



T.C.

**SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI**

**THE IDENTITY CRISIS
IN JOHN OSBORNE'S *LOOK BACK IN ANGER***

**Handan ÖZDEMİR
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ

ISPARTA-2011

T.C
SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

TEZ SAVUNMASI ve SÖZLÜ SINAV TUTANAĞI

Gönderen : Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı..... EABD Başkanlığı

Gönderilen : Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Enstitü Anabilim Dalımız **YÜKSEK LİSANS / ~~DOKTÖRA~~** Programı öğrencisi
HANDAN ÖZDEMİR..... tez çalışmalarını sonuçlandırmış ve
kurulan jüri önünde tezini savunmuştur. Sınav tutanağı aşağıdadır.
Tez Adı Değişikliği ~~YAPILDI~~/ YAPILMADI

14.04.2011
Tarih

Yrd.Doç.Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı
Enstitü Anabilim Dalı Başkanı

SINAV TUTANAĞI:

Jürimiz Lisansüstü Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 25./39. maddesi uyarınca 14.04.2011 Perşembe
günü saat 14.00 'de toplanmış ve yukarıda adı geçen öğrencinin The Identity
Crisis in John Osborne's 'Look Back in Anger'
konulu tezini incelemiş ve yapılan sözlü sınav sonunda **OYBİRLİĞİ / ~~OYÇOKLUĞU~~** ile aşağıdaki kararı
almıştır.

☒ KABUL

☐ RED

☐ DÜZELTME

Tez Sınavı Jürisi	Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı	İmza
Başkan	Prof. Dr. Hüseyin A. Rzaev	
Üye	Doç. Dr. Ramazan Gülerdem	
Üye	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ	
Üye		
Üye		

Yukarıda adı geçen öğrenci Sınav Tutanağı'nda belirtildiği üzere mezun olmaya **HAK KAZANMIŞTIR / KAZANMAMIŞTIR.**

Gereğini rica ederim.

ENSTİTÜ YÖNETİM KURULU KARARI :

Tarih:

Karar No:

Enstitü Müdürü

MADDE-25 Tez Sınavının tamamlanmasından sonra Jüri tez hakkında salt çoğunlukla “KABUL”, “RED”, veya “DÜZELTME” kararı verir. Bu karar, Enstitü Anabilim Dalı Başkanlığınca tez sınavını izleyen üç gün içinde ilgili Enstitüye tutanakla bildirilir. Tezi reddedilen öğrencinin Enstitü ile ilişkisi kesilir. Tezi hakkında düzeltme kararı verilen öğrenci en geç üç ay içinde gereğini yaparak tezini aynı jüri önünde yeniden savunur. Bu savunma sonunda da tezi kabul edilmeyen öğrencinin Enstitü ile ilişkisi kesilir. Düzeltme alan öğrenci bir sonraki dönemde kayıt yaptırmak zorundadır.

Madde-39 Tez Sınavının tamamlanmasından sonra Jüri tez hakkında salt çoğunlukla “KABUL”, “RET” veya “DÜZELTME” kararı verir. Bu karar, Anabilim Dalı Başkanlığınca tez sınavını izleyen üç gün içinde ilgili Enstitüye tutanakla bildirilir. Tezi reddedilen öğrencinin Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu ile ilişkisi kesilir. Tezi hakkında düzeltme kararı verilen öğrenci en geç altı ay içinde gereğini yaparak tezini aynı jüri önünde yeniden savunur. Bu savunma sonunda da tez kabul edilmeyen öğrencinin Enstitü ile ilişkisi kesilir.



T.C.
SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans/ Doktora tezi olarak sunduğum

"The Identity Crisis in John Osborne's
"Look Back in Anger,""

adlı çalışmanın, tezin proje safhasından sonuçlanmasına kadar ki bütün süreçlerde bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurulmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin Bibliyografya'da gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve onurumla beyan ederim.

İmza
Öğrenci Adı ve SOYADI
Gün. Ay. Yıl

Handan Özgenir

12.09.2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my parents, Bülent and Sedef Özdemir, for their unconditional support and wisdom to tolerate, and for their unfailing patience not only during all these years of my education but also throughout all my life experiences.

I would like to express my dept of gratitude and never enough thanks to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömer Şekerci, for showing empathy and giving me the opportunity to complete my research, and for assisting me with all his scholarly advice and counsel. The accomplishment of this study is due to his understanding and tolerance.

I also wish to thank to all the members of my thesis committee, including Prof. Dr. Hüseyiñağa Rzayev who made incredible suggestions on the current study to further it in the future, and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ramazan Gülendarn who proofread the footnotes and the bibliography.

Heartfelt thanks are also due to Assist. Prof. Dr. Mevlüt Karabıçak, for his support right from the beginning of my graduate study to the end.

Special thanks and a profound respect go out to Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Uysal, for his valuable contribution to the determination of methodology of the study.

My warm thanks are to my sisters, Yasemin and Kübra, for their good sense of humor to cheer me up, and especially to Vildan who typed my writing with a great patience and backed me up when my patience was to flounder.

I owe a great debt to Betül Bayram, with whom I have years and years of friendship. She has been a constant source of courage and support throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies, above and beyond friendship.

Last but not least, I would like to thank to Semiha Mutlu and Selami Şavklıyıldız for their encouragement even when I was not so confident of myself, to Laura Blumenthal and Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol Barut for their allocating time to my request for help, to my little students for their innocent prayers, and to the librarians of Süleyman Demirel University, İstanbul University and Boğaziçi University.

ABSTRACT

THE IDENTITY CRISIS IN JOHN OSBORNE’S *LOOK BACK IN ANGER*

Handan ÖZDEMİR

Süleyman Demirel University, Department of English Language and Literature

Master Thesis, 78 pages, April 2011

Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ

The aim of this study is to scrutinize the identity crisis and its probable effects onto the development of one’s personality, social or interior life, and interpersonal relationships in general terms. Correspondingly, we have attempted to find out what underpins the contradictions and inconsistencies between the personal and social identification of the characters in John Osborne’s *Look Back in Anger*.

In the first chapter of the study, we have tried to give a detailed insight into the life of John Osborne, which is important for the accomplishment of this study as the play is accepted to be strongly influenced by his own private life. A richer understanding of the underlying reasons of identity crisis observed throughout the play makes it compulsory to examine the notion of “identity crisis”. The first section of the second chapter, thus, deals with what identity crisis means in psychology. In the second section of the second chapter, we have examined the play in terms of the identity crisis of the characters, which culminates great difficulties in obtaining a clear perception of the self.

According to our examination of the play, we have concluded that their identity crises arise from the ambivalence about committing themselves to an ideology, to a social class, or just to a person. More than that, we have also observed that the lack of love has forced them to make contradictory decisions complicating their interpersonal relationships.

Keywords: *Look Back in Anger, John Osborne, Identity Crisis, Ambivalence, Modern British Drama*

ÖZET

JOHN OSBORNE'UN *LOOK BACK IN ANGER* ADLI ESERİNDE KİMLİK BUNALIMI

Handan ÖZDEMİR

Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü
Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 78 sayfa, Nisan 2011

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ

Bu çalışmada, genel anlamda kimlik bunalımının bireylerin kişilik gelişimi, sosyal veya bireysel dünyaları ve kişilerarası ilişkileri üzerinde doğurduğu olası sonuçlar ele alınmıştır. Bu bağlamda, John Osborne'un *Look Back in Anger* adlı tiyatro eserindeki karakterlerin sosyal ve bireysel kimlikleri mukayese edilerek, yaşadıkları çatışma ve tutarsızlıklar tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Çalışmanın ilk bölümünde, John Osborne'un hayatına geniş yer vermemizin sebebi, incelenen *Look Back in Anger* oyununun otobiyografik bir eser olarak kabul edilmesidir. Oyunda görülen kimlik bunalımının altında yatan sebeplerin iyi anlaşılması için, kimlik bunalımı üzerinde durmayı uygun gördük. Bu amaçla, ikinci bölümde kimlik bunalımının psikolojideki kullanımı ele alınmıştır. Son bölümde ise, oyundaki karakterlerin kimlik edinimlerinde karşılaştıkları ikilemler ve sorunlar, neden ve sonuçları bağlamında ele alınmıştır.

Sonuç olarak, karakterlerin yaşadığı bunalımın, kendilerini herhangi bir ideolojiye, sosyal sınıfa ya da başka bir insana adama konusunda yaşadıkları duygusal ikilemlerden kaynaklandığını tespit etmekteyiz. Ayrıca sevgi ihtiyacı ve eksikliğinin, karakterleri gündelik ilişkilerinde çelişkili kararlar vermeye ittiği gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Look Back in Anger, John Osborne, Kimlik Bunalımı, Duygusal İkilem, Modern İngiliz Tiyatrosu*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ÖZET	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
The Scope of the Study	2
The Aim of the Study	3
The Significance of the Study	3
The Method of the Study	4
The Limitations of the Study	4
FIRST CHAPTER	6
THE LIFE OF JOHN OSBORNE	
1.1. John Osborne's Early Life	6
1.2. John Osborne's Career	15
SECOND CHAPTER	29
THE IDENTITY CRISIS IN JOHN OSBORNE'S	
<i>LOOK BACK IN ANGER</i>	
2.1. The Psychological Bases of Identity Crisis	29
2.2. The Identity Crisis in <i>Look Back in Anger</i>	36
CONCLUSION	66
APPENDIX	69
BIBLIOGRAHPY	72
RESUME	78

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Description	Page
1.	Erikson's Eight Stages of Psychosocial Development Theory	32

INTRODUCTION

In a play, the *dramatis persona* has three dimensions to be illuminated, which are personality, character and identity.¹ In the level of personality, a person asserts himself more obviously. Until the nineteenth century, personality came to mean the quality of a person which distinguishes him from a thing, yet the contemporary understanding of the personality is the quality of a person which separates him from an *other* person.

Character is used interchangeably with personality. Personality is influenced by social aspects, like family, traditions, cultural and religious norms, race or education, while character is affected by nature. Yet, personality is inborn; character is formed over time:

Children have Personalities long before they have Characters. They are, in fact, little Personalities waiting to be filled with Characters. Thus Character is the deeper (if later) part of the person, his value sphere as defined within or against that of society, while Personality is his distinctive way of being himself.²

The last dimension, identity, means to be the same at all times and in all circumstances. It has always been a debate question both for psychology and literature. Psychology approaches identity considering mental health, while literature aims to portray the conflict between the self and the world or the others.

This approach of literature to identity has become the starting point of this study, and we have chosen *Look Back in Anger* as a literary work to analyze the state of inconsistency of the identity. *Look Back in Anger* is a play which presents the cultural transition from Britain's great Edwardian past into the mid-1950s, which was, without any doubt, a period of upheaval related to the Second World War, and, accordingly, to the important cultural and social changes.³ "The British people were

¹ Bert O. States, "The Anatomy of Dramatic Character", *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 1, (Mar., 1985), p. 88.

² Ibid., p. 90.

³ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xvi.

neither what they had been nor what they truly were.”⁴ wrote Dodsworth, and went on “Their crisis of identity is mirrored in the way in which government changed hands every six or seven years in [the mid-twentieth century]. The country just did not know what to make of itself.”⁵

There have been dozens of critical works on John Osborne’s theatre and on *Look Back in Anger*. For “it is the best young play of its decade”⁶ as Kenneth Tynan declared in *Observer*. Yet, this is not the reason why we have chosen this play to analyze. What has motivated us to take the drama of Osborne and his play *Look Back in Anger* is its “present[ing] post-war youth [who were confused and disillusioned] as it really is”⁷ during the time and serving perfectly to satisfy our aim – namely, the analysis of how a psychological notion, the *identity crisis*, can be reflected in drama.

The Scope of the Study

At the beginning of the study, an introduction to the thesis, considering its scope, purpose, significance, the research methodology used, and the limitations arisen from the analysis are presented. In the first chapter of the study, we will try to give a detailed insight into the life of John Osborne. The play is strongly influenced and has some traces of Osborne’s own life, which, we believe, will help us while analyzing the play. Besides, *Look Back in Anger* is the first well-known example of kitchen sink drama, a style of theatre that dominates Osborne’s works with their focus on the interior domestic and emotional lives of working-class people. Hence, we will try to elucidate the dramatic characteristics of the theatre of John Osborne, as well. Providing a richer understanding of the underlying reasons of identity crisis observed throughout the play is the main concern of this study, and this makes it compulsory to examine the notion of identity crisis itself. In the first section of the second chapter, thus, we will try to focus on what the term means in psychology. In the second section of the second chapter, we will examine the play in terms of the

⁴ Martin Dodsworth, “Mid-Twentieth Century Literature, 1930-1980”, *The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature*, Ed. Pat Rogers, New York, 2001, p. 475.

⁵ Ibid., p. 475.

⁶ Kenneth Tynan, “Reviews of the First Performance”, *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*, Ed. John Russell Taylor, London, 1968, p. 51.

⁷ Ibid., p. 50.

identity crisis of the characters, which ends up in great difficulties in obtaining a clear perception of the self. In the last section, a summary of the study is concluded. In appendix, Osborne's chronology has been given.

The Aim of the Study

Our main purpose for this study is to analyze the use of the *identity crisis* as a subject-matter in modern British drama. We have chosen *Look Back in Anger* for the examination, because it is one of the major plays which realistically reflects the atmosphere of blankness and frustration derived from the hard times during and after the war in Britain and led to the sense of lack of self-satisfaction and self-perception, and which personifies the common emotions, like anger, frustration and boredom, which were shared by almost all people, either those who fought in the war in the flesh or those who were post-war children.⁸ All the characters in the play have some conflicts and show contradictions between their personal and social identification. This study not only aims to focus on the identity crisis of the husband and wife, Jimmy and Alison, who are different from each other in terms of social upbringings and personalities, but also allows for a closer sense of how and why the other characters, Cliff, Helena and Colonel Redfern, are or are not satisfied with their own personalities and their lives.

The Significance of the Study

John Osborne is one of the most significant figures in modern British theatre. So many books have been written about, and so many theses or dissertations have been completed on him and his plays by this time. His plays mostly deal with the post-war people in the feeling of despair, anger and hatred arisen out of the class system, the financial collapse, the unsettled cultural changes, and, above all, the fall of the Britain from the peak of world power. Thus, most of the researches on his drama have revolved around these themes. Yet, his characters apparently suffer from the identity crisis due to these massive changes, too; the identity crisis, however, has

⁸ Martin Dodsworth, "Mid-Twentieth Century Literature, 1930-1980", *The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature*, Ed. Pat Rogers, New York, 2001, p. 460.

never been worked over as the subject of a scientific research around the world. Moreover, considering the studies done specifically in Turkey, there have not been much researches evaluating the works of John Osborne, despite his importance as the founder of the *Angry Young Men* movement and of the *kitchen-sink* drama. We sincerely hope that this thesis will constitute as a reference for further studies on John Osborne and his drama.

The Method of the Study

In our study we have preferred to use mainly the text-based research method. In addition, because of the biographical components of the play, Jimmy Porter, who is seen as the representation of John Osborne, is scrutinized applying psychological approach, which regards and examines the fictive characters not as though they were only the imaginations of the author but as though they were the reflections of existing human beings⁹, and underlying his similarities to Osborne's own life. While analyzing social and political content of Jimmy's responses, we have employed the eclectic research method. Apart from the hero of the play, the other characters are also examined carefully with the use of eclectic method, for these characters are both the representation of the writer in one sense, and fictive in another.

While collecting data for our thesis, we have tried to apply as many books, articles, periodicals or newspapers and some internet sources as we have needed. We, however, have constructed the study, mostly, under the critical works of John Osborne himself and our interpretation of the play.

The Limitations of the Study

The main concern of this thesis is the use of the state of having identity crisis in post-war British drama. However, the study is limited to *Look Back in Anger*, accepting it as a good sample of its kind.

We have tried to give a broader sense to what motivate – or single-handedly motivates – the characters for making choice in their lives and for the way they

⁹ Gürsel Aytaç, *Genel Edebiyat Bilimi*, İstanbul, 2003, p. 173.

interact – or, the way they escape from interacting – with other people. While preparing the study, we have most frequently applied to Osborne's own writings, like *They Call it Cricket* (1958), John Russell Taylor's *Anger and After* (1962) as well as *A Casebook* (1968), and Margaret Rose's *Introduction to Look Back in Anger* to explore the life and the theatre of John Osborne. Besides, we absolutely do not want to consult the internet sources, but it is worth mentioning here that we have made use of many internet sources, because of the fact that, first and foremost, there are not rich sources based on the private life of Osborne, which is important for the accomplishment of this study as his private life is accepted to be mirrored in the play, and also that the internet sources we have utilized definitely convey satisfactory and authentic information on Osborne's life. However, while scrutinizing the identity crisis seen in the play, we have had great difficulties in finding rich references, because, as already mentioned, this theme is ignored in most of the scientific researches on the play. Consequently, this thesis is completed with the limited sources based on the identity crisis. We have analyzed the play by interpreting the dialogues and exploiting the similarities between the story of the play and Osborne's life experiences.

FIRST CHAPTER

1. THE LIFE OF JOHN OSBORNE

The reign of John Osborne came on 8 May 1956, when *Look Back in Anger* premiered at the Royal Court Theatre at English Stage Company. John Russell Taylor made his mostly quoted description of its success, a “revolution”¹⁰ in British drama. He was apparently not wrong, for it was so innovative in style and content that it, addressing to a highly dissatisfied young generation, was like a ‘bombshell’¹¹ which exploded the traditional conventions of vast commercial and classical plays of the theatre of Edwardian England. Ever after, he has remained as one of the leading playwrights in the history of British theatre.

1.1. John Osborne’s Early Life

John James Osborne, one of the angriest playwrights, actors and theatre directors of the history of British drama, was born on 12 December 1929, in Fulham south west of London, as the son of Thomas Godfrey Osborne, a lower-middle-class commercial artist and copywriter from Wales, and Nellie Beatrice Grove, a cockney barmaid coming from working-class family background.¹² Osborne started his education life in a state school, but, after his father’s death from tuberculosis in 1941 when Osborne was only eleven or twelve years old, the fatherless family was inherited an insurance settlement owing to the death of his father, and therefore, could afford to send Osborne to St. Michael’s College, a minor private school in Devon, in 1943.¹³ In his autobiography, *A Better Class of Person*, Osborne gives an honest but belittling description of the school saying “St. Michael’s was probably not much

¹⁰ John Russell Taylor, *Anger and After, A New Guide to the New British Drama*, London, 1962, p. 27.

¹¹ “*Look Back in Anger*”, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, ([http:// www.pilot-theatre.com](http://www.pilot-theatre.com)).

¹² Margaret Rose, “Introduction”, *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. ix.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. ix.

seedier or inefficient than many other schools of its kind, offering the merest, timid trappings of a fake public school for the minimum expense.”¹⁴

Osborne, already scorning the school, was expelled at the age of sixteen, after hitting the headmaster, who had slapped him in the face. There are several claims about their quarrel. Some sources assert that Osborne fisted the headmaster for the reason that the headmaster had hit him because of listening to a broadcast by Frank Sinatra which was forbidden; other sources, on the other hand, quote the headmaster as saying he expelled Osborne because he quipped about the British Royal Family.¹⁵ Apparently, the latter claim seems to be one step closer to the reality, for Osborne has never been on good terms with the Royalty, not even for a short amount of time of his life.

Osborne’s childhood was marked by financial problems, his father’s death, the air raids, the general excitement of war and an unhappy period at schools, all of which, according to Osborne’s description, was ‘fourth-rate’¹⁶. As for his family life, Osborne openheartedly shares his reminiscences of his childhood in his ‘manifesto-like’¹⁷ article *They Call It Cricket*, included in Tom Maschler’s *Declaration* (1957). He recollects his maternal family a bit uneasily:

My mother’s parents were publicans –to be accurate, they managed a succession of pubs in London– until my grandfather ‘lost it all’. My mother has worked behind the bar most of her life. She still does because she likes to ‘be with other people’. ...The whole family pushed, and whenever they got together for some celebration, there would be plenty to drink, however hard things were. That alone is something middle-class people find difficult to understand or forgive. ...During all this, the rest of my family would be yelling news to each other. A lot of it would be about some illness or other. ...but then I was the only one who seemed to listen to *anybody* [italics mine]. They didn’t talk to each other so much as themselves. ...There would be baffling shrieks of

¹⁴ Margaret Rose, “Introduction”, *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. ix.

¹⁵ Ray Orley, *The Separated Self: Alienation as a Major Theme in the Plays of John Osborne, Arnold Wesker, and Harold Pinter, 1956-1971*, Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1976, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 104.

¹⁶ According to the rating system of the British Royal Navy, a ‘fourth-rate’ was ship of line used during the first half of the 18th century. (The rating ranks as the first-rate, second-rate, third-rate and fourth-rate.) The term, however, might as well be used to mean something which is inferior to the ‘first-rate’ in quality. “Fourth-rate”, Web. 23 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.aswers.com>). Herein, Osborne presumably utilized the latter meaning, highlighting his life with poor conditions in his childhood years.

¹⁷ Andrew K. Kennedy, *Six Dramatists in Search of a Language*, London, 1975, p. 196.

laughter, yelling, ignoring, bawling, everyone trying to get his piece in. A big celebration would be the worst, like Christmas, when there was invariably a row. ...The day would end up with someone –usually my father– at the piano and everyone shouting songs at each other. They bawled and laughed and they moaned. There was rivalry in the way they spoke about how hard they worked and there was no question that they did work hard –about the visits to the hospital and the *waiting*. They ‘talk about their troubles’ in a way that would embarrass my middle-class observer. I’ve no doubt that they were often boring, but still had meaning for them. Even if they did get drunk and fight, they were responding; they were not defeated.¹⁸

On the other side, when rendering his writings about his father’s family pattern, it’s straightforwardly seen that Osborne values his father above his mother:

My father’s family were baffled by them. Their value system was quite different. What impressed me most when I was a small boy about my other grandparents, and all my father’s relatives, was the calm that surrounded them. Not only were their voices soft, but they actually *listened* to what you were saying. ... Besides, my father and all his family were particularly gentle. There were no fights, few rows, hardly ever tears. Whenever there was an argument, it was nearly always about *income* and mostly characterized by gravity and long stretches of silence. ... They were kind charming people, and I was deeply fond of them. I used to enjoy the time I spent there –which was a great deal– much more than I spent with my relations in Fulham and Tottenham. They had a sense of fun which was as much a part of their assumption about life as their simple expectation that they should be waited on, that their children should go to public schools, that there should always be ‘income’.¹⁹

Osborne is child of a marriage, which was desperately caught between two social classes. He, both as a playwright and being, has never prominently been a “Labour-Party canvasser”²⁰, namely, a leftist, but he has obstinately expressed his hatred towards Royalty and his sympathy for working-class people. Herein, it is baffling that Osborne esteems his father, coming from middle-class, more highly than his mother, a member of working-class culture. Admittedly, not belonging to a single

¹⁸ John Osborne, “They Call it Cricket”, *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, pp. 62-64. (We have purposely omitted some parts of the quote in order to avoid unnecessary repetition or information.).

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 64-65.

²⁰ Mary McCarthy, “A New Word”, *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*, Ed. John Russell Taylor, London, 1968, p. 160.

social class might have caused problems of identity²¹ which was reverberated in his plays as well as other biographical items like the class struggle, fatherless family, unhappy marriage and so on.

Following to his being dismissed from school, Osborne returned London to live with his mother, instead of going to a university. In 1947, he worked as a journalist on trade papers, like *The Miller* and *Nursery World*. Afterward, in 1948, he met with the theatre world. He started tutoring junior actors touring with the repertory company of Anthony Creighton, until an education inspector found him to be uncertified as a teacher.²² Yet, his unemployment did not last long. The company offered Osborne to go on working as an assistant stage manager and then as an actor. In March, 1948, he appeared on the stage for the first time, playing a small part in *No Room at the Inn*, and spent his seven or ten years of his life as a member of Anthony Creighton's provincial repertory company.²³ During the time that he was acting on the stage, he started his career as a playwright with his first play, *The Devil Inside*, co-authored with Stella Linden, at Huddersfield in 1950. Indeed, this was a start of a playwriting career which was going to lead to an innovative style of drama, *kitchen-sink drama*, to a groundbreaking movement, the *Angry Young Men*, to several masterpieces and awards.

Almost all of his plays are centered on a male protagonist, who is mentally and physically cruel and violent towards women, which made Osborne to be accused of being misogynistic.²⁴ At this point, we run into an interesting contradiction. Osborne hated his own mother all through his life.²⁵ When we deal with Osborne's works we could easily notice that he mirrored this hatred creating female characters that are incapable of serious thought and of sincere commitment; and furthermore, his male characters are always presented as superior to the females in terms of intelligence and morality. These seem to be enough to entitle him a misogynist, to some critics. On the other side, Osborne married five times and had numerous affairs even when he was a married man. Moreover, he always expressed his hatred towards

²¹ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. ix.

²² "Look Back in Anger", Web. 24 Nov. 2009, (<http://www.pilot-theatre.com>).

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ "The Kings Road, the Misogynist John Osborne and the Women in His Life", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.nickelinthemachine.com>).

²⁵ Alan Taylor, "A Look Back in Admiration John Osborne Brought Spark and Vibrancy to", *The Sunday Herald*, 14 May 2006.

critics and warned his friends “never [to] marry an ac-tress²⁶!”, but he married two critics and three actresses.²⁷

The first wife of John Osborne was Pamela Lane. She was born in 1930 as the daughter of a respectable working class family. Lane was working as a well-known actress in a regional theatre, where she and Osborne met. In his memoirs, Osborne mentions about Lane and tells how he fell in love with her at first sight and charmed by “her independence, her fiery red hair, and the sphinx-like allure of her huge green eyes, which were, in fact pale blue”²⁸.

In 1951, Lane and Osborne hastily married in secret for some reason or other. The couple lived happily at first. Yet, their marriage did not last long. Lane’s acting career was prospering, while Osborne’s was moving up and down. Further, Lane had an affair with a dentist. In 1957, they inevitably divorced. In 2010, Lane died at the age of 80.

Mary Ure, Osborne’s second wife, and John Osborne met thanks to *Look Back in Anger*. Ure was to play the role of Alison. Shortly after they met, they began to have an affair. Osborne left his first wife, Pamela Lane, for the sake of Ure. Lane and Osborne divorced on the grounds of adultery²⁹, not the one between Lane and her dentist, but the one between Osborne and Ure.

Mary Ure was born in 1933, in London. She studied at the school of drama, and quickly became popular and famous in London. In 1957, she got married to Osborne soon after he had divorced Lane. Osborne claims that he was not in love with her. They were just fond of each other without having great expectations. Their relationship was just a feeling of fleeting heart’s ease.³⁰

Their marriage was sentenced to a bad ending. Both Osborne and Ure had adulterous relationship with others. Ure gave a birth to a son, named Colin Murray Osborne; yet, in 1963, she left Osborne and married the actor Robert Shaw, who later

²⁶ Herein, it may be necessary to remind that the word “tress” means “a long lock of woman’s hair”.

²⁷ Jeffrey Meyers, “Osborne’s Harem”, *The Antioch Review* (Spring, 2009), Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.britannica.com>).

²⁸ John Heilpern, “Pamela Lane Obituary”, *The Guardian*, 22 November 2010: 31.

²⁹ “John Osborne”, Web. 22 Dec. 2009, (<http://www.answers.com>).

³⁰ Ibid.

on, adopted Colin and named him Colin Murray Shaw.³¹ In 1975, she was found dead of overdose of alcohol in her home.

Then Osborne met Penelope Gilliatt, who was a writer, film critic, a journalist. Gilliatt wrote several novels, short stories, reviews for *The Observer* and *The New Yorker*; yet, she is best known for her screenplay *Sunday, Bloody Sunday* (1971), for which she won several awards.³² When Osborne and Gilliatt met in order to make an interview, Gilliatt was married to Roger Gilliatt, and Osborne was still married to Mary Ure and was living with his mistress; but, this did not prevent them from seducing each other. Osborne notes in *Almost a Gentleman* that what bothered him was not the sexual morality but the suppression of feminine intimacy. He adds Gilliatt was a young and animated woman, also both well-educated and in good spirits, and it was a good chance to flirt with a woman, whose “red hair to be the mantle of goddesses”³³, for a man like Osborne, who had always been inclined to flirtation.

Osborne and Gilliatt got married in 1962 and remained so for almost ten years. In 1965 they had a daughter, named Nolan, whom he rejected later on. The problems with their marriage were Gilliatt’s alcohol addiction and her obsession on her work, which Osborne thought to be unnecessary: “I tried to point out that it seemed an inordinate amount of time and effort to expand on a thousand-word review to be read by a few thousand film addicts and forgotten almost at once.”³⁴

Such problems led them to divorce. Afterwards, Osborne married once more, Gilliatt died due to alcoholism. As for their daughter Nolan, she had a life without a home, family support or money to move forward on her own. Gilliatt’s sister Angela Conner firstly confirms that John Osborne adored her daughter – not with a phoney love but genuinely – when she was a little child; yet, she later on complains that when Nolan grew up, she neither felt any enthusiasm for nor showed any interest in Osborne’s passion with the theatre, and consequently, Osborne construed this as an insult and got progressively furious with and also disappointed at her.³⁵ This is Conner’s claim about the terrible father-daughter relationship. According to some

³¹ “Mary Ure”, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.answers.com>).

³² “Penelope Gilliatt”, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.answers.com>).

³³ “John Osborne”, Web. 22 Dec. 2009, (<http://www.answers.com>).

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ “Angry Old Monster”, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://findarticles.com>).

other sources, however, Osborne expelled his sixteen years-old daughter out of his house and his life, because of Nolan's some typical adolescent behavior.³⁶

Osborne's fourth marriage with Jill Bennett was, perhaps, the worst of all. For Osborne recalls her as "the most evil woman I have come across"³⁷. Bennett, born in 1931, was an actress like two of Osborne's previous wives. They got married in 1968, and just like his other marriages before, their marriage did not last long. They both soon became unhappy to the extent that Osborne called her "Adolf" and Bennett called him "impotent" and "homosexual" in public.³⁸ In 1988, they got divorced, and two years after their divorce, Jill Bennett committed suicide at the age of 58, which was seen as the result of her depressed marriage with John Osborne. When heard of Bennett's death, Osborne expressed his regret that he could not have opened her coffin and defecated in her eyes.³⁹

Osborne was harshly criticized for his cruelty towards not only his daughter Nolan but also his wives. In addition to Bennett, he, for instance, mistreated Pamela Lane, hitting her or laying her to the ground and blowing smoke into her mouth despite knowing that she suffered from asthma.⁴⁰ Besides, he was cruel and filled with hate towards people in general, but especially to his "fellow countrymen" who, according to Osborne, has betrayed England. In a letter to his country, he burst his sincere feelings:

This is a letter of hate. It is for you, my countrymen. I mean those men of my country who have defiled it. The men with manic fingers leading the sightless, feeble, betrayed body of my country to its death. You are its murderers, and there's little left in my own brain but the thoughts of murder for you.

I cannot even address you as 'Dear', for that word alone would sin against my hatred. And this, my hatred for you, and those who tolerate you, is about all I have left and all the petty dignity my death may keep.

No, this is not the highly paid 'anger' or the 'rhetoric' you like to smile at (you've tried to mangle my language, too). You'll not pour pennies into my coffin for this; you are MY object. I am not yours.

³⁶ "The Kings Road, the Misogynist John Osborne and the Women in His Life", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.nickelinthemachine.com>).

³⁷ "John Osborne", Web. 22 Dec. 2009, (<http://www.answers.com>).

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ John Heilpern, "The First Chapter, John Osborne", *The New York Times*, 28 January 2007.

⁴⁰ Alan Taylor, "A Look Back in Admiration John Osborne Brought Spark and Vibrancy to", *The Sunday Herald*, 14 May 2006.

You are my vessel, you are MY hatred. This is my final identity. ...I fear death. I dread it daily. I cling wretchedly to life, as I have always done. I fear death, but I cannot hate it as I hate you. It is only you I hate, and those who let you live, function and prosper. My hatred for you is almost the only constant satisfaction you have left me. My favourite fantasy is four minutes or so non-commercial viewing as you fry in your democratically elected hot seats in Westminster, preferably with your condoning constituents. There is murder in my brain, and I carry a knife in my heart for every one of you. ... There is nothing I should not give for your blood on my head. But all I can offer you is my hatred. You will be untouched by that, for you are untouchable. Untouchable, unteachable, impregnable.⁴¹

This letter, we may properly claim that, is nothing but an expression of hatred with the art of eloquence. Osborne always kept his hatred towards British Royal Family and the people who dishonored England, and never became regretful for his brutal treatment to his wives. He never ceased putting his emotions of animosity and anger into words, portraying them in his plays. Nevertheless, John Heilpern has always believed that Osborne is not a bad or cruel person arguing that it is not necessary to be a good or normal human being at all in order to be a great artist:

The need still exists to believe that good art is created by good people. How could Osborne be so cruel? goes the question often asked about him with indignant, reflexive piety. He notoriously reached for his poisoned pen to damn Jill Bennett in print when he learned of her suicide. But we may also ask how the saintly Tolstoy could abandon his poor, bullied wife on a railway station? How could James Joyce neglect his insane daughter? T.S. Eliot's neglect of his insane first wife? Or Proust's sexual thrill at watching hatpins stuck into rats? How, for that matter, could a genius composer whose talent was kissed by God behave like a farting idiot savant? Are we all Salieris now? Do we still believe, in spite of all evidence to the contrary — Mozart's infantilism, Coleridge's morphine, Pound's Fascism, Baudelaire's syphilis, O'Neill's alcoholism, Math's suicide, Wagner's anti-semitism, Hemingway's bullet, Van Gogh's ear — that good and great art can only be created by good and great — and normal — human beings?⁴²

⁴¹ John Osborne, "A Letter to My Fellow Countrymen", *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*, Ed. John Russell Taylor, London, 1968, pp. 67-69.

⁴² John Heilpern, "John Osborne, Cavalier and Roundhead", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://dspace.dial.pipex.com>).

The fifth and the last wife of Osborne was Helen Dawson. She was born in 1939, studied history, joined *The Observer* in 1962 and began to work as arts editor and critic. She, however, did not hesitate to leave her career behind for the sake of a life with Osborne, and never had any sad feeling about preparing his meals or helping him to type his manuscripts⁴³ instead of building and reinforcing her own career. They remained married between the years 1978 and 1994 till Osborne died. It seems that this marriage was the one and only happy union, for John Heilpern notes that they were apart for no more than a few days during all eighteen years they lived together.⁴⁴ When Osborne died at the age of 65 in 1994, Dawson was next to her husband. She found Osborne's last scrawled words on a cigarette pack beside his deathbed in the hospital: "Sorry, I've sinned."⁴⁵

After the death of John Osborne, lots of things were said, explained or argued. Yet, the most significant one was probably his last wife Helen Dawson's: "There are no road maps in this blasted landscape. When a marriage of unselfconscious mutual dependence is silenced, sliced off, you are on your own as never before."⁴⁶

In his speech at the memorial service for John Osborne in June 1995, the playwright David Hare declared his respect and praise for Osborne. Hare spoke out his opinions about Osborne as a citizen as well as a playwright:

It is impossible to speak of John without using the word 'England'. He had, in some sense, made the word his own. Yet it is no secret that latterly John had imagined the local eclipse of fashion that is inevitable in his profession to be sharper and more hurtful than before. ... There is in English public life an implicit assumption that the head and the heart are in some sort of opposition. If someone is clever, they get labelled cold. If they are emotional, they get labelled stupid. Nothing bewilders the English more than someone who exhibits great feeling and great intelligence. When, as in John's case, a person is abundant in both, the English response is to take in the washing and bolt the back door. John Osborne devoted his life to trying to forge some sort of connection between the acuteness of his mind and the extraordinary power of his heart. 'To be tentative was beyond me. It usually is.' That it why this Christian leaves behind him friends and enemies, detractors and admirers. A lifelong satirist of prigs and puritans,

⁴³ "Helen Osborne", *The Telegraph*, 14 January 2004.

⁴⁴ John Heilpern, "The First Chapter, John Osborne", *The New York Times*, 28 January 2007.

⁴⁵ "The Kings Road, the Misogynist John Osborne and the Women in His Life", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.nickelinthemachine.com>).

⁴⁶ "Helen Osborne", *The Telegraph*, 14 January 2004.

whether of the Right or of the Left, he took no hostages, expecting from other people the same unyielding, unflinching commitment to their own view of the truth which he took for granted in his own. Of all British playwrights of the 20th century he is the one who risked most. And, risking most, frequently offered the most rewards.⁴⁷

John Osborne had a life labelled with financial difficulties during his childhood years, his father's death which was hard to bear and forget, his hatred towards women – but notably towards his mother which lasted till the day she died –, and his anger toward the Royalty which, indeed, stemmed from his deep love for England. All of these experiences have underpinned the content of his drama. Thus, while reading his plays, we read not fictive stories alone but the imaginative and dynamic reflections of a real life.

1.2. John Osborne's Career

“... a Play is like a sink in a town, whereunto all the filth doth runne...”⁴⁸ stated Henry Crosse in *Venture's Commonwealth* (1603). Playwrights are important in giving the stage a realistic position as “a forum for public debate”⁴⁹ so as to discuss all these ‘filth’, and in raising questions about social issues such as the political corruption, innovations in technology, migration from rural to urban areas, the changing role of women, and so on. Dan Rebellato argues that Osborne has been the pioneer of these kinds of playwrights at the time:

By 1956, British theatre was in a terrible state. The West End was dominated by a few philistine theatre managers, cranking out emotionally repressed, middle-class plays, all set in drawing rooms with French windows, as vehicles for stars whose only talent was to wield a cigarette holder and a cocktail glass while wearing a dinner jacket. While war and suffering raged around it, the theatre continued to reflect a tiny segment of society, and ignored the rest. ... Then, on 8 May 1956, came the breakthrough. At the Royal Court, *Look Back in Anger*, John Osborne's fiery blast against the theatre establishment burst onto the stage, radicalizing British theatre overnight. ... A new wave of dramatists sprang up in

⁴⁷ “John Osborne, A Lifelong Satirist of Prigs and Puritans by David Hare”, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://dspace.dial.pipex.com>).

⁴⁸ A.C. Ward, *The Twentieth-Century English Literature 1901-1960*, 14th ed. 1964, p. 142.

⁴⁹ Christopher Innes, *Modern British Drama: The Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, 2002, p. 1.

Osborne's wake; planting their colours on British stages, speaking for a generation who had been silent, they forged a living, adult, vital theatre.⁵⁰

"As for the theatre was concerned, his [Osborne's] experience was familiar enough; ...he knew the stage intimately before he came to the writing of plays."⁵¹ notes Sir Ifor Evans in his book *A Short History of English Drama*. Undoubtedly, his experiences that he gained as an actor might have filtered into his faculty of playwriting, but is it for this reason alone, namely, having already been an actor, that he chose to be a playwright instead of being a novelist or poet, for instance? Osborne himself gives an answer to this question:

Whenever I sit down to write, it is always with dread in my heart. But never more than when I am about to write straightforward prose, because I know then that my failure will be greater and more obvious. There will be no exhilarating skirmishes, no small victories on the way to defeat. When I am writing for the theatre I know these small victories: when the light on my desk is too bright and my back aches, but I go on writing because I am afraid that my pen will lose the words that come into my head. ... Things like this –composition, sonata form, the line that is unalterable– there are small victories to be won from them, because these are things that seem worth doing for themselves. If you are any good at all what you set out to do you know whether it is good and rely on no one to tell you so. You depend on no one. ... But whenever I sit down to write in prose about my present feelings and attitudes, my dread is enormous because I know that there will be no perks to pick up, or if there are that they will be negligible.⁵²

According to Osborne, writing a play is something that "you can learn, but it *cannot* be taught. It *must* be felt [*italics mine*]."⁵³ He further adds what he means with 'feeling a play': "Of course it [a play] comes alive – to the man who has written it, just as those three symphonies must have come alive to Mozart during those last six weeks."⁵⁴ To restate it, a playwright is to feel not only the strength to write but also the vigor of his plays with flesh and blood characters.

⁵⁰ Dan Rebellato, *1956 and All That*, New York, 2006, pp. 1-2.

⁵¹ Sir Ifor Evans, *A Short History of English Drama*, 2nd. ed., Boston, 1965, p. 194.

⁵² John Osborne, "They Call it Cricket", *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 45.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

Osborne's social background mediated his approach to playwriting; especially, his having financial troubles during childhood years led him to be a 'proletarian writer'⁵⁵. Nevertheless, the dominant figure in his inclination towards writing plays about the working-class people seems to be his grandfather:

One day I was walking with my grandfather, when we were passed by a man who seemed to greet him rather cheerfully. He was answered with a curtness that was surprising for a man as gentle as my grandfather. 'That man's a socialist', said my grandfather. I knew it couldn't be good from the quiet way he said it. He looked at me, and smiled. 'That's a man who doesn't believe in raising his hat.' That definition served me for a long time.⁵⁶

In 1961, Osborne was arrested and fined for participating in a demonstration of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND)⁵⁷, and consequently, he acquired a reputation for radicalism and activism, which he tried hard to prove the exact opposite.⁵⁸ Osborne was, indeed, associated with a reactionary movement, the *Angry Young Men*. The term originated from Leslie Allen Paul's autobiography titled *Angry Young Man* (1951). The name of the book, later on, became "the journalistic tag"⁵⁹ of

⁵⁵ Alan Sinfield, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*, London, 2004, p. 293.

⁵⁶ John Osborne, "They Call it Cricket", *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 65.

⁵⁷ The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), formed in 1957, is an anti-nuclear organization. It dates back to one of the articles of J. B. Priestley. *The New Statesman* published Priestley's article named *Russia, the Atom and the West* in 1957. Priestley criticized Aneurin Bevan for his decision to desist from his policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament. Many people, supporting Priestley's views, wrote letters to *The New Statesman*. Canon John Collins, one of the religious leaders of the organization, emphasized the importance of the article: "Whether other events may have contributed to the emergence of CND, J. B. Priestley's article exposing the utter folly and wickedness of the whole nuclear strategy was the real catalyst." The formation of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was due to Kingsley Martin, who was the editor of the *New Statesman* at the time. Martin held an organization which was motivated by Priestley's article and ended in the campaign. Amongst the early members of the campaign are J. B. Priestley, Bertrand Russell, Fenner Brockway, Wilfred Wellock, Ernest Bader, Frank Allaun, Donald Soper, Vera Brittain, E. P. Thompson, Sydney Silverman, James Cameron, Jennie Lee, Victor Gollancz, Konni Zilliacus, Richard Acland, Stuart Hall, Ralph Miliband, Frank Cousins, A. J. P. Taylor, Canon John Collins and Michael Foot. As Andrew Rigby noted: "In November 1957, Hugh Brock suggested that the Direct Action Committee (DAC) should organise a march to Aldermaston. The first Aldermaston march took place the following Easter when 4000 people left Trafalgar Square on the four day journey to the atomic weapons establishment." The Aldermaston March became annual, and gained support from large mass of people in London between late 1950s and early 1960s. However, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament topped out at nearly 100.000 in the 1980s. "Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND)", Web. 23 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk>).

⁵⁸ Malcolm Page, "John Osborne (1929-1994)", *British Playwrights, 1956-1995: A Research and Production Sourcebook*, Ed. William W. Demastes, Westport, CT, 1996, p. 279.

⁵⁹ Michael Patterson, *Strategies of Political Theatre, Post-War British Playwrights*, New York, 2006, p. 27.

British playwrights and novelist in the 1950s, who sought to portray their disillusionment with the *new*⁶⁰ England on the contrary to those writers of the period who insisted on emphasizing that everything remained the same in England after the war, and that “people [still] dressed for dinner”⁶¹. The movement argued that England, entering the imperial decline, was no longer the world’s greatest power. The people of the nation should, according to these young writers, understand that it was a new age without ornately furnished Victorian-houses and extravagant tailor-made clothes, and the other traditionalist writers, regarded as ‘illusionist’ to some critics, should show the real post-war culture in their writings.

It was those young writers who were called angry, but, actually, the whole nation was angry and frustrated – and almost a hater, because of the fall of the British Empire. Bruno Bettelheim explains the reason of these emotions giving an example:

They hate because they feel life has cheated them, has passed them by. Here in America, the assumption is that everybody, theoretically, can become President, or at least that everybody can make good in life. If we assume that we can all go to the top, it follows that if we do not there is something wrong for us. This is a painful conclusion. It attacks the very roots of our self respect and leaves us open to the developing of some degree of self hatred. And because all hatred is basically retaliatory—a backlash at a seemingly hostile world—we grow to hate others.⁶²

The British Empire had to deal with the difficulties in almost all quarters, including the society, the politics and the military. Following the end of the Second World War, Britain, which had to build itself in order to repair socio-economic devastations and had to rebuild itself so as to catch up with the post-war changes throughout the world and to re-polish its diminished status in the world, underwent a period of change and of frustration.⁶³

⁶⁰ The reason why we need to name England as ‘new’ is that England had great cultural and political transformation after the Second World War.

⁶¹ Sir Ifor Evans, *A Short History of English Drama*, 2nd. ed., Boston, 1965, p. 195.

⁶² Patrick B. Haggerty, *A Prompt Book for "Look Back in Anger"*, Diss. The University of Texas at El Paso, 1980, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, p. 3.

⁶³ Martin Dodsworth, “Mid-Twentieth Century Literature, 1930-1980”, *The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature*, Ed. Pat Rogers, New York, 2001, p. 459.

In 1944, the Education Act was passed and expanded educational opportunities. The act paved the way to the creation of several new 'red brick'⁶⁴ universities. For the first time in British history, universities opened its doors to the students coming from working-class. Next year, Labour Party won a landslide victory over the Tories and came to power. Welfare State was constructed, which meant the social and medical prosperity for all social classes, and which was actually expected to mean the end of the class system.⁶⁵ The Labour Government nationalized many industries including coal, electricity, gas, steel, water, airlines, motor transport and railways.⁶⁶ The establishment of National Health Service guaranteed that medical treatments would be free to all who wanted to use it.⁶⁷

Between 1947 and 1948, with the loss of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and African colonies like Egypt and the Sudan gaining independence, the great Britain Empire was to fade away.⁶⁸ While being the most powerful nation in the world before the First World War, it was, then, having its last days of the Empire with political and military power. In 1948-1949 the Berlin crisis proved that the hard-won peace following the Second World War was not going to be maintained easily.⁶⁹

Despite the social welfare system and the many social reform, the diminishing of political and military power made the public felt that the Labour Party could not fulfill their expectations; thus, Winston Churchill was voted into office in 1951, and the Conservative Government came back to power again.⁷⁰

⁶⁴ Red brick universities (or "redbrick universities") were provincial British universities founded in the major industrial cities of England, and established as civic science or engineering colleges. The term "red brick" was first coined by Professor Edgar Allison Peers to describe these universities, referring to the structure of the Victoria Building at the University of Liverpool, which was built from a distinctive red pressed brick. Students from low-income backgrounds, who could not afford to attend to the ancient universities, like Oxford and Cambridge, had chance to further their education thanks to the red brick universities. The ancient universities regarded these new universities as arriviste, for they were newly-built; yet, later on, they got to be classified as creditable universities owing to the rapid spread of polytechnics in 1960s and 1992. "Red Brick University", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.answers.com>).

⁶⁵ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xvi.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. xvi.

⁶⁷ Martin Dodsworth, "Mid-Twentieth Century Literature, 1930-1980", *The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature*, Ed. Pat Rogers, New York, 2001, p. 459.

⁶⁸ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xvi.

⁶⁹ "Look Back in Anger", Web. 24 Nov. 2009, (<http://www.pilot-theatre.com>).

⁷⁰ Ibid.

In 1952, the young Queen Elizabeth came to throne, and the pomp and ceremony of the coronation (1953) momentarily created the false euphoria of a new Elizabethan Age, but this, too, quickly faded.⁷¹

In 1956 The Suez Crisis was broke out just because of Britain's – maybe – the last attempt for regaining its Imperial power. Egypt refused to renew the concession of Suez Canal, and decided to nationalize the canal; but the British Government, of course, opposed to this decision, and the British forces invaded Egypt, with the support of France and Israel. However, the United Nations forced the Anglo-French Alliance a cease-fire, which was the proof of the end of power wielded by Britain till post-war world.⁷²

Anger, as a result of the feeling of blankness and frustration derived from these bad conditions during and after the war, was the common emotion shared by all people. The people were disillusioned, for their empire fell from the peak of power. They were restless for either being too young to fight in the war or being too impotent to make the war result in favor of Great Britain and not to lose the imperial power, just as Christopher Isherwood states: "We young writers of the middle twenties were all suffering, more or less subconsciously, from a feeling of shame that we hadn't been old enough to take part in the European war."⁷³

Amongst the playwrights, novelists or theatre directors, who chose to make a picture of these conditions of the post-war years in their works, are John Osborne, accepted as the *father* of the movement, (*Look Back in Anger*, 1956), Tony Richardson, Lindsay Anderson, Arnold Wesker (*Chicken Soup with Barley*, 1958), Kingsley Amis (*Lucky Jim*, 1953), Philip Larkin (*The Withsun Weddings*, 1964), John Wain (*Hurry on Down*, 1953), John Braine (*Room at the Top*, 1957) and Colin Wilson (*The Outsider*, 1956). "The movement of which they are the main members is in one sense no movement at all"⁷⁴ have been argued by some critics, and even some of the assumed members of the movement refused to be a part of it. Kingsley Amis (1922-1955), to give an example, wrote many novels, most notably *Lucky Jim* (1954), which successfully indicates the prevailing atmosphere of post-war Britain. During an

⁷¹ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xvi.

⁷² Ibid., p. xvii.

⁷³ Martin Dodsworth, "Mid-Twentieth Century Literature, 1930-1980", *The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature*, Ed. Pat Rogers, New York, 2001, p. 432.

⁷⁴ Carl Bode, "The Redbrick Cinderellas", *College English*, Vol. 20, No. 7 (Apr., 1959), p. 337.

interview of him with Dale Salwak, the writer of the book *Interviews with Britain's Angry Young Men*, Kingsley Amis explains his own ideas about whether there was really such a movement or not:

SALWAK. Looking back on your own career, can you reconstruct for me the way in which the "Angry Young Men" arose?

AMIS. As always, I think it was all certainly not one or two things. Rather, it was a combination of accidents. One was that it so happened that three or four writers (myself included), none of whom were from upper-class backgrounds or had been to public schools in the British sense, emerged at about the same time. And they were all roughly of an age, and it so happened that there had been a kind of delayed action effect after the war. ... I think there was a feeling of exhaustion after the war. The older writers were still writing, but for some reason no new writer of any fame, any note, had appeared for seven or eight years. I think this was partly because people were busy putting their lives together again. ... Then by a series of coincidences, within three years, John Wain appeared, I appeared, John Braine, John Osborne, Iris Murdoch, and Colin Wilson all appeared. And others. Now that looks like a movement, and I can quite see, since there was this business of nonupper-classness (middle-class, middle upper-class perhaps, but certainly not upper-class) people could be forgiven for mistaking this for a sort of minor revolution or turning point in English writing. I don't think it really was that, but it had the look of being one. Another reason why the thing was made to look like a movement is the fact that the novels and the plays were to a large extent about people at work.⁷⁵

In another interview with Michael Barber, when it comes to the question whether or not Kingsley Amis himself is an 'angry young man', he is not so sure about it:

BARBER. What was your reaction to being called an Angry Young Man?

AMIS. Mixed. I mean, no writer, especially a young and unknown writer, resents publicity of any kind—whatever he may say. I'm sure I didn't. But the other side of that was being lumped together with some very strange people. Again, not that I'm denigrating them. But all of us in that nonexistent movement—which is really only a string of names—felt that, I think. But this is what literary journalists have to do, don't they? Discern trends and groups even

⁷⁵ Dale Salwak, *Interviews with Britain's Angry Young Men*, 1984, pp. 15-16. (In order to give a full picture of the movement, we felt that it was necessary to quote that long lines.)

when there isn't much of a trend, and nothing in the way of a group.⁷⁶

It is not solely Kingsley Amis who denies the existence of movement and rejects being called 'angry young man'. John Wain also denies that there is such a movement, and so does Arnold Wesker: "I was never an angry young man. We were all very happy young men and women. Discovered, paid, applaud, made internationally famous overnight!"⁷⁷ As for the original angry man, John Osborne accepts being one of the angries, and even plainly restricts the scope of the movement to a very few writers including himself: "Well the principal figures in this equation seem to have been Kingsley Amis, John Wain—and myself."⁷⁸

Osborne's anger was to attack all the institutions of middle-class society including the church, the class system, but mostly the Royalty, which he calls the 'national swill': "It is poisonous, what an old vegetarian I used to know would call 'foodless food', or as Orwell might have put it, the leader-writers and the bribed gossip mongers have only to rattle their stick in the royalty bucket for most of their readers to put their heads down in this trough of Queen-worship, their tails turned against the world."⁷⁹ What Osborne meant to say, indeed, about the Royalty is that people should understand that the hey-days of Britain was over; it was only those traditional writers and bribetaker politicians or traders who still kept on pretending that nothing had changed after the war and on praising the Queen with eulogies. Osborne keeps openly questioning the honesty and value of the Royalty in his plays. Yet, he is accused of having one of his characters in *The Entertainer* criticize the Royalty unclearly and being 'vaguely anti-queen':

When my play *The Entertainer* was produced, it was complained that one of the characters was vaguely 'anti-queen'. Now, if this character was vague in the way she expressed herself, it was because the existence of the Lord Chamberlain's office⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Michael Barber, "Interviews", *The Art of Fiction*, No. 59, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://theparisreview.org>).

⁷⁷ Aleks Sierz, "John Osborne and the Myth of Anger", *New Theatre Quarterly* 46, May 1996, pp. 136-146.

⁷⁸ John Osborne, "They Call it Cricket", *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 51.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 50.

⁸⁰ Hartnoll and Found explicate the Lord Chamberlain's office thoroughly: "Lord Chamberlain, officer of the British Royal Household under whom the Master of the Revels was first appointed in 1494 to supervise Court entertainments. After the Restoration in 1660 the Lord Chamberlain himself

compelled it. I should have been delighted if she could have been more explicit, although, in this case, I was anxious that this particular point should not be made too literally. The bigger point that this character was trying to make was something like: ‘What kind of symbols do we live by? *Are* they truthful and worthwhile?’ But in expressing herself in anti-queen terms, which was a relevant and colourful image –or so I thought– I believe she was asking an important question. I still believe it to be an important question.⁸¹

Here Osborne does not deny or try to hide his animosity towards the queen. Besides, he disdains the critics who have missed the main point that there is a *big question* to be answered – that is, whether the symbols people live by are really reliable and worthy –, even if asked vaguely or not.

There are two distinctive and common features of the writers referring to the movement. The first one is that they, excluding some ones, were educated; few of them at Oxford or Cambridge, but most of them at redbrick or provincial universities which were “built of raw red brick instead of the ancient stone of Oxford or the mellow clay of Cambridge”⁸². Most of them could not attend to the most prestigious schools of England, Oxford and Cambridge, because of the social-class system. Nevertheless, owing to his statements in *They Call it Cricket*, we understand that even if given a chance, Osborne would not have gone to Oxford or Cambridge, for he argues that these two universities are “confined to second-hand observation”⁸³ about the working-class or low-middle-class life. All of them come from working or low-

began to intervene directly in the regulation of theatres and in censorship, mainly in relation to political and religious issues, his powers being legally formulated by the Licensing Act of 1737. These powers, particularly in regard to the licensing of theatres, were modified by the Theatres Act of 1843. New plays, and new matter added to existing plays, had to be submitted to the Lord Chamberlain’s office for scrutiny by the Examiner of Plays. At the time of the abolition of his powers the Lord Chamberlain had three English readers and one Welsh, who reported on the work submitted, with particular reference to indecency, impropriety, profanity, seditious matter, and the representation of living persons. Plays written before the passing of the 1843 Act could be suppressed under Section 14 of the Act. Play-producing societies and theatre clubs came within the Lord Chamberlain’s powers, although it was customary to treat bona fide societies with lenience. His power to withhold or withdraw a licence was absolute and he was under no legal obligation to disclose the reasons; but in practice the Lord Chamberlain’s office was normally ready to indicate changes in the text that would enable a licence to be issued. There was no appeal against his decision. The Theatres Act of 1968 took all theatrical matters out of the hands of the Lord Chamberlain, vesting theatre licensing in local authorities and abolishing theatrical censorship, since when stage plays have been subject to common law such as those Acts pertaining to obscenity, blasphemy, libel, and breach of the peace.” Phyllis Hartnoll and Peter Found, “Lord Chamberlain”, Web. 23 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.encyclopedia.com>).

⁸¹ John Osborne, “They Call it Cricket”, *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 50.

⁸² Carl Bode, “The Redbrick Cinderellas”, *College English*, Vol. 20, No. 7 (Apr., 1959), p. 332.

⁸³ John Osborne, “They Call it Cricket”, *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 60.

middle class, which is the second feature shared by them. Coming from working-class origins, the angry young men chose to portray what they knew the best, namely, the working-class. And this led to the born of a new type of drama, the *kitchen-sink* drama.

The term *kitchen sink* coined in 1954 due to an expressionist artist, John Bratby, one of whose paintings depicted an image of kitchen sink. He also painted several kitchen objects, bathrooms, toilets and some other everyday objects. Its popularity lied on the article named *The Kitchen Sink* in a reference to Bratby's pictures, written by the critic David Sylvester.⁸⁴ In his article he introduced recent trends in English art. Other artists associated with the *kitchen sink* style were Derrick Greaves, Edward Middleditch and Jack Smith, who focused their work deliberately on the unglamorous and everyday objects or scenes often on industrial and working-class themes, or at least drab and unheroic scenes of post-war austerity: commonplace subject matter of daily life like cluttered kitchens, backyards, tenements⁸⁵, stressing the banality of daily life.

Later on, the term began to be used as a style of drama with an aim to give social messages, to draw attention to the conditions of the working class life, which was, before the 1950s, depicted stereotypically, and to the class division, unfair wealth and income differences between the citizens of the same country.⁸⁶ Since then, country houses and tennis courts have been out; ironing boards and minor domestic squalor have been in⁸⁷.

The reflection of the innovative artists became evident in drama firstly with John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*. It is accepted to be the first sample work of *kitchen sink* drama. What was new, actually shocking, with the play was an ironing board on the stage as such a domestic scene had never shown before to the British theatre audience.⁸⁸ Roy Huss claims that Osborne has turned the theatre into a forum for attacking middle-class complacency, thanks to *Look Back in Anger*: "British theatergoers have been treated to an array of characters hovering over kitchen sink (or

⁸⁴ "Kitchen Sink Realism", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.answers.com>).

⁸⁵ "Kitchen Sink Art", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.wsu.edu>).

⁸⁶ Reade Donran, "Kitchen Sink Drama", *Western Drama through the Ages*, Ed. Kimball King, Westport, CT, 2007, p. 452.

⁸⁷ "Kitchen Sink Drama", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.wordiq.com>).

⁸⁸ Alison Reeves, "Look Back in Anger, John Osborne", *Resource Pack*, (Jan., 2005), p. 10.

ash-cans or some other receptacle symbolic of human waste) and inveighing against...the misuse of man's spiritual and intellectual resources".⁸⁹

Afterwards, it became common between other dramatists to present the working-class people, whose lives struggle with politics, industry or social-economic difficulties. The setting is simple. We, as the audience, see the depiction of a one-room flat or an attic barely furnished, and witness the characters' washing the dishes, ironing, or having conversations about social or political issues.⁹⁰

Beyond his new style of theatre with the depiction of working-class life, the main power and innovation in his drama is his use of language. Osborne argues "I think it [*Look Back in Anger*] broke out by its use of language"⁹¹. He prefers exploring the inner worlds of the characters with using vital, dynamic and highly aggressive words – actually tirades – rather than resolving the complicated events. Most of the time, we see Jimmy not talking but yelling in despair with offensive words. His violence, amplified by "the language more than the action"⁹², disturbs not only the other characters in the play, but also the critics, who are, in a word, shocked by the Osborne's dramatic language:

At the legendary first night of John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* on 8 May 1956 at the Royal Court, what offended the critics was not only the shabby setting (a Nottingham bedsit rather than a Home Counties living room) but also the hectoring tone of the play, and especially the language used by its antihero, Jimmy Porter. When Lord Harewood, a member of the board, showed the text to a friend, the response was: 'Well, it's very excitingly written, but you can't put that on in a theatre! People won't stand for being shouted at like that, it's not what they go to theatre for.'... Many critics resented this. One hated *Look Back in Anger*'s 'laborious shock tactics', another 'felt bruised' by its 'verbal artillery'.⁹³

⁸⁹ Roy Huss, "Review: [Untitled], Reviewed Work(s): Three Plays: The Waters of Babylon, Live Like Pigs, The Happy Haven by John Arden", *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Feb., 1966), p. 41.

⁹⁰ "Kitchen Sink Realism", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.answers.com>).

⁹¹ John Osborne, "That Awful Museum", *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*, Ed. John Russell Taylor, London, 1968, p. 66.

⁹² Chee Fun Fong, *The Theme of Isolation in the Plays of John Osborne*, Diss. York University (Canada), 1969, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, p. 6.

⁹³ Aleks Sierz, *In-Yer-Face Theater: British Drama Today*, London, 2001, pp. 15-16.

Another characteristic of Osborne's language is that his characters, specifically the male hero, make such long speeches that Osborne never lets any other character interrupt them. In *Look Back Anger*, Jimmy tirades, and Cliff, Alison and Helena listen to him without any attempt to intervene. In fact, Jimmy does not even mean to pause and to wait for them to give a reply:

I rage, and shout my head off, and everyone thinks "poor chap!" or "what an objectionable man!" But that girl there can twist your arm off with her silence... One of us is crazy. One of us is mean and stupid and crazy. Which is it? Is it me? Is it me, standing here like an hysterical girl, hardly able to get my words out? Or is it her? ... I want to stand up in your tears, and splash about in them, and sing. I want to be there when grovel. I want to be there, I want to watch it, I want the front seat. I want to see your face rubbed in the mud –that's all I can hope...⁹⁴

We see characters while speaking but not communicating. For they are "[i]nhibited [either] by the fear of exposure of their inner selves, or by the indifference of external reality"⁹⁵. In other words, it is either because Osborne wants to portray the post-war young men who preferred isolating themselves from the others or because he just does not want his monologues to lose their impact and power due to the interruptions in order to shake both the characters and the audience who are silent and indifferent.

The dramatic language of Osborne is highly dominated by the rhetorical questions.⁹⁶ This is as if a rule for all of his works. They do not expect the other characters to give a response; besides, their questions are, most of the time, so philosophical that they need no answer anyway:

JIMMY. I have an idea. Why don't we have a little game? Let's pretend that we're human beings, and that we're actually alive. Just for a while.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 52.

⁹⁵ Chee Fun Fong, *The Theme of Isolation in the Plays of John Osborne*, Diss. York University (Canada), 1969, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, p. 12.

⁹⁶ Bari Lynn Gilliard, *Men in Crisis: Vision and Form in John Osborne's Major Plays*, Diss. The University of Utah, 1975, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, p. 157.

⁹⁷ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 11.

Osborne asserts that it is an age of fragmentation, which makes it impossible to construct a dramatic language shared by the society. A dramatist, thus, may have difficulty in making generalization or giving social or emotional references in his works; he should, consequently, be specific – firstly – to himself and his particular experience.⁹⁸ What Osborne meant to say with ‘specific’ needs to be elaborated. He may intend to offer a dramatist either to express himself clearly so that everybody can get the point easily – for there is not a shared dramatic language –, or to be clear only to himself thinking that the others will not get the point anyway – again, for there is not a common dramatic language. It seems that the latter one is what he tried to get at. Because, according to many critics, the theatre of Osborne, especially the ending of his plays, is “ambiguous”.⁹⁹ It is clear that almost all of Osborne’s works have not a clear cut ending. So, it seems that Osborne asks open ended questions to his readers in order to get the message hidden in his works. It reminds us the main characteristic of existentialist and absurd theatre as we know absurd plays have no proper plot and characters. However, Osborne’s plays are regarded as well-made plays, but the style and the content seem to be similar to the existentialist plays. In *Look Back in Anger*, we see that Jimmy and Alison reconcile and the curtain falls; yet, we are not given any clue whether they will go on living together, or Alison will again move to her father. It is not clear because the act ends before the couple solves their problems with their marriage. Osborne’s reply to this criticism is, however, not *ambiguous*. He accuses the critics for being incapable of recognizing the texture of ordinary, the way it rhetorically expresses itself and the shabby and yet simple gestures.¹⁰⁰ Osborne claims that all art is organized evasion: It can be understood that no artist, including himself, needs to make explanations either to the audience or to the critics. For art is subjective; we, as the audience, comprehend the piece of works only to the extent that we can understand, or we just do not get the point: “You respond to Lear or Max Miller –or you don’t. I [John Osborne] can’t teach the paralyzed to move their limbs. Shakespeare didn’t describe symptoms or offer explanations. Neither did Chekhov. Neither do I.”¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Andrew K. Kennedy, *Six Dramatists in Search of a Language*, London, 1975, p. 197.

⁹⁹ A. E. Dyson, “Look Back in Anger”, *Modern British Dramatists, A Collection of Critical Essays*, Ed. John Russell Brown, New Jersey, 1968, p. 55.

¹⁰⁰ John Osborne, “They Call it Cricket”, *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 51.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

Osborne remained as one of the productive playwrights of British theatre. He wrote 25 stage plays, some of which are adaptations from other playwrights such as Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*, Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and Strindberg's *The Father*, five screen plays including *Tom Jones* with which he won an Academy Award, and *The Charge of the Light Brigade*, two volumes of autobiography, *A Better Class of Person* and *Almost a Gentleman*. John Osborne is rightfully associated with *Look Back in Anger*, but his other plays, like *The Entertainer* (1957), *Luther* (1961), *Inadmissible Evidence* (1964), *A Patriot for Me* (1965) and *West of Suez* (1971) are all memorable. Osborne has always been sensitive and alerted to the social and political issues in his plays. After his death, Marowitz successfully portrays and summarizes Osborne's approach to the theatre:

...Osborne remains the most ornery dramatist in England. He still smarts, seethes and occasionally rages. He refuses to conform to other people's idea of nonconformity. He rejects the cosy club hair and the gutless protest that crackles in the lounge and smolders on the street. He still winces at the stench in his country and refuses to pretend it is only someone burning leaves in the back yard.¹⁰²

¹⁰² Charles Marowitz, "Ascension of John Osborne", *The Tulane Drama Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Winter, 1962), pp. 178-179.

SECOND CHAPTER

2. THE IDENTITY CRISIS IN JOHN OSBORNE'S *LOOK BACK IN ANGER*

The outstanding characteristic of man is his individuality. There was never a person just like him, and there never will be again.

Gordon W. Allport¹⁰³

Psychological construct of identity crisis is not a basis to this study, but in order to make a satisfactory assessment of the identity crisis observed in *Look Back in Anger*, we thought it would be both useful and indispensable to describe specific dimensions of the identity and the identity crisis in psychological notion. As the main concern of this thesis is the use of identity crisis as a theme in *Look Back in Anger*, a detailed analysis of the play is presented in the next section of this chapter.

2.1. The Psychological Bases of Identity Crisis

The first mentions of the notion of identity date from the 1950s, but the term has become increasingly important in the modern psychology. Erikson, one of the major psychoanalytical theorists, has focused prominently on identity, and described it as

a subjective sense as well an observable quality of personal sameness and continuity, paired with some belief in the sameness and continuity of some shared world image. As a quality of unself-conscious living, this can be gloriously obvious in a young person who has found himself as he has found his communality. In him we see emerge a unique unification of what is irreversibly given – that is, body type and temperament, giftedness and vulnerability, infantile models and acquired ideals – with the open choices provided in available roles, occupational possibilities, values offered, mentors met, friendships made, and first sexual encounters.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Jerry M. Burger, *Personality*, 8th ed., Belmont, 2011, p. 3.

¹⁰⁴ “Identity Crisis – Theory and Research”, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, (<http://psychology.about.com>).

Similarly, Arkonaç defines identity in *Açıklamalı Psikiyatri Sözlüğü* as:

one's interior belief, image or concept related to such functions and roles as the identity of the body, gender, mental and social. [It] refers to a consistent awareness of who one is and of where he is going, in accordance with his attachment to the thought and value system of a social group.¹⁰⁵

Speaking of the term 'consistency' in this regard, Doğan Cüceloğlu clarifies that consistency renders "one's acting in a particular and similar manner in the different course of time"¹⁰⁶.

In the light of these explanations, identity can be summed up as 'the sense of feeling unified, whole and continuous; the individual experiences continuity within his self'¹⁰⁷. Due to its continuous structure, identity is viewed as something constructed as fluid and fluctuating; that is to say, one can have many identities based on gender, race, nationality and socio-economic status.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, a nobel-winner economist and philosopher Amartya Sen claims that people, having many differing identities, will like to have one particular dominant identity with which they associate themselves.¹⁰⁹ The dominant identity is triggered by the awareness of various aspects of the self – that is, the self-perception – and by ego identity, which is, according to Erikson, "a total integration of vocational ambition and aspiration, along with all those qualities acquired through earlier identification"¹¹⁰. The sense of self of an individual may change, but the identity, as described by Mussen, is a sense of self that is consistent within these chances over time and place:

[A] clear sense of ego identity...requires a self-perceived consistency, not only at a particular moment, but also over time. ... Any developmental influences which contribute to confident self-

¹⁰⁵ Oğuz Arkonaç, *Açıklamalı Psikiyatri Sözlüğü*, İstanbul, 1999, p. 256. (All quotes from Turkish sources are translated by the author of this study.)

¹⁰⁶ Doğan Cüceloğlu, *İnsan ve Davranışı*, 20th. ed., İstanbul, 2010, p. 405.

¹⁰⁷ Carol-Ann Gail White, *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*, Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 3.

¹⁰⁸ C. Laing, *The Muslim Identity Crisis: Shari'a as a Mechanism for Decolonization*, Diss. The University of Regina (Canada), 2010, Web. 1 Feb, 2011, pp. 18-19.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

¹¹⁰ Carol-Ann Gail White, *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*, Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, pp. 4-5.

perceptions of one's self as separate and distinct from others, as reasonably consistent and integrated in his definition of himself, and as having a continuity of the self over time, also contribute to an overall sense of ego identity. By the same token, influences which impair any of these self-perceptions foster ego diffusion.¹¹¹

The notion of identity crisis was first used to describe 'the perplexity and lack of sameness' suffered by the World War II veterans, returning home and having difficulty in adapting to a new social milieu.¹¹² It was Erik Erikson who coined and contributed substantially to the understanding of the term in modern psychology.

Erikson was interested in how one socializes, which affects his sense of self. His interest in the self stems from his own childhood: Despite being raised as Jewish and appearing very Scandinavian, Erikson often felt that he was an outsider of both groups.¹¹³ This situation helped Erikson formalize his ideas that the interaction between a person's genetic biological programming and social conditions within particular environment determines the course of development.

Erikson fostered his theory, the *Psychosocial Development*, which postulates a series of eight crises through which all the individuals pass in order to complete life cycle. His theory is actually based on Freud's theory of psychosexual development; he, however, opposed Freud's claim that personality is mostly established by the age of five or six. Erikson advanced this claim of Freud, organizing identity development into eight stages that extend from birth to death, and proposing that adolescence is the most crucial stage of establishment of the identity. Geçtan clarifies the reason of Erikson's claim:

If we were to explain everything with reference to childhood, then, everything would have been seen as another person's deficiency, and consequently, his strength for taking responsibility of his own actions would have been underestimated.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Carol-Ann Gail White, *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*, Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 27.

¹¹² B. Whitley, *Applying a Comprehensive-Internal Model for the Evaluation of Social-Scientific Research to the Identity Crisis Stage of Erik Erikson's Developmental Theory*, Diss. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 28.

¹¹³ "Identity Crisis – Theory and Research", Web. 1 Feb. 2011, (<http://psychology.about.com>).

¹¹⁴ Engin Geçtan, *Psikodinamik Psikiyatri ve Normaldışı Davranışlar*, İstanbul, 2004, pp. 93-94.

Stage	Basic Conflict	Outcome
Infancy (birth to 18 months)	Trust vs. Mistrust	Children develop a sense of trust when caregivers provide reliability, care, and affection. A lack of this will lead to mistrust.
Early Childhood (2 to 3 years)	Autonomy vs. Shame and Doubt	Children need to develop a sense of personal control over physical skills and a sense of independence. Success leads to feelings of autonomy, failure results in feelings of shame and doubt.
Preschool (3 to 5 years)	Initiative vs. Guilt	Children need to begin asserting control and power over the environment. Success in this stage leads to a sense of purpose. Children who try to exert too much power experience disapproval, resulting in a sense of guilt.
School Age (6 to 11 years)	Industry vs. Inferiority	Children need to cope with new social and academic demands. Success leads to a sense of competence, while failure results in feelings of inferiority.
Adolescence (12 to 18 years)	Identity vs. Role Confusion	Teens need to develop a sense of self and personal identity. Success leads to an ability to stay true to yourself, while failure leads to role confusion and a weak sense of self.
Young Adulthood (19 to 40 years)	Intimacy vs. Isolation	Young adults need to form intimate, loving relationships with other people. Success leads to strong relationships, while failure results in loneliness and isolation.
Middle Adulthood (40 to 65 years)	Generativity vs. Stagnation	Adults need to create or nurture things that will outlast them, often by having children or creating a positive change that benefits other people. Success leads to feelings of usefulness and accomplishment, while failure results in shallow involvement in the world.
Maturity (65 to death)	Ego Integrity vs. Despair	Older adults need to look back on life and feel a sense of fulfillment. Success at this stage leads to feelings of wisdom, while failure results in regret, bitterness, and despair.

Figure 1: Erikson's Eight Stages of Psychosocial Development Theory

According to his theory, each stage is characterized by a psychosocial crisis. The successful completion of each stage depends on the resolution to the crisis, and is crucial to the growth and development. Failure to complete a stage can result in an unhealthy personality and a sense of self, but, according to Erikson, can be retrieved at the next stages.

Identity formation is a central process in all stages; yet, the most vital stage for the establishment of identity is adolescence as Erikson states:

[T]he stage [of adolescence] is a psychosocial moratorium during which the individual through free role experimentation may find a niche in some section of society, to be uniquely made for him. ...the young adult gains an assured sense of inner continuity and social sameness which will bridge what he 'was' as a child and he is 'about to become' and will reconcile 'his conception of himself' and his 'community's recognition' of him.¹¹⁵

The psychosocial crisis encountered during the stage of adolescence is *identity vs. identity diffusion*.¹¹⁶ In order to establish a dominant positive identity, blending both his personal and social identifications, and a philosophy of life, the adolescent tries different identities, which leads to an identity crisis, according as Erikson describes:

[The identity crisis] is characterized by enormous spurt of new needs, new energies, and new faculties, and therefore receives special treatment by societies and cultures; for before the young person enters adulthood, he must be sure to put his new needs, energies, and faculties at the disposal of his society's values.¹¹⁷

The identity crisis is not a negative term; it, on the contrary, is a normal stage of identity development: The positive resolution to the identity crisis ends up in ego identity, and *fidelity* which is notably defined by Erikson as "the opportunity to fulfill personal potentialities"¹¹⁸. If the adolescent fails to resolve the crisis, the outcome

¹¹⁵ Carol-Ann Gail White, *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*, Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 13.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 11.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 11.

¹¹⁸ B. Whitley, *Applying a Comprehensive-Internal Model for the Evaluation of Social-Scientific Research to the Identity Crisis Stage of Erik Erikson's Developmental Theory*, Diss. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 127.

will be the identity diffusion that describes the lack of commitment to an ideology, self-definition, occupational choice, political orientations, religious beliefs; in short, a way of life that culminates in “a confusion of values which may be dangerous to youth and on a broader perspective, dangerous to society”¹¹⁹.

James Marcia, known for his researches on adolescent psychosocial and identity development, has expanded Erikson’s concept of the identity crisis and developed the *Identity Status Interview*, a categorization of identity statuses which are to explain the outcomes of identity crisis.¹²⁰ According to Marcia, there are four different identity statuses – or possible outcomes – which are assessed by two variables, that is, crisis and commitment. In the period of crisis, the individual questions his current ideas, beliefs, value system or choices, and examines new options or alternatives. The commitment process results in the individual’s “investment in a decision or ‘course of action’”¹²¹. The individual has to make a commitment to two crucial areas of society; that is, occupation and ideology. The assignment to an ego identity status is, in brief, determined by two criteria, crisis and commitment, in two areas, occupation and ideology.¹²²

The identity statuses are hierarchically constructed. The highest level of the statuses is *Identity Achievement*; the lowest level is *Identity Diffusion*. *Moratorium* and *Foreclosure* are the two remaining statuses, which, according to Marcia, need to be designated in a more definite position between the highest and the lowest levels.¹²³ The status *Identity Achievement* occurs when the individual has experienced a crisis period, gone through an exploration of different identities and finally committed to an occupation and ideology. In this status, the identity crisis successfully handled and the ego identity is achieved. In the status *Identity Diffusion*, the individual may or may not experience a crisis period, but it results in the lack of commitment. *Moratorium* is the status which represents a crisis period when the individual is actively involved in exploring different identities and choosing alternatives, but has not made a commitment yet. In the last status *Foreclosure*,

¹¹⁹ Carol-Ann Gail White, *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*, Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 13.

¹²⁰ “Identity Crisis – Theory and Research”, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, (<http://psychology.about.com>).

¹²¹ Carol-Ann Gail White, *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*, Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977, Web. 1 Feb. 2011, p. 18.

¹²² Ibid., p. 20.

¹²³ Ibid., p. 18.

although the individual has not experienced a crisis period of assessing his childhood concepts and resolving the acceptance of a new philosophy of life, he has made a commitment according to, mostly, his parental values.

In Erikson's theory, the identity crisis is described as the individual's constant state of searching for identity. Erikson restricts this crisis only to the stage of transition from the adolescence to the emergence of adulthood. Recently, it is, however, presumed that the crisis can transpire at any period of our life:

Identity crisis, in the course of time, is to lose the sameness and consistency of the self, and to reject one's expected social roles. Some signs of identity crisis are antisocial and exaggerating behaviours, rebellion or pessimism. In a milieu, undergone expeditious social development and technological changes, such expectations of the public as communal, educational and occupational adaptation of the individuals will quite likely exacerbate the intrinsic motivators and typically pull the trigger [of the identity crisis].¹²⁴

Life proceeds in sequential stages of human development, and each stage steers the individual's perception of his self and behaviours in a particular and prominent way. While some are lucky enough to settle their identity, the rest cannot fix their value system, make their choices nor find their paths to take; so, in conclusion, they encounter with identity crisis.

¹²⁴ Oğuz Arkonaç, *Açıklamalı Psikiyatri Sözlüğü*, İstanbul, 1999, p. 256.

2.2. The Identity Crisis in *Look Back in Anger*

*Another I, another You,
Each knowing what to do
But of no use.
Never stronger
But younger and younger,
Saying good-bye but coming back, for
fear
Is over there,
And the centre of anger
Is out of danger.
Auden – Never Stronger*

Look Back in Anger is the story of four young people, Jimmy Porter and his fellow Cliff Lewis, both coming from working-class background, Jimmy's wife Alison Porter and her best friend Helena Charles, both coming from an upper-middle-class family, who live all together and suffer from love they feel for each other; and of an old man, Colonel Redfern, the father of Alison, who stands for the great Edwardian past and "can't understand why the sun isn't shining anymore"¹²⁵.

The play is divided into three acts, consisting of exposition, development and denouement – which makes its dramatic structure very traditional, namely 'well-made' as defined by French dramatists Eugene Scribe (1791-1861) and Victorien Sardou (1831-1908) in the mid-nineteenth century¹²⁶, in spite of its being so-called revolutionary reputation, just as Osborne himself called it "a formal, rather old-fashioned play"¹²⁷. In Act I, we learn about the lives of all the major characters and witness Alison's confess to Cliff that she is pregnant and Jimmy's outburst due to the imminent arrival of Helena; in Act II, Helena's arrival complicates the marriage of Alison and Jimmy, Jimmy's asking Alison for coming with him to see his friend Hugh's ill mother but her choice to go to church instead serve to develop the situation, and Alison's leaving home leads to the denouement; finally, in Act III, the

¹²⁵ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 60.

¹²⁶ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xxi.

¹²⁷ John Osborne, "That Awful Museum", *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*, Ed. John Russell Taylor, London, 1968, p. 66.

situation moves to a resolution, when Alison returns.¹²⁸ Helena immediately leaves home, learning that Alison has lost her baby, and then Alison and Jimmy are reunited.

Look Back in Anger presents us a tangled web of interpersonal relationships between the characters, who seek and have difficulties in finding their real identity. The term *identity*, as already explained hereinbefore, is the brief answer to the question “*Who am I?*”. This answer encapsulates many other answers to, for instance, what one’s role in life is, whether or not he has assured his goals, values or beliefs, or, how much his past – it does not matter if the aforesaid past is such a long time ago as his childhood years or it is such a short time passed as a minute ago – is in harmony with his present. In his letter to his wife, which is, according to his own son Henry James, unusual, William James makes a self-analysis and defines a man’s character or identity as “seek[ing] out the particular mental or moral attitude in which, when it came upon him, he felt himself most deeply and intensely active and alive. At such moments there is a voice inside which speaks and says: “This is real me!””.¹²⁹ When examining the characters in *Look Back in Anger*, they seem to be clumsy to find the real essence of their soul, and to claim that ‘This is – or, has to be – real me’, which has inevitably ended in identity crisis.

Jimmy Porter, the central figure in the play, is twenty-five, funny, kind and childish at times, but abusive for the most part, violent and evidently angry, desperately caught between working-class, owing to his father’s origins and to running a sweet stall in a market, and middle-class, on account of his mother’s background and of being a university graduate. Jimmy, just like his creator John Osborne, has been “acutely aware of ... class stonewall in [his] own family”.¹³⁰ He has a contradictory nature, just as Osborne describes him in the opening of Act I:

He is a disconcerting mixture of sincerity and cheerful malice, of tenderness and freebooting cruelty; restless, importunate, full of pride, a combination which alienates the sensitive and insensitive alike. Blistering honesty, or apparent honesty, like his, makes few friends. To many he may seem sensitive to the point of vulgarity.

¹²⁸ Margaret Rose, “Introduction”, *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xxi.

¹²⁹ Henry James, ed., *The Letters of William James*, Volume 1, Boston, 1920, p. 199.

¹³⁰ John Osborne, “They Call it Cricket”, *Declaration*, Ed. Tom Maschler, New York, 1958, p. 62.

*To others, he is simply a loudmouth. To be as vehement as he is is to be almost non-committal.*¹³¹

Probing into the ambiguities in Jimmy's character, we come across with three roots of his paradoxes: His obsession with the past, his misogynistic motives and the social class discrimination in the British society. Jimmy is seen as a snobbish man crazily in love with his wife and an idealist pursuing radical changes in the society in one scene, and as a cruel woman hater coming from working-class background and stuck in the glorious past of British Empire in another.

Jimmy outwardly resides in an attic flat in a large Midland town, situated in the central part of England, but he internally lives in a limbo between the past and the present. He thinks that his life is consisting of the same ritual, like reading the papers, drinking tea or watching his wife's ironing everyday. Jimmy, when assessing the contemporary situation of the country during the time, seems not to believe in the headlines claiming "We are Great Britain again"¹³², which makes him look at the present in anger and frustration, and at the past in nostalgia.

Throughout the play, Jimmy rails against the contemporary state of the English nation, which "was emerging from doldrums and lassitude of early 50s and moving toward the permissive society of the 60s".¹³³ Before the World War II, Britain was in a period of strength and wealth as the leading world power, but after the war the British Empire entered a decline. It lost its military power, which was proved by its failure during the Suez crisis or by the loss of the possession of its colonies all over the world. According to Jimmy, this situation would get worse due to the politics who were nothing more than the hypocrites, for they protected only the benefits of upper and middle class and did not take any action for the change or the reconstruction. Apart from the politics, what Jimmy is annoyed with are mostly the people in general. Nobody, Jimmy grieves, raises himself out for his delicious sloth, thinks, cares, still has beliefs or convictions, nor is enthusiastic for a real and a glorious life as he used to before. Nobody can see the fall of Britain and the rise of

¹³¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 5.

¹³² Gordon Rogoff, "Richard's Himself Again: Journey to an Actor's Theatre", *The Tulane Drama Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Winter, 1966), p. 30.

¹³³ Alan Rosenthal, "Review: [Untitled], Reviewed Work(s): *Censorship and the Permissive Society: British Cinema and Theatre 1955-1965* by Anthony Aldgate", *Film Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Autumn, 1996), p. 41.

the United States on the other side: “I must be getting sentimental. But I must say it’s pretty dreary living in the American Age – unless you’re an American of course.”¹³⁴

Jimmy is afraid that America, gaining enormous political influence and military power on all countries in the world, would be such a great power that “perhaps all our children will be Americans”.¹³⁵ There occurs another dilemma: So many times Jimmy, who finds ‘The American Age’ dreary, is seen while playing the jazz trumpet, which relates to the American culture and which is accepted as “a music of rebellion by literary intellectuals seeking a serious cultural form that was not associated with established high culture”¹³⁶. Despite “the American-ness of his great enthusiasm”¹³⁷, which he seems not to recognize, Jimmy, Alison informs, had his own jazz band when he was a student, and, further, he claims that “Anyone who doesn’t like real jazz, hasn’t any feeling either for music or people”¹³⁸. Even if it is a dilemma, Jimmy’s deep interest in the jazz gives other dimensions of his character: He sees the jazz culture as the manifestation of an “oppositional identity”¹³⁹ – for it symbolizes the opposition and rebellion –, and as a way of indicating one’s love towards music and people.

No matter how heartily he seeks for change in the modern life, Jimmy cannot break his ties with the past. His preoccupation with the imperial history has become apparent thanks to his and Cliff’s “songs and patter [which] are directly borrowed from music hall routines”¹⁴⁰:

Cliff. ‘Ere! Have you seen nobody?

Jimmy. Have I seen who?

Cliff. Have you seen nobody?

Jimmy. Of course, I haven’t seen nobody!

Cliff. Are you quite sure you haven’t seen nobody?...

Jimmy. Are you still here?

Cliff. I’m looking for nobody!...

¹³⁴ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 13.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹³⁶ Alan Sinfield, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*, London, 2004, p. 297.

¹³⁷ George McKay, “Just a Closer Walk with Thee: New Orleans-Style Jazz and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in 1950s Britain”, *Popular Music*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Oct., 2003), p. 264.

¹³⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 41.

¹³⁹ Alan Sinfield, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*, London, 2004, p. 298.

¹⁴⁰ John Harrop, “The Last Laugh: Comedy as a Political Touchstone in Britain from “The Entertainer” to “Comedians””, *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Mar., 1980), p. 8.

Jimmy. ...Who is this nobody you're talking about?

Cliff. I was told to come here and give this case to nobody.

Jimmy. You were told to come here and give this case to nobody.

Cliff. That's right. And when I gave it to him, nobody would give me a shilling.

Jimmy. And when you gave it to him, nobody would give you a shilling.

Cliff. That's right...

Helena. (*not quite sure if this is really her cue*). Hey! You down there!

Jimmy. ...What is it sir?

Helena. (*shouting*). I think your sketch stinks! I say – I think your sketch stinks!

Jimmy. He thinks it stinks. And, who, pray, might you be?

Helena. Me? Oh –(*with mock modesty*) I'm nobody.

Jimmy. Then here's your bloody case!...

The two men do a Flanagan and Allen, moving slowly in step, as they sing.

Now there's a certain lady, and you all know who I mean,
She may have been to Roedean, but to me she's still a queen.
Someday I'm goin' to marry her,
When times are not so bad,
Her mother doesn't care for me
So I'll 'ave to ask 'er dad.
We'll build a little home for two,
And have some quiet menage,
We'll send our kids to public school
And live on bread and marge.
Don't be afraid to sleep with your sweetheart,
Just because she's better than you.
Those forgotten middle-classes may have fallen on their noses,
But a girl who's true blue,
Will still have something left for you
The angels up above, will know that you're in love
So don't be afraid to sleep with your sweetheart,
Just because she's better than you. ...
They call me Sydney,
Just because she's better than you.¹⁴¹

To shed more light on the relationship between music hall metaphor and nostalgia, John Osborne himself wrote in his note to *The Entertainer*: "The music-hall is dying, and with it, a significant part of England. Some of the heart of England has gone: something that once belonged to everyone, for this was truly a folk art"¹⁴².

¹⁴¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, pp. 70-72.

¹⁴² John Russell Taylor, *Anger and After, A New Guide to the New British Drama*, London, 1962, p. 50.

In other words, the music hall was one of the entertainment customs of England, and in *Look Back in Anger* John Osborne wanted to revive this tradition with the help of Jimmy who cannot prevent nor suppress his yearning for the old times. Another interesting point about Jimmy's perform related to the music hall is, John Harrop declares, that "the use [of] folk image of the music hall [is] to examine social and political issues"¹⁴³. Harrop also notes that the social and political changes since 1945 are represented with the metaphor of music hall:

As an institution the music hall has been dead some thirty years, but, in that period, it has become of interest to socialists, sociologists, and some playwrights, as a symbol of the true working-class heritage the new British society is seeking. In attempting to create an egalitarian social ethos free from bourgeois associations, there are those in Britain who look back at the music hall as an example of a truly popular cultural form.¹⁴⁴

To verify what Harrop argues, by comparing with *Look Back in Anger*, we have noticed that Jimmy, although his mother is from middle-class, shows inclinations in working-class, and furthermore he never ceases showing his antipathy toward middle-class. Jimmy's fondness for the music hall, in short, can be related to the nostalgic side of his character – despite his strong willingness for radical changes in society and his being on the side of modernity –, and to his predisposition toward the working-class life style.

Nevertheless, it is neither his love for the jazz culture nor his embracement of the music hall as a source of amusement, that prove us Jimmy's sorrow for the past. His real thoughts for the Edwardian period are indeed challenged by the existence of Colonel Redfern. On the one hand, he accuses the Edwardian period of being phoney, and recollects Colonel Redfern as "one of those sturdy old plants left over from the Edwardian Wilderness"¹⁴⁵. According to Jimmy, all the glory of the Edwardians was not genuine, and the only Edwardian he knows the best, Colonel Redfern, is still vigorous but cannot understand that the Edwardian period fell from grace. On the other hand, Jimmy cannot stop himself to admit that he can understand

¹⁴³ John Harrop, "The Last Laugh: Comedy as a Political Touchstone in Britain from "The Entertainer" to "Comedians"', *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 32. No. 1 (Mar., 1980), p. 5.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁴⁵ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 59.

how much the colonel shall be depressed and anguished due to the fall of the empire: "...but I think I can understand how her [Alison's] Daddy must have felt when he came back from India, after all those years away. The old Edwardian brigade do make their brief little world look pretty tempting. All homemade cakes and croquet, bright ideas, bright uniforms. ...even I regret it somehow, phoney or not"¹⁴⁶. Yet, the key passage reflecting his nostalgia is revealed when he desperately accepts that in the modern post-war world he – actually everybody – has lost all his chances to gain such a noble success which is a tough act to follow as his ancestors had gained before:

Jimmy. I suppose people of our generation aren't able to die for good causes any longer. We had all that done for us, in the thirties and the forties, when we were still kids. (*In his familiar, semi-serious mood.*) There aren't any good, brave causes left. If the big bang [that is, the nuclear war] does come, and we all get killed off, it won't be in aid of the old-fashioned, grand design. It'll just be for the Brave New-nothing-very-much-thank-you.¹⁴⁷

John Russel Taylor has confirmed that what Jimmy longs for is the era of Edwardian settlement and complacency, when "Alison's father's generation knew where they were, what standards their lives were ruled by and where their duty lay ...; they had causes to die for and even if they were wrong they had a certain dignity"¹⁴⁸. At what Jimmy is angry and frustrated because of having already missed is to be the part of this heroic past. Taylor has immediately added that Jimmy apparently envies the secure world of the Edwardian period, for he cannot find the certainties of the past within himself and in the present.¹⁴⁹ Even the other characters are aware of that Jimmy has caught between the past and the present "with gentility submerged, with the Empire lost, with the war seen as an ugly deceit, and with no hope or grace anywhere"¹⁵⁰:

¹⁴⁶ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, pp. 12-13.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁴⁸ John Russell Taylor, *Anger and After, A New Guide to the New British Drama*, London, 1962, p. 49.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

¹⁵⁰ Sir Ifor Evans, *A Short History of English Drama*, 2nd ed., Boston, 1965, p. 196.

Helena. ...He was born out of his time.

Alison. Yes. I know.

Helena. There's no place for people like that any longer –in sex, or politics, or anything. That's why he's so futile. Sometimes, when I listen to him, I feel he thinks he's still in the middle of the French Revolution. And that's where he ought to be, of course. He doesn't know where he is, or where he's going. He'll never do anything, and he'll never amount to anything.

Alison. I suppose he's what you'd call an Eminent Victorian.¹⁵¹

Finding himself in a situation which offers no “belief and complete conviction”¹⁵² for the present and no hope for the future, and remains no grace to be part of, Jimmy, instead of trying to bring about a change in the society, resorts to anger at not only the State but also those people around him. At this point, Jimmy's second dilemma arises: his brutal attitude to interpersonal relationships especially with women to the point of being misogynist.

Throughout the play Jimmy acts in a hostile manner towards women. The way he shows his animosity is to assault them verbally. He, for instance, calls a couple of girls who once had a flat underneath as “bastards”¹⁵³, Alison as “sycophantic, phlegmatic and pusillanimous”¹⁵⁴, Alison's mother as “an overfed, over privileged old bitch”¹⁵⁵, resembles their landlord Miss Drury to an “evil high priestess”¹⁵⁶. He admits that women are “refined sort of a butcher”¹⁵⁷ for him. In this case, he may be thinking of himself to be a ‘victim’:

Jimmy. Why, why, why, why do we let these women bleed us to death? Have you ever had a letter, and on it is franked “Please Give Your Blood Generously”? Well, the Postmaster-General does that, on behalf of all women of the world. ... No, there's nothing to left for it, me boy, but to let yourself be butchered by the women.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 80.

¹⁵² İbrahim Yerebakan, “Class Awareness in Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*”, *The Treatment of Class in the New Wave of British Theatre: 1956-1964*, The University of Hull, England, 1992, p. 180.

¹⁵³ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 19.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

When searching for the cause at the root of his antagonism to women, we have run into his unsatisfactorily relationship with his own mother. While recollecting the death of his beloved father, he is getting sentimental as well as angry at nobody's taking care of his father who was on the verge of death:

Jimmy. He'd come back from the war in Spain, you see. And certain god fearing gentlemen there had made such a mess of him, he didn't have long left to live. Everyone knew it –even I knew it. But, you see, I was the only one who cared. (*Turns to the window.*) His family were embarrassed by the whole business. Embarrassed and irritated. (*Looking out.*) As for my mother, all she could think about was the fact that she had allied herself to a man who seemed to be on the wrong side in all things. My mother was all for being associated with minorities, provided they were the smart, fashionable ones.¹⁵⁹

Jimmy implies that her mother is so full of herself, that is, so engrossed in herself, as well as in 'smart and fashionable ones', to the extent that she, Jimmy accuses, forgot her socially dictated and taught roles of wifehood. That is to say, according to Jimmy, his mother was guilty because of not fulfilling her duties as a wife. Actually, he himself acknowledges that she looked after his father, but this seems not to be enough for him. Moreover, he attacks her value system by hesitating over whether she had any human sentiment to pity a man who was dying: "Perhaps she pitied him. I suppose she was capable of that. (*With a kind of appeal in his voice.*) But *I* was the only one who cared!"¹⁶⁰ In the eyes of Jimmy, briefly, her mother failed to commit herself fully to her husband, which made her a foe for Jimmy.

Another mother in the play who has made an enemy of Jimmy is Mrs. Redfern, Alison's mother. Yet, in this case, Mrs. Redfern, too, sees Jimmy as an enemy. She hates him because he is "without money, background or even looks"¹⁶¹. Jimmy hates her because she, in order to protect her daughter and to prevent their marriage, has blackmailed him and hired detectives to watch him. Jimmy uses a very vicious language when the matter is Mrs. Redfern: "Mummy [Alison's mother] may look over-fed and a bit flabby on the outside, but don't let that well-bred guzzler fool

¹⁵⁹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 50.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

you. Underneath all that, she's armour plated. ...That old bitch should be dead!"¹⁶²
He goes on mocking at her sarcastically, and indeed intelligently:

Jimmy. ... My God, those worms will need a good dose of salts the day they get through her! Oh what a bellyache you've got coming to you, my little wormy ones! Alison's mother is on the way! (*In what he intends to be a comic declamatory voice.*) She will pas away, my friends, leaving a trail of worms gasping for laxatives behind her—from purgatives to purgatory.¹⁶³

And Alison is the last woman, with whom Jimmy has a contradictory relationship. His misogynist attitude to his own and Alison's mother is ceaseless; yet, when it comes to Alison, his feelings are inconstant. On many occasions, he rages against her, and he shows deep affection on a few occasions:

Jimmy. You're very beautiful. A beautiful great-eyed squirrel. ... With highly polished, gleaming fur, and an ostrich feather of a tail. ...How I envy you.¹⁶⁴

(Act I)

Jimmy. My wife – that's the one on the tom-toms behind me. Sweet and sticky on the outside, and sink your teeth in it, (*savoring every word*) inside, all white, messy and disgusting.¹⁶⁵

(Act II, Scene I)

Jimmy and Alison met in one of those parties which was just an "enemy territory"¹⁶⁶ to Jimmy as they were held by the middle-class people. Yet, Alison was not an enemy for him – at least, at that night he saw her for the first time. He states that Alison did not notice him, and yet he confesses that he was watching her all evening long. What attracted him about Alison, Jimmy says, was the "wonderful relaxation of spirit"¹⁶⁷, which he ascribed to be brawny, that is, to the strength to relax. Later on, he, however, found out that "it wasn't relaxation at all. In order to relax, you've first got to sweat your guts out [that is, to make an extreme effort]. And, as far as you [Alison] were concerned, you'd never had a hair out of place, or a

¹⁶² John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, pp. 45-46.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

bead of sweat anywhere”¹⁶⁸, which is to mean that it was not the relaxation but the non-commitment. Her indifference, we can assume, was the basis of their marriage problem. From the beginning of the play to the end, Jimmy complains about Alison’s getting used to everything. He, again in a sarcastic manner, claims that even if she died and woke up in paradise, she would have got used to it after the first five minutes. Giving a tirade about her indifference and aloofness, he complains that “Alison’s cool remoteness extends even to their lovemaking”¹⁶⁹:

Jimmy. Do you know I have never known the great pleasure of lovemaking when I didn’t desire it myself. Oh, it’s not that she hasn’t her own kind of passion. She has the passion of a python. She just devours me whole every time, as if I were some over-large rabbit. That’s me. That bulge around her navel –if you’re wondering what it is –it’s me. Me, buried alive down there, and going mad, smothered in that peaceful looking coil. Not a sound, not a flicker from her –she doesn’t even rumble a little. You’d think that this indigestible mess would stir up some kind of tremor in those distended, overfed tripe –but not her! She’ll go on sleeping and devouring until there’s nothing left of me.¹⁷⁰

With this tirade, Jimmy “ascribes to Alison a cold, reptilian indifference ... a sign of the absence of caring”¹⁷¹. She is, in other words, as equanimous as a python is cold-blooded.

The trouble is that it is hopeless to try to bring her into action. Jimmy says musingly that “Nothing I could do provoke her. Not even if I were to drop dead”¹⁷². Yet, Jimmy is resolute to *provoke* her; he “therefore appoints himself the torturer who will provide the ordeal by fire Alison needs to achieve real serenity of spirit”¹⁷³. She has to achieve it because “she has never had any experience unpleasant enough to make her realize the great isolation of each human being”¹⁷⁴, and because he

¹⁶⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 84.

¹⁶⁹ Terry W. Browne, “Study Guide, Look Back in Anger by John Osborne”, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.internationaltheatre.at>).

¹⁷⁰ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, pp. 31-32.

¹⁷¹ Bari Lynn Gilliard, *Men in Crisis: Vision and Form in John Osborne's Major Plays*, Diss. The University of Utah, 1975, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, p. 21.

¹⁷² John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 15.

¹⁷³ Ray Orley, *The Separated Self: Alienation as a Major Theme in The Plays of John Osborne, Arnold Wesker, and Harold Pinter, 1956-1971*, Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1976, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 109.

¹⁷⁴ R. B. Parker, “Farce and Society: The Range of Kingsley Amis”, *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (Autumn, 1961), p. 30.

himself had already achieved it thanks to the pain, which, Jimmy believes, is a necessary opportunity to establish one's identity. Pain is what Jimmy learned at the age of ten watching his father dying for twelve months¹⁷⁵:

Jimmy. Anyone who's never watched somebody die is suffering from a pretty bad case of virginity.

His good humour of a moment ago deserts him, as he begins to remember. For twelve months, I watched my father dying –when I was ten years old. ...Every time I sat on the edge of his bed, to listen to him talking or reading to me, I had to fight back my tears. At the end of twelve months, I was a veteran.

All that that feverish failure of a man had to listen to him was a small, frightened boy. I spent hour upon hour in that tiny bedroom. He would talk to me for hours, pouring out all that was left of his life to one, lonely, bewildered little boy, who could barely understand half of what he said. All he could feel was the despair and the bitterness, the sweet, sickly smell of a dying man.

You see, I learnt at an early age what it was to be angry – angry and helpless. And I can never forget it. I knew more about-love ... betrayal ... and death, when I was ten years old than you will probably ever know all your life.¹⁷⁶

It is interestingly significant that Jimmy uses the word 'virginity' referring to the maturity. He presumes, we can reason deductively, that virginity is a sign of being ignorant of or excluded from the realities of life, and that a woman can grow up and be a human being only when she loses her virginity. This deduction takes us to their wedding night. Alison tells Cliff that Jimmy taunted her when he learned that she was a virgin, and got angry with her virginity "as if [she] had deceived him in some strange way. He seemed to think an untouched woman would defile him"¹⁷⁷. It was arguably the very first time Jimmy realized that Alison never had the relaxation of spirit, and the very first time their marriage was endangered.

In order to provoke Alison, Jimmy prefers to verbally torture and to torment her. At the very beginning of the play, he despises her intelligence saying she has not had a thought for years. He insults her family as well as her friends "They're [her friends] either militant like her Mummy and Daddy. Militant, arrogant and full of

¹⁷⁵ Jimmy's source of pain and anger seem to come from the same source as that of John Osborne, who, at an early age, watched his own father die of tuberculosis. Terry W. Browne, "Study Guide, Look Back in Anger by John Osborne", Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.internationaltheatre.at>).

¹⁷⁶ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 50.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

malice. Or vague. She's [Alison] somewhere between the two"¹⁷⁸. He calls her 'The Lady Pusillanimous', and does not forget to give a detailed explanation to its meaning "wanting of firmness of mind, of small courage, having a little mind, mean spirited, cowardly, timid of mind"¹⁷⁹. Only once, when realizing that he cannot make her mentally anguish, Jimmy tries to make her undergone a physical pain, pushing Cliff on to the ironing board and into Alison so as to they shall fall to the floor and she may get burned. Nevertheless, his fiercest attempt to hurt Alison comes maybe when Jimmy, telling her how he wishes to see her suffering from the loss of a child – without knowing that she is already pregnant, "goes beyond routine attention-seeking that something psychopathic is revealed"¹⁸⁰:

Jimmy. Oh, my dear wife, you've got so much to learn. I only hope you learn it one day. If only something – something would happen to you, and wake you out of your beauty sleep! (Coming in close to her.) If you could have a child, and it would die. Let it grow, let a recognizable human face emerge from that little mass of indiarubber and wrinkles. (She retreats away from him.) Please – if only I could watch you face that. I wonder if you might even become a recognizable human being yourself. But I doubt it.¹⁸¹

Though one side of his heart – and, of his identity – is filled with the animosity towards Alison, the other side overflows with love for her. After Alison has burnt her arm on the iron, Jimmy firstly lies that it was an accident, but later on he confesses that he did it on purpose and apologizes her, revealing his fondness for her:

Jimmy. I did it on purpose. ...There's hardly a moment when I'm not – watching and wanting you. I've got to hit out somehow. Nearly four years of being in the same room with you, night and day, and I still can't stop my sweat breaking out when I see you doing – something as ordinary as leaning over an ironing board.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 15.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹⁸⁰ Andrew Wyllie, *Sex on Stage: Gender and Sexuality in Post-War British Theatre*, Bristol, 2009, p. 55.

¹⁸¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 31.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Jimmy's misogynist motives, just as already mentioned, show inconsistency, and therefore prove the identity crisis of Jimmy. On the one hand, he behaves violently to or has hostile feelings towards his own mother and Mrs. Redfern. On the other hand, Jimmy shows us that he can be compassionate, and indeed merciful to women, thanks to the existence of Mrs. Tanner, his friend Hugh Tanner's mother, and of Madeline, one of his old girlfriends.

Although they broke up a long time ago, he still admires Madeline, because she has the ability of and the inclination for living in an enthusiastic and passionate way: "She had more animation in her little finger than you two [here he compares Madeline with Alison and Cliff] put together. ... Her curiosity about things, and about people was staggering. It wasn't just a naïve nosiness. With her, it was simply *the delight of being awake* [italics mine], and watching. ... Just to be with her was an adventure"¹⁸³. Madeline, in other words, knows to be awake, which Alison is incapable of.

As for Mrs. Tanner, she has been a good friend – or, a good mother – to Jimmy to the point that she has helped establish him in sweet-stall business. Yet, this is not the main reason why he loves her. According to Alison, he does adore Mrs. Tanner principally because she is a poor and frankly ignorant charwoman. Besides, she *has sweated her guts out* almost all her life: She "spent most of [her life] struggling to support her husband and her son"¹⁸⁴, that is, she has totally committed herself to them and has undergone a great emotional pain of life, both of which Alison is, again, incapable of.

While hating his own mother and Mrs. Redfern, who are coming from middle-class background, Jimmy's intimacy with Mrs. Tanner proves that his attitude towards and relationship with women are inconsistent, and, interestingly enough, "his misogyny is inextricably linked with class issues"¹⁸⁵. His hatred against women ends up in a "chameleon emotion, changing colour and mood"¹⁸⁶ and turning into a hatred against upper or middle-class. Herein, the last paradox of Jimmy's

¹⁸³ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 14.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁸⁵ Diana Bishop, *The Politics of Stage and Screen: British Political Drama in the Theater and on Television from 1956 to 1983*, Diss. Brandeis University, 2000, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 139.

¹⁸⁶ A. E. Dyson, "Look Back in Anger", *Modern British Dramatists, A Collection of Critical Essays*, Ed. John Russell Brown, New Jersey, 1968, p. 51.

character unfolds: His crisis of class identity, the root cause of which traces to the “class crossing marriage”¹⁸⁷ of his parents. As hereinbefore described, Jimmy cannot feel he belongs to a single specific social-class. Yet, he always takes his sides on his father and on the working-class – instead of her mother, just as his closest friend Cliff reminds Alison: “Oh, I know some of his mother’s relatives are pretty posh, but he hates them as he hates yours”¹⁸⁸.

Jimmy is graduated from a university which is so new and insignificant that he calls it not even ‘red brick’, but ‘white tile’¹⁸⁹. After leaving school, he chose to run a sweet stall in a market, which is lucid to a person of working-class culture, yet not comprehensible to a middle-class man:

Colonel. Sweet-stall. It does seem an extraordinary thing for an educated young man to be occupying himself with. Why should he want to do that, of all things? I’ve always thought he must be quite clear in his way.

Alison. (*no longer interested in this problem*) Oh, he tried so many things – journalism, advertising, even vacuum cleaners for a few weeks. He seems to have been as happy doing this as anything else.¹⁹⁰

Alison seems to be contented with her own explanation to the occupational choice of Jimmy; yet, we suspect that this explanation is not enough and may not reflect the reality. For, by general admission, “university education is the surest road to advancement”¹⁹¹, he therefore would not have attended to a university if he had not wanted to advance from the poor conditions of working-class to the privileged position of upper or middle class.

While Jimmy disdains the ‘posh’ papers having snobbish and pompous tone, Taylor announces that Jimmy himself is a cultural snob who reads only the safe classics, only good books and listens to the most traditional jazz.¹⁹² Furthermore, Ward puts forward that the real name of Jimmy is indeed ‘James’ and this usage of

¹⁸⁷ Ibrahim Yerebakan, “Class Awareness in Osborne’s *Look Back in Anger*”, *The Treatment of Class in the New Wave of British Theatre: 1956-1964*, The University of Hull, England, 1992, p. 176.

¹⁸⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 25.

¹⁸⁹ ‘White tile university’ is another reference to the newest and the least prestigious universities, which have lower status even than ‘redbrick universities’.

¹⁹⁰ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 57.

¹⁹¹ Carl Bode, “The Redbrick Cinderellas”, *College English*, Vol. 20, No. 7 (Apr., 1959), p. 331.

¹⁹² John Russell Taylor, *Anger and After, A New Guide to the New British Drama*, London, 1962, p. 41.

name is “a symptom of a curious form of inverted snobbery, rooted in the habit of the period, whereby a peculiarly democratic virtue was assumed to lie in the diminutives of first names”¹⁹³.

Nevertheless, neither his university education nor his attempt to lead an intellectual life based on posh papers and music suffice for “his gate-crashing expeditions”¹⁹⁴ into the life standards of upper middle class – at least, by means of his “state-sponsored education”¹⁹⁵ alone. Samuel Brittan explains its reason:

...there is a sense in which Britain is more class-ridden than other capitalist or mixed economies. But it is to be found in the features of British society furthest removed from pecuniary matters. They lie in such things as emphasis on the social pecking order, concern with subtle differences of speech and often unpleasant residential institutions, strangely known as public schools. ... One important feature of this type of class division is that it cuts right across the higher echelons of society. ... In societies people care about their status in the eyes of their fellowmen. In Britain, however, social status has less to do with merely making money than in almost any other Western society.¹⁹⁶

Neither joining nor adapting to a higher class seems to be so easy even if attending to a well-established educational institution or just getting rich. As for Jimmy, he is even in a worse situation; he has neither got rich nor graduated from, for instance, Oxford or Cambridge. Jimmy is, consequently, deprived of the chance to live like well-bred people, and “the upper-class style of living is a closed door to him, and he reacts to that fact with anger toward the class itself”¹⁹⁷.

Another conflict arisen from his class-ridden identity crisis is that “Jimmy feels like he is trying to break out of the constraints placed on him by the class system, but upholds it by constantly identifying people as one class or another”¹⁹⁸.

¹⁹³ A.C. Ward, *The Twentieth-Century English Literature 1901-1960*, 14th ed. 1964, p. 140.

¹⁹⁴ Ray Orley, *The Separated Self: Alienation as a Major Theme in The Plays of John Osborne, Arnold Wesker, and Harold Pinter, 1956-1971*, Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1976, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 110.

¹⁹⁵ Diana Bishop, *The Politics of Stage and Screen: British Political Drama in the Theater and on Television from 1956 to 1983*, Diss. Brandeis University, 2000, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 132.

¹⁹⁶ Samuel Brittan, “How British is the British Sickness?”, *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Oct., 1978), pp. 262-263.

¹⁹⁷ Ray Orley, *The Separated Self: Alienation as a Major Theme in The Plays Of John Osborne, Arnold Wesker, and Harold Pinter, 1956-1971*, Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1976, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 110.

¹⁹⁸ Alison Reeves, “Look Back in Anger, John Osborne”, *Resource Pack*, (Jan., 2005), p. 10.

He ascribes, for instance, Alison to the White Woman's Burden, which is an ironical reference to Rudyard Kipling's poem *The White Woman's Burden* (1896), celebrating British colonialism, and he compares her superior status and self-indulgence due to her upper-class upbringing to the way British imperialists adopted an attitude to and had the responsibility on the natives of the former colonies.¹⁹⁹ He ridicules Alison's brother, Nigel, as the "straight-backed, chinless wonder from Sandhurst [that is, Royal Military Academy]"²⁰⁰, and Helena as the "saint in Dior's clothing"²⁰¹. On the other hand, he, maybe unconsciously, "associates all good human qualities with the working-classes"²⁰². Jimmy gets on well with Cliff because he is common as Cliff himself confirms, and with Mrs. Tanner because she is, with Alison's word, "rather ordinary [w]hat Jimmy insists on calling working class"²⁰³.

The last contradiction related to his crisis of class identity becomes evident when he reveals his opinions about Webster, one of Alison's friends with middle-class origins. Jimmy, who humiliates and rails against middle and upper-class throughout the play, explains that he likes and can tolerate Webster, which seems so strange even to Alison:

Jimmy. Is your friend Webster coming tonight?

Alison. He might drop in. You know what he is.

Jimmy. Well, I hope he doesn't. I don't think I could take Webster tonight.

Alison. I thought you said he was the only person who spoke your language.

Jimmy. So he is. *Different dialect but same language* [italics mine]. I like him. He's got bite, edge, drive –

Alison. Enthusiasm.

Jimmy. You've got it. When he comes here, I begin to feel exhilarated. He doesn't like me, but he gives me something, which is more than I get from most people. ... He's the only one of your friends who's worth tuppence, anyway. I'm surprised you get on with him. ... He's not only got guts [namely, has courage], but sensitivity as well.²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 89.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

²⁰² İbrahim Yerebakan, "Class Awareness in Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*", *The Treatment of Class in the New Wave of British Theatre: 1956-1964*, The University of Hull, England, 1992, p. 182.

²⁰³ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 56.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

Jimmy claims that Webster is the only one of Alison's friends whom he may take seriously. Webster is praiseworthy, because he has what Jimmy puts such an importance that he classifies people with it: Enthusiasm. As a man who seeks for a good, brave cause to make his life noble and noteworthy, Jimmy shall, of course, praise Webster, who has the enthusiasm required for energizing the good causes.

As a consequence, Jimmy is a "helpless individual, confronted with the problems of searching for a class identity"²⁰⁵. He is too rude to be a middle-class gentleman, and yet too well-educated to belong to the working-class culture. He is a lost between two social world, which are fundamentally different and distinct from each other, and a sufferer of his unsettled social identity.

Alison is one of the main reasons which bring Jimmy face to face with the dilemmas in his identity. However, she, too, suffers from identity crisis. Almost like Jimmy, she has class-ridden identity crisis. Yet, her main battle is with her emotional identity, which can, according to Jimmy, be solved only by "suffering, loss and death"²⁰⁶.

At the very beginning of the play, Osborne's directions about Alison start with neither her physical nor emotional description, but while she is leaning over an ironing board.²⁰⁷ Ward has doubts about how meaningful is the "hypnotizing effect of Alison's movements in her protracted spell at the ironing board"²⁰⁸, but Osborne, we assume, gives this direction on purpose: Despite coming from upper-middle class which offers nice houses, domestic help, money and expensive clothes²⁰⁹, she now lives in a one-room flat, and looks after two man, his husband Jimmy and his friend Cliff²¹⁰, and does domestic works – like ironing, as already mentioned – not with the

²⁰⁵ İbrahim Yerebakan, "Class Awareness in Osborne's Look Back in Anger", *The Treatment of Class in the New Wave of British Theatre: 1956-1964*, The University of Hull, England, 1992, p. 177.

²⁰⁶ Samuel A. Weiss, "Osborne's Angry Young Play", *Educational Theatre Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Dec., 1960), p. 287.

²⁰⁷ According to Alan Taylor the ironing board is an autobiographical reference to Osborne's life with Pamela Lane: "Oh, no" said Pamela Lane, Osborne's first wife, on the opening night. "Not the ironing board." For she knew what the unsuspecting audience did not: that it was symbolic of their corrosive relationship. Alan Taylor, "A Look Back in Admiration John Osborne Brought Spark and Vibrancy to", *The Sunday Herald*, 14 May 2006.

²⁰⁸ A.C. Ward, *The Twentieth-Century English Literature 1901-1960*, 14th ed. 1964, p. 140.

²⁰⁹ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xxviii.

²¹⁰ Considering Chale Nafus' article on Osborne's life and the play, we have come across with the fact that the living arrangement of the Porters and Cliff is also an autobiographical reference, because Osborne and Lane moved in with Anthony Creighton, a fellow playwright and Osborne's close friend, and the trio lived in Creighton's two-room apartment. Pamela was often away, since she was a leading

help of housemaids but on her own. Thus, the ironing board is very symbolical by means of portraying a transition *from* the upper-middle class *to* the working class. She has left her class and “dropped in a jungle”²¹¹, which has its own rules as Samuel A. Weiss counts:

Alison must break unreservedly with her past, wipe away all fond records, and submit herself at the cost of old ties and comforts to a new set of loyalties and ideals. She must endure uncomplainingly cramped living conditions and unspeakable insults heaped upon her family and friends. She may not occupy a middle, neutral position between the combatants. She is with Jimmy or against him. Social clash and the battle of the sexes become one and inseparable.²¹²

Although they belong to the disparate worlds, what made Jimmy and Alison decide to marry is ambiguous – even to Alison. When Colonel Redfern amazingly asks how and why Jimmy should have married her, Alison answers that he might have for taking revenge. At another time, she clarifies what she means with ‘revenge’: She tells that she is not so sure whether Jimmy was in love with her at the time, but when Jimmy heard about Alison’s parents’ “howl of outrage and astonishment”²¹³ at their decision to marry, he made up his mind to marry her. This was a decision of war against upper-middle class rather than of marriage:

Alison. Whether or no he was in love with me, that did it. He made up his mind to marry me. They did just about everything they could think of to stop us.

Helena. Yes, it wasn’t a very pleasant business. But you can see their point.

Alison. Jimmy went into battle with his axe swinging round his head – frail, and so full of fire. I had never seen anything like it. The old story of the knight in shining armour – except that his armour didn’t really shine very much.²¹⁴

lady in touring companies (much like Helena in *Look Back in Anger*). Although Pam became pregnant twice, neither child reached birth, just like the miscarriage of Alison. For further information, look at Chale Nafus’ article “Look Back in Anger, Program Notes”. Web. 22 Feb. 2010, (<http://www.austinfilm.org>).

²¹¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 37.

²¹² Samuel A. Weiss, “Osborne’s Angry Young Play”, *Educational Theatre Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Dec., 1960), p. 286.

²¹³ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 38.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

Weiss' comment on Alison's this explanation sheds more light on Jimmy's decision to marry: "Since Alison, ironically but inevitably, belongs to the very group Jimmy detests, his marriage to her must be regarded not as a alliance with the enemy, but as a marauding venture into his territory"²¹⁵. Consequently, we can affirm that Jimmy won the battle, and they secretly married without her parents' consent.

After they got married, it was not only Jimmy who was desperately disappointed but also Alison. She gives account of how she felt alienated early on in her life with Jimmy, far away from *the kind of people* she has been used to. However, as she broke off all connection with her family, she could not, she ruefully acknowledges, appeal to them. She describes the earlier time period of their marriage concisely as a "nightmare"²¹⁶, which should have been indeed their honeymoon. And now, after almost four years, she bursts with rage and pours her heart out to her father: "...for twenty years, I'd lived a happy, uncomplicated life, and suddenly, this – this *spiritual* barbarian [*italics mine*] – throws down the gauntlet at me. Perhaps only another woman could understand what a challenge like that means..."²¹⁷

It is obvious that the reason of their nightmare was because of their different philosophy of life. Alison, who actually loves Jimmy because his "cruelty and helplessness are all there, but also the charm which explains why [she] fell under his spell"²¹⁸, confesses that she has tried to understand and to feel like Jimmy; yet, she "can't believe he's right somehow"²¹⁹. So began their incubus, and even worse, Jimmy's insults, *spiritual* cruelty and finally tirades. Her reaction to this torturer, however, is only to keep silence, as though she was "in the grip of a deathly coma or narcosis"²²⁰. While Jimmy regards her silence as her being indifferent, and thus labels her as the "monument to non-attachment"²²¹, Alison discloses that she shows no reaction to him on purpose: "I pretend not to be listening – because I knew that would hurt him, I suppose. ... I suppose it would have been so easy to say "Yes, darling, I

²¹⁵ Samuel A. Weiss, "Osborne's Angry Young Play", *Educational Theatre Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Dec., 1960), p. 286.

²¹⁶ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 37.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

²¹⁸ Gavin Lambert, "Review: [Untitled], Reviewed Work(s): *Look Back in Anger*", *Film Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Summer, 1959), p. 41.

²¹⁹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 36.

²²⁰ Mary McCarthy, "A New Word", *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*, Ed. John Russell Taylor, London, 1968, p. 152.

²²¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 16.

know just what you mean. I know what you're feeling." (*Shrugs.*) It's those easy things that seem to be so impossible with us."²²² Hence, they cannot communicate because of the *different dialect and different language* they use.

They find the very resolution to communicate in the game of bears and squirrels.²²³ Thanks to this game, they escape from realities, including the fact that they are "completely two opposite poles"²²⁴, and from the pain of being human beings: "We would become little furry creatures with little furry brains. Full of dumb, uncomplicated affection for each other. Playful, careless creatures in their own cosy zoo for two. ... They were all love, and no brains"²²⁵. While they are playing their game, Jimmy turns into a soppy, scruffy sort of bear; Alison into a very beautiful squirrel; and both into none-bright animals. Since this world the game offers "contains no class differences"²²⁶, they feel in secure, warm and comfortable, and above all, they can speak *the same dialect and the same language*.

On the other hand, beyond Jimmy's barbarian manner, there are two conspicuous occasions showing us the extent of Alison's impassivity and phlegm. The first one is her letter she writes to Jimmy for acknowledging that she is leaving him. In addition to that she is either too aloof or too gutless that she even can give the letter to Jimmy not on her own but through Cliff to hand it, she also writes it, which begins and ends with endearments, so conventionally to the point of unemotionality. Jimmy underestimates the letter, regarding it nothing but "bloody wet [that is, 'so sentimental']...polite, emotional mess"²²⁷, and he revolts at her being sentimental instead of clearly and sincerely manifesting her emotions towards Jimmy and his torturesome behaviors. Jimmy already knows her real feelings, though: "She couldn't

²²² John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 23.

²²³ In regard to the article of Ian Jack published in *The New York Times*, the game of bears and squirrels of Jimmy and Alison has a striking resemblance to the Osborne's and Lane's: The onstage marriage of Jimmy and Alison Porter faithfully reproduces the histrionics of Osborne's marriage to the actress Pamela Lane. The script incorporates one of Lane's letters, and the game of "squirrels and bears," whose feyness never ceases to embarrass audiences, is the same playfulness that Osborne and his wife devised to relieve their mutual hatred by escaping into a second childhood. Ian Jack, "Coming-of-Rage", *The New York Times*, 28 January 2007.

²²⁴ İbrahim Yerebakan, "Class Awareness in Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*", *The Treatment of Class in the New Wave of British Theatre: 1956-1964*, The University of Hull, England, 1992, p. 180.

²²⁵ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 40.

²²⁶ Diana Bishop, *The Politics of Stage and Screen: British Political Drama in the Theater and on Television from 1956 to 1983*, Diss. Brandeis University, 2000, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 154.

²²⁷ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 64.

say “You rotten bastard! I hate your guts, I’m clearing out, and I hope you rot!”... I never thought she was capable of being as phoney as that!”²²⁸

The second occasion takes place when Alison returns home and stands face to face with Helena, who has an affair with Jimmy after Alison’s departure. Alison humbly expresses her embarrassment and regret for coming back, and yet immediately signifies her intention that she did come there not in order to gain anything or to create a breach between Jimmy and Helena, but for hysteria or just macabre curiosity.²²⁹ When Helena tells that she believes in her real intention, which makes everything more remorseful and makes her feel more ashamed, the reply Alison gives to Helena portrays her inability to express her real emotions once more:

Helena. Oh, I believe it all right. That’s why everything seems more wrong and terrible than ever. You didn’t even reproach me. You should have been outraged, but you weren’t. (*She leans back, as if she wanted to draw back from herself.*) I feel so – ashamed.

Alison. You talk as though he were something you’d swindled me out of –

Helena. (*fiercely.*) And you talk as if he were a book or something you pass around to anyone who happens to want it for five minutes. What’s the matter with you?²³⁰

Helena criticizes her for remaining neutral, but the most surprising and severest criticism comes from her own father. Colonel Redfern admits that Jimmy is right on his side, and that her wife and himself are not entirely free from blame – Mrs. Redfern is not, because of going too far over Jimmy with inquiries and private detectives; and, Colonel Redfern is not, for he could not do anything to stop her, though he tried. Colonel accuses her daughter of not totally committing herself to her husband, and of not being as honest to him as Jimmy is to her:

Colonel. I must confess I find that kind of thing rather horrifying. ... I didn’t approve of Jimmy at all, and I don’t suppose I ever should, but, looking back on it, I think it would have been better, for all concerned, if we had never attempted to interfere. At least, it would have been a little more dignified. ... We were all to blame, in our different ways. No doubt Jimmy acted in good faith. He’d honest enough, whatever else he may be. And your mother – in her

²²⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 64.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

heavy-handed way, as you put it – acted in good faith as well. Perhaps you and I were the ones most to blame.

Alison. You and I!

Colonel. I think you may take after me a little, my dear. You like to sit on the fence because it's comfortable and more peaceful.²³¹

It can be concluded that the crisis of Alison originates in the fact that her emotional identity is so immature to take sides or to express her inner thoughts and feelings freely and frankly. Dyson concisely portrays her inner world: "She has responded to physical love, but not offered it; listened to ideas, but withheld enthusiasm; submitted to the attraction of Jimmy as a knight, but clung obstinately to the security of well-bred indifference in the face of his onslaughts."²³² Nevertheless, at the end of the play she goes through "a striking evolution"²³³. She has lost her baby, and finally understands that "compassion for human misery and degradation is more important than wealth and the social graces"²³⁴. Now Alison, having filled up the void in her own life²³⁵, can mentally and emotionally give herself to her husband, who forgives her because she has been "baptised in the waters of pain and deprivation... [and] she [does] achieve true humanity"²³⁶. Furthermore, she can now freely express her feelings, having been purified from all established conventions of upper middle-class:

Alison. I was wrong, I was wrong! I don't want to be neutral, I don't want to be a saint. I want to be a lost cause. I want to be corrupt and futile!

All can be do is watch her helplessly. Her voice takes on a little strength, and rises.

Don't you understand? It's gone! It's gone! That – that helpless human being inside my body. I thought it was so safe, and secure in there. Nothing could take it from me. It was mine, my responsibility. But it's lost.

She slides down against the leg of the table to the floor.

²³¹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 58.

²³² A. E. Dyson, "Look Back in Anger", *Modern British Dramatists, A Collection of Critical Essays*, Ed. John Russell Brown, New Jersey, 1968, p. 55.

²³³ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xxix.

²³⁴ Clair Bernhardt Brohaugh, *John Osborne and The Theme of Authority*, Diss. The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1975, Web. 24 Nov. 2009, p. 23.

²³⁵ John Gassner, "Broadway in Review", *Educational Theatre Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Dec., 1957), p. 311.

²³⁶ Samuel A. Weiss, "Osborne's Angry Young Play", *Educational Theatre Journal*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Dec., 1960), p. 287.

All I wanted was to die. I never knew what it was like. I didn't known it could be like that! I was in pain, and all I could think of was you, and what I'd lost. (*Scarcely able to speak.*) I thought: if only – if only he could see me now, so stupid, and ugly and ridiculous. This is what he's been longing for me to feel. This is what he wants to splash about in! I'm in the fire, and I'm burning, and all I want is to die! It's cost him his child, and any others I might have had! But what does it matter – this is what he wanted from me!

She raises her face to him.

Don't you see! I'm in the mud at last! I'm groveling! I'm crawling!²³⁷

Cliff is soothing, easy and relaxed to the point of lethargy, which counterpoints the restless, full of anger and importunate nature of Jimmy.²³⁸ Another difference between Cliff and Jimmy is that while Jimmy is university-educated, Cliff has taught himself without getting any formal instruction at a university. They both come from working-class background, though. Yet, he is not as full of pride as Jimmy is; thus, he accepts his lower social status and tries to better himself – instead of getting furious at his lot or at the society.

However, Cliff cannot show the same confidence and tenacity with his self-education as with his ability to stand on his own feet, as he himself admits: “I don't think I'd have the courage to live on my own again – in spite of everything [herein, he means the assaults and the unabated anger of Jimmy with saying ‘everything’]. I'm pretty rough and pretty ordinary really, and I'd seem worse on my own”²³⁹.

There seems to be another underlying reason, which prevents Cliff from going his own way: the presence of Alison. Cliff and Alison have such an intimate relationship that even Helena dares to ask Alison whether they are in love with each other:

Helena. Is Cliff in love with you?

Alison. ...We're simply fond of each other – there's no more to it than that.

Helena. Darling, really! It can't be as simple as that.

Alison. You mean there must be something physical too? I suppose there is, but it's not exactly a consuming passion with either of us. It's just a relaxed, cheerful sort of thing, like being

²³⁷ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 85.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

warm in a bed. You're too comfortable to bother about moving for the sake of some other pleasure.

Helena. I find it difficult to believe anyone's that lazy!²⁴⁰

This passage proves Jimmy's claim that Alison is too indifferent and slothful to make even the slightest effort to live under the guidance of her emotions. On the other hand, this passage also demonstrates us that "while he attempted to expose his wife to the realities and meanings of life so that she would be moved out of her complacency",²⁴¹ Jimmy himself, too, can be incapable of revealing his emotions at times. That is to say, throughout the play, Jimmy does not indicate any hint of jealousy towards their tenderness in treatment to each other. He, on the contrary, remains emotionally unresponsive:

She [Alison] puts her hand on his [Cliff's] head, and strokes it thoughtfully. ... He gets up, and puts his arm around her. ... He kisses her. Enter Jimmy. He looks at them curiously, but without surprise. They are both aware of him, but make no sign of it. ... He picks up a paper, and starts looking at it. Cliff glances at him, Alison's head against his cheek.

Cliff. She's beautiful, isn't she?

Jimmy. You seem to think so.

Cliff. Why the hell she married you, I'll never know.

Jimmy. You think she'd have been better off with you? ... Why don't you both get into bed, and have done with it. ... I can't concentrate with you two standing there like that. ... You both look pretty silly slobbering over each other.²⁴²

As for Cliff, we are not let know the way Cliff feels about Alison. He never clearly expresses his feelings. However, after Alison leaves home, he deserts his good humour for the first time in the play, which implies his discomfort with the departure of Alison. However, the ambiguities related both to his dependence on Jimmy and Alison, and to his unvoiced love for Alison are removed when Cliff makes his decision to leave the Porters' flat and to try something else a bit better – another home to live, another job to work, and a girl to look after him, for instance. We can, thus,

²⁴⁰ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 35.

²⁴¹ Steven H. Gale, "John Osborne: Look Forward in Fear", *Essays on Contemporary British Drama*, Eds. Hedwig Bock and Albert Wertheim, USA, 1981, p. 5.

²⁴² John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 25.

easily deduce that Cliff, like Alison, undergoes an evolution, and takes a major step forward to his identity pending to be established.

Helena, who plays a role that is instrumental to reveal and to deepen the crisis between Jimmy and Alison, is the epitome of an inextricable dilemma between love and religion or conventions. The playwright describes her as an attractive middle-class woman who is almost “the gracious representative of visiting royalty”²⁴³ – that is to say, she is excessively attached to the moral and religious values and norms of middle-class –, and who “arouses all the rabble-rousing instincts of his [Jimmy’s] spirit”²⁴⁴, which will, later on, bring her strength and dignity to a deadlock, and her identity to a crisis.

At the beginning, we witness the tension between Jimmy and Helena. Jimmy despises her for everything she stands for. In addition to her being a “natural enemy”²⁴⁵ to Jimmy – as a member of middle-class –, she is also a source of malaise that brings him to confront with the religious beliefs not only of his but also of Alison’s and hers. In other words, the trouble between Helena and Jimmy is the clash of both social-class and religion.

However, Jimmy mostly prefers reviling at her religious identity – like, “genuflecting sin jobber”²⁴⁶, “sacred cow”²⁴⁷, or “full of ecstatic wind”²⁴⁸ – rather than her social-class identity – like, “pale Cambridge blue [blood]”²⁴⁹. Jimmy hates the Church, because it functions, according to Jimmy as the mouthpiece of John Osborne, not as a barrier in front of the social and moral corruption, but as a mechanism of oppression and hypocrisy.²⁵⁰ Besides, it is clear that for Jimmy “personal faith rather than institutional dogma [namely, the religious principles of the Church] ... is the way to salvation”²⁵¹. Hence, we can deduce that Jimmy is not in the

²⁴³ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 33.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

²⁵⁰ For more detailed information about Osborne’s opinions on the Church, look at the article *They Call it Cricket* in Tom Maschler’s book *Declaration*.

²⁵¹ Charles Marowitz, “Ascension of John Osborne”, *The Tulane Drama Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Winter, 1962), p. 178.

need of a moral and religious leader to him, but, on the contrary, “in the need to free humanity from all forms of oppression”²⁵².

Helena has never allowed Jimmy to question her values or her beliefs.²⁵³ She never loses her nerve against his insults; always manages to maintain her dignity and defends her values with courtesy. Yet, after she has interfered their marriage for she honestly considers Alison’s own good²⁵⁴ that Alison should leave “this mad-house ... this menagerie”²⁵⁵, she uncovers her armor, which Jimmy has hoped she shall bring with her when she first comes to visit them, and then lets the insults and occupancy of Jimmy in. That is, for the sake of his love, Helena represses and relinquishes her real identity. For instance, while she has felt “sick with contempt and loathing”²⁵⁶ because of his addressing to Alison’s mother as a ‘bitch who should be dead’ in Act II, she keeps her silence – even has some fun, indeed – when Jimmy imagines that Alison’s mother may be a priestess who has been sticking her pins to his wax image for years in Act III. Apparently, the most striking example to her conflict is revealed in Act III when Jimmy asks her if she is going to church, and Helena answers “No, I don’t think so. Unless you want to”²⁵⁷. It is, however, Helena herself who has convinced Alison, who has last gone to the church three years ago when she married Jimmy, to go to the church despite all the overwhelming protests of Jimmy in Act II.

Helena loves Jimmy to the extent that she can even claim that she shall never love anyone else as she has loved him; yet, when Alison returns home, Helena is obliged to face not only with Alison, but also with herself, that is, the conflicts in her character:

Alison. Oh, Helena, don’t bring out the books of rules [that is, moral and social -conventional rules] –

Helena. You are his wife, aren’t you? Whatever I have done, I’ve never been able to forget that fact. ... I still believe in the right and wrong! Not even the months in this madhouse have stopped me

²⁵² John Harrop, “The Last Laugh: Comedy as a Political Touchstone in Britain from “The Entertainer” to “Comedians””, *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 32. No. 1 (Mar., 1980), p. 16.

²⁵³ A. E. Dyson, “Look Back in Anger”, *Modern British Dramatists, A Collection of Critical Essays*, Ed. John Russell Brown, New Jersey, 1968, p. 54.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

²⁵⁵ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 40.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

doing that. Even though everything I have done is wrong, at least I have known it was wrong.

Alison. You loved him, didn't you? That's what you wrote and told me.

Helena. And it was true. ... I could hardly believe it myself...

Alison. ... You used to say some pretty harsh things about him...

Helena. I suppose I was a little over-emphatic. There doesn't seem much point in trying to explain everything. ... I can see it now. I've got to get out. ... When I saw you standing there tonight, I knew that it was all utterly wrong. That I didn't believe in any of this, and not Jimmy or anyone could make me believe otherwise. (*Rising*) How could I have ever thought I could get away with it! He wants one world and I want another, and lying in that bed won't ever change it! I believe in good and evil, and I don't have to apologise for that. ... And, by everything I have ever believed in, or wanted, what I have been doing is wrong and evil. ... I know I'm throwing the book of rules at you, as you call it, but, believe me, you're never going to be happy without it.²⁵⁸

Alison objects to Helena's will to leave saying it is not a logical decision. Helena, too, agrees with her, but then adds that it is the only right thing to do. Her answer proves us Dyson's claim that Helena is "middle-class not only by birth but instinct and conviction"²⁵⁹. Even though Helena does love Jimmy, she makes a decision in the lights of reason as well as of her sincere commitment to middle-class values and set of rules. Jimmy, hearing about her decision to leave, is now resigned but does not refrain himself from beginning another tirade about love and pain:

Jimmy. They all want to escape from the pain of being alive. And, most of all, from love. I always knew something like this would turn up – some problem, like an ill-wife – and it would be too much for those delicate, hot-house feelings of yours. It's no good trying to fool yourself about love. You can't fall into it like a soft job, without dirtying up your hands. It takes muscle and guts. And if you can't bear the thought of messing up your nice, clean soul, you'd better give up the whole idea of life, and become a saint. Because you'll never make it as a human being. It's either this world or the next.²⁶⁰

According to Jimmy, Helena leaves because she is escaping from pain and does not know what it means to be a human-being; Helena, on the contrary, leaves

²⁵⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, pp. 80-81.

²⁵⁹ A. E. Dyson, "Look Back in Anger", *Modern British Dramatists, A Collection of Critical Essays*, Ed. John Russell Brown, New Jersey, 1968, p. 54.

²⁶⁰ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 83.

because she knows what kind of human-being she should be, and because she gets to be “sure of her identity”²⁶¹ at the end, like Alison and Cliff.

Colonel Redfern is a member of middle-class, as well. He served in the army in India, and had to return Britain in 1947 when India became an independent nation. Actually, not only India, Britain had lost most part of its empire. “All of the tradition, the pomp, the majesty were now just for show.”²⁶² Being aware of this situation, Colonel Redfern, who was “brought up to command respect, is often slightly withdrawn and uneasy now that he finds himself in a world where his authority has lately become less and less unquestionable”²⁶³. Besides, he still remembers the England as it was when the colonel left it in 1914; and therefore, he has difficulty in adapting to the changing world:

Colonel. Oh, I knew things had changed, of course. People told you all the time the way it was going – going to the dogs...but it seemed very unreal to me, out there. The England I remembered was the one I left in 1914, and I was happy to go on remembering it that way. Besides, I had the Maharajah’s army to command – that’s was my world, I loved it, all of it. At the time, it looked like going on forever. ...Those long, cool evenings up in the hills, everything purple and golden. Your mother and I were so happy then. It seemed as though we had everything we could ever want. *I think the last day the sun shone was when that dirty little train steamed out of that crowded, suffocating Indian station, and the battalion band playing for all it was worth* [italics mine]. I knew in my heart it was all over then. Everything.²⁶⁴

Colonel Redfern lives in a world “that no longer exists, but which was solid and secure and comfortable”²⁶⁵. In fact, he himself remembers his country this way, while Jimmy mockingly claims that “It must have rained sometimes”²⁶⁶. Nevertheless, both Colonel Redfern and Jimmy have trouble with the time, but in different directions, as Alison points out:

²⁶¹ Margaret Rose, “Introduction”, *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994, p. xxx.

²⁶² Patrick B. Haggerty, *A Prompt Book for "Look Back in Anger"*, Diss. The University of Texas at El Paso, 1980, Web. 22 Feb. 2010, p. 5.

²⁶³ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 56.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

²⁶⁵ Steven H. Gale, “John Osborne: Look Forward in Fear”, *Essays on Contemporary British Drama*, Eds. Hedwig Bock and Albert Wertheim, USA, 1981, p. 18.

²⁶⁶ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, pp. 12-13.

Alison. You're hurt because everything is changed. Jimmy is hurt because everything is the same. And neither of you can face it. Something's gone wrong somewhere, hasn't it?

Colonel. It looks like it, my dear.²⁶⁷

They both miss the past. Jimmy sadly reminds of his father's death and of the missing chance to live in the glorious as well as secure world of Edwardian period. On the other hand, Colonel Redfern reminisces about his happiest days and the powerful status in the past. His nostalgia for the past prevents him from peacefully living in the present time, and underpins his identity crisis, which seems not to be solved at the end of the play, like Jimmy, and on the contrary to Alison, Cliff and Helena.

²⁶⁷ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 60.

CONCLUSION

Identity is a personal process inside as well as an interpersonal aspect, that is, society-oriented. Not only is it orchestrated by the person himself, but also it is assigned by the society. One's identity can be in harmony unless he is trapped in a perplexing position between the different dimensions of his identity – like, personal, social emotional or moral. Otherwise, an identity crisis is inevitable.

Identity crisis is substantially an essential research area of modern psychology. Erikson and Marcia have focused and made extensive researches on the identity crisis. Their theories, of course, counterpoints from each other when compared; yet, both congruently have acknowledged that the resolution to the identity crisis is to commit to an ideology, occupation, a religion or a political view, and to build self-esteem.

Recently, their theories reverberate more, for the identity crisis is accepted as one of the current problems of the contemporary world which is exposed to continual and sweeping changes in ideologies, politics or technology. In this thesis, we have attempted to examine the extent that these changes can or may take hold of one's life, and the way the consequences are portrayed in a work of drama. We have chosen *Look Back in Anger* to analyze, because it is set in a period of revolutionary changes due to the Second World War, and accordingly, it accomplishedly represents the influences of this atmosphere on the characters' socio-psychological worlds.

We have come to the conclusion that almost all characters in the play are mentally and spiritually restless because of the crisis derived from the confounding choices they have made. Herein, we need to emphasize the psychological states and changes that the characters have undergone in short. Jimmy cannot be himself because he has problems with his social and emotional identity. His basic crisis is with the time when he was born. While he yearns for radical changes in the contemporary society at the time – he keeps complaining about Alison's and Cliff's indifference to the socio-political issues and gives long passionate speeches about the politicians' incapability to meet the promises of equal opportunities to all social-classes –, he deeply misses the unchanged and steady security and glory of the British Empire.

Next, he has incompatible and opposing feelings towards women. What is worse is that his misogyny makes a distinction according to the social identity of the women. We have seen that, according to Jimmy, if a woman comes from working class origin – like, Mrs. Tanner –, it means she has suffered enough and knows the importance of pain to be alive, which makes her a decent and respectable woman. Yet, if she comes from upper middle class – like, Mrs. Redfern and his own mother –, then, it means that she has had everything without struggling for it and she is thus not aware of the significance of suffering; as a consequence, she is not deserving of esteem or good treatment. His social-class and gender based discrimination gets more complicated when it comes to Alison. He loves her regardless of her social-class and her lack of emotional commitment, and inevitably suffers from this love in contradiction with his values, beliefs and logic.

Alison, coming from upper middle class but living under the set of rules of working class, has conflicts with her social class identity. However, her deepest conflict is with her emotional identity. She has difficulty in showing commitment to Jimmy. She is in love with him; yet, her social status has always been a barrier between the couple. She suffers from her life with Jimmy: “I don’t think I want anything more to do with love. Any more. I can’t take it on.”²⁶⁸, and thus she leaves home. Yet, for her, sharing a life with Jimmy is as unbearable as living without him. Hence, by the end of the play, we witness she returns home, having gone through an emotional suffering because of the miscarriage of her baby, and having turned into the very woman and wife that Jimmy has always desired her to be.

Cliff, a working-class man of Welsh heritage, lives with Jimmy and Alison in their one-room attic and acts as a ‘no-man’s land’ between them. His relationship with Alison is quite complicated; they are very fond of each other and they show physical affection to each other throughout the play, but they are too lazy to move for the sake of some other pleasure. However, after the departure of Alison, he gets to question his own place in the Porters’ flat and in the world. And, at the end, he manages to settle his life as well as his identity, by coping with his crisis.

Colonel Redfern, a retired military officer who served in India from 1914, a splendid time of British Empire, to 1947, the independence of India, looks back to

²⁶⁸ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 20.

the past nostalgically: “When I think of it [his life in India, as a part of the British Empire during the time] now, it seems like a dream. If only it could have gone on forever.”²⁶⁹ His memories prevent him from adapting to and living happily in the present.

Helena stays with the Porters while performing in a play at a provincial theatre. She, a very proper middle-class woman, represents Alison’s old life before she has married Jimmy, and is sure of her identity as well as her social role which she never allows Jimmy to question. However, as the play proceeds, she could not escape from falling in love with Jimmy and replacing Alison’s place – not only the one in Jimmy’s life, but also the one behind the ironing board. Nevertheless, she is so faithfully committed to the values and the norms of middle-class culture and of the religion that she sacrifices her love towards Jimmy in the end and chooses the life style which suits her identity the most.

According to our examination of the play, we have found out that the main reason why almost all the characters suffer from the identity crisis is neither class distinction nor gender war between them alone. The underlying reason is the need for and the lack of love that has forced them to make contradictory decisions with their interpersonal relationships. It is the lack of a mother’s and a wife’s love, considering Jimmy; the lack of a man’s and a husband’s love, in the hearts of Alison and Helena; the lack of a friend’s and a family’s love, deeming Cliff; and, the need for a united and glorious country’s lovely nostalgia, when Colonel Redfern bore in mind. Concisely, we have concluded that their identity crises arise from the ambivalence about committing themselves to an ideology, to a social class, or, maybe, just to a person.

We strongly believe that this study will urge the would-be further researchers to further it. As this study is the first of its kind, it may have some shortcomings in covering the theme thoroughly. Concerning lack of the sources on character analysis in this field, we have tried to do our best to deal with the identity crisis in *Look Back in Anger*. This study has shed light on identity crisis in a modern play. We do not claim that we have dealt with the identity crisis in a comprehensive manner as the theme is as large as life.

²⁶⁹ John Osborne, *Look Back in Anger*, 1970, p. 60.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY²⁷⁰

- 1929** 12 December, born in Fulham, London.
- 1936** Family move to Stoneleigh, Surrey.
- 1938** Family move to Ewell.
- 1941** Death of father.
- 1943** Attends St. Michael's School in Devon.
- 1945** Expelled from school.
- 1947** Begins work as a journalist.
- 1948** Enters theatre as assistant stage manager and plays a small part in *No Room at the Inn*.
- 1950** Acting with repertory company Co-author of *The Devil Inside*.
- 1951** Marries Pamela Lane.
- 1952-4** Continues touring with theatre company.
- 1955** Co-author of *Personal Enemy* staged in Harrogate.
- 1956** Plays at the Royal Court Theatre as Antonio in *Don Juan* and Lionel in *The Death of Satan* (double bill by Ronald Duncan), and later in Brecht's *The Good Woman of Setzuan*. In May, *Look Back in Anger* is premièred at the Royal Court.

²⁷⁰ Margaret Rose, "Introduction", *Look Back in Anger*, Italy, 1994.

- 1957** The Entertainer staged. Divorces Pamela Lane and marries Mary Ure. Plays the Commissionaire in *Apollo de Bellac* and Donald Blake in *The Making of Moo* at the Royal Court.
- 1958** *Epitaph for George Dillon*, co-written with Antony Creighton, staged. Buys house at Edenbridge, Kent.
- 1959** Directs his own play, *The World of Paul Slickey*.
- 1960** *A Subject for Scandal and Concern* televised.
- 1961** *Luther* staged. Joins Committee of 100, for unilateral nuclear disarmament; arrested in sit-down and fined.
- 1962** *Plays for England* staged in a double bill, including *The Blood of the Bambergs* and *Under Plain Cover*.
- 1963** Divorces Mary Ure and marries Penelope Gilliatt, novelist and journalist. Writes script for *Tom Jones* and during this period writes screenplays for three films which have never been made: *The Hostage*, *The Secret Agent* and *Moll Flanders*.
- 1964** *Inadmissible Evidence* staged. Plays Claude Hickett in *A Cuckoo in the Nest* at the Royal Court.
- 1965** *A Patriot for Me* staged. Directs *Meals on Wheels*, by Charles Wood, at the Royal Court.
- 1966** *A Bond of Honour* staged at the National Theatre.
- 1967** Divorces Penelope Gilliatt.
- 1968** Marries Jill Bennett. *Time Present* and *The Hotel in Amsterdam* staged. Acts in David Mercer's television play, *The Parachute*. Co-author with Charles Wood of film-script, *Charge of the Light Brigade*.

- 1969** Acts in *The First Night of Pygmalion* on television and plays Maidonov in the film *First Love*.
- 1970** *The Right Perspective* televised. Acts in *Get Carter*, a film.
- 1971** *West of Suez* staged.
- 1972** *Hedda Gabler*, an adaptation from Ibsen, and *A Sense of Detachment* staged.
- 1973** *Jack and Jill* and *A Gift of Friendship* televised. Directs *The Entertainer* at the Greenwich Theatre, London.
- 1975** *The End of Me Old Cigar* and *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (adaptation from Wilde's novel) staged.
- 1976** *Watch it Come Down* staged at the National Theatre. *Almost a Vision* televised.
- 1977** Divorces Jill Bennet. Acts in *Lady Charlotte* on television.
- 1978** Marries Helen Dawson, drama critic. Acts in the film *Tomorrow Never Comes*. Directs *Inadmissible Evidence* at the Royal Court.
- 1980** *You're not Watching Me*, *Mummy* and *Very Like a Whale* televised.
- 1981** First part of autobiography, *A Better Class of Person*, published.
- 1982** For three months works as a television critic for *The Mail on Sunday*.
- 1985** *A Better Class of Person* and *God Rot Tunbridge Wells* televised.
- 1988** Adaptation of Strindberg's *The Father* staged at the National Theatre.
- 1992** *Déjà Vu* staged at the Comedy Theatre, London.
- 1994** 24 December, dies near his home in Shropshire, England, from diabetes related problems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCE

OSBORNE, John. *Look Back in Anger*. Frankfurt: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg, 1970.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

ARKONAÇ, Oğuz. *Açıklamalı Psikiyatri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Nobel Tıp Kitabevleri, 1999.

AYTAÇ, Gürsel. *Genel Edebiyat Bilimi*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları, 2003.

BOCK, Hedwig, and Albert Wertheim, eds. *Essays on Contemporary British Drama*. USA: Max Hueber Verlag, 1981.

BROWN, John Russell, ed. *Modern British Dramatists, a Collection of Critical Essays*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1968.

BURGER, Jerry M. *Personality*. 8th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011.

CÜCELOĞLU, Doğan. *İnsan ve Davranışı*. 20th ed. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 2010.

DEMASTES, William W., ed. *British Playwrights, 1956-1995: A Research and Production Source*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996.

EVANS, Sir Ifor. *A Short History of English Drama*. 2nd ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

GEÇTAN, Engin. *Psikodinamik Psikiyatri ve Normaldışı Davranışlar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 2004.

INNES, Christopher. *Modern British Drama: The Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

JAMES, Henry, ed. *The Letters of William James*. Volume 1. Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1920.

- KENNEDY, Andrew K. *Six Dramatists in Search of a Language*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- KING, Kimball. *Western Drama through the Ages*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2007.
- MASCHLER, Tom, ed. *Declaration*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Inc., 1958.
- PATTERSON, Michael. *Strategies of Political Theatre, Post-War British Playwrights*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- REBELLATO, Dan. *1956 and All That*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- ROGERS, Pat, ed. *The Oxford Illustrated History of English Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- ROSE, Margaret. "Introduction". *Look Back in Anger*. Italy: Black Cat Publishing, 1994.
- SALWAK, Dale. *Interviews with Britain's Angry Young Men*. Borgo Press/Wildside Press, 1984.
- SIERZ, Aleks. *In-Yer-Face Theater: British Drama Today*. London: Faber and Faber, 2001.
- SINFIELD, Alan. *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*. London: The Continuum Publishing Company, 2004.
- TAYLOR, John Russell. *Anger and After, A New Guide to the New British Drama*. London: Methuen and Co Ltd., 1962.
- _____, ed. *John Osborne: Look Back in Anger, A Casebook*. London: Macmillan Press, 1968.
- WARD, A. C. *The Twentieth-Century English Literature 1901-1960*. 14th ed. Great Britain: Methuen & Co Ltd., 1964.
- WYLLIE, Andrew. *Sex on Stage: Gender and Sexuality in Post-War British Theatre*. Bristol: Intellect Ltd., 2009.

Articles

- BARBER, Michael. "Interviews". *The Art of Fiction*. No. 59. Web. 22 Feb. 2010. (<http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/3772/the-art-of-fiction-no-59-kingsley-amis>).

- BODE, Carl. "The Redbrick Cinderellas". *College English*. Vol. 20. No. 7 (Apr., 1959). pp. 331-337.
- BRITTAN, Samuel. "How British is the British Sickness?". *Journal of Law and Economics*. Vol. 21. No. 2 (Oct., 1978). pp. 245-268.
- BROWNE, Terry W. "Study Guide, *Look Back in Anger* by John Osborne". Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
(http://www.internationaltheatre.at/Study_Guide_Look_Back_In_Anger.pdf).
- GASSNER, John. "Broadway in Review". *Educational Theatre Journal*. Vol. 9. No. 4 (Dec., 1957). pp. 311-320.
- HARROP, John. "The Last Laugh: Comedy as a Political Touchstone in Britain from "The Entertainer" to "Comedians"". *Theatre Journal*. Vol. 32. No. 1 (Mar., 1980). pp. 5-16.
- HEILPERN, John. "John Osborne, Cavalier and Roundhead". Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
(http://dspace.dial.pipex.com/town/parade/abj76/PG/pieces/john_osborne_2.shtml).
- HUSS, Roy. "Review: [Untitled], Reviewed Work(s): Three Plays: The Waters of Babylon, Live Like Pigs, The Happy Haven by John Arden". *College Composition and Communication*. Vol. 17. No. 1 (Feb., 1966). pp. 41-42.
- LAMBERT, Gavin. "Review: [Untitled], Reviewed Work(s): Look Back in Anger". *Film Quarterly*. Vol. 12. No. 4 (Summer, 1959). pp. 39-41.
- MEYERS, Jeffrey. "Osborne's Harem". *The Antioch Review* (Spring, 2009). Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
(<http://www.britannica.com/bps/additionalcontent/18/37276541/Osbornes-Harem>).
- MAROWITZ, Charles. "Ascension of John Osborne". *The Tulane Drama Review*. Vol. 7. No. 2 (Winter, 1962). pp. 175-179.
- MCKAY, George. "Just a Closer Walk with Thee: New Orleans-Style Jazz and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in 1950s Britain". *Popular Music*. Vol. 22. No. 3 (Oct., 2003). pp. 261-281.
- NAFUS, Chale. "Look Back in Anger, Program Notes". Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
(<http://www.austinfilm.org/page.aspx?pid=664>).

- PARKER, R. B. "Farce and Society: The Range of Kingsley Amis". *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature*. Vol. 2. No. 3 (Autumn, 1961). pp. 27-38.
- REEVES, Alison. "Look Back in Anger, John Osborne". *Resource Pack*. (Jan., 2005). pp. 1-20.
- ROGOFF, Gordon. "Richard's Himself Again: Journey to an Actor's Theatre". *The Tulane Drama Review*. Vol. 11. No. 2 (Winter, 1966). pp. 29-40.
- ROSENTHAL, Alan. "Review: [Untitled], Reviewed Work(s): *Censorship and the Permissive Society: British Cinema and Theatre 1955-1965* by Anthony Aldgate". *Film Quarterly*. Vol. 50. No. 1 (Autumn, 1996). pp. 40-42.
- SIERZ, Aleks. "John Osborne and the Myth of Anger". *New Theatre Quarterly* 46. May 1996. pp. 136-146.
- STATES, Bert O. "The Anatomy of Dramatic Character". *Theatre Journal*. Vol. 37. No. 1 (Mar., 1985). pp. 86-101.
- "The Kings Road, the Misogynist John Osborne and the Women in His Life". Web. 22 Feb. 2010. (<http://www.nickelinthemachine.com/2008/07/the-kings-road-john-osborne-and-look-back-in-anger/>).
- WEISS, Samuel A. "Osborne's Angry Young Play". *Educational Theatre Journal*. Vol. 12. No. 4 (Dec., 1960). pp. 285-288.
- YEREBAKAN, İbrahim. "Class Awareness in Osborne's Look Back in Anger". *The Treatment of Class in the New Wave of British Theatre: 1956-1964*. The University of Hull. England. 1992. pp. 173-185.

Master's and Doctoral Theses

- BISHOP, Diana. *The Politics of Stage and Screen: British Political Drama in the Theater and on Television from 1956 to 1983*. Diss. Brandeis University, 2000. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 24 Nov. 2009.
- BROHAUGH, Clair Bernhardt. *John Osborne and the Theme of Authority*. Diss. The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1975. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 24 Nov. 2009.

- FONG, Chee Fun. *The Theme of Isolation in the Plays of John Osborne*. Diss. York University (Canada), 1969. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
- GILLIARD, Bari Lynn. *Men in Crisis: Vision and Form in John Osborne's Major Plays*. Diss. The University of Utah, 1975. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
- HAGGERTY, Patrick B. *A Prompt Book for "Look Back in Anger"*. Diss. The University of Texas at El Paso, 1980. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 22 Feb. 2010.
- LAING, C. *The Muslim Identity Crisis: Shari'a as a Mechanism for Decolonization*. Diss. The University of Regina (Canada), 2010. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 1 Feb. 2011.
- ORLEY, Ray. *The Separated Self: Alienation as a Major Theme in the Plays of John Osborne, Arnold Wesker, and Harold Pinter, 1956-1971*. Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1976. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 24 Nov. 2009.
- WHITE, Carol-Ann Gail. *The Identity Crisis: Its Relationship to Self Perception*. Diss. University of Alberta (Canada), 1977. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 1 Feb. 2011.
- WHITLEY, B. *Applying a Comprehensive-Internal Model for the Evaluation of Social-Scientific Research to the Identity Crisis Stage of Erik Erikson's Developmental Theory*. Diss. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009. Dissertations & Theses: Full Text, ProQuest. Web. 1 Feb. 2011.

Periodicals and Newspapers

- HEILPERN, John. "Pamela Lane Obituary". *The Guardian*. 22 November 2010: 31.
- _____, "The First Chapter, John Osborne". *The New York Times*. 28 January 2007.
- "Helen Osborne". *The Telegraph*. 14 January 2004.
- JACK, Ian. "Coming-of-Rage". *The New York Times*. 28 January 2007.
- TAYLOR, Alan. "A Look Back in Admiration John Osborne Brought Spark and Vibrancy to". *The Sunday Herald*. 14 May 2006.

Internet Sources

- “Angry Old Monster”. Web. 22 Feb. 2010. (<http://findarticles.com>).
- “Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND)”. Web. 23 Feb. 2010. (<http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/PREcnd.htm>).
- “Identity Crisis – Theory and Research”. Web. 1 Feb. 2011. (<http://psychology.about.com/od/theoriesofpersonality/a/identitycrisis.htm>).
- “John Osborne”. Web. 22 Dec. 2009. (<http://www.answers.com/topic/john-osborne>).
- “John Osborne, A Lifelong Satirist of Prigs and Puritans by David Hare”. Web. 22 Feb. 2010. (http://ds.dial.pipex.com/town/parade/abj76/PG/pieces/john_osborne.shtml).
- “Kitchen Sink Art”. Web. 22 Feb. 2010. (<http://www.wsu.edu/~delahoyd/20th/kitchensink.html>).
- “Kitchen Sink Drama”. Web. 22 Feb. 2010. (http://www.wordiq.com/definition/Kitchen_sink_drama).
- “*Look Back in Anger*”. Web. 24 Nov. 2009. (<http://www.pilot-theatre.com>).
- HARTNOLL, Phyllis, and Peter Found. “Lord Chamberlain”. Web. 23 Feb. 2010. (http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Lord_Chamberlain.aspx).

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Kişisel Bilgiler

Adı ve Soyadı : Handan ÖZDEMİR
Doğum Yeri : Gümüşhane
Doğum Yılı : 18.11.1984
Medeni Hali : Bekâr

Eğitim Durumu

Lise : Aksu Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi, Antalya (1999–2003)
Lisans : Uludağ Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi A.B.D., Bursa
(2003–2007)
Yüksek Lisans : Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı A.B.D.,
Isparta (2008–2011)

Yabancı Dil(ler) ve Düzeyleri

1. İngilizce : İleri Düzey
2. Almanca : Başlangıç Düzeyi

İş Deneyimi

2007-2008 : Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu
(Okutman), Isparta
2010-2011 : Altınova İlköğretim Okulu (İngilizce Öğretmeni), Antalya