This holds true regardless of the individuals involved in them. Every formalized bond has the same essential

organization. They also have well-defined roles for participants. Once these commonalities are understood, clear categories can be established. Study is then made easier by virtue explicit, agreed upon identities.

In contrast, informal relationships come with inherent difficulties. They lack the clear parameters of their formal counterparts. The nature of connections within them varies wildly: some have members with intimate emotional ties while others form for practical reasons such as the shared necessity of completing a particular task.

Another variable in unsanctioned groups is the roles within them. With a relationship like marriage, roles are clearly delineated. They have specific labels and are codified in law. Groups without official recognition do not have such defined roles. Social positions in a group can change constantly. Role expectations have considerable flexibility as well. Not only do roles in informal groups have no solidity, they can shift frequently. In friendship, for instance, one friend might take on the role of consoler when the other person in the relationship experiences a difficult time. If the friend who offers comfort later has a tough time of their own the roles would reverse. Changes like these have no official process. They seek no outside approval or acknowledgement.

Moreover, members of groups without official status often belong to more than one group at a time, a fact that provides yet another challenge. A person may be a friend, a factory worker and the keeper of a social club's secret knowledge all at once. Each social group plays a different role in its members' lives. Relationships in them have distinctive dynamics and goals.

Sociological theory overcomes these problems. The work of Charles Horton Cooley and Robert K. Merton provide concepts that allow for more clear labeling of social groups that otherwise might defy classification altogether. Primary groups, professional associations and the theory of the Insider/Outsider account for the diverse types of informal social arrangements. Cooley's and Merton's ideas describe social groups using the nature of the relations within them. These proved helpful because they provided clear criteria that removed irrelevant variables such as the duration of a group across time.

Another problem a study like this one brings derives from the definition of ideology. Many definitions are highly nuanced and can overlap and prove difficult to separate. A project like this one requires a relatively broad definition. Only a broad denotation can account for the variety of groups discussed. Louis Althusser did path-breaking work with the concept of ideology. He developed a definition of the idea broad enough to be appropriate to a study like this one. Althusser frames the concept in terms of an illusory view of social relations. Since the groups discussed here are themselves defined in terms of relationships, Althusser's theory meshes nicely with their examination.

The idea of Repressive State Apparatuses and Ideological state apparatuses proposed by Althusser provides a helpful model as well. None of the groups discussed here fit his definition of either RSA's or ISA's. However, they offer a basic understanding of how ideology gets transmitted and enforced through various institutions. So, even though this work focuses on informal groups, rather than the institutions Althusser discussed, they support the dominant ideology in some similar ways.

As innovative and helpful as Althusser's work proved to be it required the development of Göran Therborn's theory. Therborn took Althusser's ideas and refined them. His development provides an explanation for the specific ways in which ideology works. It explains how ideology places and removes people from specific social roles.

Sometimes knowledge is used as a tool for gaining ideological dominance. Antonio Gramsci discusses how this happens. Organic intellectuals explain how understanding is dispensed or withheld in the interests of preserving class power. Gramsci's notion of hegemony makes it possible to account for the ways ideology exerts its power in the context of daily life.

The general conclusion of this study is that all groups act in an ideological way. Starting with the assumption that every social formation creates ideology, it stands to reason that large, powerful institutions do not hold a monopoly on assisting the dominant ideology in gaining power. Groups of every type would help with the task.

This fact yields some other observations. When it comes to discussion of apparatuses, like that undertaken by Althusser, images of large institutions come to mind. They all have a largely public existence. Repressive apparatuses like the police stay visible through routine patrols. Armies fight wars that get reported in widely circulated newspapers. The same holds true for Ideological Apparatuses. Schools make their educational goal clear to the populace at large. Churches erect huge cathedrals and open their doors for regular services. Nobody can doubt the intentions and ideological roles these agencies play.

Informal groups rarely appear overtly ideological. They look to be primarily dedicated to companionship or work. At best, any ideological purpose they serve would be secondary. However, I have shown that unofficial relations can and do act ideologically in significant ways that sheds light on the great power the dominant ideology holds. No longer is it limited to its overt expressions in the Church and State. It moves into every area of an individual's life. This makes any traditional boundaries between public and private individual and social more unclear than they already are.

The increased range of ideological power has other ramifications. One of the most significant is the degree of freedom possible given the spread of the dominant ideology into the public and private sphere. It is important to make clear that while I make the case for informal groups acting ideologically to spread and enforce the dominant ideology, I do not assert that these actions make that ideology totalizing. For although Ideology infiltrates most realms of an individual's life, inevitably there remains a degree of freedom and flexibility for every ideological subject. Therborn's theory accounts for this. His argument that it is possible for individuals to make choices concerning the range and application of an ideology demonstrates that even in the most rigidly defined role, choice remains, however limited that might be.

Another issue that requires clarification is ideological content. Ideology ties into many areas of life. It prescribes how individuals' lives should be lived. For almost every facet of life, there exists a corresponding ideology. Work and home life have their guiding ideologies as do parenting and socializing. To some degree, content does influence the ways informal groups disseminate ideology. For example, a courting couple would interact extensively with ideologies related to gender. Factory workers at

the same job would come up against ideologies of labor relations and the profit motive. Nevertheless, content has relevance here only the degree that it gives glimpse of the workings of ideology in informal groups. The content of the separate ideologies then is examined so that ideology's function gets revealed

An additional issue that needs addressing relates to the choice of the Victorian novel as the focus of this work. Informal groups have appeared in the literature of every era. One cannot read *Beowulf* without seeing the prominence of the primary group as exemplified in the fellowship of the mead hall. Christopher Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* could produce some intriguing findings if the relationship between the doctor and Satan were framed as a professional association. DeFoe's 1719 novel *Robinson Crusoe* could be discussed in terms of Insiders and Outsiders in the context of the relationship between Crusoe and Friday.

While all of these studies would be possible, the Victorian era provides the best subject for examination. The period saw capitalism and its social relations in their clearest forms. Its relations were governed "by the rule of profit" (Therborn 57). As a result, capitalism, as an ideology, reached its apogee. Terry Eagleton gives a good description of what happens at this peak of power. He asserts that the dominant ideology gives rise to the "material production of ideas, beliefs and values in social life" thus illustrating the ideology's power to permeate all spheres of life (Eagleton, *Ideology* 28).

As the Victorian era came to a close, capitalism did not go away. It simply changed form. Raymond Williams in his essay "Notes on Marxism in Britain Since 1945" points to the rise of the 'mixed economy'. For Williams, capitalism began to be mixed

with other ideologies. He points to “the generalized form of public intervention in a still mainly capitalist (‘mixed’) economy” which combined the fundamentals of capitalism with state intervention (Williams, “Notes” 235).

The intervention Williams points out inevitably changed the nature and action of ideological apparatuses. Twentieth century institutions like the legal system became overtly tied up with the transactions of capitalism through regulation. During the Victorian era they had remained uninvolved in such matters. Intervention by the State also changed the nature of informal relationships. It brought more social connections into the purview of formal apparatuses. Interactions previously thought casual and private fell under formal explicit regulation starting immediately after the Victorian period. In the nineteenth century for example, a worker and their employer would have an officially invisible relationship. If the same interaction occurred in the twentieth century it would have clear, explicit legal parameters.

Further complicating study of informal groups is an increased emphasis on individual subjectivity. This started in the fin-de-siècle of the Victorian period. At that time, “. . . the literature of production and reproductive social relations, the essence of high Victorian fiction, was giving way to the literature of consumption, taste, and preference located in the individual, culminating in the modern individual’s ‘stream of consciousness’” (Gagnier 63). This resulted in the internal and subjective gaining prominence and the social realm decreasing in importance.

Modernism broke away from Victorian conventions of the novel. Works of the time minimized or eliminated the existence of the social. Subjective consciousness became the most important component of Modernist narratives. While the social still existed, it rarely appeared. Virginia Woolf's 1925 novel *Mrs. Dalloway* illustrates this shift in focus. While a social event is at the center of the book's plot, the characters never form an appreciable social bond. They occupy the same physical space, but no character experiences that space in a truly social way. Even when an individual stands in close proximity to others, they remain locked in inner perception.

In one scene, Peter Walsh stands in Trafalgar Square. A group of young soldiers marches by. Seeing them triggers a reaction in Peter. He is overcome by "the strangeness of standing alone, alive, unknown, at half-past eleven in Trafalgar Square" and his mind races with questions such as "What is it? Where Am I? And why, after all, does one do it?" (Woolf 52). He then drifts into remembrances of his divorce and a succeeding rush of emotion. Peter cannot but exist in a social situation. He has connections to other people as evidenced by the reference to his previous marriage. Of greater import, his subjectivity is contextualized by the momentous events of the First World War. These are the social facts of his life. But by grounding the narrative solely in his wandering perception, the social reality fades from view and is buried beneath layers of emotion and impression.

Because Peter's consciousness exists in a social context, so does ideology. He has simply internalized it. When he speculates as to why a young man would become a soldier he is engaged with ideologies of patriotism and nationalism. As he reflects on his

divorce, he cannot help but filter the reflection through ideologies of gender. However, because the Modernist focus is drawn inward, the connections characters like Peter have to others are less pronounced and so less conducive to analysis. The filtration of ideology through the distortions of the individual consciousness make it more difficult to discern. Without the presence of clearly defined formal groups and institutions, ideology became harder to separate from the sensory and psychological.

The early twentieth century saw other changes in the British novel. They raised a new set of difficulties for studying these groups' ideological action. One significant change came with the diminishing power of traditional Ideological State Apparatuses. In M. Somerset Maugham's 1915 book *Of Human Bondage* for example, the book's main character, Philip attends seminary as a young man. He has every intention of entering the priesthood. While there, he has what could be called a materialist epiphany. He comes to the sudden realization that there is no God. The experience is transformative as it redirects his life and sends him on a years-long quest to find meaning in the world. Philip's revelation contrasts sharply with the Reverend Hale in Gaskell's *North and South*. Hale left the established Church because he could no longer accept its tenants. However, he gives no indication that he abandons the idea of God altogether. In contrast, Philip not only leaves the Church or its doctrines; he loses belief in its foundational idea of God. He has banished himself from its fold forever and completely rejected its validity. Furthermore, when Philip marries at the end of the book, he does not wind up like the protagonist in a Victorian novel. Marriage does not bring him bliss for the rest of his day. He finds only moderate happiness. More importantly, he has a

second realization. Philip ends the story believing that partial happiness is all one can expect out of life.

Maugham's book again points to the complexities of dealing with the action of ideology within unofficial groups. The narrative in *Of Human Bondage* combines the subjectivity of the Modernists with the disappearance of clearly defined social formations. Philip's instantaneous conversion to atheism involves the subjectivity the Modernists focused on. It also ties into the Ideological Apparatus of the Church. But, it ties into the rejection of the ideology it teaches. Decline in the power of an Ideological Apparatus puts the ideological equation out of balance. An institution with diminishing influence opens a vacuum for informal groups to gain greater power to disseminate and apply ideology. This could have an equalizing effect in which informal groups that had previously had considerably less power than formalized institutions now take on a role of equal power. Intra-group relations could change as a result of the lesser relevance of previously powerful apparatuses.

In the latter part of the twentieth century two trends further complicated the understanding how informal associations acted ideologically. The first of these is the large number of informal groups who engage in overtly anti-social behavior. Of course, this has occurred in some of the novels I have discussed in this dissertation. For example, the actors in George Moore's *The Mummer's Wife* lived outside the boundaries of acceptable society and embrace their marginal existence. Happily, they flaunt traditional mores and scoff at the world that has rejected them as hopelessly conservative and unhappy. Even in their indulgence however, the actors still participate in basic social structures. They do not engage in acts of violence. Nor do they look at

their society with anything more than bemusement. Graham Greene's 1938 novel *Brighton Rock* offers an indication of significant change. It also centers on a group that lives outside social acceptability. In contrast to Moore's actors, they do so much more malignantly. Pinkie, the leader of the criminal gang at the center of the story, is a violent, warped psychopath. He has a pathological hatred of sexuality and indulges in acts of terrible violence. Pinkie is consciously and maliciously anti-social. Ideology works in his cadre of gangsters, but it is tied up in a ruthless nihilism. If examining how ideology shapes characters like Pinkie, subjectivity is not the problem. It is an irreparably damaged psyche that has an over-arching hatred of civil social life that fascinates us the most.

A similar situation appears in the 1962 novel *A Clockwork Orange*. Burgess's protagonist, Alex, spends much of his time with friends, participating in rampages of rape and mindless destruction. Alex has a bond of sorts with his friends. It cannot be called one of affection since violence seems to be the only factor that unites them. His companions act more as accomplices than friends. Here too, ideology is at work, but it gets lived out in such a distorted form that it becomes virtually unrecognizable.

A second trend can be found in the number of texts in the twentieth century raise then the fundamental question of whether social cohesion of any kind is possible. William Golding's novel *Lord of the Flies* is a good example of this. The majority of the action takes place far removed from civilization, much like it did in *Treasure Island*. In that novel though, the characters still practices basic politeness and civility, even in the face of incredible violence. Golding, in his 1954 *Lord of the Flies* portrays a complete abandonment of restraint. Things deteriorate so badly that the idea of group cohesion

seems impossible. This is made worse by the fact that the book's ending reveals the horrible events it recounts take place in the larger context of global war, thus duplicating the anarchy on a massive scale.

Things reach their extreme in George Orwell's *1984*. The 1949 book describes how the dictatorship of Oceania has achieved total control of the populace, right down to their thoughts. Its stated goal is to obliterate individually completely. This goal is realized at the end of the book when the once rebellious Winston Smith is filled with love for Big Brother. In the novel's world, there is only one group, that of the State. Its ideology has completely permeated every facet of existence. The study of groups has now become impossible because in Orwell's book, there is one pervasive group with no opportunity for other formations or subjectivity.

If there is one central theme to the literature coming after the Victorian age it would be that of social disintegration. Two catastrophic world wars and the diminished credibility of institutions which the Victorians held in high esteem led to a weakening of social bonds generally. An attitude of cynicism took hold. Theorist Slavoj Zizek argues that cynicism sees "the distance between the ideological mask and reality, but it still finds reasons to retain the mask" (26). This means that in post-Victorian literature, subjects had a greater awareness of the ideologies that shaped their lives. Ideology retained its power but held it through outward displays of subversion such as jokes and mockery. No longer could ideology employ the subtle mechanisms of casual social formations to disseminate and enforce it. The twentieth century saw the transformation of ideology itself into something "no longer meant, even by its authors, to be taken

seriously" and becomes "purely external and instrumental; its rule is secured not by its truth-value but by simple extra-ideological violence and promise of gain" (Zizek 27).

The work of Zizek and others show that the changing nature of capitalism and its ideologies will provide grist for the critical mill for a long time to come. Informal groups specifically require more examination in light of new understandings and social realities. Their relationship to dominant ideologies has been too long neglected. This project marks a first step in correcting this problem and giving unsanctioned social groups their long-delayed due.

As a final thought, I would like to address the issue of pedagogy. Ultimately, every academic project has a life in the classroom. Theoretical analysis inevitably finds its way into the material acts of teaching and learning. As this project has demonstrated, ideology permeates virtually every aspect of individuals' lives. This holds true not just for fictional narratives but the actual lived lives of teachers and students.

In his book *Save the World on Your Own Time*, Stanley Fish argues for the apolitical teaching of college English, saying: "Moral capacities . . . have no relationship whatsoever to the reading of novels . . . "(11). However, study of ideological action in the novel, particularly in its realist incarnation, cannot occur without simultaneous acknowledgement of the existence and hegemony of ideology in the real world the genre purports to reflect. Consequently, engagement with ideology in its fictive and actual forms is ingrained in the act of instruction. The question then becomes the form this engagement should take.

The analysis undertaken here illustrates the importance of viewing ideology primarily in terms of its mechanisms of action instead of its specific content. Ideological content can change rapidly. An ever-changing political scene, both domestically and internationally, can quickly render any particular ideological message moot. Events from which specific ideological understandings arise can be short-lived. Classroom discussion of them can have an equal degree of transience. Any meaningful critique such a conversation achieved would disappear into irrelevance as the next generator of ideological meaning came to occupy the consciousness of students.

Understanding ideology is best achieved through a thorough knowledge of how it gains hegemony. Examination of the ways ideology gets diffused, as opposed to what it says, hones a skill that transitions smoothly between class discussion of novels from a particular epoch and students' critical scrutiny of the political and social realties which shape their own lives.

This project has attempted to broaden the milieu in which ideology has previously been seen to act. It opens opportunities to delve more deeply into the meanings of social existence and subject hood. These explorations will, in turn, yield benefits that impact scholars as critics and teachers.

Works Cited

Allen. Dennis. *Sexuality in Victorian Fiction*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1993. Print.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Toward an Investigation." Trans. Ben Brewster. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review, 2001. 85-126. Print.

Armstrong, Nancy. *How Novels Think: The Limits of Individualism from 1719-1900*. New York: Columbia UP, 2005. Print.

Baumgarten, Murray. "Fictions of the City." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 106-19. Print.

Belsey, Catherine. "Constructing the Subject: Deconstructing the Text." *Feminsims: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn Warhol and Diane Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1997. 657-73. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Random House, 2007. 217-52. Print.

Beowulf. Trans. Michael Alexander. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.

Boumelha, Penny. "The Patriarchy of Class: *Under the Greenwood Tree, Far from the Madding Crowd, The Woodlanders." The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Dale Kramer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 130-44. Print.

Braddon, Mary Elizabeth. *Lady Audley's Secret*. 1861. London: Penguin, 1998. Print.

Brontë, Anne. *Agnes Grey*. 1847. New York: Barnes and Noble, 2005. Print.

Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1847. London: Penguin, 2006. Print.

---. *Villette*. 1853. New York: Random House, 2001. Print.

Brown, Julia Prewitt. *Cosmopolitan Criticism: Oscar Wilde's Philosophy of Art*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1997. Print.

Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. 1962. New York: Norton, 2012. Print.

Butler, Judith. "Conscience Doth Make Subjects of Us All." *Yale French Studies*. 88. (1995): 6-26. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Feb. 2013.

Cain, Peter, and A. G. Hopkins. "Gentlemanly Capitalism." *The Victorian Studies Reader*. Ed. Kelly Boyd and Rohan McWilliam. London: Routledge, 2007. 83-95. Print.

Callinicos, Alex. "Anthony Giddens: A Contemporary Critique." *Marxist Theory*. Ed. Alex Callinicos. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. 105-47. Print.

Chapman, Raymond. " 'The Worthy Encompassed by the Inevitable': Hardy and a New Perception of Tragedy." *Reading Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Charles P. C. Petitt. Hampshire: MacMillan, 1998. 138-55. Print.

Chase, Karen, and Michael Levenson. *The Spectacle of Intimacy: A Public Life for the Victorian Family*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000. *Google Book Search*. Web. 1 Nov. 2013.

Childers, Joseph. "Industrial Culture and the Victorian Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Deirdre David. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 77-96. Print.

Cohen, Philip K. *The Moral Vision of Oscar Wilde*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1976. Print.

Conrad, Joseph. *An Outcast of the Islands*. 1896. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Cooley, Charles. *The Two Major Works of Charles H. Cooley*. 1909. Introd. Robert Cooley Angell. Glencoe, 1959. Print.

Cunningham, Valentine. "Anthony Trollope and Law, Laws, Legalisms and Assorted Legislations." *REAL: Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature*. Vol. 18. Tübingen: Hubert, 2002. 89-108. *Google Book Search*. Web. 17 June 2013.

Danson, Lawrence. *Wilde's Intentions: The Artist in His Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997. Print.

DeFoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. 1719. London: Penguin, 2005. Print.

Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. 1837. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

---. *Hard Times*. 1854. New York: Signet, 1997. Print.

DuMaurier, George. *Trilby*. 1894. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. 1991. London: Verso, 2007. Print.

---. *The English Novel: An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell, 2005. Print

Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. 1871. London: Penguin, 1994. Print.

Erickson, Donald. *Oscar Wilde*. Boston: Twayne, 1977. Print.

Fee, Elizabeth. “The Sexual Politics of Victorian Social Anthropology.” *Feminist Studies*. 1.3-4 (1973): 23-39. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Feb. 2014.

Fish, Stanley. *Save the World on Your Own Time*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Fletcher, Loraine. “Long John Silver, Karl Marx and the Ship of State.” *Critical Survey*. 19.2 (2007): 34-47. *Literary Resource Center*. Web. 21 July 2012.

Ford, Natalie Mera. “’The Track of Reverie’: Vision and Pathology in *Shirley* and *Villette*.” *Brontë Studies.* 36.2 (2011): 141-51. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 29 Dec. 2013.

Gagnier, Regina. “Money, the Economy, and Social Class.” *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Patrick Brantlinger and William B. Thessing. Malden: Blackwell, 2002. 48-66. Print.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *Mary Barton*. 1848. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.

---. *North and South*. 1854. London: Penguin, 1995. Print.

Geras, Norman. “The Controversy About Marx and Justice.” *Marxist Theory*. Ed. Alex Callinicos. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. 211-67. Print.

Gezari, Janet. *Charlotte Brontë and Defensive Conduct: The Author and the Body at Risk*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1992. Print.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Woodstock: Overlook, 1973. Print.

Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies*. 1954. New York: Berkley, 1997. Print.

Gramsci, Antonio. “Intellectuals and Education.” *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. Ed. David Forgacs. New York: New York UP, 2000. 300-11. Print.

Gray, Drew. *London’s Shadows: The Dark Side of the Victorian City*. London: Continuum, 2010. *Google Book Search*. Web. 9 Nov. 2013.

Greene, Graham. *Brighton Rock*. 1938. New York: Penguin, 2009. Print.

Gunn, Simon. “Public Spaces in the Victorian City.” *The Victorian Studies Reader*. Ed. Kelly Boyd and Rohan McWilliam. London: Routledge, 2007. 151-64. Print.

Hall, Donald. *Fixing Patriarchy Feminism and Mid-Victorian Mal Novelists*. New York: New York UP, 1996. Print.

Hammerton, A. James. "Victorian Marriage And The Law Of Matrimonial Cruelty." *Victorian Studies* 33.2 (1990): 269. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 11 Feb. 2014.

Hardy, Thomas. *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. 1891. New York: Signet, 2006. Print.

Harling, Philip. “The State.” *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Ed. Chris Williams. Malden: Blackwell, 2004. 110-24. Print.

Hererra, Andrea O’Reilly. “ ‘Herself Beheld’: Marriage, Motherhood, and Oppression in Brontë’s *Villette* and Jacobs’s *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*”. *Family Matters in the British and American Novel*. Ed. Andrea O’Reilly Herrera, Elizabeth Mahn Nollen, and Sheila Reitzel Floor. Bowling Green: Bowling Green U Popular Press, 1997. 55-77. Print.

Holbrook, David. *Charles Dickens and the Image of Woman*. New York: New York UP, 1993. Print.

Irwin, Michael. “From Fascination to Listlessness: Hardy’s Depiction of Love.” *Reading Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Charles P.C. Petitt. Hampshire: MacMillan, 1998. 117-37. Print.

Jay, Elisabeth. Introduction. *Miss Marjoribanks*. By Margaret Oliphant. 1866. London: Penguin, 1998. Print.

---. “A Bed of One’s Own: Margaret Oliphant.” *Essays and Studies*. 62 (2009): 49-67. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 14 June 2013.

Jones, Aled. “The Press and the Printed Word.” *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Ed. Chris Williams. Malden: Blackwell, 2004.369-80. Print.

Kane, Penny. *Victorian Families in Fact and Fiction*. New York: St. Martin’s, 1995. Print.

Knight, Frances. *The Nineteenth-Century Church and English Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. *Google Book Search*. Web. 11 Feb. 2014.

Kucich, John. *Repression in Victorian Fiction*: *Charlotte Brontë, George Eliot, and Charles Dickens*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987. Print.

Lecaros, Cecelia Wadsö. *The Victorian Governess Novel*. Lund: Lund UP, 2001. Print.

Ledger, Sally, and Scott McCracken. Introduction. *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle*. Ed. Sally Ledger and Scott McCracken. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. 11-21. Print.

Liggins, Emma. "'With a Dead Child in her Lap': Bad Mothers and Infant Mortality in George Egerton's Discords." *Literature and History* (2000): 17-36. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 21 Feb. 2013.

Mallett, Phillip. "Hardy and Time." *Reading Thomas Hardy*. Ed. Pettit, Charles P.C. Hampshire: MacMillan, 1998.156-71. Print.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Dr. Faustus*. *Dr. Faustus and Other Plays*. Ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. 137-246. Print.

Matus, Jill. "*Mary Barton* and *North and South*." *The Cambridge Companion to Elizabeth Gaskell*. Ed. Jill Matus. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 27-45. Print.

Maugham, William Somerset. *Of Human Bondage*. 1915. New York: Random House, 1999. Print.

Mays, Kelly J. "The Publishing World." *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Eds. Patrick Brantlinger and William B. Thessing. Malden: Blackwell, 2002. 11-30. Print.

McIntosh, Ainsley. "Domestic Fiction." *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Women's Writing*. Ed. Glenda Norquay. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2012. 53-62. Print.

McKee, Patricia. *Public and Private: Gender, Class, and the British Novel 1764-1878*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. Print.

Merton, Robert K. "Functions of the Professional Association." *Social Research and the Practicing Professions*. Ed. Aaron Rosenblatt and Thomas F. Gieryn. Cambridge: Abt, 1982. 199-209. Print.

---. “Insiders and Outsiders.” *On Social Structure and Science*. Ed. Piotr Sztompka. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996. 241-63. Print.

Michie, Elsie. “Buying Brains: Trollope, Oliphant, and Vulgar Victorian Commerce.” *Victorian Studies* 44.1 (2001): 77-97. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 25 Nov. 2013.

Mitchell, Sally. *Daily Life In Victorian England*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2009. *eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 11 Feb. 2014.

Moore, George. *A Mummer’s Wife*. 1885. New York: Liveright, 1966. Print.

Morrison, Kevin A. “Whose Injury is Like Mine?” Emily Brontë, George Eliot, And the Sincere Postures of Suffering Men.” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 43.2 (2010): 271-93. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 10 July 2013.

Nelson, Claudia. *Family Ties in Victorian England*. Westport: Greenwood, 2007. *Google Book Search*. Web. 8 Sept. 2013.

Nemesvari, Richard. “ ‘The Thing Must Be Male, We Suppose’: Erotic Triangles and Masculine Identity in *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* and Melville’s *Billy Bud.*” *Thomas Hardy: Texts and Contexts*. Ed. Phillip Mallett. New York: Palgrave, 2002. 87-109. Print.

Nestor, Pauline. *Female Friendships and Communities: Charlotte Bronte, George Eliot, Elizabeth Gaskell*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985. Print.

Newcomb, Mildred. *The Imagined World of Charles Dickens*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1989. Print.

Oliphant, Margaret. *Miss Marjoribanks*. 1866. London: Penguin, 1998. Print.

Orwell, George. *1984*. 1949. London: Penguin, 1977. Print.

Paxman, David. "Metaphor And Knowledge In George Eliot's Middlemarch." *Metaphor & Symbol* 18.2 (2003): 107-23. *Literary Reference Center Plus*. Web. 13 Apr. 2013.

Phegley, Jennifer. *Courtship and Marriage in Victorian England*. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2012. *Google Book Search.* Web. 6 Feb. 2014.

Podvoloski, I. “Law as an instrument of Class Domination.” *Soviet Political Thought: An Anthology*. Ed. and Trans. Michael Jawarskyi. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1967. 111-13. Print.

Pykett, Lyn. “Women Writing Woman: Nineteenth-Century Representations of Gender and Sexuality.” *Women and Literature in Britain: 1800-1900*. Ed. Joanne Shattock. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 78-98. Print.

Reed, John R., *Victorian Conventions*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1975. Print.

Rubik, Margarete. "Marriage." *The Novels of Mrs. Oliphant: A Subversive View of Traditional Themes*. Peter Lang Publishing, 1994. 169-95. Rpt. in *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism*. Ed. Gerald R. Barterian and Denise Evans. Vol. 61. Detroit: Gale, 1998. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 5 June 2013.

Schor, Hilary. “Novels of the 1850’s: *Hard Times, Little Dorrit,* and *A Tale of Two Cities*.” *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 64-77. Print.

Scott, Susie. “Charles Horton Cooley.” *Fifty Key Sociologists: The Key Theorists*. Ed. John Scott. London: Routledge, 2007. 26-31. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*. Web. 27 Feb. 2014.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985. *Google Book Search*. Web. 1 Nov. 2013.

Shuttleworth, Sally. *Charlotte Brontë and Victorian Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Treasure Island*. 1883. New York: Penguin, 1999. Print.

Stevenson, W.H. *Emily and Anne Brontë*. New York: Humanities P, 1968. Print.

Stoneman, Patsy. “Gaskell, Gender and the Family.” The Cambridge Companion to Elizabeth Gaskell. Ed. Jill Matus. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 131-47. Print.

Surridge, Lisa. *Bleak Houses: Marital Violence in Victorian Fiction*. Athens: Ohio UP, 2005. Print.

Therborn, Göran. *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. London: Verso. 1999. Print.

Thomas, Ronald. “Detection in the Victorian Novel.” The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel. Ed. Deirdre David. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 169-91. Print.

Thompson, F.M.L. *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain 1830-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988. Print.

Trollope, Anthony. *The American Senator*. 1876. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Trotter, Jackson. “Foxhunting and the English Social Order in Trollope’s *The American Senator*.” *Studies in the Novel* 24.3 (1992): 227-41. *MasterFile Complete*. Web. 25 Nov. 2013.

Uglow, Jennifer. Introduction. *Hester: A Story of Contemporary Life Hester: A Story of Contemporary Life*. Virago, 1984. ix-xxi. Rpt. in *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism*. Ed. Gerald R. Barterian and Denise Evans. Vol. 61. Detroit: Gale, 1998. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 3 June 2013.

Vicinus, Martha. “Helpless and Unfriended: Nineteenth-Century Domestic Melodrama.” *New Literary History* 13.1 (1981): 127-43. JSTOR. Web. 17 July 2013.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. 1905. New York: Penguin, 2002. Print.

Wilde, Oscar. *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. 1890. New York: Barnes and Noble, 2003. Print.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1977. Print.

---. *Culture and Materialism*. London: Verso, 2005. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *Mrs. Dalloway*. 1925. Fort Washington: Harvest, 1990. Print.

Young, Arlene. *Culture, Class and Gender in the Victorian Novel*: *Gentlemen, Gents and Working Women*. Hampshire: Macmillan, 1999. Print.

Zizek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 2008. Print.