

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**



THE CRITIQUE OF NEOLIBERALISM IN DAVID HARE'S PLAYS

PhD THESIS

Hakan GÜLTEKİN

**Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program**

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. (Ph. D.) Ferma LEKESİZALIN

June, 2018

**T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**



THE CRITIQUE OF NEOLIBERALISM IN DAVID HARE'S PLAYS

PhD THESIS

**Hakan GÜLTEKİN
(Y1414.620014)**

**Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program**

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. (Ph. D.) Ferma LEKESİZALIN

June, 2018



29/06/2018



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ
DOKTORA TEZ ONAY BELGESİ

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Doktora Programı Y1414.620014 numaralı öğrencisi Hakan GÜLTEKİN'in "THE CRITIQUE OF NEOLIBERALISM IN DAVID HARE'S PLAYS" adlı doktora tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 01/06/2018 tarih ve 2018/16 sayılı kararı ile oluşturulan jüri tarafından *oylandığı* ile Doktora tezi olarak ... *Kabul* edilmiştir.

| | Unvan- Ad-Soyad | İmza |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Danışman | Doç. Dr. Ferma LEKESİZALIN | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Üye (TİK) | Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Öz ÖKTEM | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Üye (TİK) | Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mesut GÜNENÇ | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Üye | Prof. Dr. Mehmet TAKKAÇ | <i>[Signature]</i> |
| Üye | Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gamze SABANCI UZUN | <i>[Signature]</i> |

Tezin Savunulduğu Tarih : 29/06/2018

Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun tarih ve sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Özer KANBUROĞLU

Enstitü Müdür Vekili



DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results, which are not original to this thesis. (/ /2017).

Hakan GÜLTEKİN





FOREWORD

I would like to express my appreciation to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferma LEKESİZALIN for her persistent encouragement, guidance, patience, and Dr. Ahmet Gökhan BİÇER for his erudite comments and invaluable contribution. I am also indebted to Dr. Öz ÖKTEM and Dr. Gamze SABANCI UZUN for supporting me in Istanbul Aydin University days. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Mehmet TAKKAÇ for his suggestions. Special thanks go to Prof. Dr. İbrahim YEREBAKAN and Dr. Mesut GÜNENÇ, whose encouragements have been of particular note here. I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gillian Mary Elizabeth ALBAN, Dr. Hüseyin EFE, Dr. Arsev Ayşen ARSLANOĞLU YILDIRAN, Sercan ÖZTEKİN and Florentina GÜMÜŞ for their help during the creation phase of my thesis. The last but not the least, I should highlight my appreciation to Aybike and Kuzey, my wife and son, without whose caring support and motivational inspiration, the present study might not have been accomplished.

June, 2018

Hakan GÜLTEKİN



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| FOREWORD | vii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | ix |
| ÖZET | xi |
| ABSTRACT | xiii |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 The Historical Origins of Neoliberalism | 5 |
| 1.2 The Dialectical Relationship between Neoliberalism and Literature..... | 19 |
| 1.3 History of Political Theatre in Britain | 24 |
| 1.4 David Hare’s Drama and Politics..... | 35 |
| 1.5 The Relevance of Materialism | 49 |
| 2. FROM NEOLIBERALISM TO NEW IMPERIALISM | 63 |
| 2.1 Carving out a Path for War: <i>Stuff Happens</i> | 63 |
| 2.2 Neoliberal Trauma in the Post 9/11 World: <i>The Vertical Hour</i> | 84 |
| 3. DISSOLUTION OF SOCIAL INTEGRITY | 97 |
| 3.1 Dissolution of Social and Political Solidarity via Privatization: <i>The Permanent Way</i> | 97 |
| 3.2 Politics of Dispossession: <i>Behind the Beautiful Forevers</i> | 115 |
| 4. CORRUPTION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS | 127 |
| 4.1 A Dramatist seeks whether a Sustainable and Clean Market Capitalism is Possible: <i>The Power of Yes</i> | 127 |
| 4.2 Cynicism of the Labour: <i>Gethsemane</i> | 140 |
| 5. CONCLUSION | 153 |
| REFERENCES | 165 |
| RESUME | 175 |



DAVID HARE'İN OYUNLARINDA NEOLİBERALİZM ELEŞTİRİSİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, David Hare'in oyunlarında neoliberalizmin önem durumunu keşfetmeyi amaçlar. Herhangi bir edebi üretimin kendinden daha büyük ve karmaşık bir sosyal yapıdan ayrı değerlendirilemeyeceği bilinciyle, bu çalışma Hare'in seçili oyunlarında, yansıttıkları toplumsal yapıları ve 1970'lerden beri dünya politika sahnesinde gözle görülür biçimde baskın olan neoliberal politikaları inceleyerek, diyalektik ilişkileri gün yüzüne çıkarmayı amaçlar. Bu çalışma, diyalektik metodu kullanarak, oyunlar ve sosyo-politik bağlamları arasındaki birbirini etkileyen dizgelerin analizine değinir. Bu bağlamda, çalışmanın ardında yatan saik; ekonomik ve sosyal adaletsizliklere yoğunlaşarak, David Hare'in, batı toplumunun ve altında yatan toplumsal sözleşmenin temel değerlerini yerle bir eden neoliberalizmi eleştirme kanallarını araştırmaktır. Analiz ve tartışma bölümlerinde, tez ilk olarak, yeni emperyalizm gibi politik çeşitlenmelerine değinerek, Hare'in neoliberalizmin tarihsel gelişimini sahneye taşımasını tartışır. İkinci olarak, neoliberalizm Hare'in oyunlarında mülksüzleştirme ve özelleştirme politikalarını betimleyen tematik bir belirteç olarak incelenir. Sonuç olarak da, kurumların yozlaşması, serbest pazar kapitalizmi ve emek hareketinin kinizm içinde bulunması açılarından tartışılır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *David Hare, Neoliberalizm, Tiyatro, Yeni Emperyalizm, Mülksüzleştirme, Özelleştirme, Toplumsal Bütünlük*



THE CRITIQUE OF NEOLIBERALISM IN DAVID HARE'S PLAYS

ABSTRACT

This study aims at exploring the significance of neoliberalism in the selected plays written by David Hare. Acknowledging that any literary production cannot be examined without considering a bigger and more complex social structure, the study attempts to find out about the dialectical relationships among Hare's selected plays, the societies which they reflect and the neoliberal policies which have been perceptibly dominant in the world politics since 1970s. Using dialectical method, this study deals with the analysis of the interactive arrangements between the plays and their socio-political context. The impetus behind this study is therefore to investigate the ways in which David Hare critiques neoliberalism which destroys the foundational values of the western society and the social consensus lying in its base by deepening the economic and social injustices. In the parts of analysis and discussion, the thesis argues that, first; Hare presents the historical development of the neoliberalism by underlining its current political dimensions such as neo-imperialism. Second, neoliberalism is examined as a thematic marker in Hare's plays implying politics of dispossession and privatisation. Consequently, corruption of institutions is analysed in terms of legitimacy market capitalism and cynicism of the labour.

Keywords: *David Hare, Neoliberalism, Theatre, New Imperialism, Dispossession, Privatization, Social Integrity*



1. INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the critique of neoliberalism in David Hare's plays. The British playwright, Sir David Hare, is known for his long and distinguished writing career which consists of a remarkable number plays, television, and film-radio scripts. David Hare gives a unique place to cultural and political criticism of the British Institutions in his plays. From his early career days which coincide with the emerge of "the angry young man movement" of post-war Britain, he depicts "the contradictory trends of the nation and shares with his predecessors the idea of social and usefulness drama" (Boireau 2003: p.27). As regards with his personal and historical status as a dramatist, David Hare dramatizes the social disorders within the society and portrays them in a way that shows their dialectical bounds with culture, society, and ideology. In this context, it is not surprising that neoliberalism, dominating the world politics for nearly forty years, has a literary presence in Hare's drama.

This thesis focuses on specific plays written in the core period of the neoliberal era. The plays are selected from the ones that are written in 2000s and include strong criticism of neoliberal policies which are considered to lead to a decline of neoliberalism. The plays under consideration are as follows: *The Permanent Way* (2003), *Stuff Happens* (2004), *The Vertical Hour* (2008b), *Gethsemane* (2008a), *The Power of Yes* (2009) and *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (2014a). Acknowledging that any literary production cannot be examined without considering a bigger and more complex social structure, the study attempts to find out about the dialectical relationships among Hare's selected plays, the societies which they reflect and the neoliberal policies which have been perceptibly dominant in the world politics since 1970s. I therefore attempt to put David Hare's selected plays into their historical context and argue that the plays have a dialectical relationship with the society in which they were created. Using the dialectical method, I offer an analysis of the interactive arrangements between the plays and their socio-political context. In this sense, the impetus

behind this study is to offer a dialectical analysis of David Hare's selected plays in order to underline his unique language and thematic choices to construct his literary argument.

Additionally, with the new perspectives this study provides, it is believed that Turkish researchers will find a new ground to evaluate Hare's plays in further studies.

When it is considered that neoliberal ideology is the dominant thought that "bestrode the world like a colossus" (Steger and Roy 2010: p.X) especially towards the late nineties, this study concentrates upon the plays that was written after the new millennium. The reason why plays have been selected lies in the fact that all of them include strong reflections of neoliberal policies which are considered to be the creator of neoliberalism's decline. When neoliberalism started to be criticized openly, the most prominent critical point was that it deepened the economic inequalities in the western society. The present study therefore aims at investigating the representation of economic and social inequalities within Hare's plays along with dissolution of social integrity and corruption of institutions, which coincide with the decline of neoliberalism.

As regards with his personal and historical status as a playwright who is interested in politics, David Hare did not hesitate to dramatize crucial international political events and their dialectical effects. This study aims to analyse to what extent neoliberalism creates a sense on David Hare's plays. It is clear that this influence of neoliberalism provides a basis for Hare's political criticism, which includes the themes of socio-political struggles such as widespread resistance to privatization, the emergence of new imperialism as a sign of criticism, and the dissolution of social integrity as a sign of the collapse of political opposition. David Hare critiques neoliberalism which destroys the foundational values of the western society and the social consensus lying in its base by deepening the economic and social injustices.

After examining neoliberalism, as the hegemonic ideology of the period when David Hare's plays were written, with the help of cultural materialist analysis, this study will focus on Hare's critique of neoliberalism and new imperialism as the major reasons behind dissolution of social integrity and corruption of public and private institutions.

As an ideological phenomenon, neoliberalism emerged from intellectual and academic debates carried out by specific universities and institutions mostly based in The US in the early seventies.

Ruling classes and venture capitalist groups had already adopted a remarkably warm attitude towards neoliberalism in the subsequent years of the birth of neoliberalism. 1980s were the golden age of neoliberalism. Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan put neoliberal theory into practice in a sharp way. For David Harvey, globalism is the new name of “economic configuration” (2007: p.2). In accordance with this context, the declaration of Washington Consensus gave a path to “a set of economic institutions and policies alleged to have been designed by the United States to globalize American capitalism and its associated cultural system” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.X). Neoliberalism globalized in a short time, even affected the Chinese Communist Party, which has been a leading figure in the socialist bloc. However, after the ‘roaring nineties’, something started to change. The positive perception about neoliberalism proposing “that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (Harvey 2007: p.2), led towards severe discussions on legitimacy of neoliberal policies within academic and political circles.

The new millennium began with serious global problems. 9/11 attacks and globalized terror, Afghanistan and Iraq interventions of the US, rapidly raising wage gap in the global context, impoverishment and dispossession policies of the neoliberal states and finally the US based mortgage crisis of 2008 were the principal happenings which carved the way for the questioning of the neoliberal legitimacy. All these serious global happenings and disasters have been criticised by various scholars and politicians and most of their criticism regards neoliberalism as the main source of global political instability and economic recession. For David Harvey neoliberalism is an ideological project to restore the conditions of capital accumulation and re-establish absolute sovereignty of ruling classes.

In my investigations into David Hare’s critical perspectives of neoliberalism reflected by his plays, I also draw from Michael Billington, Richard Boon,

Finlay Donesky and Carol Homden's views. In *The Cambridge Companion to David Hare* (2007a), critics discuss Hare's stance against Thatcherism and his reading of recent history determined by neoliberal economy-politics.

Hare scholars performed similar attempts by studying themes that emerge in his drama such as social and political corruption and degeneration of social bounds as a result of crass materialism that dominates the Western world.

Considering the fact that worldwide neoliberal policies have eventually led to a new imperialist era, this thesis looks at the links between neoliberal approaches and the current imperialist processes in Hare's plays. *Stuff Happens* (2004), for example, focuses on the Republican Bush Administration's efforts for initiating the occupation of Iraq. The play presents the audience with real characters from real-life situations. I further argue that David Hare portrays the negative effects of the neoliberal attitude that promotes individualism against social collaboration, solidarity, and collectivism. Hare stages the corruption of institutions under the neoliberal administrations. In this regard, *The Power of Yes* (2009) is completely about the global financial crisis that questions neoliberal economic system.

Hare's plays are analysed in three groups. The first group of plays, including *Stuff Happens* (2004) and *The Vertical Hour* (2008), are examined in the light of the views that explore the process 'From Neoliberalism to New Imperialism'. The second group of plays which consists of *The Permanent Way* (2003) and *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (2014) relate to role of neoliberalism in 'Dissolution of Social Integrity'. *The Power of Yes* (2009) and *Gethsemane* (2008) are discussed considering the theme of 'Corruption of Public and Private Institutions'. As I proceed in my discussion of the plays, I refer to the cultural materialist analyses of David Hare's plays and forefront political, cultural and historical contexts of the plays.

The concluding chapter consists of the implications of Hare's critical view of neoliberalism and neo-imperialism. The limitations of the study are also explained in this chapter.

1.1 The Historical Origins of Neoliberalism

As a hegemonic ideological project, neoliberalism has got a quite complex history within the modernisation period. Its historical origins might go back to the early years of the 20th century. Neoliberalism has always created intellectual controversy among the constituents of the society and led to harsh discussions during the 90s when neoliberalism was experiencing the most successful years.

In accordance with the main principles of cultural materialist analysis, this chapter will discuss neoliberalism from a historical point of view. David Harvey's analysis deserves a mention at this point: Harvey (2007) stresses the fact that neoliberalism has actually been active in providing suitable links for capital accumulation and created different capitalist systems that legitimize the interests of capitalist elites. Trying to determine how neoliberalism proliferates in such a remarkable way, Harvey tries to understand the world historical forces that created the deviation towards neoliberalism from classical liberalism. Accordingly, Michel Foucault also regards "the origins of neoliberalism in the radicalization of liberalism's view of markets" (cited in Žižek 2009: p.12).

As stated earlier, neoliberalism is an ideology that has historical bounds with former ideologies, specifically with liberalism. According to Dieter Plewhe (2009), in 1947, Mont Pèlerin Society was established to maintain European Liberalism and American Conservatism combining them with free market principles, individualism and consumerism. This small and distinguished intellectual group "had gathered together around the renowned Austrian political philosopher Friedrich von Hayek" (Harvey 2007: p.19). Milton Friedman, Ludvig von Mises, Friedrich von Hayek and Karl Popper are regarded as the pioneers of neoliberal intellectuals.

Later on the World War II, western world was reshaped in accordance with the capitalist development system:

The restructuring of state forms and of international relations after the Second World War was designed to prevent a return to the catastrophic conditions that had so threatened the capitalist order in the great slump of the 1930s (Harvey 2007: p.9) Robert Dahl and Charles Lindblom (1976) underline the fact that the moral systems of

both capitalism and communism had collapsed, and the world needed a New Democratic blend that would guarantee the future of established order. The only way to peace and prosperity was to create the right mix of state, market and democratic institutions to guarantee inclusion and stability. Throughout the following years of the Second World War, “pretensions of the Axis powers to organize continental Europe and East Asia had collapsed” (Maier 1977: p.608).

This situation led to a remarkable uneasiness among the social classes of the capitalist world. For Harvey (2007), the established consensus between capital and labour on capitalist accumulation was about to diminish. What is more, the political organisations of the revolutionary left were strengthening.

Thus, the ruling classes of the advanced capitalist countries had to take a series of economic and social precautions against the risk of unexpected emergence of revolutionary attempts. The economic elites of the advanced capitalist world had to create a new alternative system in order to survive in post-war era. Henry Hazlitt (1984) stresses the fact that the nations of the advanced capitalist world had to understand the urgent necessity of an international economic collaboration. According to Hazlitt, countries leading the developed economies of the West had to find a way to establish trade networks with countries all over the world.

Allies of the Second World War held a conference named as The Bretton Woods Conference, and it “was the gathering of 730 delegates from all 44 Allied nations at the Mount Washington Hotel, situated in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, United States” (Markwell 2006: p.1). In this conference, as Harvey (2007) reports, an international new world order was built by agreement with Bretton Woods.

The IMF was established to create fiscal and monetary policies for the survival of the post-war capitalist hegemony. In addition to this task, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was originally set up to provide loans for the reconstruction of post-war Europe. During the Bretton Woods Conference, John Maynard Keynes took the responsibility for leading the British committee, and the impact of his ideas in the general theoretical atmosphere of the conference was irrefutably crucial.

A new economic and social theory, Keynesianism, was emerging during the sessions of the conference. Depending upon his work *The General Theory of*

Employment, Interest and Money (1936), “Keynes introduced a new set of concepts into macroeconomic analysis based on the balance between aggregate demand and supply” (Hall 1989: p.363). His theory was mainly into constructing a balanced system that controls the mutual relationships of the social classes, since the class reconciliation between capital and labour was often seen as the main guarantor of inner peace and well-being throughout the early years of post-war period. As Jonathan Kirshner (1999) asserts, Keynes made a campaign for restraining uncontrolled liberalism. For this reason, he expressed another preference presenting a middle path that is a capitalist economy in which some market processes are to be ruled and infused.

Keynes’s alternative to the classical laissez faire liberalism requires a great compromise among the social classes of the community in accordance with the hopeful atmosphere of the post-war world, and “This was the essence of the embedded liberalism compromise: unlike the economic nationalism of the thirties, it would be multilateral in character; unlike the liberalism of the gold standard and free trade, its multilateralism would be predicated upon domestic interventionism” (Ruggie 1982: p.393). As Kirshner (1999) points out, the institutions founded to maintain post-war peace and prosperity were supposed to promote international market system; however, states would reserve the right to intervene in the market processes which was no longer untamed. Indeed, as Steger and Roy (2010) asserts, Keynesianism had also been called for some state ownership of important national businesses such as railways or financial enterprises. Clarifying how state controls the market system, Harvey (2007) also refers to embedded liberalism. Harvey stresses that all market systems “were surrounded by a web of social and political constraints and a regulatory environment that sometimes restrained but in other instances led the way in economic and industrial strategy” (Harvey 2007: p.11).

During the 1950s and 1960s, Keynesianism gained importance in developed capitalist countries. Significant improvements had been observed in key sectors such as energy, finance, transport and education. Thanks to the embedded liberalism, developed capitalist countries provided high economic growth.

Throughout these years, it was observed that Karl Polanyi’s ideas on the distinction between disembedded and embedded economic systems were

verified. It was seen that “the economic order is merely a function of the social, in which it is contained” (Polanyi 1957: p.74). Within this context, business investments were supervised by Keynesian fiscal policies. Besides, Social and moral values such as national identity and citizenship were involved in the natural implementation of the embedded liberal state. Moreover, as Harvey stresses (2007), the unions and left-wing political parties came to be the voice of the working class. And, these institutions had an important influence in the state functioning mechanism. It was clear that the state had a direct role in regulating the mutual confrontations of social classes.

The notion of the welfare state “was first used to describe Labour Britain after 1945. From Britain the phrase made its way round the world” (Briggs 1961: p.9).

The welfare state was firstly embodied in the states applying embedded liberal regulations. Welfare states do not cut the budget of social security systems, on the contrary, this kind of states promote employment policies and social security. For Foucault (2007), social insurance is one of the dispositions of the welfare state in which the regulation between the political power applied to citizens is carried out. That is, insuring citizens against any health problem by the state is important in terms of being a welfare state practice. Harvey clarifies social regulations by referring the idea of the welfare state as follows:

What all of these various state forms had in common was an acceptance that the state should focus on full employment, economic growth, and the welfare of its citizens, and that state power should be freely deployed, alongside of or, if necessary, intervening in or even substituting for market processes to achieve these ends (Harvey 2007: p.10)

Asa Briggs (1961) implies that there were few attempts to define the welfare state. However, he underlines the fact that the definitions of the welfare state generally refers to the reduction of poverty, the elimination of income inequality between social classes, the development of accessible health services, and the establishment of free and scientific education. Keynesian policies and embedded liberalism had impinged upon international politics for nearly 30 years. Fiscal and monetary regulations of Keynesianism resulted in the creation of a welfare state in the United Kingdom, and of the Great Society or the New Deal procedures in the USA.

Due to the fact that taxation was set up from the upper classes to the lower ones, as Steger and Roy (2010) asserts, the quality of social services and wages increased on behalf of the proletariat. As a result, there appeared a shift of working class people towards the middle classes in advanced capitalist countries.

Keynesian policies and embedded liberalism had experienced their golden age until the first years of 1970s. However, as Harvey (2007) states, after that date, problems began to appear in the markets of the countries on the capitalist block. The high growth rates of developed capitalist countries are obviously exhausted and have not worked anymore. These countries were expecting serious financial crises. Finally, alternatives to embedded liberalism began to be discussed among economic circles. According to Howard and King (2008), by using a historical materialist perspective, various social theorists from different schools had already recognized the catastrophic decline of the market.

Howard and King assert that the social theorists “identified fundamental changes in the forces of production that would tend to eradicate market relations” (Howard and King 2008: p.147). Harvey (2007) regards the accumulation crisis of 1970s as a stagflation crisis. Moreover, Harvey (2007) reports that Inflation was 26 percent and the number of unemployed was over 1 million. National industries now generated costs that the country’s treasury could not afford.

The capital accumulation crisis of the 1970s and the transnational economic instability eventually carved a path to sharp changes in international monetary and fiscal policies. As Howard and King assert;

Between August 1971 and March 1973, the Bretton Woods system fell apart: the United States was no longer obliged to provide gold in exchange for dollars held by other central banks, and all currencies began to float. This took away a major rationale for maintaining international capital controls. Significant autonomy in domestic policy could still be preserved even if exchange controls were lifted completely because the constraint of maintaining fixed exchange rates had been extinguished (2008: p.150).

As Howard and King underline, the US did not have to supply gold reserve to exchange for dollars that were kept by other countries. This regulation naturally led to capital shortfall in the world markets. In accordance with liberalisation

process, the US called off all capital control mechanisms in 1974. Inevitably, the UK and other advanced capitalist countries followed the US within the next decade.

Harvey (2007) claims that there was a sympathetic outlook towards neo-liberalism in the political-economic practices and theories of developed capitalist countries since the beginning of the 1970s. Privatization policies and deregulation of the state mechanisms have been remarkably popular among advanced capitalist countries. The English speaking countries pioneer in establishing neoliberal world were British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the United States President Ronald Reagan. For Steger and Roy, “these political leaders not only articulated the core ideological claims of neoliberalism but also sought to convert them into public policies and programmes” (2010: p.21).

Nick Couldry (2010) points out that neoliberalism is a historical result of the crisis of Keynesianism. Regarding Keynesianism as the major responsible for the market failure, neoliberal theorists set to work in order to integrate their principles. Couldry probes his idea by giving details about economic crises of the 1970s.

For him, high oil prices, unbearable inflation rates or problematic relations between government representatives and organized labour are barely stemmed from wrong policies and applications of Keynesianism. According to Richard Peet, “the real crisis of capitalism in the 1970s was interpreted as the failure of Keynesian policy” (cited in Couldry 2010: p.13).

To Mark Purcell, (2008) the next generation of economists were creating an argument for an alternative where the government would play a very minor role in the economy. This alternative would be shaped around the principles of neoliberalism. Additionally, Mark Purcell asserts that the free market processes would have the priority to determine the organisation of economy rather than state interventions or regulations. In this sense, it is worth underlining the major difference between neoliberalism and Keynesian liberalism that:

for neoliberalism, it is the freedom of the enterprise and the entrepreneur which needs to be produced and organized, whilst the

freedom of the worker and that of the consumer who were at the centre of Keynesianism are made subordinate (Lazzarato 2009: p.120)

As Harvey (2007) stresses, neoliberal theorists fiercely opposed the Keynesian methods.

They believed that a state intervention which was to be influenced by biased institutions such as trade unions or trade lobbies would diminish the free natural aura of market competition. For Lazzarato (2009), by deconstructing the Welfare State's institutions on behalf of free market principles, Neoliberalism tries to transform society into a business community. In this kind of society, the worker moves away from being a sort of worker individual and becomes a means of ownership. According to Laurent Montreuil (2010), the notion of the enterprise society in a neoliberal state can be comprehended as the organised group of people that are to deliver specific goods and benefits on behalf of capital accumulation. However, this kind of social construction inevitably requires financialization of economy, and this means, according to Lazzarato, "the redistribution of risk and protection" (2009: p.124).

Neoliberalism tended to "ignore the need for universal economic security as a means of enabling people to internalise principled behaviour" (Standing 2011: p.174).

In accordance with this principle, neoliberalism attempted to destroy mutual risk management systems that would charge the state with the protection of poorer members of the society in the Keynesian liberalism. Lazzarato states that neoliberals;

have learned to tame its institutions and make them serve the ends of neoliberal capitalism, in much the same way as they have tamed democratic institutions to ensure they remain dominated by an 'oligarchy of wealth' (2009: p.128)

In addition, Standing argues that these institutions created a neoliberal propaganda that regarded being poor as a disgraceful social situation. That is, "To talk of 'the poor' is to talk of pity, which is akin to contempt, as David Hume taught us" (Standing 2011: p.174). As a consequence of the ideological transformation and "those rescaling processes" (Purcell 2008: p.13), the rise of neoliberalism performed an immediate acceleration.

As stated earlier, the Mont Pelerin Society had a central role in the development of neoliberal ideology. The ideological position of this society clearly affected Milton Friedman, the influential academic of the Chicago School of Economics. As Steger and Roy (2010) asserts, Milton Friedman and the Chicago School had shown tremendous strides in the success of neoliberalism as a radical economic doctrine in the 1950s, becoming the dominant economic doctrine of the 1990s.

David Harvey (2007) argues that neoliberalism has to integrate its principles into all the sections of the state such as education policy, economic and monetary administration or military plans. Harvey defines this kind of state as neoliberal state. For Harvey, Pinochet's Chile was "The first experiment with neoliberal state formation, it is worth recalling, occurred in Chile after Pinochet's coup on the 'little September 11th' of 1973" (Harvey 2007: p.7). Salvador Allende was defeated by Augusto Pinochet with a military coup. For Harvey (2007), it was an ideologically planned action organised by the Chicago School because all social and political organisations were closed and the labour market had been freed from regulatory or intrusive restrictions.

Harvey (2007) declares that the first draconian shift from Keynesianism to neoliberalism occurred in 1978. Paul Volcker, the chief economist of the time, changed the US monetary policy, and Keynesian fiscal and monetary policies were relinquished, which was the main objective of the former economic philosophy.

According to Harvey, the period between the years of 1978 and 1980 was a sharp turning point in the social and economic history of the world. This revolutionary change in developed capitalist countries would inevitably affect the rest of the world.

Since then, the People's Republic of China "took the first momentous steps towards the liberalization of a communist-ruled economy" (Harvey 2007: p.1) in addition to the US. Towards the last days of the 1970s, various nations were arranging their economy policies in accordance with the principles of neoliberalism. As Steger and Roy (2010) underlines the fact that these shifts were not consistent; contrarily, different countries have increasingly found different ways to get involved in the global market.

In the final analysis, “The rise of neoliberalism in the English-speaking world is most notably associated with US President Ronald Reagan (1981–8) and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (1979–90)” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.21). In 1980, Ronald Reagan became President of the United States of America, “a country suffering from low growth, inflation and the Carter malaise” (Blanchard, Branson, and Currie 1987: p.17). While Reagan was preparing for his inauguration ceremony, “Margaret Thatcher had already been elected Prime Minister of Britain in May 1979” (Harvey 2007: p.1).

Their neoliberal turns have a place in the history of neoliberalism, since their attempts were the most comprehensive examples of “successful ideological crusade against Keynesian-style ‘big government’ and state ‘interference’ in the market” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.48).

The Republican Party of the United States “moved sharply to the neoliberal right during the Reagan years” (Peck 2013: p.138). As Harvey (2007) notes, in accordance with this inclination, the Reagan Administration applied a neoliberal economic program known as Reaganomics, whose principles are primarily to limit the power of workforce, reorganize the principles of industry, release the forces of agricultural potential and free the finance. According to Reaganomics, all public institutions had to be deregulated including “key industry sectors such as communications, transportation, and banking” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.31). Since, these deregulations were required for the construction of a global market in which the capital could be accumulated in a more effective way.

As Jennifer Bair (2005) asserts, rich countries of the global south abandoned state interventionist policies “in favour of an export-oriented development strategy” (2005: p.161) because economy policy makers and business elites tended to transnational trade networks.

Across the Atlantic, Thatcher’s Conservative Party initiated major social and economic reforms “that went under the name of ‘neoliberalism’ and transformed it into the central guiding principle of economic thought and management” (Harvey 2007: p.2). Thatcher’s social and economic policies, known as Thatcherism, caused a remarkable social dissolution within the British Society. For instance, “Labour’s traditional constituency, the working class, was anyway eroding both in numbers and in loyalty” (Evans 2013: p.26). Moreover, Harvey

(2007) stresses that Thatcherism diminished the impact of the aristocratic tradition on public service and the capitalist class. However, her main interest was to liberalize the Active Labour Market Policy, applied by former British Governments and to provide workers with employment training. Instead of the Welfare State's working class oriented system, neoliberalism applied a market oriented system. To Steger and Roy (2010) Thatcherism foresaw a more neoliberal educational plan that would be more sensitive to the market for unionized workers' training needs. Ignoring workers' personal development was a result of neoliberalism, which regards workers as commodities.

Although Thatcherism and Reaganomics created social dissatisfaction especially among working class members, they were seen as successful political movements. For Harvey (2007), the main reason why they succeeded was to make their political and intellectual positions mainstream. Washington Consensus, "a list of the principal economic reforms" (Williamson 1993: p.1329), was born to aid the transnational capital accumulation because "The US and UK models of neoliberalism were there defined as the answer to global problems" (Harvey 2007: p.93). The major principles of the consensus were:

strong fiscal discipline, reductions in public expenditure, tax reform to encourage market investors, interest rates determined by markets and not the state, competitive exchange rates, trade liberalization, the encouragement of foreign direct investment, privatization of public services and assets, deregulation of financial and other markets, and the securing of private property rights (Couldry 2010: p.4)

The Washington Consensus was upon neoliberal principles.

Thus, it was utilised as the "lowest common denominator of policy advice directed at mostly Latin American countries" (Steger and Roy 2010: p.19) by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. International think tanks and capitalism oriented economic institutions created oppression over the rest of the World including Japan and Europe. Harvey (2007) underlines the fact that the World Trade Organization determined neoliberal procedures for the implementation of transnational economies and played a key role in directing countries to the neoliberal path. Anthony Giddens, Blair's Adviser, clarifies the Third Way:

The Third Way involves a balance between regulation and deregulation, on transnational as well as national and local levels; and

a balance between the economic and non-economic life of the society. The second of these is at least as important as the first, but attained in some part through it (1999: p.100)

Giddens argues that the post-cold war democratic left did not have to choose between Keynesianism and Thatcherism, as alternatively the Labour Party could construct a third way by combining two dominant democratic approaches. Tony Blair in the United Kingdom and Bill Clinton in the United States were the major representatives of the second wave of neoliberalism, and they were hoping to create a conscious marketplace globalism with a social aspect. Unlike their predecessors, Blair and Clinton tried to synthesize harsh rules of market globalism within a set of ethic notions.

Additionally, the Clinton Administration's globalisation of markets and Blair's the Third Way Doctrine and demonstrated that the principles of corporate-led globalization had become the determiner of the economy policies of the civilized world.

As Zajda and Rust state, "Globalisation, marketization and quality/efficiency-driven reforms around the world since the 1980s have resulted in structural and qualitative changes" (2010: p.5). As Steger and Roy (2010) assert in short, globalisation aimed at the growth of markets worldwide, the strengthening of transnational corporations and the increase of economic flows around the world. The formation of strong markets around the world meant that more markets were involved in the game. Neo-liberalism would be the main ideology to assume the role of referee in this multiple game. For market globalists, the global expansion of commerce meant peace and prosperity.

However it might also create human rights violation or conflicts within international relations. In the final analysis, neoliberalism and its natural consequence, globalisation went through a severe crisis on the late days of the 1990s.

As Mark Purcell reports, the novelist and human rights activist Arundati Roy declared that "we be many and they be few. They need us more than we need them. Another world is not only possible, she is on her way. On a quiet day, I can hear her breathing" (2008: p.1). The crisis of neoliberalism created an unsustainable situation in the definite areas of the earth. For instance, right wing

fundamentalism had risen in Europe. Indeed, a worldwide web of anti-globalist organisations was protesting neoliberal applications almost everywhere. According to Mark Purcell, “they are gathering in places like Seattle, Cancun, Davos, Doha, Goteborg, and Genoa to demand a more democratic and socially just global economy” (2008: p.1). However, with coercion or consent, neoliberalism influenced all social segments of the nations.

Bob Jessop states that “novelty of recent neoliberal projects lies in their discursive, strategic, and organisational reformulation of liberalism” (2002: p.452). However, “Classical liberalism is the more comprehensive set of ideas” (Howard and King 2008: p.2). Classical liberalism includes similar notions with neoliberalism such as small government, individualism or civil society oriented social organisation.

Nonetheless, “neoliberalism is a considerably more specialised set of ideas, proclaiming the efficiency of markets over other mechanisms of coordination and disciplining” (Howard and King 2008: p.2).

Steger and Roy (2010) point out the fact that neoliberalism has been under discussion in the world politics for nearly 30 years. And, neoliberalism is not only criticized by its historical rival, Marxist tradition, it is also evaluated by the other schools. What is more, its principles have influenced various politicians from different political backgrounds and countries such as Boris Yeltsin, Jiang Zemin or George W. Bush.

As an ideology, neoliberalism has a doctrine. The Washington Consensus, the Chicago School or the emergence of IMF were dialectically bound to the historical evolution of the neoliberal doctrine. Neoliberalism depends on “increasingly unequal distribution of the benefits” (Couldry 2010: p.5) when compared with classical liberalism.

Steger and Roy (2010) argue that neoliberalism changed the course of classical liberalism by modifying its self-regulating market principle. Steger and Roy states that a clear conceptualization of neoliberalism relies on “three intertwined manifestations: (1) an ideology; (2) a mode of governance; (3) a policy package” (2010: p.17). In this respect, it is clear that neoliberal doctrine has to capture the state so that ruling elites may infuse it with neoliberal principles. As

it is seen, a smooth functioning of the free market system is crucial for neoliberalism. Furthermore, Harvey (2007) adds that the neoliberal state needs to conquer new markets. Neoliberalism aims to bring the existing sectors into capital through privatization. If the state under neoliberalization does not have enterprises in education, health, social security, environment, public works or mining areas, the neoliberal ideology pioneers the establishment of institutions in those areas that are lacking. As David Harvey states:

According to neoliberal theory, the sorts of measures that Bremer outlined were both necessary and sufficient for the creation of wealth and therefore for the improved well-being of the population at large. The assumption that individual freedoms are guaranteed by freedom of the market and of trade is a cardinal feature of neoliberal thinking, and it has long dominated the US stance towards the rest of the world (2007: p.7)

For neoliberalism, freedom of the market means wealth and prosperity. Free market means free man.

Neoliberals insist on the fact that the market has an “invisible hand” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.3) controlling and fixing the economy. The main starting point of the neoliberals was Adam Smith’s definition of the market. For them, the hidden hand of the market can control everything about economic processes “Neoliberal doctrine was therefore deeply opposed to state interventionist theories, such as those of John Maynard Keynes” (Harvey 2007: p.21). Those market definitions made by different scholars converge on the same idea: The market has to be globalized in order to function properly. In this context, Steger and Roy (2010) asserts that globalization aims primarily to liberalize markets. However, liberalized markets have no place in an environment where they do not interact with other markets. So, globalization is concerned with the global integration of these markets in the next step.

Steger and Roy (2010) regards market globalism as an inevitable process, and the globalization of the market, in the last analysis, serves the thoughts of a worldwide democracy and ultimate freedom.

For David Harvey, “neoliberalization has meant, in short, the financialization of everything” (2007: p.33). In this context, it is clear that this kind of financialization has to be globalized. According to Mark Purcell, “That globalization of its operations has been an important strategy on the part of

capital to achieve two goals” (2008: p.10). The first is to extend capital accumulation. And, the second goal, a literally political one, which is to tame labour movement. Since, As Harvey (2007) claims, Commercialization thinks that property rights can affect the existence of processes, things and social relations. Commercialization assumes that they will be able to get a price and process it according to the legal contract. Organised labour movements were standing as the major obstacle in the financialisation of labour. Harvey promotes the idea that the market will establish an economic value for everything, including social relations -even humanbeings- can be traded like a commodity.

To Harvey (2007), neoliberalism applies a precarization process in order to create labour flexibility against security of tenure. In this way, ruling upper classes find a way to overthrow any possible revolutionary threat or democratic political opposition. Indeed, this means that the neoliberal capitalist administration may achieve a restrained capitalist exploitation of labour.

According to Foucault’s analysis, “neoliberalism has transformed society into an ‘enterprise society’ based on the market, competition, inequality, and the privilege of the individual” (cited in Lazzarato 2009: p.109). For Lazzarato (2009), in the neoliberal system, upper classes tend to regard workers as human capital that can be exploited like economic investments. In accordance with this principle, insurance applications are not organised in conformity with the model of the mutualisation of risks. In this context, social rights are relatively eradicated due to the neoliberal policies of the governments. The Human capital and the entrepreneurial mind are the key constituents of human financialization.

Harvey stresses the fact that neoliberalism invokes the spirit of competition and these competition facilities are open to every citizen. However, it is quite different in practice.

Neoliberal policies have been giving the way for consolidation of oligopolistic and monopolistic economic structures. As David Harvey (2007) exemplifies, The soft drinks market has been reduced to Coca Cola against Pepsi. In the energy industry, the five largest transnational corporations control the whole world. Media organizations around the world are in the hands of several media emperors. In addition, the informatics sector is dominated by large US-based

firms. The inevitable conclusion of the notions of human capital, the entrepreneurial mind and competitiveness leads to the precarity of financialized labour:

In the concept of 'human capital', has achieved the redistribution of risk and protection, leaving the individual increasingly at the mercy of the market. Additionally, financialization has transformed the pension funds of wage earners and public employees into a fiscal resource for the enterprise, with the consequence that savings are co-opted for the benefit of capital, thus ensnaring the earner in a double bind, at the affective, cognitive and political levels. Together with the monetarization of state administration, this has produced a situation of permanent insecurity and precarity, conditions necessary for the new apparatuses to work (Lazzarato 2009: p.111)

As Howard and King (2008) state, the new middle class was rising from the ashes of old middle classes. The new middle class was characterized with "the possession of educational qualifications, specialised knowledge and technical expertise rather than the ownership of property" (Howard and King 2008: p.115). Harold Perkin (2003) named this kind of society as 'professional society'. According to this social structure aphorism, "professionals derive their status and self-esteem from the possession and exercise of expertise, not capital" (Perkin and Perkin 2003: p.115).

As mentioned earlier, the ultimate goal of neoliberalism is to capture the state. With the neoliberal transformation, "the neoliberal state should favour strong individual private property rights, the rule of law, and the institutions of freely functioning markets and free trade" (Harvey 2007: p.64).

1.2 The Dialectical Relationship between Neoliberalism and Literature

As Terry Eagleton (2002) argues, every literary work inevitably depends upon the historical context in which it is produced, and cannot be analysed without considering the socio-political and historical facts of its own time. In this context, it can be argued that every literary work is supposed to be criticized, considering the fact that the dominant ideology of the time when the work is produced. Steger and Roy stresses socially integrative dimension of the ideology in the following lines:

Ideologies are systems of widely shared ideas and patterned beliefs that are accepted as truth by significant groups in society. Such 'isms'

serve as indispensable conceptual maps because they guide people through the complexity of their political worlds. They not only offer a more or less coherent picture of the world as it is, but also as it ought to be (2010: p.10)

As Harvey (2007) stresses, neoliberalism, the dominant ideology of the capitalist world after the 70s, both captured both major state organisations and all social mechanisms such as “divisions of labour, social relations, welfare provisions, technological mixes, ways of life and thought, reproductive activities, attachments to the land and habits of the heart” (2007: p.3). For Steger and Roy (2010), massive neoliberal propaganda was applied by large transnational corporations, institutional lobbyists, well-known journalists, public relations experts, cultural elites and world of entertainment. Even politicians such as Clinton in the US or Blair in the UK had been the voice for the neoliberal propaganda. Nick Couldry (2010) states the fact that neoliberalism, with a special discourse, began to affect the contemporary world formally, practically and culturally.

As Steger and Roy (2010) expresses, neoliberalism has become well known by the public. Today, it can be read almost every day in the headlines of the world’s greatest newspapers. Additionally, Mark Purcell (2008) notes that neoliberalization supports the free market, which is believed to make economy much more effective. In this context, neoliberalization aims that free market principles should extend beyond the economic environment to all aspects of life, such as the state, universities, hospitals, schools.

Furthermore, neoliberalization “means neoliberal government must take over social processes to create the conditions inside them amenable for market mechanism” (Lazzarato 2009: p.117).

In addition to previous approaches, Howard and King mention the relationship between the social classes and neoliberalization:

Neoliberalism in advanced capitalist economies was the product of a long period in the development of the productive forces and associated changes in the production relations, which modified the superstructure and had significant effects on social consciousness (2008: p.193)

Boltanski and Chiapello (2005) regard neoliberalism as the new logic of capitalism. Besides, the old and commercial logic of capitalism was removed by

this system of logic “which in a world of expanding and interconnected markets validates mobility of capital, resources and labour” (Couldry 2010: p.29).

Integration of free market values into all social segments and relations means commodification of every human production. In accordance with this, it can be argued that literature, as a social phenomenon, has been dialectically affected by neoliberalization. As stated earlier, neoliberalism is clearly an ideology which stemmed from the heart of capitalism. David Harvey (2007) stresses the ideological task of neoliberalism:

Neoliberalism was well suited to this ideological task. But it had to be backed up by a practical strategy that emphasized the liberty of consumer choice, not only with respect to particular products but also with respect to lifestyles, modes of expression, and a wide range of cultural practices (p.42)

The history of the neoliberal transformation of capitalist societies goes back to early 70s. Actually, “In the early 1970s, it is doubtful that US strategic planners, or anyone else, were able to anticipate all the parameters of the new system” (Howard and King 2008: p.196). However, neoliberalism managed to impose its ideological aphorisms and principles into the world politics in spite of the fact that everyone, including the ideologists of neoliberalism, was suspicious about the applicability of neoliberal turn. Specifically, intellectual circles were targeted for the realisation of neoliberal inception. David Harvey (2007) stresses the fact that neoliberalism had already begun to be central to the political sphere, particularly in the United States and the UK, rapidly influencing think tanks, universities and literary circles.

Harvey (2007) points out the fact that the neoliberal policies were being applied “on the unfolding of government policies in many other arenas” (p.24) in the early phase of the 80s. As mentioned earlier, Thatcher in the UK and Reagan in the US were applying direct neoliberal interventions over social policies.

For instance, The National Labour Relations Board, established in 1935 in order to protect labour rights against ruling elites, was transformed into a rally to attack the rights of the working class and to reorganize them in the direction of market interests due to Reagan’s appointments. According to Howard and King (2008), the deregulation of market and reorganisation of social relations were

not coincidental. On the contrary, it was a natural outcome of a historical breakdown occurred in the advanced capitalist world.

The market and accumulation crises of 70s created deep incompatibilities and “the most fundamental contradiction was the one between the productive forces and the productive relations” (Howard and King 2008: p.211). Mark Purcell (2008) contribute to the idea of a neoliberal siege of the capitalist institutions:

Over the past 30 years or so, the global economy, and cities in particular, have been increasingly “neoliberalized.” That is to say social life has become increasingly subjected to the logic of neoliberalism: free markets, competitive relations, and minimal state regulation of capital (p.2)

Due to the fact that neoliberalism is an ideological tool for capitalist accumulation, it gave a path to a “greater social inequality and the restoration of economic power to the upper class” (Harvey 2007: p.26). The inevitability of neoliberal economic restoration was propagated so effectively that almost all social and political units were convinced to “adapt to the inherent rules of the free market if they are to survive and prosper” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.54). In this way, capitalist elites and the ruling classes achieved their main political goal: Making inequalities among the society admissible. Being a member of the society in which social, economic and political inequalities are not seen as an obstacle for natural flow of daily life, was a neoliberal dream to make capitalist accumulation maintain. Foucault (2007) calls this situation as ‘equal inequality’.

For Foucault (2007), if any state is governed by a market government based on competition and enterprise, it must ensure that everyone is in a state of equality inequality. As Louis Althusser (1972) stresses, cultural apparatuses are organised by dominant ideology and turned into a server for the ruling classes. In the early 90s, as Harvey (2007) notes, higher education institutions, such as Stanford and Harvard, which are generously financed by universities, think tanks or institutions and foundations, have become centres of neoliberal orthodoxy since the rise of the neoliberal ideology.

As Couldry (2010) asserts, neoliberal democracy is not a type of democracy, yet this is an example of how a lie of a great democracy can be sustained. In neoliberalism, every political agenda or system creates an illusion for maintaining neoliberal principles. Social and Political apparatuses such as

parties, media, social organisation or even organised labour are transformed into the neoliberal agenda, and they serve to neoliberal ideological system. Neoliberalization is “significant in intellectual history because it constitutes a refutation of much social and economic thought in the twentieth century” (Howard and King 2008: p.9).

Within this respect, it is clear that literature as a cultural apparatus, as stated in the Althusserian terminology, was exposed to neoliberalization. Rachel Greenwald Smith discusses the relation between neoliberalism and literature in her in-depth study *Affect and American Literature in the Age of Neoliberalism* (2015).

Smith makes a historical and dialectical comparison between neoliberalism and the affective hypothesis:

While neoliberalism casts the individual as responsible for herself, the affective hypothesis casts feeling as necessarily owned and managed by individual authors, characters, and readers. Neoliberalism imagines the individual as an entrepreneur; the affective hypothesis imagines the act of reading as an opportunity for emotional investment and return. The neoliberal subject is envisioned as needing to be at all times strategically networking; feelings, according to the affective hypothesis, are indexes of emotional alliances (2015: p.2)

It is already mentioned in the present study that neoliberalism reinforces individualism rather than social solidarity. In this context, Smith (2015) considers the fact that the affective hypothesis, which requires self-evaluation and individual care towards any literary work, was dialectically effected by the neoliberal transformation of contemporary world. Furthermore, Smith (2015) points out the historical coincidence that the affective hypothesis has gained the attraction of literary circles since the early phases of 1990s, the years when neoliberalism created the roaring nineties. As Harvey (2007) underlines, individualism is regarded as one of the central values of neoliberalism.

Identifying individualism as a central social value means that any outer intervention is probably seen as a collective judgement and regarded as an authoritative action in neoliberalism. Besides, it is observed as a kind of intervention “that substituted collective judgements for those of individuals free to choose” (Harvey 2007: p.5). Similar to neoliberal individualism, Rachel

Greenwald Smith states that the affective hypothesis relies on individual feelings.

For Smith, “personal feelings function like personal property. They are private, not in the sense of being secret or interior, but in the sense of being privatized” (Smith 2015: p.2). In this respect, the structure and principles of the affective hypothesis demonstrate that neoliberalism ideologically effected literary approaches and had a remarkable role in the emergence of the affective hypothesis

1.3 History of Political Theatre in Britain

Edelman states that “art is central to politics” (1996: p.3). According to Edelman, Art produces worlds and realities. And, these realities are capable of reproducing historical facts by analysing them in accordance with social structures such as identity, class or gender. Theatre, as an artistic form, has been inevitably shaped by politics in theory and practice for centuries.

Furthermore, the political issues and ideologies have made such a remarkable influence on drama that a unique branch, named as political theatre, has emerged approximately for 600 years.

Weeks defines political drama as a kind of historical narration which “tends to reflect the patterns of historical thought characteristic to the age in which it is produced” (1988: p.30). On the other hand, Weeks (1988) underlines the fact that it is hard to determine a consistent definition of political theatre because of the variability of historical facts. What is more, it is hard to identify which play is political, or not. The perception about political theatre may change from time to time, and this kind of plays naturally reflects the spirit and the ideology of the time in which it is written. According to Weeks:

Axe and Crown could only have been written during the century and that Shaw’s Saint Joan could only have written during the twentieth. The Taylor play reflects the typically Victorian conception of history as a parade of moral archetypes, and Saint Joan reflects the deepening pessimism about history and progress that permeated the aftermath of the Great War (1988: p.31)

As Weeks mentioned, historical situation and hegemonic ideology of the time inevitably cover the essence of play, since the play and its creators are inseparable parts of the society in which they exist.

Judy Lee Oliva (1988) argues that the historical roots of British political drama goes back to 17th century. Oliva presents a couple of significant dates for the historical development of political drama in Britain. The first significant date is 1660, when “when Charles II granted a patent to Thomas Killigrew and Sir William Davenant creating a monopoly on legitimate drama” (1988: p.16).

The year of 1660 is also accepted as the beginning of Restoration Period which is successor of the Commonwealth. For Carter and McRae (1996), “the political side of literature became important during the commonwealth” (p.57); therefore, the new successors had to establish a counter-politics against commonwealth values. Consequently, the political essence of literature continued to enlarge.

In this context, Allardyce Nicoll (1921) points out that the Restoration period witnessed complex political issues and any critic who wants to analyse this period ought to classify the political developments such as “the struggle among Catholics and Protestants and Cavaliers and Puritans and the struggle among the Whigs and Tories, the King and the Parliament” (p.230). According to Oliva:

Of the plethora of political plays that chronicled the events, scholars generally agree that those that best theatricalize politics include Milton's *Samson Aqonistes* (1671), Payne's *The Siege of Constantinople* (1674), Lee's *Lucius Junius Brutus* (1678), Behn's *The Roundheads* (1682) and Crowne's *City Politiques* (1683). (1988: p.25).

The mentioned plays vary in their structures. They are tragedies and farces including allegory, satire and panorama of the Restoration of English Monarchy. However, their political structures are descriptive, not critical. They generally present a view of historical incidents, and rarely direct a critical sight to the ideological structure of that time, since the ideological structures under monarchic governments are autocratic and dictatorial. Eventually, there could have been no politically critical attempts towards to the establishment in a society shaped by a dictatorial ideology; therefore, the political plays of the Restoration were widely descriptive.

The second significant date for British political drama is 1737; the beginning of censorship enacted by Sir Robert Walpole's the Licencing Act. The political atmosphere of early 18th century England was "a curious mixture of corruption and stability, status quo and innovation, property and poverty" (Oliva 1988: p.0).

As Thomas Lockwood (1987) argues, Sir Robert Walpole served as prime minister for twenty years, and his administration tended to be totalitarian in order to diminish the governmental problems led by unstable political conditions of the 18th century. Taking into consideration that dictatorial administration, Walpole's Theatre Licensing Act was "a prime example of the price of political stability" (Oliva 1988: p.30). As an ideological outcome, the Theatre Licencing act of 1737 officially gave the prime minister the right of inspecting the plots of plays. Literally, it meant a kind of censorship that would limit the scope of playwrights.

According to Carter and McRae (1996), the Theatre Licencing act of 1737 was indeed the major reason for famous playwright Henry Fielding's moving on to write novels. Due to the political pressure over society, "theatre and drama were not any longer the main forms of literary exploration" (Carter and McRae 1996: p.75).

The next dates presented by Judy Lee Oliva (1988) as landmarks of British political theatre belong to the 19th century.

Oliva highlights government regulations on patent creating in 1843 and Theatre Regulations Act of 1891. The most significant incident of the 19th century was Queen Victoria's reign, undoubtedly. The Victorian Period was the last glorious days of the British Empire. However, there were remarkable social and political problems:

Members of the working class were severely punished if they wanted to join together in trade unions; the Corn Laws kept the price of bread high; the Chartist movement wanted votes for all and social reforms. During Victoria's reign the population grew bigger. Britain became the richest manufacturing country in the world. (Carter and McRae 1996: p.125)

Depending upon economic boost and rapid industrialisation, working class and middle class strengthened in Britain. There appeared new theatre companies

addressing lower classes. As a result, theatre was no longer belonging to privileged classes. Within this period, Queen Victoria regularly participated in theatre performances. Booth (1977) states the fact that rising classes, Queen's interest and Theatre Regulation Act of 1891 led to vast improvements in theatre. Michael R. Booth defines the 19th century drama as a ceremony of "the agonies of domestic melodrama" (1980: p.45). There were limited attempts to create political plays; on the other hand, melodrama was experiencing its golden ages. Burlesque, with musical attachments, was also popular in the 19th century.

In the early 20th century, British economy was based on industrial production, and "nearly 70 per cent of the 25 million people in the country" (Carter and McRae 1996: p.159) was living in cities. The British Society was rapidly abandoning social values of agricultural society. Due to capitalist organisation of society, socio-political distinctions and conflicts among classes were gradually becoming apparent. The British Society of the early 20th century witnessed "formation of the modern British Labour Party, the emergence of socialism and the development of the middle class" (Oliva 1988: p.65). As Carter and McRae (1996) asserts; British domination over countries was disappearing. As a consequence of this, colonies began to organise rebellion movements.

Political theatre experienced a glorious revival in the first years of the century. George Bernard Shaw was one of the leading figures of British political drama at that time. According to Judy Lee Oliva:

Though most of his work confronts socially oriented issues, of interest to this study of political drama are his later plays: *The Apple Cart* (1929), *Too True To Be Good* (1931) and *On the Rocks* (1935). All are labelled by Shaw as 'Political Extravaganzas' or 'Political Comedy' (1988: p.67)

As a socialist polemicist, Shaw used theatre scene as a tool for political discussion. Shaw's style made a great contribution to the development of political drama in private theatres; however, "it was not until the fifties that there was a resurgence of political drama recognized in the mainstream" (Oliva 1988: p.91).

Additionally, As Carter and McRae (1996) states, distinguished playwrights such as John Galsworthy, Sean O'Casey and Joan Littlewood produced well

established plays depicting socio-political situations of the early 20th century Britain.

In 1956, Berthold Brecht's Berliner Ensemble visited to London, "shortly after Brecht's death, which began the process by which he became firmly established in the British theatre" (Williams 2009: p.76). This visit initiated a remarkable inspiration journey for young British playwrights. For Oliva, "The Berliner Ensemble offered new dramaturgical models for young British playwrights by which to historicize events in an epic structure" (1988: p.92). In general:

Brecht's experiment proposed an epic theatre that was anti-illusionist and anti-bourgeoisie. The overall objective of epic theatre was to make visible an ideology, which he argued was deliberately hidden in realism and naturalism, through a series of alienation techniques or *Vermfremdungseffekt* ('the V effect') (Caceres 2013: p.11)

With his Epic Theatre techniques, the *Gestus*, the V effect and alienation effect, Brecht aimed at diminishing false realities, and tried to convince his audience about what is good for proletariat. Especially, alienation effect, which "allows the audience to be more objective and free in assessing the play's meanings" (Turley 1993: p.11) created sensation beyond German speaking areas. Brecht applied an experimentalist approach with his the greatest collaborator, Erwin Piscator. German Director Erwin Piscator and "Brecht have had a decisive influence on theatre in this century beyond the German-speaking territory" (Kerz 1968: p.363). Brechtian drama combined Marxist aesthetic with political theatre tradition.

However, as Christopher Innes argues; in addition to Brecht contribution towards political theatre, "Piscator defined 'political' in a wider sense, perceiving that every aspect of twentieth century existence was affected by public events and so related to politics" (1972: p.195). In this sense, it is clear that Brecht's contribution to British political drama ought to be considered with Piscator's attempts. Since, As Peacock (1990) stresses, Piscator was one of the first artists to define the political theatre in the early twentieth century. Having served as political actor and screenwriter, Piscator gave his greatest artistic contribution as director.

As Stephen Hyer Weeks argues about Brechtian contribution to British Theatre, “there can be little doubt that it is real and that it has had an impact on nearly every area of theatre work” (1988: p.42).

Furthermore, Weeks points out that this interest towards Brecht’s drama approach revealed a ‘British Brechtianism’ in the theatrical areas of playwriting, designing, directing and acting. Additionally, Katherine Williams points out that a hybrid type of Brechtianism in Britain appeared; however, she stresses that this British Brechtianism appeared “losing his politics in the process of being rendered suitable for a bourgeois audience” (2009: p.88) instead of calling the proletariat.

In the same year with Berliner Ensemble’s visit to London, John Osborne’s *Look Back in Anger* (1956) was staged at the Royal Court Theatre. Osborne’s masterpiece successfully portrays the change of British society. In addition, “the watershed for change in the theatrical fare came with this play” (Oliva 1988: p.92). Apparently, John Osborne gradually benefitted from the major principles of Brechtianism.

For Weeks, Osborne applied the epic form into his plays, “But his approach to history through the psychology of the individual is far removed from Brecht’s emphasis on socio-economic analysis” (1988: p.47). As David Ian Rabey (1986) asserts, Osborne’s concerns were individualistic, such as identity crisis or the loss of the self; “rather than by reference to political ideologies exposing economic and judicial inequality inherent in the social status quo” (p.78). Notwithstanding structural and ideological differences, Osborne’s dramatic approach can be seen as one of the first examples of British Brechtianism. According to Peacock:

In the late 60s and early 70s, there was a remarkable alliance - artistic as well as ideological - between two great traditions of twentieth century radical theatre; between the surreal, the symbolic, the absurd on the one hand and the Brechtian on the other. (1990: p.10)

Owing to Brechtian contribution and socio-political context of post-war Britain, It was then “possible to identify a clearly discernible period of left-wing political theatre in Britain, produced by a loosely associated group of playwrights” (Peacock 1990: p.1). Some of these British Playwrights were John Osborne, Arnold Wesker, David Hare, Edward Bond, Harold Pinter and Howard

Barker. Judy Lee Oliva underlines the fact that “How they theatricalized politics not only reflects a critique of postwar political and social issues, but also demonstrates the changes in method and technique which they embraced to depict such concerns” (1988: p.118).

This generation of playwrights combined British political theatrical tradition with Brechtian notions and they created a critical drama scrutinising post-war British world with its all socio-political features. Edward Bond was one of the distinguished playwrights who brought political drama at a higher level in Britain.

His plays “in the 1960s and 1970s brought a new political tone to the theatre” (Carter and McRae 1996: p.222). The Bondian approach concentrates on discourses. In accordance with this, Edward Bond “uses language and movement - the word and the action - to register his characters' social position and social dysfunction” (Oliva 1988: p.106). Harold Pinter’s plays, such as *The Birthday Party* (1958), *The Dumb Waiter* (1960) and *The Caretaker* (1960) are known as comedies of menace.

Similar to Samuel Beckett, Harold Pinter “ creates a world of his own and, again, a special adjective has been invented to describe it- Pinteresque” (Carter and McRae 1996: p.220). Especially with his famous plays, *The Kitchen* (1959), *the Wesker Trilogy* (1958-60) and *Chips with Everything* (1962), Arnold Wesker created an eclectic theatrical form that adds working class’s revolutionary political motivation to kitchen-sink drama. Arnold Wesker mainly created domestic settings “to examine social and class issues” (Carter and McRae 1996: p.220). Arnold Wesker “portrays equally the good and bad of both the working class and the upper class, balancing the debate, much as Hare does in *A Map of the World* (1982)” (Oliva 1988: p.101).

In his book, *New British political dramatists: Howard Brenton, David Hare, Trevor Griffiths and David Edgar* (1984), John Bull proposes ‘three interlocking areas’ for a comprehensive study of the British Political Theatre: “developments in historiography, the influence of Berthold Brecht on the British theatre, and the rise of the alternative theatre movement” (p.30).

It is quite apparent that Brechtian notions made great contribution to the British political drama tradition, however, the political theatre evolved to a new form which is named as alternative theatre movement. According to Scott Fraser:

Political ideology was certainly not absent from the pre-1968 theatre, but while the Osborne generation had demonstrated a leaning toward the Left this newer generation exhibited a greater urgency in its attack on all forms of establishment, including the hierarchy of the dramatic establishment and the accepted forms of stage realism (1996: p.9)

Fraser points out the difference between Osborne Generation and the new generation emerged from the ashes the market crisis of seventies.

Historically, it is not a coincidence that alternative theatres appeared on the same days with the collapse days of Keynesian policies. As mentioned earlier, the market system founded after the World War II was gradually exposed to degradation towards the late seventies. Thereupon, the capitalist classes began searching new ways to overcome the market crisis.

As discussed before, neoliberalism was a way out for capitalist classes so that they could handle the crisis and establish a new system. In this context, it is clear that alternative theatre movement was an historical outcome of unsettling political times. The alternative theatres were the products of pell-mell society of the time.

After asserting a historical line about alternative theatres, John Bull (1984) discusses that this new political theatre movement has two major forms: Agit-prop and avant-garde. Peacock clearly defines the aims and backgrounds of these forms:

One which has responded to and reacted against, but nevertheless utilized the traditions and infrastructure of the existing theatre (National, Civic, Royal Court) to dramatize a wide range of social and political issues for its audience. The latter is predominantly educated and middle-class (1990: p.1)

For Stephen Hyer Weeks (1988), agit-prop theatre stresses the importance of addressing working class directly. Thus, agit-prop abstains from mainstream theatre. The ultimate aim of agit-prop theatre is to do a Marxist analysis of society in order to create a class consciousness.

On the other hand, Bull (1984) argues that avant-garde theatre regards middle class as audience. The rise of the avant-garde theatre was convenient with the spirit of those years, since British political drama portrayed “conventional bourgeois life and its institutions as contemptible not simply because they are fraudulent or outmoded, but because they are soulless” (Dean 1990: p.115).

In accordance with this, avant-garde theatre emphasizes “a radical movement more concerned with personal liberation than with social change” (Coates 1989: p.3). Unlike agit-prop “regarding the capitalist system as the cause of all injustice in society and the working class as the natural agent of change” (Coates 1989: p.3); avant-garde theatre refers to “shock effects and an all-out assault on the values of a consumerist society” (Weeks 1988: p.57). Additionally, John Bull (1984) states that the relationship between these two camps of alternative theatre is dialectical. While avant-garde tradition consists of agit-prop notions, agit-prop theatre benefits from techniques of fringe movement.

For Coates (1989), in addition to being a member of the fringe theatre movement, David Hare is one of the most interesting and successful political playwrights in the avant-garde theatre movement. As discussed earlier, any ideological change in the superstructure shall directly influence the base, which includes all structures of the society.

Therefore, the rapid ideological change in the late seventies not only transformed the plays and playwrights, but it also affected the expectations of theatregoers. In the early eighties, Margaret Thatcher’s inauguration “and the enterprise economy produced a theatre audience less interested in ‘committed dramas’ than in theatrical spectacle” (Taylor 2007: p.49). Neoliberal transformation of the British society and institutions naturally influenced all constituents of the British theatre. Globalism, main tool of neoliberalization for maintaining transnational capital accumulation, attempted to impose its principles into the British scenes as it did in the other areas of the society.

As Peacock (1990) argues, audiences inevitably follow these commodified media products that are set to serve global capitalism by means of mass media controlled by transnational companies. Within this commodification process, plays transform into economic goods serving the dominant ideology rather than

being independent artistic forms. As Rebellato (2009) states, there appeared many opposition movements against neoliberalization and globalism. For instance, ‘We are the 99%’ protest towards Wall Street in 2011, demonstrations towards the G8 Summit in Genoa in 2001, critical graffiti works by independent artists or ecology resistances are some of major resistances against the destructive policies of globalism. In addition to these oppositional attempts, theatre makers have performed significant oppositional artistic efforts against globalism.

By creating mainstream or independent productions, theatre makers have contested “the ideology and values of globalization and to promote a more democratic and pluralistic ethos” (Caceres 2013: p 20).

In the United Kingdom, the process neoliberalization and ideological interventions of globalism totally began after Margaret Thatcher’s election victory in 1979. Naturally, oppositional voices revealed against these policies as well. For example, on 5th September 1981, a politically organised group ‘Women for Life on Earth’ marched from Cardiff in order to protest the nuclear military base established in Greenham. As Fairhall (2006) points out, since the great resistance of the suffragettes movement for the right to vote in the early years of the century, there has been no such a large and organized resistance to this struggle.

The central motivation of Greenham women was to protest militaristic interventionist policies driven by the NATO, whose administrative structure had already been reshaped by neoliberalization.

Thatcher’s administration unhesitantly employed neoliberal transformation laws, including the reorganisation of theatre grants. As Taylor claims:

The crisis in British theatre in the 1980s, precipitated by a withdrawal of state funding for and a lack of investment in the arts, a failure of the political Left, and a loss of confidence in theatre as a political arena, resulted not in conspicuous critical resistance to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher’s market economy by British playwrights but a nervous retreat from mainstream politics and the ‘State of the Nation’ play (2007: p.49)

Despite the remarkable decline of mainstream political plays criticizing new system and its international or domestic collaborators, there were still attempts

to portray and criticize reflections of the new world order. For instance, Caryl Churchill's *Top Girls* (1982) depicts catastrophic career journey of a company director, Marlene "who embodies the Thatcherite values of individual ambition at the expense of others" (Dorney 2008: p.7). *Top Girls* is a critical response to the process of privatization, individualism and bourgeois feminism of the Thatcherism.

Churchill underlines the fact that neoliberalism's stress on individual success is a threat for social integrity. Howard Brenton's *The Romans in Britain* (1980) is a criticism of withdrawal of major social funds in Thatcher's Britain. In David Edgar's *That Summer* (1987), neoliberal attack to the unity of working class is depicted via the miners' strike of 1984-85. David Hare's *The Secret Rapture* (1988) motivates on the question of what is good or bad for society.

Acknowledging that identification of good or bad is extremely relativistic, Hare analyses the ideological roots of good-bad distinction. The dominant ideology under consideration is naturally Thatcherism, which "becomes the central issue of" (Peacock 1999: p.85) the entire play. The play mainly revolves around Isobel, who is a middle class woman trying to remain good and honest in a world of opportunities. As expected, Isobel cannot survive in this social jungle and has a catastrophic end, since surviving rules of the society in which she lives have been established by Thatcher's neoliberal policies, promoting individual success at all costs.

Peacock claims that "Hare's plays of the 1980s are a subjective response to the materialism and lack of sensibility of Thatcherite culture" (1999: p.80).

Additionally, "many of Hare's films will participate in his critique of Thatcherism and individualism" (DeVinney 1993: p.24). Despite the fact that the critics generally regard Hare's criticism as a moral one, Hare's opposition is ideological as well. Thatcherism and its policies are inevitable outcomes of the dominant ideology of the time, neoliberalism. Hare's later plays, such as his trilogy on the British Institutions, continued to focus on the changes, mostly catastrophic ones, led by rapid ideological transformation of Britain in a decade. The first play of the trilogy, *Racing Demon* (1990) depicts the corruption within the Church of England. *Murmuring Judges* (1993) reveals the judicial system whose constitutional independency is under the threat of politicians who follow

Thatcherite laissez faire principles. The final part of the trilogy, *The Absence of War* (1994), “based on a fictionalised version of the 1992 election campaign, might seem to stand slightly apart from the other two plays in the trilogy” (Pattie 1999: p.372).

The play demonstrates the dramatic change of the Labour Party on behalf of right wing policies. As Pattie (1999) states, the discourse used by the Labour Party is a language that has been used by the Tories for years and is available in society. At this point, it shall be useful to remember David Harvey’s words about construction of neoliberal consent. Harvey (2003) notes that neoliberalism does not destroy the structures of former ideologies that were dominant before neoliberalism. But, it transforms them. Since, neoliberal mind primarily prefers to integrate its principles into any society with consent, not with coercion. In accordance with this principle, neoliberalization made the Labour Party suitable for applying free market procedures.

In *Absence of War*, David Hare apparently portrays that the Labour Party disappoints its natural party grassroots, the working class, by abandoning its revolutionary spirit that founded welfare state once upon a time. Despite the fact that components of the trilogy address different issues, “they provide a potentially human, social response to the dynamic of the market” (Pattie 1999: p.369).

1.4 David Hare’s Drama and Politics

When David Hare attended his first class at Cambridge University, his feelings about the world which he just became a part of were both complex, but enthusiastic: “You wouldn’t recognize Cambridge from when I went to study there in 1965” (Hare 2014d: p.1). With these words, David Hare speaks as though he understands that a great literary career is waiting for him. Cambridge was the unique place which gave an unbreakable infrastructure to Hare’s career journey.

The courses that Hare took from Raymond Williams or his fellowship with Tony Bicat may exemplify the Cambridge effect on Hare’s literary background.

As Dean reports, “In 1968 Hare and Tony Bicat, who also studied English literature at Cambridge in the late 1965, founded the touring company Portable Theatre” (1990: p.4). This company was an outstanding start for Hare’s theatrical adventure. As Hare declares:

The ideas behind the Portable Theatre were very simple. We thought, wrongly as it turned out, that England was in a state of apocalyptic crisis. And we didn't believe that the contemporary theatre dealt with that crisis. We felt that plays about psychology were simply irrelevant to what we took to be our country's terminal decline. We had lost faith in its institutions, we thought that Britain's assumption of a non-existent world role was ludicrous, and we also thought that its economic vitality was so sapped that it wouldn't last long (Gaston 1993: p.214)

For this reason, Hare and his colleagues performed plays that were supposed to provoke a political interest on audience. Unlike mainstream theatre, The Portable travelled to the provinces with a van, and intended to reach working class.

The Portable Theatre Company was the first professional theatrical attempt of David Hare. And, this attempt was based on a socialist political agenda, as Hare states: “It was socialist and it was fair, even if it would turn out to be incompatible with making a living” (Hare 2015: p.178). When compared with National Theatre or Royal Court Theatre, The Portable Theatre was a political freedom sphere for Hare and Friends; since they were fleeing from “fundamental distrust of the dominant – ‘bourgeois’ - culture and the values inherent in it” (Andersen 1987: p.124).

Finlay Donesky (1996) points out Hare’s ability to portray the spirit of post-war Britain and adds that literary circles began to recognize Hare’s socialist perception of the society. Within this context, Boon (2007b) states that Hare began his career by defining himself as a political dramatist of a certain kind. On the other hand, Dean (1990) argues that it is hard to categorize Hare’s work. He has been described as a political dramatist since the beginning of his career. However, his characters are not constructive, they are always complicated.

As mentioned earlier, David Hare’s generation, including David Hare, Snoo Wilson, Howard Brenton and David Edgar, is called as Fringe Theatre Movement. According to Judy Lee Oliva (1988), the Fringe Theatre is the

second wave of Angry Young Men Movement, triggered by John Osborne. The Fringe writers were outsiders who were challenging mainstream theatres. Carol Homden (1995) states within this context that:

As Brecht's historical method was a reaction against the bourgeois German theatre as he found it in the 1920s, so what Hare and Brenton had in common was a dislike of a rhetorical, over-produced, lavish, empty and conventional theatre (1995: p.45)

Their theatrical approach “was a theatre of unorganized mobility, often producing collaborative efforts, often labelled as socialist, and usually exploring new forms and techniques to express their political concerns” (Oliva 1988: p.1)

David Hare, as one of the distinguished figures of the Fringe, has served the British Theatre with his subtle analysis of the British society and politics, through playwriting, directing films and writing scripts. In addition to his theatre works, David Hare has produced films for both television and cinema. *The Hours* (2002), *The Reader* (2008) and *Denial* (2016) are box office Hollywood productions whose scripts were written by David Hare.

Additionally, *Wetherby* (1985), *Strapless* (1989) and *Page Eight* (2011) are worldwide known films written and directed by Hare. For David Edgar (1982), David Hare wanted to convey his message to a broader audience; therefore, he moved to cinema and television in order to offer transatlantic productions. Since 1968, “One of the most high profile and prolific British playwrights of the modern era, David Hare has amassed a body of work that covers a period of over four decades” (Wallace 2013: p.7).

Upon Hare’s writing style, Richard Boon (2007a) points out the fact that Hare’s style motivates on a large scale of social issues such as individualism, alienation, commodification of the self.

Within this respect, Boon (2007b) claims that Hare’s Drama offers a qualified analysis of the values we have experienced in our lives. Despite the fact that Hare performs political enthusiasm, he actually followed an eclectic writing style which benefitted from divergent narration techniques. As Hare states, he “had no desire to train to be a non-commissioned officer in the arts police, patrolling literature for capital offences” (Hare 2014d: p.2). Richard Boon exemplifies this great diversity of scale by mentioning “smaller-scale, more

intimate pieces such as *My Zinc Bed* (2000), *The Breath of Life* (2002) – and, of course, *The Vertical Hour* (2008b) – and one monologue, *Via Dolorosa*, which he performed himself for the first time in 1998” (2007a: p.4). Hare’s literary diversity may also be exemplified with his diversified and “the shallowest purposes: rock music, black propaganda, gun-selling, diplomacy” (Hare 2014d: p.34).

As a conclusion to Hare’s literary diversity, “it is worth remembering that his ambition as a young artist was not to write, but to direct, and indeed he has done so consistently throughout his career, and on both stage and screen” (Boon 2007a: p.4).

As Hans Christian Andersen (1987) points out, Hare’s early theatrical success was not a surprise:

He behaved like traditional playwright, capable of handling words wittily, keen to work with intellectual ideas and using non-verbal imagery only to stress the meaning latent in the words, not to leave gaps in the text for creative actors to fill (p.179)

In *The Blue Touch Paper* (2015), Hare defines as the testimony of his apprenticeship, there are clear expressions implying that Hare has referred to his own autobiography during the creation phases of his plays. For Boon (2007a), Hare’s literary career and works may be regarded as paradoxical or contradictory, since using autobiographical details may contradict with Brechtian approach or his stress on private lives may not be convenient on socialist ideals. However, Boon acknowledges this contradiction as evolution. In this context, Hare argues about his early career that:

My desire was to use the theatre to argue for a political change, and, at the start, to no other end. But early on it became obvious that the demands of what you would wish to accomplish politically cannot be so easily reconciled with what is artistically possible (2014b: p.32)

As Hare stresses, his theatre has changed in accordance with his artistic development. To Boon (2007a), Hare's use of various themes and eclectic techniques is quite successful. This success represents a kind of purpose, linear progress, open and consistent sense of development.

Additionally, it is worth to remember that “Hare acknowledges Ibsen, Chekhov and O’Neill as his mentors” (Ansorge 2007: p.187). In addition to Ibsen,

Chekhov and O'Neill, the Brechtian effect on Hare's Drama is clear. Another inspiration source for Hare is Angus Calder's historical approach, which analyses history from the standpoint of working class people. In respect to this, Hare declares that *The People's War* (1992) impressed him exceedingly well, since "it attempts a complete and alternative history to the phoney and corrupting history I was taught at school" (Hare 2014b: p.121). As it can be seen from examples, Hare's mentors and philosophical inspirations belong to different schools and this is also another indicator of Hare's eclectic theatre.

Another example of Hare's eclectic theatre is his characterization. As mentioned earlier, Brechtian influence upon Hare's drama has been obvious throughout his writing and directing career.

In accordance with Brechtian approach, insisting "that the individual must be placed in his social and historical setting" (Wandor 1993: p.31); David Hare acknowledges that individual actions are inevitably bound to the social conditions. However, "Hare believes that a clash of strong emotions in his characters helps the audience to reflect on their own values" (Williams 2009: p.159), and this conflicts with Brecht's alienation effect. For Stephen Coates (1989), unlike Brecht, the hare relies heavily on the individual identity of his characters in his plays. And, this is consistent with Hare's simple characterization formula: "people live their lives together" (Wade 2007: p.75).

According to Megson and Rebellato, "the theatre, for Hare, bears implacable witness to the world" (2007: p.244). Hare believes that witnessing the world is a political process. To Megson and Rebellato, "For Hare, theatre's political purpose is to portray the world, without artifice, and then permit an audience to scrutinise that portrait" (2007: p.244). However, Hare (2014b) acknowledges that writing a unique political play requires great amount of patience and workload. According to him, the emergence of a great political game will require genius, torture and art at the same time as the creation of others. It is clearly known that Hare carried out detailed investigations on the topics and themes that he used in his verbatim theatres. As he reports in the opening part of *The Permanent Way* (2003), nine actors from the National Theatre Studio made early interviews and his team had had several meetings with citizens and railway experts for months.

Throughout his career, Hare has insisted on that a political play do have a deep insight instead of chanting slogans. He states that:

I mean that sinking of the heart when you go to a political play and find that the author really believes that certain questions have been answered even before the play has begun. Why do we so often have to endure the demeaning repetition of slogans which are seen not as transitional aids to understanding, but as ultimate solutions to men's problems? Why the insulting insistence in so much political theatre that a few gimcrack mottoes of the left will sort out the deep problems of reaction in modern England? Why the urge to caricature? (Hare 2014d: p.29)

In accordance with his seek of a literary quality for political plays; Hare, who also produced agitational-propaganda forms in his early career, criticizes agit-prop theatre productions. As Fraser (1996) points out, Hare regards agit-prop as intellectually and structurally simple. And, he remarks that political drama will be marginalized because of its limited audience that is eager to concede its didacticism.

Hare asserts that “when people tell you they value political art, what they often mean is that they enjoy political propaganda which corroborates what they already think” (2015: p.251). This perception of political play can be found in the agit-prop tradition, which Hare avoids. To Hare (2014d), agit-prop tradition is insulting audience's intelligence, experiences and choices.

A play does not only compose of actors, the text or the setting, it is also an outcome of the stage and audience interaction. Performance is the main determinant of theatrical world. In this context, “if a play is to be a weapon in the class struggle, then that weapon is not going to be the things you are saying” (Hare 2014d: p.30).

It is clear that David Hare does not intend to condemn class warfare; however, he wants to create qualified and literal forms of dramatic production. Hare both wrote and directed political criticism. However, he has always rejected to be one of “the slaves of Marxist fashion.” (Hare 2014d: p.30).

Scott Fraser (1996) divides David Hare's career into five periods. They are Juvenilia, Satirical Anatomies, Demythologies, Martyrologies and Conversions. In the Juvenilia period, Hare principally created propaganda plays such as *Slag* (1970) and *Lay By* (1970). The most important theatrical event of this period for

Hare was the establishment of Portable Theatre Company. The Portable was the first platform for Hare to reflect his drama, and it meant freedom of expression for those young theatre enthusiasts. Hare explains why they actually established the company:

What we had in common was that we thought we were living through a period of extreme decadence, both socially and theatrically. We just couldn't believe that the official culture was incapable of seeing the extreme state of crisis that we thought the country was in (1975: p.115)

As Carol Homden (1989) reports, The Portable founders regarded the dominant culture as corrupted because the cultural hegemony was established by right-wing middle class values. With Portable Theatre Company productions, Hare and his colleagues created an effective dramatic opposition against this set of values. In the Satirical Anatomies period, whose landmark productions were *The Great Exhibition* (1972), *Brassneck* (1973) and *Deeds* (1978), Political freedom of the individual characters were one of the major themes of Hare's drama. The stage of this period was depicted as a cruel conservative by Hare and there was no place for dissent.

In the third period, Demythology, establishing Joint Stock Theatre Company with his friends, "Hare came to be seen as a seminal figure in the alternative theatre movement" (Wallace 2013: p.1).

Broadening his audience scope with nationwide network of venues, Hare used individual dissent within public history as the central theme of his plays. Within this period, David Hare tended "to examine the effects of a war on two fronts - the class war and the Second World War in his history plays" (Homden 1989: p.). *Fanshen* (1976), *Plenty* (1978) and *Licking Hitler* (1978) exemplify this period. In this period, Hare presents alternative histories on his characters' individual lives with a socialist perspective. With Peter Ansorge's definition, This period is the phase of "the imaginative re-enactment of past experience" (2007: p.85).

Fraser states that "in the martyrology, the individual can deliberately choose a form of personal martyrdom as a means of generating the subversive action in the text" (1996: p.9). In this period, Hare developed his narration style that successfully portrayed ideological and social changes of the British society from the bottom to the top. Towards the end of seventies, Hare's tendency to

chronicle his age became apparent. David Hare's trilogy that criticizes the British establishment, *Racing Demon* (1990), *Murmuring Judges* (1991) and *The Absence of War* (1993), is the landmark of this period. For Peter Ansorge, David Hare's State of the nation trilogy "centring on the key public institutions of law, church and politics, which was staged at the National Theatre in the early 1990s, was significant in establishing his reputation in this respect" (2007: p.183). Hare declares that "it would be sad if this historical period had no chronicler" (2014d: p.34).

The Last Period is called as Conversions in Fraser's words. According to him, this period is the phase where Hare has reached his dramatic maturity. Besides, Hare himself defines this period as 'stage poetry'. As Wu (2007) asserts, Hare's stage poetry is a form that allows viewers to take their characters to the heart of their spiritual life. Within this period, Hare produced *Skylight* (1995), *Amy's View* (2008a) (1997), *My Zinc Bed* (2000) and *The Breath of Life* (2002). Richard Boon (2003) observed that these plays indicates "a steady progress towards increasingly 'private' plays" (p.51). This inclination towards private plays does not mean that Hare performed a tendency towards creating individual characters who cope with their existentialist problems in their small worlds.

Contrary to this, David Hare's political stance "reveals a major theme that runs throughout his work: the intersection of public and private life" (Oliva 1988: p.3). Since, Hare's drama does not deal with individual by separating it from the society in which the character lives. To Dean:

Despite its political or social roots, the ultimate tragedy of Hare's characters is invariably personal, never simply abstract. His plays reflect the state of British society since World War II with an unremitting focus on the inextricable links between; the private and the public, the personal and the political (1990: p.56)

It is worth to note that Hare's stage poetry period is the maturation phase of his political characterisation, which refers to private lives within collective social forms. As Hare asserts, a drama which ignores society is "just a place of private psychology, is inclined to self-indulgence" (2014d: p.34). With this approach, David Hare "portrays psychologically complex characters often in intensely romantic relationships set against social and political backgrounds" (Dean 1990: p.8) for years. As Nicole Boireau (2003) contributes, none of Hare's characters

is a simple caricatured symbol of an ideology of social schism. On the contrary, the characterization of the hare serves an enlightening purpose. Hare's characters bring up current political questions and never allow social behaviour to be confined to narrow boundaries. Hare's characters dictate a poetic drama, conveying problems into the scene without shouting slogans. According to Wu (2007), stage poetry period is the final station of Hare's long literary evolution journey.

In addition to Scott Fraser's five periods, this study presents the sixth period of David Hare's oeuvre. Beginning with *The Permanent Way* (2003), which evolves around privatization policies of the British railway mechanisms; David Hare initiated a new literary period in which he presented a critique of neoliberalism.

In *Stuff Happens* (2004) and *The Vertical Hour* (2008b), David Hare outlines the path ending to Iraqi Occupation of coalition forces under the framework of new imperialist policies. *Gethsemane* (2008a) and *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (2014a) present neoliberal traumas led by dissolution of social solidarity and politics of dispossession. *The Power of Yes* (2009) is settled at the core of the global financial crisis of 2008, which is accepted as the symbolic incident of the collapse of neoliberalism.

As a playwright, David Hare has always tried to establish a balance between his political stance and his artistic creation.

Indeed, he has succeeded in carrying on a writing and directing career with a balanced and eclectic literary style. Hare states that:

I grew used to having to argue to the literal-minded that drama is not and cannot be a cartoon form of exhortation. It is about people it is not about types. Shakespeare did not end Macbeth to be an indictment of Scottish monarchy. Nor is the characterisation of Lady Macbeth misogynist. The idiotic language role models would take hold and grow like a creeper to try to stifle the life out of art and reduce it to sociology (2015: p.251)

Hare stresses the fact that political art does not mean political propaganda. For Hare, political criticism on the stage must not turn into a caricature of daily political debate. Within this respect, Dean points out the fact that "Hare's plays

are not primarily didactic vehicles that assault the audiences sensibilities with dramatizations of Social injustices” (1990: p.7).

In years, Hare has developed impressive dramatic techniques that elegantly portray individuals within their socio-political contexts. Within this scope, Nicole Boireau (2003) affirms that political issues may lead unexpected emotional situations in Hare’s characterisation. Hare integrates his characters into the game in a harmonious manner, blending idealism with the necessary reality and despair. Moreover, the Hare goes beyond a simple belief that the theatre can move towards silent revolutions, which can make social changes.

Hans Christian Andersen (1987) claims that Hare, as middle class left wing writer, focuses on the individual; “but his perspective was not individualistic” (p.128). He stresses the importance of collectivism, rather than individualism having promoted by neoliberal propaganda since the seventies. David Hare creates a sympathetic and empathetic relationship between audience and his characters.

By this way, he seeks to arouse his “audiences a sense of moral indignation towards those generative socio-political preconditions” (Peacock 1990: p.135). Supporting the idea that Hare’s drama preserves a dialectical bound among politics, society and individual emotions; Oliva (1988) claims that “Hare’s work, unlike many of his contemporaries’, has a cumulative effect” (p.15). That is, David Hare creates meaning; instead of conveying a stereotype meaning. And, the main role in this meaning creation belongs to the audience.

In this respect, Hare Affirms that “For years I wrote plays which the critics rejected but which the audience enjoyed.

If I had credited what critics had to say, I would have given up years ago” (1999: pp.161-62). Oliva (1988) reinforces this idea by regarding audience as the essential notion in David Hare’s Dramaturgy.

Oliva concludes her claim that “The interrelationship and the interdependence of content and form as produced on stage in front of a live audience is the essence of theatricalizing politics” (1988: p.16). David Hare (2014b) claims that political plays are similar to lectures. Since, both disciplines are based on performance and the audience’s perception. However, Hare inherently

acknowledges that theatre is more than a lecture can create. In addition to political theatre and lecture relationship, Hare stresses the fact that dramatic narration must not be a kind of journalism. In this respect, Hare (2014d) states that:

To begin with the obvious: the playwright writes plays. He chooses plays as his way of speaking. If he could speak more clearly in a lecture, he would lecture; if polemic suited him, he'd be a journalist. But he chooses the theatre as the most subtle and complex way of addressing an audience he can find. Because of that, I used to turn down all invitations to speak in public, because I didn't want an audience to hear the tone of my voice. I don't like the idea that they can get a hand-down version of my plays sitting in a lecture hall and sizing me up (p.24)

Remarking that theatricalizing politics and history has been considered to be an action that is akin to journalism rather than theatre, Hare (2014b) complains that the playwright wanting to do political drama productions is treated like a magician who is supposed to solve any political conflict with his magic wand. Hare admits that "Interest groups will always be waiting, whether they are political, religious or aesthetic" (2014d: p.26) and they are not androids that are programmed to take only aesthetic issues from a play; However, Hare insists on that a political play is not only made up a bunch of political speeches and messages.

Hare (2014b) states the fact that audience wants the truth; "but also they want the chance to look at the facts together, and in some depth" (p.28).

Hare implicitly criticizes agit-prop tradition once again. As mentioned before, Hare regards agit-prop theatre as a superficial theatrical form, since he thinks that this kind of dramatization reduces theatre into a political weapon. In accordance with this, Hare gives examples from both his oeuvre and classics. For instance, "no, *The Permanent Way* is not about railways, any more than *Kes* is about a kestrel on *Moby Dick* about a whale" (Hare 2014b: p.31). Grief is the main theme of *The Permanent Way*, and Hare points out that the audience, critics or playwrights ought to ask something more than reportage of political incidents.

To Hare, the world of plays is a colourful and multidimensional sphere; therefore, a playwright must use all his imagination and inspiration in order to

create density. Hare asserts that “As soon as a line is put into the reconstruction of a particular event, it will be judged. In this way the theatre is the exact opposite art to journalism” (2014d: p.26).

Robert Shannon Turley (1993) expresses the fact that Hare, like many of his contemporaries, creates a connection between social issues and political topics such as working class problems, gendered approaches, racial segregation and oppressive ideologies. Accordingly, Dean (1990) clearly states the fact that “Hare’s depiction of Britain invariably carries class connotations” (p.117). Dean (1990) contributes this idea with his claim that David Hare has always been conscious about the British class system, which is one of his starting points for political criticism; moreover, “no less important than his modest origins and his privileged educational background is Hare’s class consciousness” (p.2).

There are several examples within Hare’s narration criticizing hierarchical class relations of the British Society. For example, In *Murmuring Judges* (1991), David Hare criticizes The British Legal System. The play presents an institutional disfunction led by ideologically corrupted political system. As a result, this ruling class oriented political system creates a “systematic injustice that often leads to the ‘mashing’ of those caught in the cogs” (Wade 2007: p.70). Another example may be observed in *The Absence of War* (1993), whose concentration is on the Labours Party’s reckless abandon of socialist policies before 1992 general election. The year of 1992 is a symbolic year, since it was the starting point of ‘roaring nineties’ when neoliberal social approaches, such as individualism or careerism, were presented as principal moral values. In this play, Hare portrays the surrender of the Labour Party to these neoliberal moral values and leaving working class in the lurch at the peak of capitalist hegemony.

Hare’s drama employs political topics as the essence of his plays; however, Hare has never created didactic scenes throughout his career. As Les Wade (2007) affirms; “What Hare’s career demonstrates is a turn from the broad critique of British culture to a more studied investigation of private moralities” (p.65). Depending upon Hare’s this inclination, Robert Wallace (2013) states that Hare is a representative of a school of political writers who are interested in identity politics.

Wallace underlines the fact that identity politics are staged via characters whose existences are shaped by their social identities such race, ethnicity, religion and class.

This idea corresponds with Hare's fundamental political writing principle: Staging individuals, but not individualism. David Hare has been a left-wing playwright throughout his career. However, his political stance is a mixed and eclectic just as his writing style. Within this respect, Tony Bicat (2007) stresses the fact that "David's socialism, leavened as always with his wit and humour, was born of a very genuine anger at an unjust society" (p.22). In search of a deep and literary expression, "Leon Trotsky, Antonio Gramsci or Labour Party policy can be detected in his work" (Donesky 1996: p.21).

Whichever left-wing faction he employs as ideological framework, Hare (2015) declares that he has made "a series of peculiar choices, but they were in response to common problems" (p.XIV). David Hare "usually conceives of his characters as representatives of a social group" (DeVinney 1993: p.4). Hare's political stance has always processed in favour of ordinary people, who work in factories, teach in schools, fight in fronts or homeless people. Using contemporary socio-political problems as a subsidiary to the development for his stories, David Hare constructs most of his plays. As Hare (2014b) states, "nothing pleased me more than the sympathy of being part of a struggle for something more important and larger than my work" (p.27).

Since the early days of Hare's career, some critics have tended to evaluate Hare's changing political stance as a reactionary attitude. As Hare (2014d) says, he was quite sure of that he should study Marxism when he was seventeen at Cambridge. On the other hand, he is able to write opening sentences in *The Blue Touch Paper* with these words: "As a non-Marxist" (Hare 2015: p.50). Therefore, "many critics have viewed this shift in Hare's writing as reactionary and regard Hare as a middle-class liberal, disillusioned by the demise of the post-war Welfare State" (Wade 2007: p.65).

In reply to this comments, Hare insists on the importance of change. As Hare (2007) declares, "If you don't believe in change, then you can write about rooms" (p.188). Hare points out the fact that change lies in the core of historical approach; therefore, a playwright ought to adapt himself into the outcomes of

the history. However, Hare's insistence on change does not mean a sharp shift from fundamental values.

David Hare's change has been an evolution from a utopic socialist who wanted to revolutionize world with the help of theatre, to left-wing humanist social democrat. In the final analysis, His change has remained within different factions of socialism. His style has always been critical; namely, he has criticized the historical and political developments which he welcomed with excitement and happiness. For example, Hare's *Fanshen* (1976) is a sensational masterpiece which praises The Chinese Revolution of 1949. In the play, Hare openheartedly portrays the rise of peasants and working class under the flag of communism. However, as he declares, He did not hesitate to criticise Mao's cultural revolution during a discussion with William Hinton, famous historian and the writer of "*Fanshen: A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village* (1966):

"I did believe that Mao had liberated millions of peasants from servitude. But I also had read enough them into a different, more ambiguous kind of slavery" (Hare 2015: p.251). Hare argues that being a political writer brings serious responsibilities for the writer. He complains about the representatives of different political factions persistently attacks his works by demanding more than Hare writes. Hare reminds that those playwrights, critics or theatregoers always ask Hare for writing issues which they regard as the most important problem of the society. In this respect, Hare states that "political writers are treated as short-order chefs, who ought to be able to go a la carte" (2014d: p.40). In addition to this, he complains about that "Many dramatists found themselves suddenly under attack from a utilitarian left which believed that everything, including art, could be judged only by how useful it was" (Hare 2014b: p.25). However, David Hare argues that political theatre must be more than a mirror which only reflects politics of the daily life. According to Hare, political theatre must theatricalize politics by interpreting it with its social and historical context. In an interview Hare underlines:

I believe history has a great effect on who you are and how you think. To put two characters in a room and let them go at it, hammer and tongs, so to speak, just in a psychological way, seems to me a false way to write because it's very hard in that room to give the impression

of the way in which history shapes them, the way in which they are, to an extent, victims of circumstance (Gaston 1993: p.217)

With his own words, Hare underlines the significance of history in analysing political dimensions of society. To Hare, dressing characters with traditional and historical clothes or constructing a literal scene cannot give the exact historical impression.

A political playwright must recognize the historical context of the theme which he tries to create sympathy on his audience.

1.5 The Relevance of Materialism

This study aims to show how neoliberal ideology is exposed by David Hare's plays and his criticism of the extent neoliberalism diffusing all the structures of British society and culture. For this reason, cultural materialism is thought to be a convenient method for this study.

In *Culture and Society* (1958), Raymond Williams identifies culture as a broad phenomenon infiltrating all the aspects of life. Culture cannot be considered separately from the socio-political and economic context in which it emerges. In this context, Williams argues that culture has dialectical bounds with the society. As Pierre Macherey (1978) states every work of art can be defined as a literary production, the plays are examined within their socio-political, economic and historical contexts. In the final analysis, any literary work is a product of the social and political group to which the writer belongs; Terry Eagleton (2013) reinforces this idea by arguing; all of the literary works have been productions of particular historical contexts. In this respect, the analysis of the plays entails Raymond Williams's approach:

If all activity depends on responses learned by the sharing of descriptions, we cannot set 'art' on one side of a line and 'work' on the other; we cannot submit to be divided into 'Aesthetic Man' and 'Economic Man.' (Williams 1961: p.54)

When considered from this point of view, a cultural materialist analysis is a methodology for the kind of questions raised by this study. According to Raymond Williams, culture has a significant place in the historical development of a society. Totality of the state and hegemony are both key notions for in Williams's account. By embedding culture in his theoretical framework,

Raymond Williams presents a significant interpretation of theoretical notions such as determination, hegemony, dialectical bound between base and superstructure, and labour. David Hare is a playwright and director who deploys a historical perspective in his plays. Theory of cultural materialism, which regards culture as a historical production, offers valuable perspectives for interpreting Hare's plays. It is the most important inference that "Hare reveals through his use of historical perspective is that things have not always been as they are now, and that they do change" (Ansorge 2007: p.188).

This study aims at analysing David Hare's selected plays, foregrounding some of Raymond Williams's cultural materialist concepts. It discusses the bounds between neoliberalism and drama, and to what extent Hare's drama can be situated as a politically dissident art. Historical changes within society play a central role in Hare's literary creation. However, it does not mean that it is the material facts that only shape society and its structures. In accordance with this context, Terry Eagleton asserts that:

It is true that all literary works arise from particular conditions. Jane Austen's novels spring from the world of the English landed gentry of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, while *Paradise Lost* has as its backdrop the English Civil War and its aftermath. Yet though these works emerge from such contexts, their meaning is not confined to them (2013: p.117)

As Eagleton points out, a work is a product of the context in which it arouses from. However, its meaning is limitless, it cannot be confined only its historical or socio-economical context. Material conditions cannot be enough to determine the literary value of a text. In a broad sense, culture has a voice in the determination of meaning.

Therefore, a remarkable recognition of culture may help in evaluating literariness. At this point, Raymond Williams's definition of culture barely rates a mention. According to Williams:

The shaping influence of economic change can of course be distinguished, as most notably in the period with which this book is concerned. But the difficulty lies in estimating the final importance of a factor which never, in practice, appears in isolation. We can never observe economic change in neutral conditions, any more than we can, say, observe the exact influence of heredity, which is only available for study when it is already embodied in an environment (1958: p.299)

Williams argues that economic situation and the dominant ideology may affect culture in a certain degree; however, culture is more than any economic or political analysis can do. To point out the role of culture for a detailed analysis of a social unit, Williams compares the British society with French society, two developed capitalist countries. In a socio-economical level, both of the countries demonstrate similar indications; nevertheless, their cultures are clearly different.

To Williams, historical differences are responsible for this reality. For this reason, culture must be acknowledged as “the way of life as a whole” (Williams 1958: p.300). Another discussion over the theory of culture is exemplified by Williams with the concepts of bourgeois and the proletariat cultures. Williams (1958) hints that the borders of cultures or subcultures are not definite.

Since, the source of the intellectual and creative product that each branch adopts as a traditional culture is always, and necessarily, more than the product of a single class. According to Williams, cultural notions may trespass on their counter-cultural areas. Thus, it is hard to determine strict borders to the cultures. Different cultural notions can endure even in the most inappropriate place. In his later works, Williams defines his theory of culture as “the study of the relationships between elements in a whole way of life” (Williams 1961: p.63).

Raymond Williams’s critical approaches on cultural sphere mainly stems from Marxism. Williams carried out remarkable academic and critical studies and “extended a preoccupation with the relationship between ‘literary’ and non-literary textual production within the purview of a class politics” (Drakakis 2001: p.44). Throughout long and gruelling working days of his early career, Raymond Williams especially examined traditional Marxist model of the base and superstructure relationship. According to this model:

The economic structure of society always furnishes the real basis, starting from which we can alone work out the ultimate explanation of the whole superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical, and other ideas of a given historical period (Engels 1935: p.26)

Within this model, culture is defined as a superstructure element, which will always be controlled by social and economic factors. That is, as the literary

production depends on economic values and social structures, literature will always depend upon capital. To De Valle Alcala (2010), Raymond Williams regards the deterministic nature of the traditional Marxist model as problematic for analysing culture. This model reveals crucial problems “regarding, first, the precise nature (and semantic scope) of this “determination” and second, the specific range of definition included in the terms base and superstructure” (De Valle Alcala 2010: p.69). In *Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory* (1973), Williams discussed that the traditional Marxist model of base and superstructure model is not sufficient to identify cultural forms and practices.

Williams’s approach argues that “the notion of economic base, for its part, was severely impaired in the more vulgar characterisations of the model by a narrow range of definition” (De Valle Alcala 2010: p.70). He mentions Christopher Caudwell’s work, *Further Studies on Dying Culture* (1944), and criticizes Caudwell’s describing the British cultural practise after the seventeenth century as bourgeois.

Additionally, Williams points out that depicting English Literature as ‘dying’ is barely a reduction of a complex social notion into a simple formula. According to Williams (1958) the whole society is always more diverse and is not limited to economically dominant classes. In accordance with, Williams asserts that:

Marx himself outlined, but never fully developed, a cultural theory. His casual comments on literature, for example, are those of a learned, intelligent man of his period, rather than what we now know as Marxist literary criticism (1958: p.283)

Considering the traditional Marxist concept of base as considerably strict, Williams asserts that the economic base is not a static situation or notion. In this context, Williams (1958) says:

For, even if the economic element is determining, it determines a whole way of life, and it is to this, rather than to the economic system alone, that the literature has to be related. The interpretative method which is governed, not by the social whole, but rather by the arbitrary correlation of the economic situation and the subject of study, leads very quickly to abstraction and unreality (p.300)

To Williams, the base must be analysed in reference to the dialectical relationship between social, economic, political and cultural spheres of society.

Analysis of cultural forms and practices must not be reduced into a kind of economism, an ideological inclination stressing that economy is the main determinant of society.

In *Culture and Society* (1958), Williams criticizes the reductionist approaches towards what Marx wrote about culture. Moreover, he explicitly condemns the “quite shocking ignorance of what Marx wrote among those who have been prepared to criticize him” (Williams 1958: p.293). To Williams, major terms created by Marx such as superstructure, have been misunderstood or misinterpreted by thinkers who are actually members of Marxist tradition. According to Williams, Marx reversed the stereotyped idea that had hitherto been ordinarily accepted. To him, the people who determine their existence are not unconscious but rather conscious of their existence. This idea was shocking for those artistic creators who had regarded themselves as the pioneers of cultural development history of humanity, since their status was changing.

That is, it is the society that determines the creative conditions of any artistic work, not inspiration muses or “inner energy of the individual” (cited in Williams 1958: p.299) as Christopher Caudwell offers. For Williams, this inference is one of the most crucial contributions of Marx to the definition of culture.

Raymond Williams ascribes the formation and changes within culture to emerge of different ideologies. Considering the fact that ideologies have effective impact over societies, culture may be described in reference to the dialectical relationship among elements in a society, such as politics, law, religion, and literature so called notions of superstructure. In this respect, Williams argues that:

It would seem that from their emphasis on the interdependence of all elements of social reality, and from their analytic emphasis on movement and change, Marxists should logically use 'culture' in the sense of a whole way of life, a general social process (1958: p.301)

As R. S. Neale (1984) states, Williams contends against vulgar Marxist evaluations of cultural forms and practices. However, he does not deny “a determining and controlling power in ‘literature’, especially in its manifestation as ‘tradition’ and ‘criticism’” (1984: p.199). Williams (1958) acknowledges the fact that literature has its own tradition; however, this is also related with the

culture in which that literature is born. Culture is complex, and the recognition of this complexity is the first check in any valid situation in a Marxist culture theory. Williams argues that subcultures constituting society are also hard to describe.

In order to widen the discussion, he examines two major Marxist subculture categories: Working class culture and Bourgeois culture. Williams (1958) claims the fact that both of the two polarised cultures has their own institutions, ideas, ambitions, manners or intentions. However, all of these cultural notions are permeable. That is, “there is both a constant interaction between these ways of life and an area which can properly be described as common to or underlying both” (p.346). Terry Eagleton (2013) gives an imaginative example on this aphorism:

Imagine some community, perhaps in the far-flung future, in which the English language was still in use, but its resonances and conventions, maybe because of some momentous historical transformation, were very different from the English of today. Perhaps phrases like ‘And can be seen from miles away’ would not sound particularly lame; rhymes like ‘Tay’, ‘railway’, ‘day’ and ‘away’ would not appear absurdly repetitive; and the flat literalism and rhythmical clumsiness of ‘With your strong brick piers and buttresses in so grand array’ might come through as rather charming (p.206)

As Eagleton implies, as long as culture and its hegemonic ideology changes, cultural practices may change. Eagleton (2013) reminds that Samuel Johnson, one the most important critic and artist of Elizabethan period, did not appreciate, even humiliated Shakespeare’s plays within their time, however Shakespearean drama survived with a gradually rising reputation.

In accordance with this, it is clear that as time changes, cultures change. And, culture has a crucial role in the evaluation of literary production. Williams argues that understanding culture is important, but dangerous. He defines culture as “one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” (Williams 1985: p.76). Andrew Milner asserts that:

Williams had identified four important kinds of meaning that attached to the word: as an individual habit of mind; the state of intellectual development of a whole society; the arts; and as the whole way of life of a group or people (2002: p.12)

In *Culture and Society* (1958), Williams literally divides the perceptions and definitions about culture into four categories. To Williams, culture, first, reveals as a noun depicting intellectual background of a social form. Second, culture stands as a “a noun of general process, specialized to its presumed configurations in ‘whole ways of life’” (1958: p.17). After that, the concept of culture is eligible for establishing definitions in arts and humanities. Finally, it has an important part in the organisation of social sciences. As Raymond Williams (1958) reveals, definitions of culture may vary, and The history of cultural thought is a record of our meanings and definitions, but they should only be understood in the context of our actions.

Throughout the twentieth century, the theory of culture was discussed under two polarised faction. While Williams identified these two basic ideas, he was influenced by liberal humanist thinking styles and classical Marxist corpus. For Williams (1986), the first polar was represented by liberal humanist ideologies, the second was “deployed in both post-Weberian sociology and post-Durkheimian anthropology, and materialist accounts, normally of a specifically ‘vulgar’ Marxist kind” (p.17). Williams’s theory of culture was a reaction against traditional British Marxist model, which was clearly affected by romanticism. Williams’s main aim was to diminish this model, and to process a “search for a resilient alternative to the dead-ends of leavisite practical criticism” (De Valle Alcala 2010: p.69). To that end, Raymond Williams carried out a depth analysis of cultural theories by examining cultural forms and practices in their social context. Raymond Williams’s cultural theory developed and took its final for with the combination of these polarised factions.

As Christopher Prendergast (1995) claims, a critical survey on Raymond Williams’s methodology reveals the ordered repetition of three adjectives: Whole, active and social life primary. However, Prendergast’s main contribution is to define what is not culture, rather than the clarification of Williams’s definition of culture. To Prendergast (1995), culture, first, is neither a secondary concept, nor it is a delayed outcome of outer socio-political determination process. Second, it is an active constructor of society, rather than a passive reflection of the base and superstructure relationship. Finally, culture is not “separated from the rest of social life (as in the standard specialization of

culture as the arts), but has to be seen in terms of a principle of wholeness” (Prendergast 1995: p.10).

Raymond Williams’s study on culture simultaneously created a new style of literary criticism. For E. Eldridge and J. Eldridge (2005), Raymond Williams had a revolutionary kind of realism, which was influenced by Brechtian tradition. Thus, his analysis of cultural forms and practices occurred as an attack towards traditional meanings and clichés of the established order, which was organised by capitalism. Within this respect, it is clear that “Williams’ literary critique is also a social critique” (Eldridge and Eldridge 2005: p.114). Raymond Williams named his literary criticism as cultural materialism. This literary and social criticism, as he explains:

is a theory of culture as a (social and material) productive process and of specific practices, of ‘arts’, as social uses of material means of production (from language as material ‘practical consciousness’ to the specific technologies of writing and forms of writing, through to mechanical and electronic communications systems) (Williams 1976: p.243)

Cultural materialism investigates the dialectical relationship between social contexts and cultural texts and practices; nevertheless it does not discriminate any texts from each other. The texts under consideration may vary from religion, law, or history to politics or literature. In addition to this, cultural practices may refer to any kind of manifestation of any culture, such as customary practices, traditional habits, power relationships or daily life actions. Accordingly, John Drakakis (2001) states that cultural practices must be analysed in view of the fact that “the material complexity of human activity” (p.55). Williams acknowledges this as “the experience of social practice” (1980: p.32). The stress on ‘experience’ is important, since, as Drakakis (2001) asserts, Williams aims at understanding the nature of a cultural practice before analysing its social conditions.

In *Marxism and Literature* (1977), Williams defines cultural materialism as “a theory of the specificities of material cultural and literary production within historical materialism” (p.5). As it was mentioned before, cultural materialism has developed upon Marxist ideology. Therefore, it establishes its structure as being accordant with the aim of explaining cultural practices and their ideological motives within materialistic framework. For this purpose, cultural

materialism deploys Marxist base and superstructure model by revising it in accordance with Williams's definition of culture. Dollimore and Sinfield (1994) makes a definition of cultural materialism as considering the effects of Marxism, structuralism, feminism, psychoanalysis and poststructuralism over the methodology:

Historical context undermines the transcendent significance traditionally accorded to the literary text and allows us to recover its histories; theoretical method detaches the text from immanent criticism which seeks only to reproduce it in its own terms; socialist and feminist commitment confronts the conservative categories in which much criticism has been hitherto conducted; textual analysis locates the critique of traditional approaches where it cannot be ignored. We call this 'cultural materialism' (p.14)

Williams needed to revise traditional Marxist standpoint of culture, since he saw shady areas over Marxist perception of culture, such as Marxism's regarding culture as secondary and passive.

In this respect, Drakakis (2001) claims that Marxist materialist approaches has an inclination of reserving culture in their methodological formulations "an essentially secondary one" (p.17). According to Williams, this means that traditional Marxism considers culture as "a prisoner of the social order" (1983: p.21). As it is seen, cultural materialism has taken its major form after nearly thirty years of discussion over Marxist factions.

Cultural materialism studies the historical context, focusing on those historical aspects that have been discarded by hegemonic narratives of history, with an eclectic theoretical approach. In the development phase of cultural materialism, not only the revisionist Marxism, but also a number of productive thought structures such as feminism, poststructuralism and psychoanalysis came together. Similar to cultural materialist analysis, new historicism also examines the historical contexts of given texts. However, their readings are quite apolitical when compared with cultural materialist analysis. According to Drakakis, "new historicism is primarily descriptive in its procedures, even though it is self-consciously so, cultural materialism is interventionist as well as descriptive" (2001: p.55).

Raymond Williams's cultural materialism carved the path of Cultural Studies. Cultural studies can best be defined as "the particular kind of 'Marxism'

associated with the work of Raymond Williams” (Milner 2002: p.2). Tony Bennett clarifies that cultural studies is basically related to “the relations of culture and power” (Bennett 1998: p.53). Milner (2002) presents a more detailed clarification of cultural studies:

Its various senses have tended to cluster around four main sets of meaning: as an interdiscipline; as a political intervention into the existing disciplines; as an entirely new discipline, defined in terms of an entirely new subject matter; and finally, as a new discipline, defined in terms of a new theoretical paradigm (p.3)

Raymond Williams’s cultural materialism led to the birth of cultural studies. However, they are different disciplines from each other. What is more, Raymond Williams avoided using the term. As Milner (2002) reports, Williams preferred using the term ‘cultural sociology’. But, in the final analysis, “the project Williams pursued was recognisably still that of the Cultural Studies he had first mapped out in *The Long Revolution*” (Milner 2002: p.6).

During his career, Raymond Williams studied or created various concepts such as determination, hegemony, dualism of base and superstructure, the conditions of plausibility, dominant, residual, emergent and ideology. Williams correlated them with his theory of culture.

This correlation carved the path of cultural materialism. Depending upon his inference about traditional Marxism’s inadequacy of defining culture, Raymond Williams integrated Gramscian concept of hegemony into his literary criticism. Thus, “Williams’ enthusiastic invocation of the Gramscian concept of hegemony is offered as an apt alternative to this theoretical universe of objectification and stasis” (De Valle Alcala 2010: p.71). Williams clarifies the importance of the concept of hegemony for his theoretical framework:

It is in just this recognition of the wholeness of the process that the concept of ‘hegemony’ goes beyond ‘ideology’. What is decisive is not only the conscious system of ideas and beliefs, but the whole lived social process as practically organized by specific and dominant meanings and values (1977: p.109)

Within this context, Drakakis (2001) remarks that a whole sense of cultural analysis is not only required for a comprehensive literary criticism, it also serves lower classes for their political struggle against the ideas of dominant

rule. To Drakakis (2001), as a way of dealing with this problem, Williams adapted the concept of Gramscian hegemony to his own intellectual world.

With the integration Gramscian hegemony to his literary criticism, Williams “suggested an effective penetration of class rule and a specific distribution of power throughout the social tissue” (De Valle Alcala 2010: p.71) and widened his criticism scope for the possibilities of oppositional analysis.

Cultural Materialism aims at revolutionizing the social order, established by the dominant ideology. Cultural materialist analysis tries to reveal the ideology imposed by hegemonic structures of the society. Thus, it examines texts that concentrate on ‘the marginalised’ and ‘the oppositional’. Williams defines the oppositional as “someone who finds a different way to live and wants to change the society in its light” (1980: p.35). For Williams, the exploited has a dissident identity, and this “arises from the individual’s involvement ‘in a milieu, a subculture” (Drakakis 2001: p.56). Raymond Williams was conscious of the textual and practical potential of culture for oppositional cultural analysis. Therefore, he proposed a new way of analysis: Dissident reading.

In *Marxism and Literature* (1977), Raymond Williams presents how dominant socio- political apparatuses establish their reign and preserve it. Under the heading of “Dominant, Residual, and Emergent”, the dominancy mechanism is elaborately explained in light of social reactions about both submission to the system or resistance against it. According to Drakakis (2001):

His formulation of the synchronic structure of culture involving a tripartite tension between ‘dominant’, ‘residual’ and ‘emergent’ forces, where past and new practices and meanings are incorporated into the dominant values and practices of the present, reinforces a sense of the present as a site of potential contest particularly at those junctures where the process of incorporation is incomplete or breaks down (p.52)

Actually, Williams’s main ideas on the hegemonic model of cultures lie in the chapter title. To Williams, There are dominant, residual, and emergent layers within social groups. For De Valle Alcala (2010), This hegemonic model Williams offers a taxonomic contribution. According to this taxonomy, culture emerges with dominant, residual and emergent directions and these phenomena are separated from each other. That is, dominant, residual and emergent culture

structures have their own conceptual ideas and members in order to shape the total structure of the hegemony.

According to Williams (1977), the dominant culture mainly relates to the dominant political ideology. Like ideological notions incepted within society, ideas of the dominant culture subsist on within the social life in a natural way. Their existence is reacted normally, and they cannot be made out easily. For instance, coke consumption for refreshment is a common cultural practice almost in every corner of the world. People have it daily with meals or alone and never question the socio-economic background of drinking this acidic and carcinogenic liquid material. Since, drinking coke has been ideologically imposed by the hegemonic structure with its apparatuses into the lives of people.

The Coke no longer belong to a company, it is now a part of daily life. It is valid in the consumer's dominant culture. These cultural notions clearly reveal through practices and ideas and require no logical and ideological explanation.

Williams (1977) presents a wider description for 'Residual':

What I mean by the 'residual' is very different. The residual, by definition, has been effectively formed in the past, but is still active in the cultural process, not only and often not at all as an element of the past, but as an effective element of the present. Thus certain experiences, meanings, and values which cannot be expressed or substantially verified in terms of the dominant culture, are nevertheless lived and practised on the basis of the residue – cultural as well as social – of some previous social and cultural institution or formation (p.122)

To Williams, Residual means the intellectual remnants of past cultural forms and practices over contemporary societies. They consciously or unconsciously inherit from past cultures to the modern ones. According to Williams, peasantry, organised religion and monarchy are remarkable examples of culture's residual form.

For instance, "organized religion, for one, expresses an evidently residual dimension of advanced bourgeois culture, inherited from a past social formation and yet accommodated within dominant structures" (Williams 1977: p.123). Emergent is clearly explained within another part. Williams defines emergent as the new cultural forms and practices that are produced perpetually in a society

by groups and cultural structures. In that respect, a “new class is always a source of emergent cultural practice, but while it is still, as a class, relatively subordinate, this is always likely to be uneven and is certain to be incomplete” (Williams 1977: p.124). Emergent ideas may be dominant; however they may also be oppositional. Oppositional emergent ideas are performed towards the dominant culture and are naturally to be confrontational. According to Sinfield (1992):

Conflict and contradiction stem from the very strategies through which ideologies strive to contain the expectations that they need to generate. This is where failure—inability or refusal—to identify one’s interests with the dominant may occur, and hence where dissidence may arise. In this argument the dominant and subordinate are structurally linked (p.41)

Sinfield (1992) asserts that the dominant culture of any society does not have a homogeneous structure. It has a layered structure. For example, the dominant class of Victorian England might reflect both aristocratic and bourgeois inclinations.

However, in the final analysis, both of the hegemonic structures acted as the constituents of the dominant culture of Victorian England. In addition to this, Subcultures are not always in a clear conflict with this. They may live harmoniously with hegemonic structures. Within this context, it is also cultural materialism’s duty to invoke these sleeping structures.

The last theoretical notion created by Williams is ‘structure of feeling’. In *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (1985), Williams refers to the notion that:

is strongly felt from the beginning, in the way that important actual relationships are felt, but also it is a structure and this, I believe, is a particular kind of response to the real shape of a social order: not so much as it can be documented—though it ought never, I think, to contradict the documentation—but as it is in some integrated way apprehended, without any prior separation of private and public or individual and social experience (p.264)

Structure of feeling, as a part of Williams’s terminology, “both a practical experience and a theoretical tool” (Eldridge and Eldridge 2005: p.112). This notion was dominant throughout Williams’s all writing history.

According to De Valle Alcala (2010), This practice and notion aims at producing This practice and notion is intended to be an additive and experiential production of the restructuring of meanings and values experienced as a specific historical reality. To Eldridge and Eldridge (2005)

Applying this concept to cultural theory, Williams argues that 'structure of feeling' is a way of defining forms and conventions in art and literature as inalienable elements of a social material process: not by derivation from other social forms and pre-forms, but as social formation of a specific kind (p.112)

With the help of this theoretical notion, Williams put literary developments into their historically and socially changing context. Moreover, this concept helped Williams in diminishing the dominancy of rigid determinism, and replacing it with "interrelationship, itself implicit to the concept of structure of feeling" (Eldridge and Eldridge 2005: p.113)

2. FROM NEOLIBERALISM TO NEW IMPERIALISM

2.1 Carving out a Path for War: *Stuff Happens*

David Hare wrote *Stuff Happens* (2004) in days coinciding with the first anniversary of military intervention to Iraq, accomplished by the coalition forces organised by The US and United Kingdom. *Stuff Happens* focuses on George Bush Cabinet's carving out a tolerable path to initiate occupation. Furthermore, the play depicts the first days of war. Concentrating on a currently occurring event with a critical eye, Hare reveals a panorama of dialectical relationships between rapacious expansion need for free market capitalism and military occupation practises of neoliberal ruling class world, which have the capability of costing lives of thousands. Formed by two acts and twenty four parts, the play stitched together fact and fiction. Hare (2004) declares this aspect of the play:

Stuff Happens is a history play, which happens to centre on very recent history. The events within it have been authenticated from multiple sources, both private and public. What happened happened. Nothing in the narrative is knowingly untrue. Scenes of direct address quote people verbatim. When the doors close on the world's leaders and on their entourages, then I have used my imagination. This is surely a play, not a documentary, and driven, I hope, by its themes as much as by its characters and story (p.VI).

Applying verbatim theatre technique, Hare uses public speeches of politicians to create dialogues. Additionally, he uses his imagination for the discussions made behind the closed doors. For instance, the first verbatim quotation of the play is the name of play. A month after the US leading coalition forces embarked on Iraq in order to overthrow Saddam Hussein, Donald Rumsfeld, The Defence Secretary of Bush administration, gave a historical answer to a question of a reporter:

Think what's happened in our cities when we've had riots, and problems, and looting. Stuff happens!... And it's untidy, and freedom's untidy and free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things. They're also free to live their lives and do

wonderful things, and that's what's going to happen here (Loughlin 2003)

In this way, 'Stuff Happens' was first mentioned by Donald Rumsfeld on a looting occurred in Iraq. The play begins with this verbatim. Thus, Hare prepares his audience for a play depicting an administration without hesitation for applying the cruellest neoliberal agenda, "where thousands of deaths are explained away with one damning phrase: 'Stuff Happens'" (Hamilton 2007: p.13).

In act one scene three, an actor steps forward and speaks directly to the audience:

An Actor: So where to begin? To take the story back- April 25th 1975, the unforgettable event: the fall of Saigon. For the first time there are limits to American power (Hare 2004: p.4)

Hare opens a discussion on the historical background of the US hegemony. And, he turns the date back to 1975. This date is not accidentally chosen by David Hare. Since, the mid-seventies were the years the market crisis appeared in addition to the American defeat in Vietnam. As The Actor states, The US understood the limits of her power; however, the real and sensational change was not about military power. The history of neoliberalization of capitalist societies goes back to the mid-seventies. As Harvey (2007) points out, neoliberal theory earned respectability in the academic circles with Hayek's Nobel Prize in economics and Friedman's winning same award in 1976. The former hegemonic model, Keynesian form of capitalism was no longer processing. In accordance with Raymond Williams's (1977) words stating that every hegemonic process must be alert and responsive, especially to alternatives, the US leading capitalist bloc was creating a new kind of hegemonic paradigm called as neoliberalism. Hare mentions this new hegemonic mind with Paul Wolfowitz's fictional words: "I focus on geo-strategic issues. I consider myself conceptual. I am willing to re-examine entire precepts of U.S. foreign policy" (Hare 2004). Wolfowitz is the new millennium representor of the neoliberalization history, and as he says, the neoconservative administration has the intention of changing the balance between consent and coercion. A new phase of neoliberalization is about to begin.

After George W. Bush Cabinet members, including Paul Wolfowitz, Colin Powell, the British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld, makes their debuts:

Blair: I particularly resent the assumption that if you find Neanderthal elements in the Labour party; you have found the real party (Hare 2004: p.7)

Blair's words during his first appearance on the stage are verbatim. Conveying this verbatim quotation into the scene, Hare wants to remark the great policy change of the Labour Party after Tony Blair's leadership.

As it is widely known, Britain has experienced a sharp neoliberalization process since Margaret Thatcher's inauguration in 1979. During Thatcher Administration, the British society experienced a deep and entire change from top to bottom. Steger and Roy (2010) summarize the principal applications of Thatcherism:

Thatcher unleashed a comprehensive set of neoliberal reforms aimed at reducing taxes, liberalizing exchange rate controls, reducing regulations, privatizing national industries, and drastically diminishing the power of labour unions (p.41)

A rapid integration of Neoliberalism into the government policies and institutions was the main aim of Thatcherism. Since, Thatcher was rigorously opposed to the post-war welfare state structure. Thatcherite mentality considered Keynesian social expenses as the major motivation for the economic decline. Thus, Thatcher administration carried out the required operations for neoliberalization. As society changed, the Labour Party was inevitably affected by the winds of change. Eventually, Tony Blair applied a drastic neoliberal change on the Labour Party policies with his Third Way doctrine. Blair's doctrine intended to develop a "centre-left principle of strengthening social solidarity without dropping the neoliberal ideal of market-oriented entrepreneurship" (Steger and Roy 2010: p.51). Hare consciously quotes Blair's words in this scene in order to highlight the fact that the Labour Party is no longer a working class oriented organisation. Harvey (Harvey) states that the Labour Party once refused to send troops to Vietnam, thus saving the country from direct internal trauma by not engaging in a war that was not in the best interest of the people. However, the New Labour tended to reject this legacy and

participate in the Iraqi attack. Blair's Labour shall do anything to be the party of government, since Tony Blair "did not join the Labour Party to join a party of protest" (Hare 2004: p.8). Towards the end of third scene, George W. Bush makes his first appearance and steps forward with seven central characters. Bush's first dialogue is verbatim:

Bush: My faith frees me. Frees me to put the problem of the moment in proper perspective. Frees me to make decisions which others might not like. Frees me to enjoy life and not worry about what comes next (Hare 2004: pp.8-9)

It is directly quoted by Hare from George Walker Bush' book *A Charge to Keep: My Journey to the White House* (2001). Hare chooses Bush's religion-oriented words for his debut. Hare continues to quote Bush's own words:

Bush: I feel like God wants me to run for president. I can't explain it but I sense my country is going to need me. Something is going to happen and at that time my country is going to need me. I know it won't be easy, on me or on my family, but God wants me to do it (Hare 2004: p.9)

This monologue is also a verbatim. This is from a public interview between George W. Bush and James Robinson, an American Evangelist journalist in 1999. Bush's debut words chosen by Hare to be staged serves to underline the fact that Bush clearly believed that his presidency occurred according to "a divine plan which supersedes all human plans" (Hare 2004: p.9). No matter how Bush believes in divine intervention to the US politics, his presidency actually depends on an ideology: Neoconservatism. Quoting Bush's public words verbatim, David Hare specifically underlines the neoconservatist ideological stance of his administration. Since, the US Neoconservatism applied policies consistent with neoliberal ones. As Harvey (2007) identifies:

US neoconservatives favour corporate power, private enterprise, and the restoration of class power. Neo-conservatism is therefore entirely consistent with the neoliberal agenda of elite governance, mistrust of democracy, and the maintenance of market freedoms (p.82)

In the first three acts, Hare prepares his audience for a play which criticizes political applications and military interventions of a neoconservatist Bush administration, whose motive was to establish free trade and market system, corporate power and total surveillance in consistent with neoliberalism. For this

purpose, As Steger and Roy (2010) states the neoconservatives endorse the ambitious and widespread use of seemingly both economic and military power in order to promote freedom, free markets and democracy. Depending on “socio-political critique of the power structures governing their environment” (Oliva 1988: p.10), David Hare gives an introduction to his main dramatic discussion and presents his main characters.

The fourth scene begins with Bush Administration’s the first meeting at the National Security Council on January 30th 2001, ten days after Bush’s inauguration ceremony. Bush is at a meeting with a group of cabinet members and a rank of generals, including Powell, Cheney, Rumsfeld and Rice. The director of CIA, George Tenet debuts by joining them at the meeting. Bush takes the first turn and his major topic revolves around the last political situation in the Middle East.

The session starts with Israeli–Palestinian conflict; However, Bush deliberately broaches the subject to Iraq and Saddam Hussein. The CIA director Tenet unfurls a big aerial visual onto the meeting table. Every participant on the stage is crowded around the photograph. That low resolution photo is from Iraq, and shows a kind of production plant with a railroad and some trucks. According to Tenet: “This might well be a plant which produces either chemical or biological materials for weapons manufacture” (Hare 2004: p.13). Bush seems content with Tenet’s findings; but the others nonetheless cannot find the evidences persuasive. Powell and Rumsfeld clearly state their ideas on the photo. Bush closes the fourth scene by saying: “We need to know more about hits. We need to know more about the weapons” (Hare 2004: p.13).

David Hare reserves the fifth scene for an angry journalist, seemingly European. The journalist performs a long monologue throughout the act. It is understood from his words that Iraqi has been invaded by the US and her collaborators for more than there years old. Thus, “a country groaning under a dictator, its people oppressed, liberated at last from a twenty-five year tyranny - and freed” (Hare 2004: p 14). However, he is dissatisfied with the freedom Iraqi people gained after the occupation. In this respect, David Harvey (2007) asserts that Bush administration regarded the idea of free Iraqis as justification for the occupation. Yet, the US and coalition forces did not have a well-established

plan for their future. It is ambiguous that “to what destination, then, are the Iraqi people expected to ride the horse of freedom donated to them by force of arms?” (2007: p.6).

It is clear that Hare agrees with Harvey’s ideas, and discusses the neoliberal form of freedom on the stage. In his book *The New Imperialism* (2003a), Harvey clarifies the relationship between the concept of freedom and the US Foreign Policy:

In foreign affairs, the US presented itself as chief defender of freedom (understood in terms of free markets) and of the rights of private property. The US provided economic and military protection for propertied classes or political/military elites wherever they happened to be. In return these propertied classes and elites typically centred a pro-American politics in whatever country they happened to be. This implied military, political, and economic containment of the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union (pp.51-52)

As Harvey explains, freedom matters if it is used on behalf of neoliberalization processes. To Harvey (2007), there are good freedoms and bad freedoms from the standpoint of neoliberalism. Depending upon Karl Polanyi’s view stating that “no society is possible in which power and compulsion are absent, nor a world in which force has no function” (1957: p.67); Harvey claims that liberal or neoliberal utopias eventually ends with violence and authoritarianism. Referring to Bush’s public speech, “as the greatest power on earth we [the US] have an obligation to help the spread of freedom” (Bush 2004); Harvey recognizes the ideas of Polanyi. In this context, it is clear that the only way to sustain a neoliberal order is to use military power, and it is a matter of discussion on the stage for the fifth scene.

Usage of military power is inevitable in the neoliberal order; however, the main discussion is whether militaristic option will be used in public consent or coercion. David Hare gives a prelude to this issue in the seventh scene. In the beginning of the scene, Bush reads a story to children in a kindergarten. Then, an actor steps forward and informs audience about the 9/11 attacks with its details. Surrounded with little children, Bush hears an aide and makes a statement:

Bush: Make no mistake. The United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts. Freedom itself was attacked

this morning by a faceless coward. And freedom will be defended
(Hare 2004: p.16)

Using little children during 9/11 attacks, Hare makes a symbolic choice of setting. Since, children symbolize the future and the freedom, and protection of all these concepts worth doing anything in any culture, especially in the American social culture. Militaristic options are always tragic and deciding to use deadly weapons for political issues requires convincing reasons. As Harvey (2007) stresses, Neoliberalism could also find a military way to impose its principles, such as with the IMF's operations in Mozambique, as in financial or in Chile. David Harvey also (2003b) states, neoliberalism not only applies an economic programme, it also seeks the ideological way for making market system hegemonic. As mentioned before, neoliberalization may prefer to integrate its principles and actions into any social mechanism with consent, not primarily with coercion. Whether or not neoliberalism will enter through consent production or military intervention may depend on the social structure, economic situation and military power of the country in which it wants to operate

Stressing an unspoken dimension of Gramsci's concept of hegemony, Dylan Riley argues that Gramsci's concept discusses "a deep appreciation for the importance of liberal political institutions" (2011: p.2). In accordance with this context, Gramsci (1971) underlines the fact that establishing a social order requires a manufacture of consent, not coercion. On 9/11 attacks, Hare asserts:

When in September 2001 Al-Qaeda flew planes into the World Trade Center, I rang Howard Brenton to say, 'Look what they're doing. They're tearing a hole in the fabric. They want capitalism never to look the same again.' (Hare 2015: p.170)

Hare integrates the 9/11 terror attacks into his play, since he knows something terrible deeper thing was happening beyond the ashes and screams. In this respect, David Harvey (2003a) mentions the ideological background of Iraqi Occupation corresponding with 9/11 attacks. To him, a neoconservative group, including Paul Wolfowitz, Donal Rumsfeld or Richard Perle who were in the centre of Bush administration's cabinet of foreign policy and defence, had already decided to organize a military operation towards Iraq since 1997. It was a geostrategic priority for them. Eventually, the 9/11 attacks provided US-based

coalition forces the opportunity to establish a link between Saddam and Al Qaeda. Hare recognizes that these terrible attacks might lead more terrible, and definitely militaristic, interventions all around the world, and he uses this concept in his play in order to stress the real aim of Iraq occupation. The sixth scene ends with the declaration of public consent to Iraq operation: “Le Monde: ‘We are all Americans now’” (Hare 2004: p.17).

The seventh scene begins with the war cabinet of Bush Administration at Camp David. The dialogues behind the closed doors belong to Hare’s imagination. Bush opens the meeting with a prayer, and the first thing they speak is the situation of the New York Stock Exchange. After 2,948 people of 91 different nationalities die in a horrifying terrorist attack, Hare presents an implication to his audience that the cabinet’s first issue to discuss is free accumulation of capital and safety of the market, not bereaved families of social policies towards 9/11 orphans. As the seventh scene progresses, Paul Wolfowitz insists on taking out Saddam and blowing a fresh air to the Middle East. To Wolfowitz, occupying Iraq “is something we can do with very little effort. For a minimum expenditure of effort, we can get maximum result” (Hare 2004: p.20). Wolfowitz seems to be talking about an all-round economic investment.

However, what he actually talks about is the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. This capitalist materialism and inhumanity is prevalent throughout the meeting.

Somewhere in the meeting, Wolfowitz also claims that Saddam Hussein might be responsible for the attack on the World Trade Center. Yet, naturally he has no concrete evidence. And, it is clear that “Hare brings it into the conversation in order to illustrate its absurdity” (Hamilton 2007: p.22). Wolfowitz voices his claim that Saddam might be involved in the 9/11 attacks for the first time in the play.

The eighth scene starts with the Labour Party Congress, Blair addresses the party members “with a vaunting promise to remake the world as a better place” (White 2001). Hare quotes Blair’s a part of speech verbatim. Referring internal disorders within Africa, Afghanistan and Palestine, Blair says that “the pieces are in flux. Soon they will settle again. Before they, let us reorder this world

around us” (Hare 2004: p.27). The reason for Hare's quotation of Tony Blair's speech is that the audience once again acknowledges the neoliberal change in the Labour Party.

As stated earlier, neoliberalism succeeded in influencing almost all social units of advanced capitalist world including democratic left organisations. The Labour Party of Britain, which was always defender of working class and interventionist state, and the Democratic Party of the US, the creator of Keynesian New Deal Policies, were manipulated by neoliberalism's major principles that were historically opposed by the centre-left.

For Nikolas Rose (2000), when Tony Blair became the leader of the Labour Party, his administration began applying a new program, the Third Way, which “is a certain way of visualizing political problems, a rationality for rendering them thinkable and manageable, and a set of moral principles” (p.1). Since the end of 19th century, it had been discussed in Britain whether individualism could replace with traditional collectivist economic programs. Tony Blair and intellectuals of the New Labour contributed to these debates, arguing that “New Labour stood for social advancement through individual achievement” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.50). While the New Labour crew gave importance to individualization, it needed to emphasize the old solidarity and collectivist structure of the Labour Party of the UK.

The wholesale rejection of the past would not have been so wise at that stage, since much of the society still relied on the socialist policies of the Labour Party.

In this scene David Hare emphasizes that the once revolutionary and collectivist British Labour Party had undergone a neoliberal transformation and abandoned the principles of egalitarianism and anti-imperialism, the traditional values of the left. In this respect, the British Labour Party leader, who is normally expected to curse the US interventions in Afghanistan or Iraq, defines these interventions as opportunities with an exploitative point of view and even, suggests that his country must be involved in the capitalist exploitation processes. Hare continues to stage the Labour Party politics in the ninth scene. Hare reserves the entire scene for a fictional Labour Party member who is

clearly supports Blair's approaches. She understands the dynamics of the US; the neoconservatist movement is already open to imperialist interventions towards different points of the world. However, she seems not to acknowledge the fact that how the Labour Party collaborates with such an insane intervention. She complains about the neoliberal transformation of the party and informs audience about the problems within the party.

To her, this is the most controversial issue since whose first years. "Colleague no longer speaks to colleague. Lifelong friendships have been tested, tested again, and finally destroyed" (Hare 2004: p.31). She is content with Saddam's removal; however, she claims that the people in the party and the community are still in doubt about why Britain is involved in the Iraq War. The character is in a serious confusion, and it cannot make sense that the consequences of an action made for the sake of friendliness and liberation are so catastrophic. David Hare talks about the trauma experienced by British society over this character. The main reason for this traumatic situation is not only that Britain is taking part in this meaningless war, but the weakening of social ties and the increasingly dominant conception of a capitalist individualism. This troubled situation in society is the result of a historical neoliberalization process.

In the tenth scene, Hare fictionalise the details of Iraq intervention with a long dialogue between Bush and Blair. Blair mentions Bush about criticism of the British society and his party on the intervention to Iraq. Hare opens the tenth scene with George W. Bush's State of the Union address:

Bush: Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility towards America and to support terror. States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. All nations should know: America will do whatever is necessary to ensure our nation's security. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer (Hare 2004: pp.32-33)

After the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration attempted to protect the US from possible terrorist attacks and to protect the free world, which they claim to have led the United States around the world. As Robert Jervis (2003) states, this initiative is called the Bush Doctrine, whose basic inclination was a preventive war on Terrorism. Iraq occupation is the peak of this doctrine. Since, the

Saddam Hussein regime possess chemical or nuclear weapons could not be proven even after his removal. There is no confirmed evidence except some controversial intelligence information. For this reason, the Iraqi attack was carried out in order to prevent possible future attacks; and this situation has been spoken out of the most competent administrators. On the other hand, this preventive war concept has been subjected to serious criticism on account of the fact that the preventive war on terror concept is actually used “in order to justify the creation of a pseudo-fascist state, in which the administration can do anything” (Hamilton 2007: p.23).

In the play, David Hare clearly points out that this concept is not a preventive intervention but rather a tool that leads to human rights violations and is a means by which sovereign powers can build hegemony. Hare places sections showing oppositional reactions into his play to reinforce his point of view. In a Blair-Bush dialogue in the later part of the tenth scene, Blair speaks of an oppositional structure in his own party. He warns Bush about a hundred and thirty Labour MPs have signed an early motion, special session request done by members of the UK parliament for special issues. To Blair it is a deep unease, since “They're expressing their opposition to British support for a US-led war on Iraq” (Hare 2004: p.37). Blair seeks a way to suppress these criticisms and the rapidly growing opposition towards his administration. In addition to fighting the Conservative party, which is one of the most powerful historical competitors, The Blair administration had to deal with the intra-party opposition, which was disturbed by the neoliberal transformation they had made in the Labour Party.

Blair is quite aware that the Bush administration will intervene in Iraq at any cost; therefore, he wants the Iraqi intervention to take place with the decision of the United Nations. In this way, the intervention could become more legitimate. Tony Blair is also convinced that the United Nations will act on the will of the United States and Britain. Blair thinks that “The UN is an American-built institution. America built it” (Hare 2004: p.40). With this scene, David Hare wants to underline the idea that the United Nations is a tool that can be used for American interests when necessary. From this point to the end of the first act, he wants to convey this thought to the audience.

For Example, Blair argues that the West has the right to intervene in the sphere of democracy and freedoms, regimes that imposed oppressive rule in their own country. In his view, “there is such a thing as progressive war” (Hare 2004: p.41). Another example from the next scene belongs to Colin Powell’s turn. In a meeting with Bush, Powell insists on that:

It would be great to say we can invade Iraq unilaterally. Except we can't. We need access to bases, facilities. Overflight rights. For that you need allies. Not allies you buy, not allies you bribe: allies you can actually trust, because they believe in what you're doing and they're signed up to it. We need a coalition. And if that takes time, amen. And the only place to do it is at the UN. With the help of a new UN resolution (Hare 2004: p.54)

It is clear that for Powell and Blair, there is no disruption in theory when there is no visible evidence for a sovereign state. They even argued that it is clearly their right. Both of them do not care whether such military intervention is ethical or moral in terms of human rights. The only thing they care about is the reflection of such a deadly attack on their internal politics. Therefore, both characters want the intervention to take place under the coordination of the United Nations. Thus, the legal infrastructure for military intervention in Iraq will be provided. The legal ground of such a bloody intervention has also been revealed by neoliberalism, which has been the dominant ideology since the 1970s. The United Nations, which was established immediately after the World War II, has always been manipulated by the United States, which attracted the head of the capitalist bloc; principles and decisions have been directed by the dominant ideologies of the ruling classes.

As Harvey (2006) points out; a couple of transnational organisations such as the IMF, the UN and the World Bank were founded in order to maintain the new order. Specifically, these institutions of capitalist bloc have key roles in manipulating world economy through liberal principles and applications. Michael Hudson (2003) clarifies the main functions of the after war organisations:

Their articles of agreement were designed to avoid a resumption of the financial problems that had plagued the interwar period, in particular monetary and fiscal protectionism, by meeting Europe’s immediate postwar reconstruction needs within the context of American self-interest (p.144)

The United Nations, operating in the direction of American interests even after the World War II, became more US-centred with the rise of neoliberalism in the seventies and the US consolidation of the leadership of the capitalist world. Due to the leadership of the transnational capitalist classes, the US-centred inclination at the United Nations was also observed simultaneously in other international organizations such as the IMF, NATO and the World Bank. For David Harvey (2003a), the ‘neoliberal’ United States of America:

The US placed itself at the head of collective security arrangements, using the United Nations and, even more importantly, military alliances such as NATO, to limit the possibility of inter-capitalist wars and to combat the influence of the Soviet Union and then China (p.53)

Hare describes *Stuff Happens* as a play “about the diplomatic process leading up to the invasion of Iraq” (2014b: p.27). In this sense, Hare underlines the fact that international organizations whose task is to provide world peace, class economic balance and equality of opportunity within all phases of daily life have been guided by the USA, the leading country of international capital, through neoliberalization. Hare brings neoliberalized institutions to the attention of the audience as a dominant cause of the invasion of Iraq. Blair and Powell succeed in convincing Bush when the first act ends. The Bush administration decides to give up on the idea of a sudden unilateral military operation and to act with a decision before the United Nations to make it a legal case. And the first act ends.

In act two scene twelve, Hare continues to stage the controversial political position of the United Nations from where he remains. When the second act begins, a Palestinian scholar appears on the stage

During his quite long monologue, the scholar refers to speculations circulating around the real cause of the occupation of Iraq in public opinion. However, “For Palestinians, it's about one thing: defending the interests of America's three-billion-dollar-a-year colony in the Middle East” (Hare 2004: p.57). With these words, it is clear that the Palestinian scholar points to Israel. However, it is noteworthy that he does not give a direct name and describes Israel through American interests and dollars. The Palestinian scholar implies that the unstable political situation, which cannot be rectified in the Middle East for decades, is stemming from the US's neo-imperialist policies.

Towards the end of the Palestinian academic's monologue, David Hare emphasizes a very important double standard that the United Nations could cause. Accordingly, the United Nations, which has been forced to make a decision to legitimize the occupation of Iraq, also ignores the decision that would force Israel to withdraw from the 1967 borders. According to Hare, the United Nations, which is seen as a useful tool of legitimizing an occupation, comes to ignore the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which has almost transformed into a festering sore. In this scene, David Hare clearly claims that the United Nations has become a capitalist exploitation tool. The current situation of the United Nations is the result of a neo-imperialist politics adorned with neoliberal ideology.

Scene twelve ends with the monologue by the Palestinian academic. Scene thirteen begins with an actor appearing on stage and addressing the audience directly. As the actor reminds, Colin Powell, who advocates intervention in Iraq through the United Nations from the beginning, has won the fight. The US will apply to the UN "for fresh weapons inspections and promising harsh penalties if Baghdad failed to cooperate" (Hare 2004: p.58). After the actor, Bush, Powell, Rice, Tenet and other members come together to start a National Security Council meeting. The main theme of the meeting is the new resolution demand to be made to the United Nations. Vice President Dick Cheney is thoughtful because he has been against this initiative from the beginning. However, Bush's decision is clear: "We put the monkey on Kofi Annan's back" (Hare 2004: p.59). The fate of the resolution will now be revealed in the halls of the United Nations. Bush proceeded with certain steps in its strategy of disseminating responsibility

In the fourteenth scene, Tony Blair meets with Sir Richard Dearlove, Head of MI6. It is clear that Blair will act in favour of the US at the United Nations session for resolution; however, Blair wants from his intelligence chief solid evidence that the Saddam regime has weapons of mass destruction. Since, Blair knows very well that a possible failure about Iraq occupation can be used against him in domestic politics. Dearlove informs Blair that they have taken an e-mail from a man claiming to be an Iraqi military commander, and that the Iraqi army has been able to attack a biological or chemical attack within 15 to

40 minutes. However, Dearlove asserts that the MI6 unit cannot verify that the electronic mail contains accurate information.

As a matter of fact, on 12th October 2004 “UK Foreign Secretary Jack Straw tells the House of Commons that the head of MI6 has withdrawn the claim” (“Timeline: The 45-minute claim” 2004). Yet, Blair welcomes this controversial finding with childlike joy. David Hare consciously depicts such an absurd scene as being taken seriously by the Blair administration. David Hare’s purpose here is to emphasize that Blair has no other option except for supporting the US. Margaret Thatcher in the UK and Ronald Reagan in the USA from the beginning of the 1980s quickly adapted their countries to neoliberalism. This economic and political partnership, which started at the beginning of the 80's, reached its peak in the 90's. The US and British economies have become increasingly common as a result of neoliberalism, which considers free market economy and free flow of capital to be the dominant principle. Because the neoliberal regime has to comply with global fiscal policies established in large capital centres, rather than determining local and national economic policies.

David Harvey (2003b) underlines that neoliberal states system requires an integration of states into an economic web in which the states will no longer able to act with national and independent fiscal policies. This system is a free market system in which neoliberal states are interdependent in many different sectors. As mentioned earlier, David Harvey (2007) stresses that The role of the neoliberal state is to establish an institutional structure in accordance with neoliberal principles. For Harvey, the neoliberal state is to make suitable bureaucratic structures for the free accumulation of the capital and to ensure the free circulation of money. In the final analysis, the neoliberal state is one of the most powerful political forms at the international level, neoliberalized in all its sides.

Therefore, as David Harvey (2007) asserts, the neoliberal state must also establish the military, defence, police and legal structures and functions necessary to secure private property rights. In addition, the Neoliberal state must establish mechanisms to ensure the proper functioning of state markets. Moreover, when considered that the Blair government's economic situation is not good and in 2007 “UK state indebtedness soared from £323bn to £617bn”

(Halligan 2014), it becomes a must. In accordance with the principle of proper functioning of markets, due to the problematic relations with the capitalist west, the Saddam regime, which was naturally outside the neoliberal system, should also be included in the international market system. The main reason for the US insistence on the invasion of Iraq is that the neoliberalization of Iraq, which is not carried out with consent, is carried out by coercion. And, David Hare will not miss it.

The fifteenth scene opens at Hotel Pierre. Colin Powell, the US Secretary of State, is meeting with Sergey Lavrov, Foreign Minister of Russia Federation, Jack Straw, Foreign Secretary of the Great Britain and Dominique de Villepin, Foreign Minister of France. The issue is the resolution demands for military intervene in Iraq, which is planned to be discussed at the United Nations. Powell asks for support from the participant authorities, yet it will not be easy to convince them. During the conversation, De Villepin took a critical stance against the US foreign policy moves in recent years:

De Villepin: You see in the last two years, since Mr. Bush came to power, there have been - what would you call them? - Signs - indicators –

Powell: Yes, I know.

De Villepin: What are they? Straws in the wind? Gestures - like the repudiation of the Kyoto protocol on the environment, withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, rejection of the comprehensive Test Ban treaty, repudiation of the protocol to the Biological Weapons Convention, refusal to recognize or take part in the International Criminal Court - presumably so that your Mr Kissinger can continue climbing onto aeroplanes without fear of arrest ...

Powell: Yes, I know.

De Villepin: Call us over-sensitive, but some of us find it hard to believe you're now getting wholeheartedly behind the idea of international law (Hare 2004: p.69)

David Hare criticizes the United States for remembering when it comes to international law

This is brought to the attention of the spectator by the French foreign minister. In neoliberalism, international law, like international institutions, politics or political parties, is subject to neoliberalization. Globalization, the greatest invention of neoliberalism, enables this process to take place and control

throughout the world. Globalization of the market requires development of special institutions. In accordance with this purpose, “Important state functions and powers are being shifted to other scales, both supranational and sub-national” (Purcell 2008: p.11) during the construction phase of neoliberal states. The UN, NAFTA, The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank are always the strong examples of transnational institutions that have special roles in globalization. Harvey (2007) states that these organizations have become centres of free-market fundamentalism and an ideology for the spread of neoliberal orthodoxy. These organizations are transformed into important institutions that provide ideas, personnel and capital for the implementation of the neoliberal ideology.

For Harvey (2003a), the Bush administration equates liberty with free trade and tries to impose this idea through consent. The US wills to use its military strength when it cannot globalize the neoliberal ideology in good faith. This is the moment when the Bush administration introduced new imperialism. The new imperialism, in the name of universal prosperity and development, implements institutional arrangements. These arrangements can be through political pressure or military intervention. The fifteenth scene ends with strict diplomatic controversy between the French representative De Villepin and Colin Powell. The French representative argues that there should be two separate resolutions, not one in the United Nations. According to De Villepin, the first resolution is for disarmament; and the second one - if necessary - for the attack. Powell is very frustrated with this suggestion and ends the scene with his threatening words: “I warn you now, don't vote for the first unless one day you're going to be ready to vote for a second. We'd take that very badly” (Hare 2004: p.76).

Scene sixteen begins with the Iraqi sessions in the American Senate and the British Parliament. Among the representatives of both chambers there are various voices about Iraq. However, the most interesting words belong to the representative of the British Parliament whose last name is Simpson:

Simpson: Bush will hit Iraq much the same way that a drunk will hit a bottle - to satisfy his thirst for power and oil. I must tell the Prime Minister that the role

of a friend in such circumstances is not to pass the drunk the bottle (Hare 2004: p.77)

According to the UK Parliament official website, this speech belongs to Alan Simpson, Member of Parliament for Nottingham. This speech made during the negotiations on September 24, 2002 is quoted verbatim by David Hare. This quotation is important because it emphasizes another important reason for the occupation of Iraq. The only reason for the invasion of Iraq was not to integrate Iraq into the neoliberal system, of course. The other important reason was to establish an absolute sovereignty over the oil reserves by military means. Since the set of the free market principles in neoliberalism is the biggest determinant, the power of transnational corporations is very high.

In neoliberalism, transnational corporations and state apparatus are almost identical. While the profit targets of the companies become the growth pins of the countries, all kinds of military operational power of the state can be mobilized for companies to search for new markets. The search for new markets and the globalization of neoliberalism can be the cause of new wars. The usurpation of underground resources such as oil reserve, technological innovation centres or deterioration of lands remains at the side of neoliberal states as “war calamities” (Harvey 2007: p.37). To Harvey (2007), the case of Halliburton is the most obvious crime that the neoliberal state is committed to. David Hare clearly agrees with Harvey, thus he reserves one of the most vital parts of the play for alleged involvement with Vice-president Dick Cheney's Halliburton, a transnational oil company:

Cheney: Since I left Halliburton to become George Bush's vice-president, I've severed all my ties with the company, gotten rid of my financial interest. I have no financial interest in Halliburton of any kind and haven't had, now, for over three years.

An Actor: In fact, Cheney is still receiving deferred compensation and owns more than 433,000 stock options. Those options were worth \$241,498. They are now worth \$8 million. Halliburton has 10 billion dollars-worth of no-bid contracts in Iraq (Hare 2004: pp.116-17)

Vice-president Dick Cheney at first rejects the claims. However, Harvey (2003a) informs that “Halliburton, Vice-President Cheney’s old company, stands to gain nearly a billion dollars in contracts for oil services in the immediate aftermath of the war” (p.18).

David Hare integrates Cheney's a part of the quote from a TV program in 2003 into the play. Hare discloses the lie that Cheney publicly expresses in public, in the form of a public announcement of an actor. Apparently, Hare would prefer to “speak the truth in public is thus directly responsive to politicians’ inability or unwillingness to do the same” (Megson and Rebellato 2007: p.240). Since, Hare believes that neoliberalism corrupts almost every institution and makes it work only for capitalist purposes, and corrupts people for the same purpose. In the final analysis, Hare describes Cheney as a politician carrying on for the concerns of the corrupted capitalist ruling class through neoliberalization. Hare makes this depiction through a shameful lie that has been said in front of millions. However, the lies that will reveal are not limited to that of Cheney.

The scene 17 depicts the efforts of the United States to suppress the United Nations on the legitimization of the Iraq attack. The road to the end is shortening. Everything is in the way except a few procedural obstacles. In the 18th scene ‘a Brit in New York’ appears on the stage. The Brit is quite astonished at the sharp psychological change in US society in recent years, especially after 9/11 attacks. For the Brit, “the language of childish entitlement becomes the lethal rhetoric of global wealth and privilege” (Hare 2004: p.92). For example, he cannot develop empathy to that the president of the United States could say ‘I feel good’ after an attack on hundreds of thousands of people, or the seller in the street can say ‘Is not it great?’ after a similar attack. As he writes in *Blue Touch Paper* (2015), once upon a time in New York, “the talk had once been of civil rights, of Vietnam and of revolution. These days, to judge from what I was overhearing, it seemed to be exclusively about yourself” (p.240). Hare is quite aware that the US society has gone through a serious psychological change.

This psychological change, which has become a paranoid logic, is not only a result of 9/11 attacks. The greatest cause of this psychological state is the neoliberal ideology that has been imposed on the whole world, especially the media organs, for nearly forty years. If the issue is about neoliberal upper classes, media tyrants provide support in all circumstances. On Iraq occupation, for example, “all 175 newspapers owned by Murdoch world-wide, staffed by

editors supposedly chosen for their independence, unanimously proclaimed war was a good thing”(Harvey 2003a: p.12).

In accordance with neoliberal ideology; individual freedom against solidarity, freedom of the free market against freedom of thought, and rights of the privileged in response to the rights of the oppressed have been presented as norms all over the world. US society eventually changed, for Hare, “It got much stupider” (2004: p.93). In scene twenty and twenty one, the audience witnesses the Bush administration having resolutions demanded by the United Nations. During this process, Hare skilfully dramatizes the US administration's interpretation of international law rules in its favour. Attacking Iraq is now the legal right of the neoliberal world. Scene twenty two and twenty three are the phases of confessions. Hare uncovers the lies on Iraq occupation within these scenes. Hare allocates the first turn to Donald Rumsfeld:

An Actor: In May 2003, Paul Wolfowitz admits weapons of mass destruction had originally been chosen only for what he terms ‘bureaucratic reasons’:

Wolfowitz: the Bush administration focused on alleged weapons of mass destruction as the primary justification for toppling Saddam Hussein by force because it was politically convenient, because it was the one reason everyone could agree on (Hare 2004: pp.114-15)

Hare adds the most important part of the interview given by Wolfowitz to the *Vanity Fair* magazine. Wolfowitz's words, of course, are not secrets, they are public words. The reason for the confession here is that the most ardent advocate of the Saddam regime's weapons of mass destruction has refuted itself. Right after Wolfowitz, Hare dramatizes Dick Cheney’s confession:

Interviewer: Vice-President, this time last year, you claimed Saddam Hussein was developing nuclear-capability.

Cheney: Yeah, I did misspeak. We never had any evidence that Hussein had acquired a nuclear weapon (Hare 2004: p.115)

Hare quotes Cheney's confession from a public speech . Vice President Dick Cheney confesses that they have not found evidence that the Saddam Hussein regime is nuclear weapon-possessed. Another confession belongs to Colin Powell: “We were wrong” (Hare 2004: p.117). David Hare, one by one, uncover the lies of the Bush Cabinet and present it to the audience’ discretion. What Hare wants to emphasize is that even the most absurd lies of neoliberal

ideological propaganda can be seen as truth for the sake of neoliberal hegemony. To Hare, Neoliberal hegemony can legitimize even the most terrible lies for the sake of neoliberalization.

Constructing a neoliberal state means establishing a hegemonic structure. For Couldry, “neoliberalism, in short, is a hegemonic rationality” (2010: p.6). Couldry’s standpoint stresses the fact that neoliberalism can easily be understood within the terminology of Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony. In the final analysis, neoliberalism is an ideology, and it creates a hegemonic atmosphere to be broken by proletariat with an alternative hegemony, as Gramsci (1971) asserts. According to Mark Purcell, “Conceived of in Gramscian terms, as a hegemonic project, neoliberalization is always only imperfectly realized” (2008: p.15). In this sense, Couldry’s assertion rates a mention that neoliberalism reduces world historical forces into a market system, “blocking other narratives from view” (2010: p.6).

Neoliberal hegemony can be established with consent or by coercion according to circumstances. The occupation of the USA by Iraq naturally took place with military methods; however, the transnational upper classes, which had to establish neoliberalism for capitalist exploitation, had to lie to the lower classes in their own countries. Therefore, they have created an intense propaganda storm with the state and private sector apparatuses that had already been neoliberalized. The media, controlled by transnational monopolies, paved the way for these propaganda activities. As Harvey (2003a) underlines, Afghanistan and other troubled lands today are screaming to be enlightened by a foreign administration and Niall Ferguson clearly states that “the US must stiffen its resolve, shell out the money, and make the transition from informal to formal empire” (p.4). As a result of this propaganda, As Hare stresses the fact that “in 2005, forty-seven per cent of the American electorate still believe that Saddam Hussein was directly involved in the planning of the 9/11 attacks” (Hare 2004: p.119). In the last scene, Hare allocates the last turn to an oppressed. An Iraqi exile appears on the stage:

Iraqi Exile: My family left Iraq 17 years ago. I longed for the fall of the dictator. In exile, I worked for it. Then Donald Rumsfeld said “Stuff happens.” It seems to me the most racist remark I ever heard.

A vacuum was created. Was it created deliberately? I cannot comprehend. They came to save us, but they had no plans.

And now the American dead are counted, their numbers recorded, their coffins draped in flags. How many Iraqis have died? How many civilians? No figure is given. Our dead are uncounted (Hare 2004: pp.119-20)

As David Hare ends the play, he wants the audience remember an Iraqi exile after the play. The Iraqi exile is the dissident of the Saddam regime, and has worked to overthrow it in the course of time. However, the exile implies that a transnational tyranny has arrived instead of a local assault. The suffering of Iraq continues to increase. David Hare tells us that imperialism has been resurrected for the sake of new economic moves at a time when Neoliberalism has completed its ascension period and has begun to crumble, leaving new pains to the Middle East under the name of new-imperialism.

2.2 Neoliberal Trauma in the Post 9/11 World: *The Vertical Hour*

The Vertical Hour (2008b) received its world premiere at the Music Box Theatre on Broadway, on November 30, 2006. Within the direction of Sam Mendes, “it starred Julianne Moore, best known for her work as a Hollywood actress (which includes the 2002 film *The Hours*, for which Hare wrote the screenplay)” (Boon 2007a: p.1), and Bill Nighy, British Actor. *The Vertical Hour* portrays opposing ideas on the traumatic atmosphere after the Iraq War of 2003 by depicting psychological relationships between the public and the individual. There are five characters in the play. Nadia Blye, a former journalist who experienced Bosnia and Iraq wars “finds herself in another kind of battle zone when she accompanies her boyfriend, Philip Lucas” throughout a holiday visit to Oliver Lucas, Philip’s father. Oliver Lucas “is an idealistic liberal who hides the strength of his views behind a mask of cool ironic detachment” (Boon 2007a: p.2). Terri Scholes and Dennis Dutton are students of Nadia. In the play, they represent the last generation of American youth.

The play begins with a monologue by Oliver Lucas. Standing alone in casual clothes, Oliver talks about mistakes. According to him, if you make a mistake, “you pay the price” (Hare 2008b: p.3). The audience begins to get curious about Oliver Lucas with this monologue. Hare describes Oliver in mystery from the

first scene. In the second scene, Nadia sits in her office opposite Dennis Dutton, in his early twenties. Dutton attends Nadia's international politics class. Throughout the conversation, Nadia gives feedback to Dutton about his homework. According to Nadia, Dutton's essay is insufficient. Specifically, Nadia finds Dutton's definition of 'politics' problematic. Dutton tries to clarify himself:

Dutton: I don't see it that way.

Nadia: No.

Dutton: For me, politics is about the protection of property and of liberty.

Nadia: Yes, that's what you seem to be saying in this essay.

Dutton: It is what I'm saying. It's about peoples' rights to live their own lives. It's about absolutes (Hare 2008b: p.4)

Dutton makes a definition of 'politics' from his perspective. With this definition, Hare emphasizes two key neoliberal concepts.

These concepts are neoliberal mottos that the neoconservative government led by George Walker Bush, was elected as president of the United States in 2001, emphasized in all matters. As Harvey (2003a) reports, when Bush came to power in 2001, the US and the global market were experiencing a serious recession, unemployment in the country was increasing and economic insecurity was felt in every financial area. In the midst of such an economic crisis, the new conservatives did not deviate from the valid principle of neoliberal superiority of the upper classes. However, the neoconservatives decided to apply military intervention option besides economic methods of political pressure. On behalf of the neoliberal hegemony, The Bush administration sought social control by building the legitimacy of this new imperialist and neoliberal government style, and at the same time a consensus opportunity under the framework of a coherent group of moral values.

In other words, the Bush administration intended to occupy the economically valuable regions of the world in order to be able to maintain the hegemonic domination of the upper classes in the US, and they had to produce public consent for it. The economic stagnation and the 9/11 attacks that took place in the same year fed the logic of fear that the US needed for consent production. Within this context, Steger and Roy (2010) states that:

the fear factor did not come into full play until the traumatic events of 11 September 2001, when radical forces of jihadist globalism attacked what they considered to be the 'godless' and 'materialistic' symbols of the world's most neoliberal society. By the time al-Qaeda launched its heinous attacks, the link between political violence and anti-globalization demonstrators was already so firmly anchored in the public mind that a number of commentators in the global North immediately named such 'radical elements' as the prime suspects (p.121)

The economic situation and the social psychological state after the 9/11 attacks made it easier for the society to perceive the anti-globalization protesters already referred to as radical elements as a threat to personal freedom and private property. At this point, the importance of Hare's play character Dutton's defining politics as protection and freedom of private property reveals. Since, Dutton's character and personality as a young student has been shaped by the Bush administration's neoliberal propaganda machine. In this sense, Dutton's reduction the concept of politics into private property and an individualist freedom perception is understandable. Accordingly, Nadia responds to Dutton's answer by explaining the ideologies that shape the world. However, Dutton says he does not accept the term capitalism. Nadia frowns, and asks:

Nadia: So what name do you give it then? The system we live under today? The system we call 'consumer capitalism', 'liberal democracy', characterised by political parties and -I don't know - huge corporations, massively powerful industrial and military interests? The system as evolved by the West, by Western democracies? What do you call it? (Hare 2008b)

Hare depicts Dutton as a perfect outcome of neoliberalization policies over daily life. Dutton has seriously internalized capitalism and neo-liberalism, its current form. Thus, Dutton ignores all the ideological and intellectual accumulation of human history that has taken place so far, and regards capitalism as life itself. Dutton is a good example of a neoliberal civilisation model that does not question, not think, investigate, and dispute. Since, as Steger and Roy (2010) presents, Being 'civilized' means not only positively approaching American-style democracy and free market system, but also finding American foreign policy as successful as well. In accordance with this, Dutton adds that "America wins. It always wins. You can do all that historical perspective stuff, you can say it's an empire and like any empire it's going to fall. But not yet it isn't" (Hare 2008b: p.9).

David Hare, by Dutton's words, refers to the necessity of a hegemonic power. As Dutton declares, The United States naturally always wins it indeed has to win. Since, "any hegemon, if it is to maintain its position in relation to endless capital accumulation, must endlessly seek to extend, expand, and intensify its power" (Harvey 2003a: p.35). As Gramsci (1971) claims, any hegemon is always under threat of counter-hegemony.

In the universe of neoliberal hegemony led by the United States, naturally, the US has to perform a constant economic development, market expansion and even military invasion, in order to prevent attempts to establish counter hegemony that might come from lower classes. Hare refers to this obligation in the words of Dutton.

Nadia understands that it is pointless to talk to Dutton, who insists that the US exist as an imperialist force. Dutton also said that in later parts of his dialogue with Nadia, he was in love with Nadia; Nadia gets angry and stops talking. Nonetheless, Nadia would like to advise her student of the last word:

Nadia: Maybe it's my ignorance, but I don't believe that world will be different from any other. The most important thing you can take into it is an open mind.

Dutton looks at her a moment.

Dutton: Why? Why would I want an open mind?

Nadia: Why would you not?

Dutton: Our enemies don't have open minds (Hare 2008b: p.14)

Nadia advises Dutton to be open-minded anyway. Dutton says he consciously prefers not to be open-minded, because his country's enemies are not. Hare depicts Dutton as a paranoid character, referring to his enemies, even in a simple farewell. In this scene, Hare's preference is conscious. Hare wants to emphasize the state of fear that has arisen after the 9/11 attacks of US society over Dutton. Harvey (2007) argues that Radical Islam developed as a real danger in the 90s and culminated in 9/11 attacks. This fear and anxiety in the US community continued with a permanent war against terrorism concept that demanded militarization both at home and abroad to ensure the security of the country. After the 9/11 attacks, the idea of possibility of a sudden attack by enemies terrorizing 'the free world', was injected into the US community and this led to a social paranoia. The concept of permanent war on terrorism, which

was practiced by the Bush administration, fed this paranoia. Since, the Bush administration intended to use this social mood for the neoliberalized upper classes that it represented. Hare ends the second scene by presenting this paranoid logic of fear to the audience.

In scene three, Nadia performs a monologue on the stage. Hare limits this scene to Nadia's speech. Nadia appears to be partially desperate and confused. In the fourth scene, Nadia finally meets with Oliver in his house. Philip Lucas and Oliver Lucas make their debut in the beginning of the scene.

Philip, Oliver and Nadia are chatting after breakfast under a tree in canvas chairs. In the first part of the conversation, Oliver tries to learn more about Nadia. With Oliver's questions, the audience will have more information about Nadia. For example, the audience learns that Nadia was a war correspondent in Iraq and Yugoslavia. Or, it turns out that Philip and Nadia met at an international conference. It is also clear that as Oliver brings the conversation to political matters, Nadia's concern with politics reveals:

Nadia: All right: why so many people live in such poverty. And so few live well. And what can we do about it? These huge facts, these enormous facts not up for study. Ignored. You'd think that to be alive would mean to want to find out (Hare 2008b: p.21)

Nadia states that her she has been in politics since the first years of her youth. Besides, Nadia looks at social events from the perspective of the lower classes. Income injustice among social classes, for example, is a situation that Nadia criticizes in her turn. This interest in politics by Nadia leads Oliver to talk more about current political developments. The most interesting moment during the discussion of politics between Nadia and Oliver is about Nadia's meeting with US President Bush:

Oliver: Which you were able to give?

Nadia doesn't answer

About Iraq?

Nadia: Yes. He knew I'd written about Iraq.

Oliver: Clearly you were in favour? You were in favour of the invasion,

Nadia: The liberation, yes. Yes, I was in favour. I don't think the President would have asked me if I wasn't

Oliver: No (Hare 2008b: p.30)

Oliver dislikes Nadia's meeting with US President Bush, and reveals her discomfort even though it is not explicit. Since, Oliver sees the US occupation of Iraq as an imperialist intervention. Nadia is categorically anti-war academics and does not approve the policies of the Bush administration. However, according to Nadia, it is a national duty to go to the White House when called. No matter who the President is, a US citizen should perform his national duties when necessary. Nadia calls it 'national loyalty'. Oliver does not agree with Nadia, and he conveys it to Nadia with sarcasm and naivety.

Oliver says that he has a "button marked 'patriotism'" and He adds, "But –let's say- I am choosy about who I allow to press it." (Hare 2008b: pp.31-32). Oliver emphasizes that he is a patriot to a certain extent, yet, he does not use his patriotism for the dirty relations of the corrupt politician class. Oliver tries to keep himself apart from the current hegemonic structure, pursuant to David Hare's major task: "to challenge the existing hegemony" (Coates 1989: p.11). This hegemonic structure is the US-based global neoliberalism And this hegemonic order is not in favour of the lower classes; it is in favour of the ruling elites. Oliver reinforces this idea with a historical example. Oliver reminds one of the bloodiest wars of history, the Battle of Somme, which ordinary young people from the working class was sent to death under patriotism masquerade. According to Oliver, patriotism has been a historical tool to mobilize the poor in the direction of the ideals and interests of the ruling elites. The definition of hegemony by Raymond Williams also overlaps with Oliver's definition. To Williams (1985), "social practice is seen to depend on consent to certain dominant ideas which in fact express the needs of a dominant class" (p.146). Thus, Oliver regards Nadia's so called nationally loyal attitude as pointless, and implies that Nadia indirectly served for Bush's legitimization process of Iraq occupation.

As Oliver increases his criticism, Nadia becomes uncomfortable, but on the other hand she likes to talk about her favourite topics. Saying "in the United States, you are building an empire. Remember, we've dismantled one" (Hare 2008b: p.33), Oliver mentions political differences within the USA and the United Kingdom. He makes comments on the UK in this part of his speech.

Oliver states that “the politicians dismantle communities, then complain that community no longer exists” (Hare 2008b: p.33). Here, Hare explicitly refers to the opinion of the former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher about society: “There is no such thing as society” (Thatcher 1987). According to Thatcher, society is absent; but there are male and female individuals living together. Thatcher, with these words, does not reject society “as a codeword for the complex of social relations in general” (Shaw 1993: p.168); what Thatcher really ignores are the concepts of social solidarity and communal cooperation. Since, they are the antidote to neoliberalism that Thatcher has institutionalized in Britain.

Free market principles, which regard the consumerism and individualist freedom as the norm, do not like the idea of social solidarity, which, in time, leads to the social resolution that Oliver refers to. Nadia’s advocating for the Iraq war dominates the next part of the talk. Nadia, from the very beginning, defend the invasion of Iraq, despite the fact that she has doubts about deeper intents on Iraq oil. According to Nadia, if diplomatic channels were closed against cruel dictators, there is no option from military intervention. Nadia exemplifies the disintegration process of Yugoslavia for this reasoning. Nadia is angry that western states did not intervene to the massacre in Bosnia.

Nadia advocates that the US must intervene in Iraq to prevent a similar human rights violations and massacres. Nadia also believes in the assertion that Iraq supports terrorist groups. In fact, what Nadia is defining is the concept of preventive war that the Bush Cabinet has proposed to legitimize military interventions after the new millennium. In scene six, Nadia, this time clearly refers to the same subject, by saying: “There was far more terrorism in the 1980s when nobody thought about it than there is today when nobody thinks about anything else (Hare 2008b: p.47). David Hare leaves the Bush administration's concept of protective war against terrorism, which it has previously implied, to be viewed by the audience. As Harvey (2007) points out, this concept is an integrated method of warfare programmed to ensure that global market freedoms continue. For this aim, the state surrounds the society with all its ideological apparatuses within this concept and enables the individual to feel that the continuity of daily life is in danger.

David L. Altheide enlarges this discussion in his book, *Terrorism and the Politics of Fear* (2017) by referring to the idea of the politics of fear. To Altheide, this term “refers to decision makers’ promotion and use of audience beliefs and assumptions about danger, risk, and fear in order to achieve certain goals” (p.15). Altheide portrays politics of fear as a weapon used by the sovereigns to manipulate society. The politics of fear is ideological in all cases as well. And the source of this fear is sometimes authority, or god, or sometimes external enemies. Given the ongoing experience of American society since the cold war, the best way to manipulate American society through intimidation is, of course, the use of the possibility of terrorism by external enemies.

David Harvey (2007) claims that the Bush administration produced instruments of democratic, hierarchical and militarist legal regeneration, and tended to be open to non-democratic practices of neoliberalism. The Bush administration has resorted to the politics of fear in order to screen its authoritarianism and legitimize its military interventions. Nadia complains that the US people think nothing but terrorism; this appeal is a critique of Hare's against this neoliberal propaganda.

Scene six is a psychological cold war between Nadia and Oliver. Oliver constantly animadverts at Nadia's political preferences. Yet, Nadia skilfully defends this criticism. Among all these intellectual debates, an emotional intimacy between Oliver and Nadia emerges. Oliver is a medical doctor. He makes societal outcomes through his profession. Accordingly, he says:

Oliver: Not if they won't help themselves. The first instinct of a sick person is to suspend judgement. Their immediate impulse is very powerful: they want to put themselves in someone else's hands.

Nadia: Is that a bad thing? (Hare 2008b: p.56)

To Oliver, the first way in which sick people apply to get rid of the disease is to submit them fully to the doctors who they regard as authority. Oliver's words are directed at Nadia, who thinks that the oppressed people should be rescued by Western sovereigns. Oliver directs Nadia to an ironic critique. Nadia notices this psychological move of Oliver and asks Oliver to extend that thought. Oliver says that people prefer to gamble instead of making calculations in difficult times. In other words, Oliver emphasizes that ordinary people should establish strong organizations and fight capitalist hegemony initiatives with their own

forces. However, he complains that people are always waiting for a saviour. Nadia seems to change her idea in this regard. She deserves the interpretation of Oliver's attitude on ordinary people in hegemonic processes. Eventually, Nadia is influenced by Oliver both emotionally and intellectually.

In act two, scene eight, the audience will see clues within Nadia's words, where they can sense the source of the play's name: "In combat medicine, there's this moment - after a disaster, after a shooting - there's this moment, the vertical hour, when you can actually be of some use" (Hare 2008b: p.71). Term of the vertical hour, which gives the name of the play, is used to emphasize the importance of the first shocking minutes after an accident.

Especially in the first 24 hours, traumatic effects of the unexpected incident are observed. The victim is mostly in shock. In this sense, David Hare naturally wants to draw attention to a social issue, not a health problem, through Nadia's words. Hare has named his play as *The Vertical Hour*, since the play is based on the traumatic atmosphere of the 9/11 attacks and the traumatic shock experienced after the Iraq war. As Hare's interest in social issues is considered, Hare's fiction finds its social value when examined by Naomi Klein's the shock doctrine. In her book, *The Shock Doctrine* (2014), Klein asserts that the shocked masses after an unexpected catastrophe are forced to submit to the politics and applications they opposed, not accepting the earlier. Klein (2014) notes that neoliberalism benefits from shocks to gain strength:

The history of the contemporary free market was written in shocks. Some of the most infamous human rights violations of the past thirty-five years, which have tended to be viewed as sadistic acts carried out by anti-democratic regimes, were in fact either committed with the deliberate intent of terrorizing the public or actively harnessed to prepare the ground for the introduction of radical free-market reforms (p.III)

The shock doctrine is a consent production process of hegemony through the desperations by using crisis, fear, disaster, war and traumatic events. The US and coalition forces have been in a fast-paced plan since the first moment of their first attack on Iraq. "The theory of Rapid Dominance and its brutal adjunct 'shock and awe' appealed to this aggressive streak" (Sepp 2007: p.229) and the US has completed the occupation in a short period of time for today's war terminology. As Slavoj Žižek (2009) states, with the shock and awe strategy,

Iraq was now ready to fulfil the requirements of the free market economy. When the shock doctrine came to its place, the public was so traumatized that no social class of society could offer any political opposition. With Nadia's quote, Hare portrays the traumatic effects of the Iraq war on Western society. Besides, Western societies are already shocked by 9/11 attacks. Hare offers a picture of how people can be imposed by the shock doctrine of the political and socio-economic systems they would never accept under normal circumstances.

Oliver tries to find out why Nadia has left her job as a war correspondent, and she has switched to academics. Oliver feels Nadia is hiding something. According to Oliver, the traumatic event that happened to Nadia had radically altered her life.

Oliver raises his questions about her old profession to understand Nadia's real feelings. In response to this, Nadia notes that seventy-nine journalists have been killed so far in the war in Iraq. These deaths have seriously hurt Nadia. The main reason for this sorrow is the death of her colleagues. However, another cause of this sadness is that Nadia lost her former love in the Bosnian war. This loss has caused a serious trauma in Nadia. Thus, Nadia is angry, but another cause of her anger is the unresponsiveness of society to these neo-imperialist interventions.

Nadia says:

Nadia: As if nothing worried them except their jobs and their bosses and their fucking love lives. And I remember thinking, 'I have no right to despise these people, I have no right to look down on them...'
(Hare 2008b: p.79)

Nadia is basically a war correspondent. Throughout her career, she has seen the destruction that new imperialist policies created on innocent people. Nadia has watched the razing of social life in Bosnia, Afghanistan and Iraq. The wars for the globalization of neoliberal sovereignty rules have affected Nadia's psychology in a very negative way. Thus, Nadia is very angry with those who do not even feel a small part of the pain she is sensing. Nadia is furious at individuals who are concerned only with their own little lives and their own little afflictions, when such catastrophic events take place in the world. David Hare once again stages the concept of neoliberal individualism, which threatens social ties and solidarity. Hare looks at the concept of individualism with a

critical eye. Since, individualism leads people to focus on their own personal problems and ignore social problems. This selfish preference of individuals is, of course, ideological. As already mentioned, neoliberalism aims to destroy a possible opposition through the production of social consent before it begins economic or military operations. The working class people who care about their own interests instead of socio-political problems cannot unite and defy the ruling classes that impose neoliberalism on the public sphere.

Nadia's trip with Philip to his father Oliver's country house does not end as expected. Nadia's visit results in her entering a self-criticism phase, which ultimately redesigns her life. Nadia leaves Oliver's house and does not see him anymore, moreover, she ends his relationship with Philip. Nadia goes back to college. Scene ten opens in Nadia's office.

Similar to the first scene, Nadia is on stage with one of her student again. Terri Scholes is a twenty-year old, African-American girl. Nadia quotes her essay:

'Why did Bush go to war? Because he could.' What kind of a statement is that? 'Because he knew he'd get away with it.' Do you call that a theory? 'For Bush and those like him, the exercise of power is enough in itself. Iraq was irrelevant to the war on terror. The point of the action was its very arbitrariness. To demonstrate to any possible enemy of the US that no one should ever consider themselves safe?' (Hare 2008b: p.107)

Nadia first criticizes Terri's use of everyday language in an academic article. Besides, Nadia cannot make sense of Terri's ideas. Nadia, for example, defines Terri's expression of that the US destroys all its enemies in the name of fighting terrorism as 'blowhard'. For Nadia, Terri's essay reflects an incomprehensible cynicism. She feels a frightening darkness in this article. Upon reading the essay, Nadia deeply regrets that a young person is so desperate for the future of her own country. Terri has written that: "There is only one truth. The powerful exploit the powerless. Indiscriminately" (Hare 2008b: p.112). To Terri, the US is right in its new imperialist policies, applied with globalization and military power. Nadia gets angry and asks how she can write these brutal expressions. Terri answers: "Because I've just lived through the last five years. I read the papers. I watch television. It's what I've seen for myself" (Hare 2008b: p.113). Terri's words are the manifestation of neoliberal consent production mechanism.

Terri argues that every US military intervention is justified, since all the broadcasting channels and educational resources are voicing this. David Hare, in these words, portrays how intensely the neoliberal ideology tries to dominate the structure of social thinking sphere. Gramsci (1971) names this sphere as 'common sense'. To Gramsci, common sense is a "response to certain problems posed by reality which are quite specific and original in their relevance" (1971: p.225). Common sense has a history and content. It develops its range with customs, traditions, wise sayings, religions and of course ideologies. Due to its complex structure, common sense is a contentious area. However, neoliberalization of the US and Britain has given a way to "the individualisation of everyone, the privatisation of public troubles and the requirement to make competitive choices at every turn" (Hall and O'shea 2013: p.6). In this way, common sense of Bush's America was underpinned by "the particular brand of religion-fuelled utopianism, Neoconservatism" (Couldry 2010: p.5). In this context, Terri's words reflect the common sense of its age.

When Nadia learns of some of Terri's personal problems in later parts of the conversation, she decides to empathize with Terri. At that point, the central argument of the play reveals "that you cannot separate public actions from private lives" (Billington 2006). Throughout the play, Hare fictionalises scenes depicting that private lives inevitably coincides with socio-political traumas. In this way, Hare argues that individualistic and selfish interests (as Neoliberalism recommends) do not bring salvation; on the contrary, social and collaborative solidarity is the key to true peace and social happiness. Accordingly, at the end of the play, Nadia realizes that she has focused on her individual happiness with an individualistic point of view. In order to realize herself, Nadia refuses to orient herself into the social norms of neoliberalized everyday life. The curtain closes with Nadia's freedom of choice: "I used to be a war correspondent. Recently, I've noticed I miss it. I'm going to back to Iraq" (Hare 2008b: p.114).



3. DISSOLUTION OF SOCIAL INTEGRITY

3.1 Dissolution of Social and Political Solidarity via Privatization: *The Permanent Way*

First staged in 2003, *The Permanent Way* (2003) is a verbatim play offering a sharp criticism of neoliberal privatization policies on British national rail system. David Hare himself expresses the production phase of the play where they had countless meetings with individuals and experts to benefit from their experience. And, he placed parts from the interviews into his play. For Hare, privatisation of the railways was a controversial act. *The Permanent Way* consists of fictional social reactions about real train accidents such as Hatfield train crash or Southall accident. It also includes several opinions from different persons who were directly or indirectly involved in British railway operations.

Terry Eagleton (2013) underlines that openings are quite important in understanding the value of a literary work. In this manner, Hare opens the play with a striking sentence from an ordinary train passenger: “Britain, yeah, beautiful country, shame we can’t run a railway” (Hare 2003: p.3). The first sentence of the play reflects Hare's basic objection. According to Hare, Britain's railway system cannot be managed properly. The primary responsibility of this situation directly belongs to the society. To emphasize this, Hare deliberately chooses the word “we” as the subject of the sentence.

“Nine people, once passengers, now customers” (Hare 2003: p.3) enter a discussion over the ideological change of British railways. Part one begins with this prologue. Referring to the fact that those who were once called passengers are now called customers, Hare underlines this ideological change. To passenger 4, Labour Party “did everything except the one fucking thing they needed to do” (Hare 2003: p.3). Passenger 4 charges the British Labour Party, which is supposed to be the most important advocate of public transport under normal circumstances, not to perform its essential duty. Passenger 4 states that the Labour Party has been ignoring the real problem with the railways. Since, they

are anxious about getting a criticism from *the Daily Mail*, the major supporter of British conservatives and liberals. David Hare implies that a newspaper publishing on a conservative-liberal line may influence the policies of the Labour Party.

The reason for this is that the Labour Party has undergone a neoliberal transformation specifically after Thatcherism. In this respect, Tony Blair publicly stated that “I believe passionately that our government will fail if it sees its task as dismantling Thatcherism” (Darnton 1996). As a result of this transformation, the Labour party abandoned socialist politics and tended towards free market practices. So-called ‘New Labour’ “willingly peers at the world in economic terms through neo-liberal lenses” (Heffernan 2000: p.19). Hare's words about a bad review in the Daily Mail, hint at a sharp policy change in Labour politics. Thus, the Labour Party has not made much effort to stop the conservative party governments (1979-1990 Margaret Thatcher and 1990-1997 John Mayor) that are determined to privatize railways instead of developing its services with state means. Hare criticizes this attitude here.

In the last part of the conversation, passenger 5 complains that contemporary governments do not care about railways. When compared with education and health services, railways are ignored by the politicians. Passenger 5 talks about one of his neighbour. The Neighbour is a bank officer who works in a bank which is responsible for the privatisation of the British railways. He underlines that the bank has produced a high income via privatization. The neighbour has also increased his income on this issue, yet he complains that he uses train routes every day and that the trains neither leave nor arrive on their scheduled times. Hare presents an anti-privatization stance here. To Hare, the privatizations made by considering that the trains will serve better have not created positive outcomes; on the contrary, Hare implies that the privatization policies helped the capitalists in increasing their profits. Since, privatization is one of the most important economic instruments of neoliberal economy.

For Nick Couldry (2010), neoliberal ideology claims that human organization, besides operating in the market system, has not a valid reason for existence. That is, neoliberalism proposed that all economic and social activities had to be regulated by free market principles. As Claire Berlinski (2011) states, Margaret

Thatcher, pioneer practitioner of neoliberal agenda, defends the idea insisting that there is no alternative except from free market capitalism. According to Steger and Roy (2010), privatization has a central role in Thatcherite applications.

In order to reduce the effect of organised labour and established bureaucratic order, Thatcher's administration privatized almost all public assets and intuitions including key ones such as British Rail, British Aerospace, British Petroleum and British Steel.

According to David Marsh, Margaret Thatcher applied privatization so that the state could bring about "controlling the money supply, reducing public expenditure and cutting income tax" (1991: p.460). For instance, Thatcher administration applied a program for privatization of social housing in the UK. For Harvey (2007), The Housing Act of 1980 was a landmark political application of Thatcherism. This act was presented lower classes as gift because the residents of council houses had a right to buy with a specific discount their own rented houses. However, this act has led to "the loss of affordable housing in central areas" (Harvey 2007: p.164) and a huge homelessness problem specifically in definite areas. Applying harsh privatization policies, Thatcherism, as seen in the examples, led to serious social problems in Britain. While the wealthy of the capital became richer, the lower classes were forced to deal with increasingly material and social problems.

Passenger 9 claims that:

My father always said, 'There's no free lunch.' My father was right. There's no free lunch and there's no free market. The market is rigged, the market is always rigged, and the rigging is in favour of the people who run the market. That's what the market is. It's a bent casino. The house always wins. One way or another, the taxpayer always pays for the railways. The Treasury wouldn't subsidise the railways properly when the railways were owned by the public, because they said they must be inefficient. Why? Because they were owned by the public (Hare 2003: pp.7-8)

Passenger 9 claims that there is no free market concept, which is the basic ideological tool of neoliberalism. To Passenger 9, the idea of deregulation of market always implements in favour of the ruling classes. The free market is a roulette table that the house has always won. He also complains that

governments did not adequately supported railways in times of public ownership. With this respect, Passenger 9 implies that railways are inactivated by these methods. Passenger 9 is also angry that taxpayers still have to support the railways after privatization. Since, one of the most important claims of privatization advocates is the reduction of the tax burden on the citizen.

Neoliberalism has to seize all the ideological apparatus of states and channels of interstate interactions in order to continue its existence. This necessity creates a new state form over time. Bobbit (2011) defines this state form as market-state system, where “world markets are restructured on supra-national lines” (p.146). Similarly, David Harvey (1989) calls this state as neoliberal state. Steger and Roy (2010) define a set of rules that a neoliberal state must possess. One of the most important of these rules is the guarantee of partial fiscal discipline. A neoliberal state should also deal with the removal of the budget deficit, financial liberalization, interest rates determined by the market, and protection of property rights. Neoliberal thinkers insist on that only the freedom of the market may bring wealth and prosperity. Neoliberals consider that the invisible hand of the market is capable of regulating the dynamics of economy. Neoliberals depend on Adam Smith’s description of the market. To them, the secret hand in the market can control everything about economic processes.

As Harvey (2007) states, neoliberalism theoretically rejects any interventionist economy theory, like Keynesianism or state capitalism. However, in practice, unexpected developments have appeared since the ending days of ‘roaring nineties’. After the new millennium, neoliberal state governments are no longer content with remaining faithful to free market processes, “instead, they want to use the market to bolster their own domestic political positions” (Bremmer 2009: p.47). That means the end of deregulation of market. For instance, “On September 16, 2008, the Federal Reserve stepped in with an \$85 billion loan to keep AIG afloat” (Mishkin 2011: p.54). As *The Financial Times* writer Tom Braithwaite reports in April 2015, “The US’s free markets are being distorted by the government, which is riding roughshod over investors”. As it is clearly seen in the examples, the idea of deregulation of markets with an invisible hand has collapsed since the new millennium, and Hare underlines this fact with his characters, passenger 9’s words.

Passenger 5 says that conservatives do not like public transport. To him, “they don’t like any form of transport you have to share” (Hare 2003: p.8). Since, conservatives do not like common places where people can share ideas. Through Passenger 5’s words, David Hare criticizes a conservative ideological rhetoric, capitalist obsession towards private property.

As Friedrich Engels (2010) asserts, with the emergence of capitalist societies, ruling classes employed the private property as a tool for securing the management of the means of production. To the British conservatism, which is traditionally capitalism oriented, “property ownership makes citizens more engaged and interested in public affairs” (Lundqvist 1998: p.217). For these reasons, neoliberalism has insisted on private property. For example, John Moore, Secretary of State for Work and Pensions of Thatcher administration, states that “As we dispose of state-owned assets, so more and more people have the opportunity to become owners. So these policies also increase personal independence and freedom” (cited in Abromeit 1988: p.71). Thatcherism emphasized the development of the concept of private property in the UK. For this aim, Thatcher governments made several privation operations over different sectors. One of them was The Housing Act 1980, which provided council house residents in Britain the Right to buy their house from the local authorities. For Marsh (1991), “the sale of council houses was a popular move to reduce the size of the public sector” (p.476). However, As Rowan Moore reports in his article, *Margaret Thatcher Began Britain's Obsession with Property. It's Time to End It*,

At almost every level, the market isn't working, from ex-industrial towns in northern England, where the values are too low to justify repairs to existing houses, to the under-supply and high prices in London, where an average home now costs £458,000, or 13 times the median full-time income. Hidden favelas are growing up in suburbs such as Newham and Southall, with unauthorised developments in back gardens and flats occupied at many times the levels for which they were designed

As seen in the housing example, the idea of private property would bring more freedom and social peace seems to have collapsed. As Moore asserts, the number of homes per capita in Britain has increased rapidly since the 1980s, yet the number of homeless and rented residents has also increased dramatically.

The upper classes buy the empty circles in Belgravia and Kensington as a kind of investment, the poor has to prefer living in favela style housing in suburbs. Through the words of passenger 5, David Hare leads a critique of the neoliberal insistence on preservation and development of private property. Since, the aphorism about its positive effects on freedom and social cohesion has collapsed. Calling out to the audience, Hare finishes the prologue of his play, where he presents main lines of his criticism.

Passenger 4 asks; “Why aren’t people angry? They were robbed. What belonged to them was taken from them by a bunch of bankers and incompetent politicians” (Hare 2003: p.8-9). With these lines, Hare tells the audience that they must be angry. Since, their social rights have been seized by upper classes and neoliberalism-oriented politicians. Passenger 4 discusses the cause of this silence in the last part of his speech: “Nobody believes that by being angry, by expressing anger, anything changes, anything can change” (Hare 2003: p.9). However, Hare knows that the only thing that will take action to defend the rights of the working class is anger. In *the Communist Manifesto*, as Marx and Engels (2017) clarifies, The capitalists tend to have all factories, mines, railways or other means of production. And, this condition creates an unfair in the distribution of wealth among the classes. In this way, the rich inevitably becomes richer and the poor becomes poorer. This unfair distribution of the wealth is supposed to lead to the working class being frustrated and angry. Therefore, the working class has to rise up to seize the means of production, as they eventually have “nothing to lose their chains” (p.87). So, Anger is the starting point for a working class initiative, but it is not enough as well. Working class needs unions and solidarity programs to defend their rights. To Hare, The working class believes that nothing will change, since labour organisations have suffered serious loss of rights, especially during thatcher era. Workers’ hopes have been crushed under Thatcher's iron posts.

David Marsh (1991) claims that Thatcherism employed privatization in order to curb union power within public sector. To him, “privatization was seen as a means of reducing their size, bargaining power and influence over policy” (Marsh 1991: p.472). As Harvey (2007) informs, Thatcher’s monetarist and strict budget control policies led to high unemployment. Within this harsh

economic condition, Thatcher attacked the organised working class opposition in order to break its bargaining power. On the ending days of 1984, “the Trades Union Congress lost 17 per cent of its membership in five years” (p.59). The most significant Thatcherite attack towards labour unions was the one occurred during the 1984-85 strike of miners under the flag of The National Union of Mineworkers. The same union had succeeded in a nationwide strike wave in 1972 arguing that the rights of workers’ personal rights were under serious attack by the state and capital class.

However, “the miners faced a quite different type of political opponent in ’84 that had a critical vested interest in breaking them, combined with a formidable array of weapons with which to do so” (Darlington 2005: p.7). Thatcher administration showed no mercy to the miners, and the fear of unemployment led by economic conditions created anxiety over the miners. In the final analysis, the miners lost, and this paved a clean way for Thatcherism to bulldoze organised labour. Thatcher governments in eleven year, major British industries such as steel industry, shipbuilding or national automotive industry, were privatized. Their national character was integrated into a limitless free market flow with their trade union power. By the time Margaret Thatcher left office, organised labour was dismantled and a new precariat appeared. The new precariat had no bargaining power, and were ready to be exploited by the capitalists, who seek for ground to make easy profits. In accordance with neoliberalization, Thatcher administration “had eradicated inflation, curbed union power, tamed the labour force, and built middle-class consent for her policies in the process” (Harvey 2007: p.60). Hare underlines the fact that Thatcher managed to neoliberalize her country because she managed to destroy organised labour power which could voice working class anger.

Part two opens with a quite long conversation among a High-Powered Treasury Thinker, a Senior Civil Servant and an Investment Banker. The audience begins to learn more details about the privatization of British Rail. In his turn, High-Powered Treasury Thinker praises the privatization applications. Hare symbolically depicts him as the representor of neoliberal state. His views are mere reflections of neoliberal ideology. In his next turn, High-Powered

Treasury Thinker gives the historical background of British Rail privatization and details the process:

High-Powered Treasury Thinker By the time you get to the railways you're getting to the harder stuff. Thatcher's attitude had always been, 'They don't make money, let's wait till they make money and then let's privatise them.' It wasn't that she was hostile more that -like most people - she didn't think of them as a particularly agreeable way to travel. Well, they're not. That's why only seven per cent of us use them. Nobody would choose to go on them unless they had to. I mean, would you? The one thing that was clear to the Treasury team was that we didn't want to replace a public monopoly with a private monopoly. We did that with the telephones and it didn't work. So we had the idea of splitting the ' track from the trains and then having competitive franchises for the actual operating companies. And, then we came up with this notion called Railtrack (Hare 2003: pp.11-12)

High-Powered Treasury Thinker points out that the issue of privatization of railways is old enough to go back to the Thatcher era. He states that Thatcher did not appreciate railways as a public transport. However, the Thatcher government did not privatize the British Rail because they believe it would not provide much profit. Margaret Thatcher has made it clear that she thought there is no such thing as society. From this point of view, the Thatcher administration assessed public services, such as education, health or transportation, whether any social service would bring in profit. This perspective naturally brought a negative effect on the quality of the services, and this led to a remarkable degradation over social cohesion over the long term. Harvey (2007) labels this degradation as a chaos of individual interests. Thatcher employed "a free-market economy and promotion of private enterprise fostered individualistic self-interest and avarice, and a denial of societal responsibility" (Taylor 2007: p.49). Eventually, this led to "a breakdown of all bonds of solidarity and a condition verging on social anarchy and nihilism" (Harvey 2007: p.82). With a government administrator's words, Hare stresses the dissolving nature of Thatcherism in the beginnings of the play.

In the same turn, High-Powered Treasury Thinker also refers to the privatization method of the British Rail. He says that the treasury team did not want to create a private monopoly, instead of a public one. They made it, in accordance with the neoliberal principle of competitiveness. They decided to privatize railway services in pieces. As Gomez Ibanez (2009) informs, Britain privatized its

railways by selling the railroads infrastructure to nearly seventy different companies. Yet, High-Powered Treasury Thinker draws attention to one of these companies: “The most important company, Railtrack, owned and maintained all the tracks and stations” (p.247). High-Powered Treasury Thinker mentions the name of this company, since the first technical problems after privatization appeared in the responsibility of this company.

The Hatfield train accident was one of the disasters occurred after the privatization. As Simon Jeffery (2000) reports, the Hatfield crash happened in 17 October 2000 and four citizen died. High-Powered Treasury Thinker talks about this accident in his turn. However, his speech neither involves the citizens who died, nor the bereaved families. He says that “since Hatfield everything is down, productivity is down disastrously” (Hare 2003: p.16).

In this terrible disaster, High-Powered Treasury Thinker only sees problems about private property. The Hatfield crash was not the first disaster, however High-Powered Treasury Thinker acknowledges that “all grip has been lost” (Hare 2003: p.16), since “it was the first to be blamed immediately on Railtrack and rail restructuring” (Gómez-Ibáñez 2009: p.284). Commodity-oriented perspective of High-Powered Treasury Thinker can be explained under the framework of Marx’s concept of alienation. Since, “alienation, the fundamental category of both the counter-culture and Western Marxism, is Hare’s main target” (Coates 1989: p.6). In *The German Ideology* (1970), Marx and Engels defines alienation as a creation of the capitalist market itself and the capitalist social system. As a result of capitalist class system, the person is alienated to his own nature. Thus, man becomes alienated to self, to his own interests, to relationships, to the world and to life. It becomes one of the cogs that function as an element of the capitalist market. Marx predicts that alienation is a systematic consequence of capitalism. To him, capitalism transforms individuals as “a mentally and physically dehumanized being” (p.12)

From this perspective, it is clear that High-Powered Treasury Thinker, who is responsible for the privatization applications of the neoliberal Britain, is alienated from his own class. He persistently defends capitalist values and ignores “the public service ethic” (Hare 2003: p.17), which is crucial for the working class. In the final analysis, he is a lower-middle class public officer

who has to work for survival. His individualistic interest in relations with ruling classes and the imposition of a pro-capitalist lifestyle imposed by neoliberalism make him a cynical individual who acts against the interests of his class. David Hare deliberately leaves the interpretation of the Hatfield disaster to him. Hare aims to show that neoliberalism, a contemporary interpretation of the capitalism, can alienate a working class individual to the class where he belongs to.

Investment Banker changes the topic:

Giving organisations to people in the public sector does seem to destroy them. I don't know about you, but I can only work when I feel the hot breath of a competitor down my neck. Otherwise, I'd be idle (Hare 2003: p.17)

With Investment Banker's turn, Hare changes the topic with another neoliberal notion. Investment Banker symbolizes entrepreneurial mind of private property.

Free market system depends mainly on private enterprises. Entrepreneurial mind is believed to initiate individual wealth and national development in a neoliberal state. For this reason, state enterprises are "deregulated. Competition—between individuals, between firms, between territorial entities (cities, regions, nations, regional groupings)—is held to be a primary virtue" (Harvey 2007: p.65). Then, a Leading Entrepreneur appears on the stage:

I took on the railways because I like a challenge, and they were an interesting challenge. I've tried to make the whole travel experience more like an airline. More customer oriented. Just an example: I was on one of our new trains the other day, the Peridalinos, and there was no hot milk. So I rang ahead to the next station. It's details like that you have to fix. When we started the company, then it's true we were nervous of the British Rail staff, because their reputation was not great. We wanted to take them on and motivate them. So what I did was invite them to a big party at my house. I had seven thousand of them round at my place. You see, they didn't feel loved. I wanted to give them what they hadn't had (Hare 2003: p.22)

David Hare describes Leading Entrepreneur in a somewhat exaggerated way. He has a highly materialistic manner. In this way, Hare tries to capture full attention of his audience. Leading Entrepreneur reduces the privatization, a topic that interests the future of thousands of workers, into a safari adventure. The entrepreneur dreams of a more customer-focused railway service compared to the old. Since, he could not find hot milk service during one of his trip. It

may seem ridiculous, but Hare consciously tries to draw attention towards a specific mode of thinking. This thinking style is entrepreneurship. As Stevenson and Jarillo (2007) describes, entrepreneurship is the creation of an organization in which economic factors are transformed into liberal values by combining production factors for production of economic goods or services. By introducing the necessary time and effort, financial, psychological and social risks are taken to achieve monetary gain and individual satisfaction. Neoliberalization supports entrepreneurship because it is eligible for creating an individualist sphere in the society. For this reason, neoliberal doctrine tends to regard “citizens as customers or clients and encouraged administrators to cultivate an entrepreneurial spirit” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.14).

Thanks to neoliberal entrepreneurship, “Fast fortunes were made in new sectors of the economy such as biotechnology and information technologies” (Harvey 2007: p.34).

Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg or Richard Branson are examples of the fast and popular fortunes. The propaganda apparatuses of the neoliberal state present what these people does like a success story. Since, “neoliberal governmentality is rooted in entrepreneurial values such as competitiveness, self-interest, and decentralization” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.12). Throughout the day in newspapers or on television, the individual enrichment stories of these people are portrayed as a heroic story. The aim of the neoliberal state is to impose that collective individual wealth is one of the most important moral values of the contemporary world. This consumer-centred perspective seeks to create generations suitable for neoliberalization, ignoring socialist values such as social solidarity, equal opportunity and social development. As a result, this weakens social ties and destroys solidarity among people.

David Hare argues about the concept of entrepreneurship, which plays a key role in the neoliberalization process. In this sense, entrepreneurship is a tool for neoliberal individualism. Entrepreneurship promises dreams emphasizing that it will be easier for working class people to be rich by working for their own interests on their own, rather than struggling within organizations for communal gains. The promise of being rich on the easy path is a very attractive dream for the working class. Success hereby refrains from socialist solidarity and is

reduced into individualism. Hare's emphasis on entrepreneurship can also be understood from his including a quote by Richard Branson, an entrepreneurial icon, at the very beginning of the play: "If you can run one business you can run any business" (Hare 2003). It is ironic, of course, that Hare places this phrase, which can be understood as an entrepreneurship slogan, at the beginning of the play. Hare naturally does not quite agree with this view. However, He finds this concept very important. It is an ideological milestone for dissolving society.

Senior Rail Executive appears on the stage and gives details about the criticism on privatization. To him, "balkanisation was a complete disaster" (Hare 2003: p.18). Senior Rail Executive reminds the audience that railway services have been privatized to be made by 113 separate companies in order to increase competition. For him, this decision is successful in theory, but it is a very difficult decision to achieve in practice.

Another character, Very Experienced Rail Engineer agrees with Senior Rail Executive. He says that "everybody knew privatization was being done wrong, but politicians were determined" (Hare 2003: p.19). While the government representative High-Powered Treasury Thinker and the capital representative Investment Banker are enthusiastically advocating the privatization of the Railways, the working class representatives, Senior Rail Executive and Very Experienced Rail Engineer criticizes both privatization and the way that it has been done. In this way, David Hare implies which social class the privatization will be in the interest of. This class is of course the ruling class. In the next part of the conversation, Senior Rail Executive and Very Experienced Rail Engineer talk about the causes of the Hatfield accident with technical details. No firm emerging after the privatization of the British Rail assumes responsibility in this accident.

One of the important areas that privatization influences is the working conditions of the workers. David Hare naturally includes this topic in his play. For instance, Rustin' Hoffman, a railway worker, claims that there are lots of works on the Stansted Express line. However, "It's all subcontracting. You don't actually know who the fuck you work for" (Hare 2003: p.23). Another character, Sven complains about long working hours and workload. He says, "There's a lot of fucking waiting, but then when you work, you fucking work.

I've got a knackered tendon so I take four Neurofen a night" (Hare 2003: p.24).

Finally, Rail Union Leader discusses the present situation of labour:

I was twenty-three years a train driver. Nothing like getting up at four in the morning and seeing all those foxes and badgers. Mrs Thatcher nearly smashed our union. In 1999 we had debts of half a million pounds. Membership down from over 50000 to 13000. We've got it back up to eighteen. A Eurostar driver gets £41000. That's top. Some drivers go as low as 23. Always the same, always goes with privatisation: a two-tier system. There's chronic low pay throughout the industry and endemic overtime factors... (Hare 2003: p.34)

All workers, in their turns, state that their working conditions gradually deteriorate. The inadequate and harsh working condition has begun to affect their physical health status. Precarious and flexible working conditions also cause worsening psychological conditions. This creates serious unrest in the working class, which constitutes a large majority of the population.

In the final analysis, unfair distribution of income and welfare between social classes negatively affects social cohesion. Actually, before neoliberalization of the global markets and states, "organised labour was powerful and state activism was sufficiently popular to counter market dependency when it threatened the social rights of citizenship" (Howard and King 2008: p.209). As Rail Union Leader stresses, due to neoliberal precarization policies, Thatcherism planned and succeeded in destroying the bargaining power of all trade unions that Margaret Thatcher calls as "the enemy within" (Ross 2013). For this purpose, the neoliberalization process first sought to weaken traditional classes by subdividing them into subclasses. For example, "the CEOs, the key operators on corporate boards, and the leaders in the financial, legal, and technical apparatuses that surround this inner sanctum of capitalist activity" (Harvey 2007: p.33) are the constituents of the capitalist activity. On the other hand, working class has been divided into several subcategories such as subcontracting workers, part-time workers or full-time workers. In the final analysis, while the ruling classes gained strength with professionalized experts, organised labour lost power due to the disagreements within unions and depressive atmosphere led by precarization.

With neoliberalization, governments have also begun to retreat from social applications such as health care, social security, infant care, unemployment aid.

They have argued that these social programmes do not bring profit and they kill competitiveness. Mark Purcell argues that (2008) neoliberal states regard welfare programs such as social security or unemployment reinforcement as seriously problematic processes that “will lack the incentive to participate energetically in the labour market. If government removes such security, the argument goes; workers will be highly motivated to succeed in their jobs” (p.17). Thus, it is clear that neoliberalization aims at diminishing welfare programs and job security with the help of precarization. Standing (2011) points out a new rising class:

The result has been the creation of a global ‘precariat’, consisting of many millions around the world without an anchor of stability. They are becoming a new dangerous class. They are prone to listen to ugly voices, and to use their votes and money to give those voices a political platform of increasing influence. The very success of the ‘neo-liberal’ agenda, embraced to a greater or lesser extent by governments of all complexions, has created an incipient political monster. Action is needed before that monster comes to life (p.1)

Guy Standing claims that the traditional working class is divided into subcategories and evolved into a new social class due to neoliberalization. This new social structure includes “an army of unemployed and a detached group of socially ill misfits living off the dregs of society” (Standing 2013: p.2). The precarization process is the attack on the proletariat, which was under the assurance of the welfare state and had the capacity to move in a more organized way, so that neoliberalism can become more applicable in harmony with competitiveness and market conditions. Thatcherism, for instance, “introduced liberalising economic measures (joined to increasing political authoritarianism) in order to tame organised labour” (Howard and King 2008: p.208). Guy Standing (2011) confirms that neoliberalization focused on growth depending on competitiveness of labour and marketization of all aspects of daily life. With the neoliberalization of global markets, short term contracts, part-time jobs, subcontracting mechanisms and working through projects became mainstream employment methods. For example, “Nine out of every ten jobs created in the U.K. between 2008 and 2010 were part-time jobs” (Standing 2012: p.595).

Keynesian Welfare state was replaced with neoliberal workfare programmes, “designed to get workers off the government dole and into the labour market”

(Peck 2003: p.67). Neoliberals aimed at establishing flexibility of labour market in order to load economic risks onto the working class, which “shrivelled and lost their sense of social solidarity” (Standing 2013: p.2). Workers represented in the Permanent Way, are members of this new class, the Precariat. All workers in the play, including Rustin’ Hoffman, working as subcontracting employee, Catweasel, working within a three day short-term contract, and Sven, who has to take four Neurofen every night; have to deal with harsh working conditions of the railway services. David Hare wants to portray the present working conditions of railway workers after neoliberalization. Hare emphasizes that neither the privatization policies nor the efforts to create a flexible labour market bring about peace and prosperity. Contrary to what is hoped, Hare points out that such neoliberal policies have caused social fragmentation and an increase in income disparity between classes.

Hare integrates the Southall Accident of 1997, which led to seven citizens’ death and hundreds of wounded people as a destructive example of neoliberalization.

British Transport Policeman appears on the scene and declares that he is conducting the accident investigation himself. He starts to talk about the details of the accident report. As he reports, the conductor confessed that he had passed during the red light. In addition to this, the audience learns that there were two systems to stop the train automatically, one of which was not working. ATP, the working one, was not switched on, since the conductor was not trained to operate this system. As deepening his investigation from the drivers to managing director, British Transport Policeman finds out that the government policy is the main responsible for this disaster. He states that:

There was no structure, you see, for investigating corporate crime. I had to make it up as I went along. A lot of the way Railtrack obstructed me. I had to go to court several times with injunctions, stuff I needed from them and from Great Western Trains which they didn’t want to give me (Hare 2003: p.27)

British Transport Policeman determines privatization as liable for the Southall crash. However, he could not go further for his investigation. Since, he was obstructed by Railtrack, a private enterprise. Moreover, Great Western Trains, another private enterprise operating on railway services, did not accept the

required information he needed. British Transport Policeman astonishes at the attitudes of these companies, which rejects helping a public officer who runs a state investigation. Yet, it is a normal situation for a neoliberal state, in which public interests have been replaced by capitalist requirements. With this scene, Hare wants to draw attention to the catastrophic consequences of profit-oriented operating policies.

Bereaved families are represented among the other catastrophic consequences of neoliberal policies in the play. In the second part of the play, a bereaved mother and father appear. Their son died in the Southall crash. Bereaved Mother and father are in grief. When Bereaved Father learned of his son's death, he seriously considered killing himself. Afterwards, the family recovers from the first shock of losing their sons and begins to follow the Southall accident investigation. Bereaved Mother goes on clarifying the technical details of the accident. Bereaved Mother claims to be a serious negligent in the accident. She says that there were two engines in the Swansea Train, one at back, one at front. She claims that the front engine warning system was working appropriately; however, the engine at the back wasn't working despite the reports that had informed the technical problem.

Finally, Bereaved Mother and father come to the point:

Bereaved Mother that way the engine with the working safety system is at the front. But they didn't, you see, because they would lose ten minutes.

Bereaved Father And under the privatised system, if you're ten minutes late, you have to pay a Fine (Hare 2003: p.30)

According to the family, the company, which is responsible for the train security systems, has not made the necessary technical maintenance for the damaged system. Since, this kind of maintenance will lead to a delay in the train schedule or lead to the cancellation of the train service. In this context, this delay or cancellation will affect the profitability of the company. In addition, the delays experienced in trains are reflected to the drivers as monetary penalties. This creates a serious injustice. The companies are imposing their technical inadequacies or negligence on the drivers, who are not directly responsible for the maintenance of engines. Intensive workload and irrelevant responsibilities play an important role in increasing accidents. Thus, Bereaved

Father thinks that the privatization is responsible for the death of his son, not an ordinary individual mistake.

At the end of two years of investigation, British Transport Policeman confirms Bereaved Father's claim. He reports that "the driver was responsible, Great Western Trains was responsible, Railtrack was responsible and the Health and Safety Executive was responsible" (Hare 2003: p.30). As British Transport Policeman informs; the driver did not switch on the train protection system, Health and Safety Executive did not make supervisions regularly and the driver was not trained to use ATP, the protection system because "Great Western had cut back on training" (Hare 2003: p.30). In the final analysis, it is that that was an avoidable accident. Yet, profit-oriented policies of companies and the conscious collaboration of the government institutions to this ideological choice have led to this catastrophic end. As Wolmar (2001) states that the accident "was not caused by a broken rail. It was caused by total mismanagement of Railtrack and its contractors" (p.122) Hare once again criticizes the privatization of the British Rail, the major requirement of the neoliberalization of Britain. Hare gives a chance to a public thought defending that the British Rail privatization wrecked the safety standards and the decline of public sector funding led to "the accidents and declining levels of service" (Smith 2003: p.12) Hare seems adamant that train crashes were the outcomes of privatization.

John Prescott, the only politician in the play, appears on the stage. Prescott was the deputy prime minister in charge of railway privatization. He stands in front of the cameras and speaks: "This must never happen again" (Hare 2003: p.32). Prescott is portrayed as top-level government official by Hare, and "he is largely reduced to an impotent fall-guy standing helplessly in front of the cameras" (Billington 2003). In the next scene, the audience learns about another disaster. A Thames train, the Bedwyn Turbo crashed head-on with The First Great Western High Speed Cheltenham Flyer on October 1999. John Prescott stands in front of the wreckage and says again the words he said before, 'this must never happen again'.

Prescott was the deputy prime minister of the Labour party, the founder of welfare state in the UK, and "by ridiculing Prescott, the show implies that Labour should have instantly re-nationalised the railways on taking office in

1997” (Billington 2003). However, Blair’s the Third Way Programme, “which labels all neoliberal policy as ‘reform’” (Petras and Veltmeyer 2003: p.16), aimed at reforming the British railway system in accordance with free market principles. Hare consciously portrays Prescott as impotent because he wants to criticize in such an absurd way that the elected politicians of the people have surrendered to the private companies in order to fulfil their profit-oriented interests.

Towards the end of the Part Two, Survivors’ Group Founder makes his debut. Hare uses the character of Rail Union Leader as a symbol of workers’ solidarity before. However, He made it clear that the neoliberal Thatcher government had made this working class union dysfunctional. This time, Hare refers to another oppressed segment of society through a survivors’ group. This group is an organization where relatives of casualties and those killed in the crash meet. The group follows the ongoing investigations while dealing with the psychological state of post-accident families and casualties. Meanwhile, the audience gets information about the Ladbroke Grove Train Crash, which “occurred at 8.11am at a points intersection on a busy line near Ladbroke Grove, west London, about two miles from Paddington station” (Tran 1999) and led to 26 dead. Survivors’ Group Founder informs that they “recognised it was a system failure, not a person failure” (Hare 2003: pp.45-46).

The survivors’ group try to explore the real causes of the accidents, using all official and democratic means. Yet, all of these channels have been already closed. Finally, they get nothing. In the Part Three, Survivors’ Group Founder declares:

The group has shrunk. I mean, quite a few have wandered off, wanted to start afresh. Perfectly understandable. There’ve been some went back to work, a bit like, went back to work, thought they could cope. Couldn’t. So had to come back again. When I set up the group I remember one of the first things I said was, ‘This group will have been successful when it no longer has any members (Hare 2003: p.66)

In the last part of the play, Hare explains that the survivors’ group is scattered. Similar to what happened to the railway union representing the organized power of the workers, it also happened to this group. Neoliberalism, the dominant ideology since the late 1970s, imposed individualism instead of collective solidarity. The Thatcher administration, its successor Conservative John Mayor

Administration and Blair's Labour government have implemented this basic neoliberal principle uninterruptedly. In line with this principle, while public resources in the hands of the British people are rapidly privatized, organizations with the potential to protect the interests of the people have been rendered dysfunctional by government policies. States that have taken a historical position in favour of upper classes have sought to reduce or even destroy the structures that could oppose these policies.

The British governments have rearranged the legislation in this direction, and at some time they have also had harsh interventions in their workers' organizations and actions. The government intervention towards the miners' strike of 1984-85 exemplifies this. The Thatcher Government "undertook a large-scale national mobilization of its physical, financial, and propagandist resources in direct support of a public sector employer (the National Coal Board)" (Towers 1989: p.172). This interventionism led to a major defeat of the National Union of Mineworkers. After that defeat, the labour movement has not reached its former power and the privatization policy has accelerated. This has led to the weakening of social solidarity networks and ultimately to social corruption and dissolution. David Hare discusses the reasons for these resolutions, addressing the newness of the working class and the organizations of the oppressed. Undoubtedly, neoliberalism is the main cause of social dissolution.

Hare depicts oppositional voices from the oppressed side of the society. However, most of these voices are ineffective due to the fact that organizations such as trade unions or worker's associations do not have the political capability of creating a change for the sake of citizens. The main reason for this unorganized state of labour has stemmed from neoliberal policies reinforcing individualism and precarious work for more profit.

3.2 Politics of Dispossession: *Behind the Beautiful Forevers*

Behind the Beautiful Forevers (2014a) was adapted into a play by David Hare from the original Pulitzer rewarded novel written by Katherine Boo. The play depicts a slum created by the immigrant workers who once worked in the construction of the Mumbai Airport. The immigrant workers occupied a land that actually belonged to the airport. The play portrays dispossessed residents of

a slum who become a remaining of an architecture that is designed to serve higher or middle class people. David Hare, who previously described the US foreign policy in *Stuff Happens* (2004) or China Revolution in *Fanshen* (1976) once again goes out of the British borders with *Behind the Beautiful Forevers*. Although the setting is different, the political atmosphere of the play stems from neoliberalism, which has a global influence on contemporary politics.

The curtains open with a very short boy standing on a maidan. He pulls a large sack of rubbish. Sunil speaks directly to the audience:

You ask me what I want? I want cotton buds. I want ketchup packets. Because silver paper is good. Chocolate. Cigarettes. Cigarette packets. Umbrellas. That's what I want. Cardboard. Plastic. Batteries. Shoelaces. Metal. Problem: there's always a wall. Wherever you go, you'll find a new wall. With barbed wire, or bottled glass. All the time, new guards, new dogs, new guns. There's a lot of good stuff in the world, that's why they've electrified the fences. Have you been to the airport? Mumbai airport? Have you? It's not just that rich people don't know what they've got. They don't even know what they throw away (Hare 2014a: p.3)

Sunil refers to the class distinctions in the society in which he lives. He knows that wealthy people live behind the walls when he collects the wastes. Sunil has learned this class distinction from bitter experience from electrified fences, guardians and dogs. The rich, who are not even aware of the trash, do not even want to see the poor living in the same society.

With Sunil's words, Hare implies that people of slums are quite similar to loads of garbage, which are consumed and thrown away by rich man; since people of the slum are thrown away by free market capitalism after being exposed to labour exploitation and being dispossessed. Before the seventies, when neoliberalization blossomed out, India "pursued a developmental state strategy based on an uneasy alliance between the state and national capital. In this sense, India's post-independence economic model was characterised by strong direct state involvement" (Schmalz and Ebenau 2012: p.492). After liberation from British Colonial order in 1947, Jawaharlal Nehru, India's the first prime minister, "chose a democratic socialist middle way between the capitalist West and the communist Soviet bloc by rejecting both Western 'liberal' economic ideas such as free trade and entrepreneurial individualism" (Steger and Roy 2010: p.91).

With Narashima Rao's inauguration in 1991, Indian Society was introduced with neoliberalization, and this implementation "unleashed its current wave of rapid economic growth at a pace that promises to double average productivity levels" (DeLong 2003: p.2). As a result of neoliberalization, "India has seen considerable economic dynamism, with pre-crisis GDP growth rates peaking at 9.8% in 2007" (Schmalz and Ebenau 2012: p.492), and a new disparate class emerged with "an Indian passport, a castle in Scotland, a pied-a-terre in Manhattan and a private Caribbean island" (Žižek 2009: p.4). Guy Standing (2013) defines this new kind of ruling class as 'elites'. They are super billionaires of neoliberal order who live in extreme luxury. Rich People Sunil addresses in the play belong to this elite class. Sunil's words depicting that "there's always a wall. With barbed wire, or bottled glass. All the time, new guards, new dogs, new guns" (Hare 2014a: p.3) are clear representation of neoliberal elites. In this way, Hare inscribes the underpinning of severe class polarization in Indian society. In the first scene, Hare implies that the audience will face with a fragmented social structure corrupted by neoliberal policies.

After Sunil, Manju Waghekar, a beautiful eighteen years old girl, makes her first appearance on the stage. She addresses directly to the audience:

Mrs Dalloway. I don't understand it. It's a book by the English writer Virginia Woolf. Do you understand it? Who are these people? What do they do? I know nothing of these people. I try to read it. Clarissa goes out to get flowers. Later she gives a party. I'm trying to learn it, that's my only chance; I'm going to learn it by heart (Hare 2014a: p.6)

With these words, Hare once again emphasizes sharp class distinctions in India. Manju is an unemployed, dispossessed and futureless young girl who lives in Slum. Naturally, Manju cannot recognise the plot or the themes including in Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*, which depicts a part of British upper-middle class lady's daily life. Manju refers to the opening sentence of the novel: "Mrs. Dalloway said she would buy the flowers herself" (Woolf 2013: p.1). These words "emphasize the solitary nature of the shopping trip for one of life's most necessary luxuries" (Wicke 1994: p.13). Yet, luxury means nothing for a slum girl. Manju says that she does not understand Clarissa Dalloway's words or actions, such as buying flowers for herself or giving a party. It is understandable that Manju cannot comprehend the rules or habits of Mrs. Dalloway's world, since her class position is too far from understanding upper-middle class rituals.

In addition to class distinctions, Hare refers to the terrible conditions of the slums in India. In the next scene, Asha Waghekar, a middle aged imperious woman, makes her debut and tells the audience that the five stars hotel owners built walls in order to hide slums from their wealthy customers. She implies that the ruling class tries to make them invisible. She adds that:

The world is changing, and it's changing fast. It's tipping eastwards and the money is flowing this way. Globalisation. But the politicians are unhappy. Mumbai's doing well but Singapore and Shanghai are doing better. Why? Because Mumbai doesn't seem modern. Why riot? Obvious. Because of us. Here we are, sitting in the way beside the airport, stopping the economic miracle being a miracle (Hare 2014a: p.8)

To Harvey (2009), rapid neoliberalization of India, occurred in the eighties “contemporaneous creations of primitive accumulation in rural zones and processes of exclusion and marginalization of a disposable reserve army of labour and productive capacity in urban areas” (p.1272). This made class distinctions within India wider than ever.

For Harvey (2007), new neoliberal disparate class has benefitted from social, economic and political advantages derived from neoliberalism.

Furthermore, This disparate class “exercise immense influence over global affairs and possess a freedom of action that no ordinary citizen possesses” (Harvey 2007: p.36). Žižek (2009) calls this disparate class as ‘the new rich’. The new rich have a tendency in living secluded places where there is no hierarchy among same nation citizens and lower class residents. For this reason, for example, there are more than 250 heliports in Sao Paolo, which protects the new rich “from the dangers of mingling with ordinary people” (Žižek 2009: p.5). Accordingly, the new rich of India prefer not seeing lower classes of slums and establishing their neoliberal illusionary world behind the walls. With neoliberalization of India, while the rich are getting richer and have become ‘the new rich’, the poor are getting poorer and has been stuck in slums walled out by the ruling elites.

Abdul says that “if I don't work the family don't eat” (Hare 2014a: p.7). This is the simplest rule of the slums. There is a thin red line between survival and dying. However, poverty is not the only challenge for slums. As neoliberal state, India has tended to cut the budget for social security and health care. The

welfare system of risk and protection, depending upon the asymmetrical duty allocation among worker, trade union and employer, was diminished by neoliberalization. As a result, social security systems are not established in terms of the model of the mutualisation of risks. That is, the state does not share the cost of health spending and citizens eventually have to buy the health care service. In the play, David Hare mentions this situation several times. On a question about his heart problem, Raja Kamble, a forty year old toilet cleaner, tells that the doctor will not do operation to his heart “for less than sixty thousand rupees” (Hare 2014a: p.10). Kamble asks Asha Waghekar to borrow money; but, there is no sign of solidarity in the slums of India. Asha rejects Kamble’s request despite the fact that her daughter Manju insists her on a help for Kamble.

Economic conditions in Slum are extraordinarily poor, and the state does not provide social security or free health care for citizens. What’s more, ruling classes carry out precarization in order to establish a harmless social structure where there is no democratic political opposition or a revolutionary threat. Steger and Roy (2010) term this process as ‘new public management’.

They claim that “operationalizing the neoliberal mode of governance for public servants, it redefined citizens as ‘customers’ or ‘clients’” (p.31). Neoliberal public management regards individuals as possible customers. And, this approach gives severe harms to social unity by destroying any possible channel for social solidarity.

The deep social injustices in Slum cause serious crime rates to increase. Hare reflects this situation to the scene. In act one scene eight, Kalu, a fifteen year old Slum resident, appears on stage with two drug dealers. Kalu is in panic. Two dealers in white suits catch Kalu and assault him. The two dealers blame Kalu for cooperating with the police, and The First Dealer stabs Kalu. At this very moment, a plane jet engine sound is heard on stage. A shadow of a Boeing 747 appears on stage. Hare uses the aircraft motif to reflect the different fates of different classes in India. Young Kalu is dying under the tough Slum conditions; maybe another young man of the same age is traveling on holiday. Boeing’s presence on the stage, typical of the upper-middle class, almost absorbs the presence of the dispossessed Slum resident, and the scene closes.

Act one scene nine begins with Zehrunisa's turn. Zehrunisa, a forty year old a little plump woman, is sitting with a group of dwellers. Zehrunisa says:

I can't help it. We're doing better. We're doing better than other people. So what? It's not our fault. And yet everyone dislikes us. What can we do? Abdul is the best sorter in the district, My dullest son, Abdul, and the hardest working (Hare 2014a: p.16)

David Harvey (2007) reminds us that when the state abandons welfare state practices like state health, social services and education, impoverishment becomes institutionalized. As a result, social solidarity "is reduced to a bare minimum in favour of a system that emphasizes personal responsibility. Personal failure is generally attributed to personal failings, and the victim is all too often blamed" (p.76). In this way, Zehrunisa links the poverty of others to their failure. This individual perspective is one of the most important memoranda of neoliberal propaganda. According to the memoranda, capitalist society offers equal opportunities for enrichment for each individual, and individuals spend their efforts and investments in unlimited freedom on their way to individual enrichment. However, this proposal has no validity in practice. First of all, the class differences naturally found in a capitalist society, at first, eliminate equal opportunity.

To Lazzarato, "In this continuum, none of the positions of inequality should feel safe or stable" (2009: p.119). This inequality leads to alienation. Zehrunisa is a little wealthier than the people around him, yet she is still a member of the class that can be defined as that precariat, including the unemployed, the poor, the precarious worker and the dispossessed. However, she does not care about the pain and suffering of people who are in the same social class as her. Zehrunisa will not be in solidarity with them. In fact, Zehrunisa underestimates the neighbours and acquaintances that are in a difficult economic situation. According to Zehrunisa, the only reason the neighbours are in a difficult situation is their personal failure.

In act one scene ten, Zehrunisa's daughter Kehkashan makes her debut. Zehrunisa, Abdul and Kehkashan are seated together to separate the wastes brought by Abdul. Kehkashan says that "I'm not going back. I'm not going back to him" (Hare 2014a: p.17). Upon her mother's insistence, Kehkashan was forced to marry a man she did not want. Due to a disagreement with her

husband, Kehkashan, returned to her mother's house. She is quite unhappy and desperate. As the authority of her family, Zehrunisa represents the common sense. Since, dominant ideology of the society determines the common sense. To Sinfield, "Ideology produces, makes plausible, concepts and systems to explain who we are, who the others are, how the world works. The strength of ideology derives from the way it gets to be common sense" (1992: p.32).

As the dominant ideology of today's world, Neoliberalism determines the common sense. Perception of the neoliberal ideology on women's social position and gender equality is centred on the free market principles. That is, as long as it does not create economic benefits, there is no value in gender equality. Scharff (2011) states that "Individualism and neoliberalism shape subject positions for young women that are seemingly irreconcilable with forms of collective organising" (Scharff 2011: p.23). To Scharff, due to individualization, structural inequalities are considered to be individual problems. In her study, she shares the outcomes of a field research about effects of individualisation on gender equality. Her study clearly illustrates that "young women are disempowered by individualisation" (p.10). As seen in the example, neoliberalism reduces gender equality issue to a simple profit-loss relationship.

In this way, women are seen as commodities, and Hare integrates this commodification into the stage with Kehkashan's situation. To Hare's characterization, Kehkashan is a helpless woman whose life has already been determined by the dominant ideology and her social circle. Another oppressed woman in the play is Fatima Shaikh, who is in thirty-five and with one leg. She talks about women rights:

Fatima A woman has rights. I have rights. From birth nobody loved me. From the very beginning. Everyone told me I was born wrong. And I believed them. I was shamed. I hated myself. Because I wasn't even a person I was an animal. One Leg, they called me. Why give a thing a name? Why send a thing to school? People say I'm a whore (Hare 2014a: p.27)

David Hare, after delivering Kehkaskan's desperate situation, emphasizes women's rights through Fatima. Fatima is a disabled and poor woman. In neoliberal order, Fatima has all the negative qualities to be exploited by the ruling classes. She has no freedom of choice. However, Hare thinks that

“freedom is not a privilege. It is a right” (2015: p.42). The issue of social rights in neoliberalism is a very controversial issue. Harvey (2007) stresses that social rights are derivative and they cannot be protected without active citizenship. By underlining citizenship, Harvey proposes an organised type of solidarity against destructive nature of individualism. Since, “If political power is not willing, then notions of rights remain empty. Rights are, therefore, derivative of and conditional upon citizenship” (p.178).

On the other hand, Samuel Moyn (2014) reminds the theory that the concept of international human rights has gained importance through neoliberalization. However, Moyn proposes that this theory is wrong. He stresses that the human rights revolution and free market fundamentalism have risen simultaneously. According to Moyn, it is impossible for these two concepts to be in peace with one another. Moreover, Due to the fact that neoliberalism has created disastrous effects on wealth distribution both in national and transnational levels, “neoliberalism has damaged equality locally and globally much more than it has basic human rights outcomes” (p.151). In the final analysis, neoliberalism does not develop any kind of social right, since instead of regarding social rights as a matter of humanist principle, it evaluates them in the direction of economic interests. This is a kind of human commodification, which David Hare denounces.

With Fatima being included in the scene, it is understood that there is a dispute between Fatima and Zehrunisa due to their adjoining houses. From time to time there appear discussions between these two women due to the walls of their homes. During these discussions, The Airport Director speaks to the audience:

Building an airport in Mumbai: it's like trying to do an open-heart surgery on a runner during a marathon. It's a problem. I don't pretend otherwise. This is a city where everyone blames everyone else. We all complain about the poor, but, believe me, We're happy to employ them. At very low wages, because there are always more. I'm trying to run a twenty-first-century airport. I'm trying give my investors a decent profit. Come on, if you make an investment, you expect a profit. Don't you? Isn't that what you expect? To do my job I need one thing. I need space. I need land (Hare 2014a: p.34)

According to Guy Standing's class taxonomy, The Airport director is a member of salariat, which includes high salaried managers serving big capital.

Depending upon his class position, The Airport Director admits how the ruling classes govern the poverty, which is normally a socio-political problem. The Airport Director indicates that as the number of the poor increases, 'reserve army of labour' also increases. The Airport Director implies that this situation increases the profitability ratio of the big capital. In *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Marx claims that the reserve army of labour will grow a little more each day as technological unemployment increases, which in many cases will reduce the level of wages. In this case, Unemployment and poverty will become more manageable by the ruling classes, as The Airport Director implies.

In capitalism, Marx (2004) asserts that capital accumulation inevitably occurs due to the fact that worker's labour has been seized without payment. This process is called as surplus value, which is defined as "the directing motive, the end and aim of capitalist production, is to extract the greatest possible amount of surplus value, and consequently to exploit labour-power to the greatest possible extent" (Marx 2004: p.363). The surplus value created by the unpaid labour of the salaried worker is the common source of the labour-incompetent income of the whole ruling class. To Harvey (2004), capital accumulation continues via dispossession:

Wholly new mechanisms of accumulation by dispossession have also opened up. The emphasis upon intellectual property rights in the WTO negotiations (the so-called TRIPS agreement) points to ways in which the patenting and licensing of genetic materials, seed plasmas, and all manner of other products, can now be used against whole populations whose environmental management practices have played a crucial role in the development of those materials. Biopiracy is rampant and the pillaging of the world's stockpile of genetic resources is well under way, to the benefit of a few large multinational companies. The escalating depletion of the global environmental commons (land, air, water) and proliferating habitat degradations that preclude anything but capital-intensive modes of agricultural production have likewise resulted from the wholesale commodification of nature in all its forms (p.77)

David Harvey stresses the fact that capital accumulation has reached the dimensions beyond which Marx cannot even imagine. The rhetoric of neoliberal economic and environmental policies will reveal that Harvey's processes of accumulation and capital transfer through the expropriation described above are

also vigorous all over the world. Transformations in economics, social policy, environment, urban, education and health indicate the capital accumulation and transfer process through expropriation. It is seen that all kinds of resistance against these movements are criminalized on the one hand and suppressed by a state violence on the other hand. Neoliberal states tend to govern poverty and they do not want any kind of resistance. Neoliberalism has effective methods for governing poverty. 'The debt trap' is, for example, one of the most effective ways of dispossession. For Harvey (2007), "debt crises were orchestrated, managed, and controlled both to rationalize the system and to redistribute assets" (p.162). With The Airport Director's turn, Hare underlines that debt creation and management is important for ruling classes from the standpoint of neoliberal class restoration and governing poverty.

Meanwhile, the tension between Zehrunisa and Fatima increases. When Zehrunisa's son Abdul accidentally damages Fatima's wall, a fight broke out between the two families. As a result of the fight, Zehrunisa and Fatima are taken into custody. The police releases Fatima immediately, but continues to keep Zehrunisa in the cell. Asha comes to Zehrunisa at the police station. According to Asha, the police are waiting for bribes. Asha tells Zehrunisa that "they know you've got money. They let Fatima go because she has'nt" (Hare 2014a: p.43). Asha offers to help her release to Zehrunisa. However, Zehrunisa rejects this offer.

In act one scene twenty-one, the scene opens within a Bollywood atmosphere. Fatima, dressed as an extravagant Bollywood star, dances in front of her door. At the same time, Zehrunisa's daughter Kehkashan sits outside to guard family possessions. Suddenly, Kehkashan moves forward and says that she cannot stand Fatima's behaviour. A fierce debate between Kehkashan and Fatima begins. Fatima provokes all family members with mocking words. Karam, father of the family, is also involved in the debate and threatens Fatima. The debate ends with neighbours' intervention. Everyone goes back to their homes. In ten minutes, a blow sound comes from Fatima's house. Fatima suddenly returns to the scene as wounded. While Fatima is suffering on the stage in screams, Kehkashan tells Abdul to leave immediately. According to Kehkashan, the police could associate Fatima's wounds with the previous fight and imprison the

family. If Abdul, the only source of money for the family, went to jail, this meant that the family would be hungry. Thus, Abdul flees from there and disappears.

In act one scene twenty-three, Fatima is in the hospital. Hare depicts hospital conditions horribly badly. And, Fatima says that “this hospital has no medicine” (Hare 2014a: p.55). Hare draws attention to the market-oriented healthcare system with hospital conditions and Fatima’s words. In neoliberalism, cuts in public health spending are conscious choices. As Purcell (2008) points out, neoliberalization “reduces state spending in some areas. Perhaps the most important example is that of welfare spending” (p.17). Public health is a welfare spending, and neoliberals have had a tendency in ignoring it due to its being uncompetitive. For this reason, the state is withdrawn from the health investments for the benefit of the poor, and health investments fall under the control of capital owners. For example, Steger and Roy (2010) state that Reaganomics in the US destroyed “Programmes and policies ranging from those aimed at the poor – such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, school lunch programmes, and Medicaid” (p.34).

In the hospital, the audience witnesses to Fatima’s tragicomic happiness moment:

Fatima People have come to see me since I came to hospital. I’m finally important. I’m an important person at last. At last I count. I count for something (Hare 2014a: p.57)

Hare, in these words, ironically mentions a very serious social situation. Fatima, who has not been regarded as a human being by any authority throughout her life, feels important though she is in pain. Fatima feels strangely happy. Her happiness symbolizes the desperate situation that Fatima is in. From a sociological point of view, Fatima belongs to the precariat class found at the bottom of the community. For Guy Standing (2011), the precariat is a social class that is constituted by precarious individuals including service industry workers, immigrants, temporary workers, sex workers, internet workers, students or garbage dump dwellers. According to this context, Fatima is a member of the precariat, and “precarious-ization is a formation of neoliberalism” (Molé 2010: p.39).

As mentioned earlier, the precariat consists of very different social groups. From sex workers in New York to slave-labourers who work 16 hours a day in China; the precariat has a wide range. Major weakness of the precariat is that it is not an organized and a single body of political power like the proletariat of Keynesian capitalism. This makes the precariat invisible to the ruling classes. Because the masses, which are not politically threatening, are absent for ruling classes. In this sense, as a member of the precariat, Fatima is also invisible, and her joy of being important symbolizes dissolution of social integrity. Act one ends when Abdul is a fugitive, Fatima is in hospital and Zehrunisa is in prison.

Act two begins with Zehrunisa's monologue. Zehrunisa feels very regretful that she did not save herself from prison by bribing the police at the first time. As Abdul is a fugitive, his family is out of the money. Zehrunisa informs the audience that she has to sell the housewares one by one. In act two, Hare prefers to tell his story to the audience through a fluent narration. In act two scene three, the audience learns that Abdul is captured and detained in Dongri Youth Detention Center. In act two scene eight, Sunil begins his long monologue with these words: "Something happened in America. Something bad. There's a street called Wall Street. Everyone says 'Wall Street. They all say 'Wall Street's crashed'" (Hare 2014a). Sunil talks about global economic crisis of 2008. Hare makes a reference to the biggest crisis of neoliberalism. According to Sunil, the empty water bottles of 25 rupees a week ago are now 10 rupees.

And they were forced to return to the mouse eating habit they left a few years ago. This major crisis has also adversely affected the precariat which is at the bottom of the class taxonomy. Abdul, who has terrible days in Dongri Youth Detention Center, finally becomes free. When Abdul returns home, he finds his mother and family in a miserable state. Zehrunisa has sold almost all family assets. Fatima has died in hospital. The play ends with Sunil and Abdul's dialogue. Sunil wants to commit suicide; but Abdul is hopeful despite the fact that he has lived many problems. Hare finishes the play with Abdul who represents hope: "I'll see you around" (Hare 2014a: p.129)

4. CORRUPTION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

4.1 A Dramatist seeks whether a Sustainable and Clean Market Capitalism is

Possible: *The Power of Yes*

David Hare opens his play, *The Power of Yes: a Dramatist seeks to understand the financial Crisis* (2009), with Author, one of the characters addressing Hare's himself, and Author stresses that capitalism has come to a grinding halt, which is the central statement creating play's literary spirit. *The Power of Yes* is "a story. Or rather it's only partly a play" (Hare 2009: p.X) centering on the financial crisis of 2008. The play harshly criticizes the fiscal crisis by showing its historical background. On the other hand, Hare seeks to understand and clarify the financial crisis with a wholehearted effort. The great majority of the characters are real person characters such as George Soros, Alan Greenspan or Howard Davies, whose roles are arguable in the breaking out of the crisis. *The Power of Yes* is intertwined with reality, thus some dialogues are verbatim. In the beginning of the play, David Hare clearly puts forth a relationship between the neoliberal phase of capitalism and the financial crisis:

Chair of Mortgage Lender Fear and greed drive capitalism. Capitalism works when greed and fear are in the correct balance. This time they got out of balance. Too much greed, not enough fear (Hare 2009: p.6)

Hare's emphasis on 'this time' clearly refers to the transnational market capitalism which has reached it's its most widespread level in the neoliberal era. Throughout the play, Hare points out public opinions about the bankers of Wall Street or the ideas of the western economists on the financial crisis in a dramatic way. Hare shows the fact that speculative money accumulation system having its golden age in the era of neoliberalism is the main source of the financial crisis of 2008. In his another turn, Chair of Mortgage Lender makes a request from Author not to portray bankers as "a load of shits" (Hare 2009: p.4). His request is not for the prestige of bankers, but for the play itself. He ironically warns Author about not to create a 'dull play' as he "will be writing what

people already think” if he discredits bankers. In this case, Hare points out a public opinion about bankers of the Wall Street. The origin of Bankers’ disrepute comes is directly related to neoliberal policies. Starting with 2007, “the United States experienced the worst financial crisis since the 1930s.

The crisis spread rapidly from the United States to other countries and from financial markets to the real economy” (Hull 2009: p.2). The sudden depreciation of the household market in the US and the consequent rise in personal bankruptcies in persistent mortgage sales are thought to trigger this crisis. As Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr. (2008) reports, “household mortgage debt nearly quadrupled between 1991 and 2007, rising from \$2.7 trillion to \$10.5 trillion” (p.1009). As a result of the large increase in mortgage debt, equity as a percentage of the market value of the household’s real estate volume has declined to 47.9% in 2007 from 60.5% in 1991. Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr also points out that the total of non-mortgage consumer credits consisting of credit card loans, student loans and auto loans “more than tripled between 1991 and 2007, increasing from \$800 billion to \$2.55 trillion” (p.1009).

In this context, debt ratios clearly show that the banking system of the neoliberal economy is the main actor in the financial crisis of the capitalist western world. It is clear that speculative money accumulation was one of the main sources of the crisis. However, bankers, mortgage brokers, mortgage lenders or credit suppliers are all also responsible for the collapse, since they were the fundamental processors of the system. In another turn, David Hare mentions the gambling nature of the banking system. Hare’s character Harry Lovelock says that in the last decade, “banks began to gamble with people’s money in ways which nobody really understood” (Hare 2009: p.12). With these words, Hare refers to the profit-oriented and greedy nature of the banking system. As Harvey (2006) stresses, with the neoliberalization, global banking system has become largely managed by the private sector. The state does not intervene in the banking system as it is in almost every sector. However, the financial crisis of 2008, lots of countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom, had to intervene in their banking system.

Especially, fundamentalist neoliberal circles, intentionally refused state intervention. They have insisted that the market will be able to overcome this

crisis with their own dynamics. David Hare also portrayed a character representing these fundamentalist neoliberal circles. Hedge Fund Manager says that;

On Friday the world's only superpower was doing things it would have considered unthinkable on Monday. At the beginning of the week it could have dispatched its troubles by spending a few billion. By the end of the week it's spending seven hundred. And overnight, the US is a socialist country. It owns its banks. Having claimed all the advantages of the free market, all its benefits, not least for themselves, the bankers go running to the government saying, 'Give us some money. Gee whiz, you have to give us some money or we're going to go bankrupt. And when we go bankrupt we're going to drag everyone down with us.' (Hare 2009: p.55)

Hedge Fund Manager criticizes the US administration for providing financial support to the banks. To him, it is an unacceptable state intervention towards free market system. Additionally, he accuses of the bankers not trusting the market rules. Hedge Fund Manager labels this process as “new kind of socialism. Socialism for the rich” (p.55). Just as Hedge Fund Manager says, the state intervention towards the market is regarded as ‘financial socialism’. Contrary to the state interventionism of the Keynesian period, which was created for working class interests, financial socialism reflects “the expression of the expectations of managers of banks and funds which are threatened with drowning in the whirlpool of the financial crisis” (Altvater 2009: p.85). To Zizek (2009), there has always been a flaw within neoliberalism. Yet, capitalism has the capability of leading economic crises and collapses. Zizek claims that there is a dialectical relationship between the dotcom bubble burst of the nineties, the collapse of Enron and the global economic crisis of 2008. In the final analysis, capitalism has ways to survive. Zizek uses the dream metaphor to stress this. He states that “the predominant narrative of the meltdown will be the one which, instead of awakening us from a dream, will enable us to continue dreaming” (p.14). Hare underlines this dream with Hedge Fund Manager's words.

David Hare, in many of his plays, has criticized the Labour Party. He directs the most furious criticisms towards the Labour Party, since he has believed that the Labour Party is the central for democracy and welfare for British People. In *The Absence of War* (1993), for example, Hare reflects the ideological corruption

mainly created by neoliberalization. In scene two, Hare's character Paul Mason, a left-wing journalist in real life, talks about the Labour Party with Author:

Paul Gordon Brown's the villain, I would have thought that was obvious. This all happened under a Labour government. It didn't happen under a Conservative government (Hare 2009: p.5)

Paul recommends Author Gordon Brown as the villain of the play.

Yet, Alan Greenspan and Goodwin have already been nominated as the villain of the play by other characters. Thus, a discussion about identifying a villain begins among the characters. What's interesting is that the villain candidates for Author's play, Alan Greenspan, former Chair of the Federal Reserve of the US, Fred Goodwin, former CEO of the Royal Bank of Scotland, are all prominent economists who have roles in the construction and implementation of neoliberal policies over the world markets. However, Hare gives a special attention to Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and Leader of the Labour Party during the global financial crisis of 2009.

Contrary to the fact that an egalitarian and socialist democrat government shall do, Brown's crew performed a central role in sustaining neoliberalization of the UK. Since, "What is clear is that both neoliberalism and New Labour are children of the crisis of Keynesian welfarism and the post-war settlement" (Daniels and McIlroy 2009: p.22). Depending upon this context, Paul blames Gordon Brown for being responsible for the economic recession of 2008. It happened under a labour government, not under a Tory government, and this is a shame for the Labour Party, which once constituted the welfare state. Hare, once again, presents a critique of the labour party which he has always been hopeful for its revolutionary side.

In scene three, a Leading Industrialist begins to speak and complains that people have already stopped to think and evaluate the past:

Industrialist It's worse than that. They don't even know I about the past. I was actually a banker for a couple of years, after the army and university. I went to work in a merchant bank, and you could feel the effect of the Great Depression, ingrained in bankers' minds. The mood hung over the place. There was a rule, repeated over and over. Debt one-third, equity two-thirds. Because that generation had an active memory. I've learnt not even to talk about the eighties, because

nobody knows what I'm talking about. Thatcherism. Who remembers?
(Hare 2009: p.12)

The industrialist draws a critical eye to the phenomenon of neoliberalization. The industrialist makes a comparison between the pre-neoliberal generation and the last generation that has lived in the neoliberalization era. Contrary to the previous generation, the newest generation has been living in an illusionary world not possessing a historical consciousness. What Hare underlines in this dialogue is the social illusion that neoliberalism creates through concepts such as entrepreneurship, individualism or market competitiveness. Harcourt (2008) regards this situation as the illusion of the markets:

The terms, as well as their companion expressions, "market efficiency," "natural order," "self-adjusting markets," etc., are illusory and misleading categories that fail to capture the individual distinctiveness of different forms of market organization and mask the redistributions of wealth that characterize our peculiar mode of market organization (p.2)

Harcourt implies that neoliberal level people live in an illusion. Especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Francis Fukuyama's famous declaration of the end of history is the beginning of this illusion. After Fukuyama, with the help of globalization, societies quickly began to integrate into neoliberal values. For the people there was no past, because a new era based on absolute sovereignty of the markets began. The illusion that Harcourt underlines is generally this, and Harcourt argues that this illusion is a deliberately prepared tool by the ruling classes to mask the capitalist exploitation. This view of Harcourt is in keeping with David Harvey's theory of consent construction. In the final analysis, neoliberalization is the redesign of the means of production and of economic resources as a means of enrichment for the ruling classes. To this end, the impoverished masses need to be persuaded not to pose a threat to the ruling classes. Poor masses are favoured by the ruling classes to get rid of their past and act without historical ties to the future. In this sense, David Hare refers to neoliberal illusion and the consent construction with the words of *The Industrialist*.

Scene Four is opened with music. David Marsh, chairman of London and Oxford Capital Markets, joins Masa Serdarevic, who became the face of the banking crisis when she was pictured on the front pages leaving the Canary

Wharf offices of Lehman Brothers (Walker 2009), and the Author. In his first turn, David Marsh says that anyone who wants to know what is happening in this country must understand the history of the new labour. With Marsh's words, Hare engages in criticism of the new Labour on a small scale. When she introduces David Marsh to the Author, Masa says that he had worked in The Financial Times before. Afterwards, the author asks whether everyone has worked in the Financial Times or not. Upon that question, Masa answers: "London School of Economics, Goldman Sachs, the Financial Times – that covers just about everyone" (Hare 2009: p.14). With Masa's turn, Hare mentions the leading capitalist institutions of the neoliberal world. These institutions are important for neoliberalism, since they have always determined the norms of neoliberalism and played a central role in dissemination of neoliberalization.

In this way, Hare implies that the main source of the financial crisis of 2008, which is the subject of the play, is neoliberalism.

Since the intellectual structure represented by these institutions believed that the market economy would never be wrong. As Robert Skidelsky (2009) stresses, "behind the efficient market idea lay the intellectual failure of mainstream economics. It could neither predict nor explain the meltdown because nearly all economists believed that markets were self-correcting" (p.36). Hare makes it clear that the main cause of the economic crisis is neoliberalization. He stresses the fact that the New Labour has voluntarily integrated its apparatuses into neoliberalism in order to "demonstrate they would be no threat to business" (Hare 2009: p.14). Within this context, Hare notes that the New Labour, as a neoliberal project, is also responsible for the UK side of the crisis. Hare goes on the discussion of the New Labour. In the ongoing scene, Jon Cruddas, a Labour Member of Parliament, takes a turn:

Think about that. The longest period of uninterrupted growth for three hundred years. New Labour bet the ranch on the financial services. And it paid off. Tony Blair told us it was a new economy. The old cycles of capitalism had been abolished. The class-based solutions of old Labour were no longer relevant, because the laws of political economy had been suspended! It was a new society and only New Labour understood it (Hare 2009: p.20)

The Announcer calls Jon Cruddas as the future candidate for leadership of the Labour Party. As a left-wing Labour MP, Jon Cruddas defends in the free opinion part of *the Guardian* that “Labour must return power to the people” (2015). Cruddas suggests that the Labour Party should move away from structural conservatism to a new and revolutionary spirit. In addition, Cruddas argues that a new economic policy must be urgently pursued. This means that neoliberalism’s exclusion from the Labour Party. In other words, Jon Cruddas wants to destroy the New Labour. In this respect, it makes sense for David Hare to give Jon Cruddas a long monologue. In his turn, Cruddas emphasizes the emergence of the bourgeoisie class with 300 years of growth and the process of settlement of capitalism in Britain. Cruddas says the Labour Party has been gambling on the financial services. According to Cruddas, the Labour Party’s abandonment of its historical class position and its evolution into a neoliberal structure is a gamble. And, the Labour Party has become this play’s loser. Cruddas sees Tony Blair as the cause of this destruction. Tony Blair’s new social structure calls for a new workers’ party as the starting point of this destruction.

Afterwards, Jon Cruddas continues his criticism over Gordon Brown. He imitates Gordon Brown: “an end to boom and boost” (Hare 2009: p.21). Hare uses Brown’s words verbatim. In the same speech, Gordon Brown “also laid some of the blame on the global economy” (Summers 2008), and claimed that every country in the world was to be affected by the global crisis. However, David Hare finds Brown’s explanations inadequate and inaccurate. According to Hare, the basic cause of the crisis is not the real economic turbulence in the world; it is neoliberal politics. And, the Labour Party has played a role in betraying the history of the crisis and of harming the British community.

In scene five, Hare begins to discuss the details of the financial crisis. The stage changes one more time. Masa Serdarevic and the Author stand on the stage:

Masa Because now I’m going to lead you to the sources of the great disaster. Are you ready?

Author I think I am.

Masa There are two basic triggers. One is sub-prime mortgages. The other is securitised credit arrangements (Hare 2009: p.22)

John B. Taylor states that western capitalism “had a housing boom and bust, which in turn led to financial turmoil in the United States and other countries” (2009: p.1). In his detailed essay, Taylor also determines the loose-fitting monetary policy, global savings glut and subprime mortgages as the main reasons for the crisis. To Taylor (2009), while the housing market is expected to experience a sharp rise and a negative impact on the financial markets, falling housing prices can be expected to lead to defaults and foreclosures. David M. Kotz (2009) regards the financial crisis of 2008 “as a systemic crisis of a particular form of capitalism, namely neoliberal capitalism” (p.306). After giving a detailed historical analysis of the neoliberalism’s principal regulations over markets such as deregulation of transnational markets, privatization of state services or reduction in social services, Kotz (2009) notes that neoliberalization has made easier to occur speculative economic activities:

Much higher profits could be made in such speculative activities as creating and selling increasingly exotic instruments such as subprime and alt-A mortgages intended for securitization, collateralized debt obligations, and credit default swaps (p.308)

As Kotz states, neoliberalization has been responsible for the emergence of asset bubbles which was the direct reason of the financial crisis of 2008. When an asset bubble starts, it requires a financial system that can easily lend to feed the bubble, which is constantly growing within short-time-horizon.

Thus, After 2000, the financial sector has created new mortgage-backing practices that provide substantial support for the management of a large and growing amount of borrowed funds in the purchase of housing and the growth of the last asset bubble in that period. Hare mentions this asset bubble and credit supplement with Masa’s words:

The business of lending on debt became huge and hugely profitable. And to test the quality of the mortgages, banks came to depend on professional rating agencies. Under pressure from the banks, those agencies became somewhat free with their ratings. Mysteriously, everything got rated AAA (Hare 2009: p.24)

Masa Serdarevic implies that the assets bubble possibilities are much loved by the transnational banking system, since banks has got profits from mortgages at incredibly large rates. Masa Serdarevic also claims that the banks have also intervened in the profits of the professional rating agencies. She says that

everything is rated as AAA. This attitude of the banks is not in accordance with the law in normal conditions. However, the banking system has made this explicit lawlessness based on the current ideological structure, neoliberalism. Hare exemplifies this by recounting the verbatim words of the US President George W. Bush on a question about mortgage system: “We want everyone in America to own their own home”” After that, the criterion for a loan became, ‘can you breathe? If you can breathe we’ll give you a loan”” (Hare 2009: p.24). As George W. Bush, leader of the neoliberal capitalist camp, said, the basic condition for getting a mortgage loan is the applicant’s being alive. Under normal circumstances, the credits to be awarded based on the applicant’s financial situation and economic background could be provided without any conditions. David Hare discusses the credit arrangements stemming from the mortgage system on stage. David Marsh, chairman of London and Oxford Capital Markets takes a turn and gives details about securitised credit arrangements. Marsh notes that those who could not pay their mortgages were given bigger credits than their actual debts. Then, Masa says that “and now the banks were taking on so much debt, they looked for a way of offsetting the risk associated with that debt” (Hare 2009: p.25). So, securitised credit arrangements have arisen:

About 80% of the subprime mortgages were financed via securitization, that is, a mortgage was sold in as part of a residential mortgage-backed security (RMBS), which involves pooling thousands of mortgages together, selling the pool to a special purpose vehicle (SPV) which finances their purchase by issuing investment-grade securities (i.e., bonds with ratings in the categories of AAA, AA, A, and BBB) with different seniority (called tranches) in the capital markets (Gorton and Metrick 2012: p.430).

It is the financial application of the collection of contractual debts of various kinds such as securitization, housing mortgages, commercial mortgages, auto loans or credit card debt obligations. Securitization removes the necessity for all the debts to be taken over by one person alone, and ensures that all the debts are distributed to different individuals. In this way, the banks will try to guarantee their receivables. This was a new banking process “in which loans are pooled, tranced, and then resold via securitization” (Brunnermeier 2009: p.78). With this method, while banks guarantee their receivables, they also make profits at high interest rates. This is a serious example of corporate corruption. And Hare confirms this corruption with his

character's words. The Leading Industrialist takes a turn right after David Marsh and says that "these securitised credit arrangements were a new invention, and they engendered a new level of hubris" (Hare 2009: p.26). In this respect, The Leading Industrialist states that the bankers considered securitised credit arrangements as a new response to the risk. However, he adds that the situation became worse.

David Hare reminds us that neoliberal imperialist policies of the US have played a central role in catastrophic economic situation. After The Leading Industrialist's turn, David Marsh steps forward on the stage. He smiles ruefully. Marsh talks about the concept of 'exorbitant privilege'. Historically, the term stems from French Minister of Finance Giscard d'Estaing, who "asserted that the U.S. enjoyed an "exorbitant privilege" because of the dollar's role in the international monetary system" (Canzoneri et al. 2013: p.372). As Canzoneri et al. (2013) clarifies, 'exorbitant privilege' is a kind of extreme privilege that refers to the benefit that the US has claimed to have because its currency is the international reserve currency. Hence, the US will not face the balance of payments crisis because it has bought imports in its own currency. As a concept, an exorbitant privilege cannot be attributed to currencies that have a regional reserve currency role, not just global reserve currencies. As it is clearly seen in the definitions, exorbitant privilege also refers to a financial imperialism. In the next turn, David Marsh confirms that idea. He says that "George Bush was happy to run up bigger and bigger national debts. Because it was understood the US was a kind of historical exception" (Hare 2009: p.27). George Bush's privileged vision of the United States is a reflection of neoliberal new imperialist political outlook.

Leon Tickly (2004) determines "the role of the USA as an imperial power in world affairs since the end of the Second World War up to and including the recent occupation" (p.174). Unlike the old forms of imperialism, which emphasize political control, the new imperialism uses economic control and surveillance as a basic tool. Neoliberalism is the basic dynamics of this choice. Globalisation is the outcome of this process. In the final analysis, "globalization represents an ideological facade that camouflages the manifold operations of imperialism" (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2001: p.138). The new imperialism used the option of military intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan, but at the same time the Bush administration did not recognize the rules in the economic arena and had an interventionist attitude. Hare integrates this

arbitrary interventionism to his play with Young Man's words: "Bush really did believe the rules don't apply to America" (Hare 2009: p.27).

In scene 5, Ronald Cohen, a British venture capitalist, appears on the stage says:

Chuck Prince was Head of Citibank. He said, 'As long as the music is playing, you've got to get up and I dance.' Wonderful, isn't it? The banks were all in a dancing marathon. You couldn't take a break, you had to keep dancing, and your only hope was that you'd be nearest the exit when the music stopped. You don't dare stop, because then your clients will remove their money and take it to another bank which is still dancing. And meanwhile the building is falling down, the roof is open to the sky, the hall's slipping off the pier and no one has the wit to stop the marathon (Hare 2009: pp.38-39)

Competitiveness is one of the most important concepts that constitute the philosophical infrastructure of neoliberalism. As Ngai-Ling Sum (2009) asserts, competitiveness has been systemically "constructed and coordinated by academic gurus/entrepreneurs, consultancy firms, policy think tanks, and international/regional organisations" (p.158). According to this concept, companies, holdings or countries have to be in a continuous race. In this way, these capitalist constellations struggle with a balance where the most powerful survive and achieve the highest profit. As Cohen emphasizes, the free market is like a dance floor, and the participants have no right to rest. Those who want to rest should be ready for heavy loss. What the neoliberal ideology is referring to as 'market arrangements' is precisely this. According to this principle, the free market regulates the market fairly with an invisible hand. Tore Fougner (2006) defines competitiveness as a tool for neoliberal hegemony and asserts that "the hegemony of neoliberalism as a rationality of government has led states practice sovereignty in a way that effectively subjects them to such external discipline and governance" (p.184).

After mentioning the concept of competitiveness with Ronald Cohen's words, David Hare leaves the turn to Cohen again. Cohen says that each bank competed with each other to give mortgage loans, yet "at no point did any bank ask, 'what will happen if no one can borrow and no one can lend?'" (Hare 2009: p.43). Hare criticizes the fact that the banks have entered such a race in an unplanned way. Hare also implies that this race is the cause of that catastrophic ending in 2008. The audience learns Hare's this stance from turn of Jon Cruddas, the left-wing Labour MP: "you see, I think it's the end of liberal economics. This is the end of experiment" (Hare 2009: p.39). These words of Cruddas are the imagination of David Hare. Cruddas's words are not

quoted from anywhere. David Hare clearly points to neoliberalism by defining ‘the end of experiment’. Hare explicitly states that neoliberal policies are bankrupt simultaneously with banks. According to Hare, the main reason for this collapse is the two basic principles of neoliberalism: competitiveness and free market economy. The aim of Hare to refer to the concept of competitiveness through Cohen’s character is to support this view.

Adair Turner, a British academic and businessman, appears on the stage and attempts to clarify the situation after the crisis. Adair notes that no one understood how risky the system was and “that was the answer to the queen’s question” (Hare 2009: p.43). Author is amazed and asked: The Queen? Turner nods and adds that the queen graduated from the London School of Economics. Turner continues to clarify the situation. Turner states that the queen was involved in the process, and expresses that the Queen asked why no one could predict the upcoming crisis. Turner announces the answer; there appeared a collective failure to see how all parts of the system were assembled. To Turner, “no one thought it was their job to look at the whole picture” (Hare 2009: p.43). Turner implies that no institution wanted to take responsibility. Neither the Financial Services Authority nor the Bank of England thought it was their job to deal with the crisis. To Hare, this apathy caused the effect of the crisis to be felt much more strongly. British journalist and political activist Paul Mason reappears on the stage. By referring the run on queues in front of the Northern Rock branches, he mentions the bankruptcy of Northern Rock Bank, which “was the UK’s fifth-largest mortgage lender, suffered the first run on a British bank since 1866” (Rooth 2017).

In scene seven, Hare refers to the bankruptcy of a financial institution from the US this time. Hare integrates the collapse of Lehman Brothers, “one of the most prestigious players on Wall Street” (Wearden, Teather, and Treanor 2008) into the play. Hedge Fund Manager, an American with early fifties, appears on the stage and says: “All our problems were down to the Wall Street securitisation industry” (Hare 2009: p.50). Identifying himself as qualified Wall Street player, Hedge Fund Manager states that Wall Street brings bad assets together, packs them in opaque structures and sells them to investors. And when these investments start to fall, they fall at high rates. Howard Davies, British economist and scholar, takes a turn and blames the US Treasury for not seeing the results of the collapse of Lehman

Brothers. Since, as Hedge Fund Manager defines, “it was the biggest corporate failure in history” (Hare 2009: p.51).

David Hare wants to give a message by discussing the details of the bankruptcy of both the Northern Rock Bank and the Lehman Brothers on the scene. This message is experienced on stage by Hedge Fund Manager’s words: “Capitalism is having a cardiac arrest” (Hare 2009: p.52). While David Hare says that the capitalism’s heart is stopping, what he essentially says is the collapse of the free market economy. Because, one of the most important arguments of free market economic understanding is that the market will regulate itself without any external intervention. Neoliberal economists claim that in the free market system, any intervention to the economy would seriously harm both national and international economic functioning. However, as in the case of Northern Rock and Lehman Brothers, the free market could not stop the collapse of two powerful financial institutions of two powerful neoliberal states. As a result, the world economy has found itself in a catastrophic situation that was labelled as “another Great Depression” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.131). As a consequence of this second Great Depression, thousands of people have become unemployed, and citizens have become severely impoverished. Simon Loftus, a young bond trader, is portrayed as one of the depressed citizens by Hare. Loftus says:

If you want to know what I think: I feel betrayed. Society over-borrowed, the banks were reckless, the politicians mismanaged the economy and at the end of it all my generation has missed the boat. We missed the good years (Hare 2009: p.65)

Loftus is a young entrepreneur twenty-four years old. Loftus, by age, is an individual belonging to the neoliberal generation.

He has lived in a sociological and political climate where neoliberalism dominates. In fact, Loftus, who graduated from the Mathematics Department of Oxford University, has identified his profession by this neoliberal socio-political atmosphere. However, Loftus feels betrayed, as he openly admitted. With this confession, David Hare draws attention to the situation of millions of young people left over by the neoliberal state of mind.

Within this respect, Neoliberalism is the main reason Loftus feels betrayed. Since, from the middle of the seventies, Neoliberalism has imposed an individualist entrepreneurialism. Neoliberal thought, which destroyed collective

and solidarity models of development, replaced these models with individualistic and speculative enrichment models. Upon the financial crisis of 2008, Layers of the Society that abandon realistic and labour-based economic models have found them in a deprived and depressed psychology. The real reason why Loftus feels betrayed is to understand that the promise of neoliberalism, the predominant ideology, is nothing more than a big lie. To stress this, Author finalizes the play with this phrase: “People are saying that markets are decent and wise. And now we know they’re not (Hare 2009: p.67)

4.2 Cynicism of the Labour: *Gethsemane*

Gethsemane is the latest part of a trilogy that specifically concentrates on British Politics reshaped during the neoliberal era. *Stuff Happens* was one-third transcribed, two-thirds imagined. *Gethsemane* is pure fiction (Hare 2008a)”. Once again after *The Absence of War* (1993), David Hare dramatizes a play on The Labour Party. With this new Labour Party concentrated play, theatre circles created an expectation about “Hare would crucify New Labour” (Fielding 2009: p.371). In the play, Lori, the protagonist, grabs her ‘gethsemane moment’ and quit her job in order to be a busker. Making life changing decisions are seen in the play both for the characters and The Labour Party. By depicting individual conflicts and challenges of the characters, the play reflects the cynicism of a working class oriented political party which was the hope of crowds for creating a welfare state. It is implied in the play that The Labour Party ought to challenge the neoliberal ideology integrated to the party by Tony Blair’s Third Way and create a new hope for the lower classes. This is the gethsemane point of The Labour Party.

Act one and scene one opens with Lori Drysdale’s monologue. Lori establishes links between books and people’s beliefs. Although Lori does not specify it explicitly, it is understood to refer to the sacred books. The name of the play comes from a religious reference concept. Gethsemane is the place where “Jesus Christ suffered the agony and was taken prisoner by the Jews” (Marthaler et al. 2003: p.523). It is accepted that in all the interpretations of Christianity, the agony that Jesus experienced between the last supper and his arrest was passed on in the gardens of Gethsemane. In this process, Jesus prays to God and grasps

the meaning of his atonement. From this point of view, the moment of Gethsemane is a time of intense internal reckoning. Thus, Lori's monologue in the very beginning of the play informs the audience that they will face a series of internal reckonings and self-criticisms.

Scene two begins with a cocktail party atmosphere. Otto Fallon, fundraiser of the Labour Party, and Mike Drysdale, a young rugby player, make their debut. Both of the characters are in suit. Frank Pegg joins them later, and these three people start to a long conversation. The audience begins to get detailed information about the characters through these dialogues. For example, it turns out that Otto Fallon was a hairdresser before he was introduced to politics. The audience also learns about Lori Drysdale's unusual story. Lori has left his job as a teacher and preferred to continue her career as a busker. Otto is astonished at Lori's choice. However, Otto would rather not talk much about it at that moment, since, Otto is planning to make a job offer, and he offers it to Mike immediately. Otto offers Mike a position in the fundraising business he is conducting. Although Mike does not give a definite answer, he is positive about Otto's job offer. After scene three consisting of Frank Pegg's monologue, scene four begins with Meredith Guest and her daughter Suzette. Meredith Guest, the home secretary in the cabinet, and her daughter are arguing within a nervous climate where its roots are based on past years. Monique Toussaint, an officer in her late twenties, accompanies them. Suzette complains that her mother is not interested in her daughter because of her busy working schedule. Reminding her being Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, Meredith claims that this is a natural process. And, Meredith also claims that her daughter is unfair. Since, Suzette went to the best schools and lives a privileged life.

However, Suzette says that she has never demanded such a privileged life and adds: "I want to be like everyone else" (Hare 2008a: p.17). Suzette claims that the schools where the children of rich and privileged families go are not as good as they thought, and adds:

I am all for that stuff. Really. I am. But culture's something you buy, isn't it? Like a handbag. It's about status. It doesn't change how you live. It doesn't affect your life. Does it? (Hare 2008a: p.22)

Although Meredith is a member of a political party that is regarded as the mainstream representative of the working class, the discourse she uses to her daughter to describe a quality life is 'bourgeois' terminology. For example, according to Meredith, Suzette should be happy because she has been trained in one of the most expensive private schools in the country. Or, Suzette has travelled abroad many times, despite his young age. The terms Meredith uses when describing a quality and happy life are all concepts that can be bought with money. Suzette reacts to this commoditized language of Meredith and rejects it. According to Suzette, culture is a concept that is too complex to be bought for money or status. Culture is more than a handbag. With this dialogue, David Hare reveals that the ruling mind of the Labour Party is alienated from the working class struggle. This means that the Labour Party, which established the welfare state by annihilating the remaining psychological and material destruction of the Second World War, rejected all this democratic socialist past. Thus, Hare's attitude can be seen as the criticism of the 'The Third Way' movement, which has blessed neoliberalism and placed it in the party program. "Neoliberalization was from the very beginning a project to achieve the restoration of class power" (Harvey 2007: p.53), and it has aimed at integrating its main principles to the all segments of the society, including the institutions of organised labour. The Third Way Doctrine was the Trojan horse of the neoliberalization for the Labour Party. One of the main aims of the neoliberalization is that all mainstream political movements become compatible with capitalism. For this purpose, even if the political parties changed, the ruling classes would continue to be in power in all cases. In this sense, Meredith, who is the minister of a socialist democratic party, can easily refer to capitalist principles in his daily life. In this way, David Hare criticizes the neoliberalization of the Labour Party. In the final analysis, *Gethsemane* is "a theatrical and imaginative response to the governing class" (Higgins 2008).

In the last part of his talk with Meredith, Suzette gets a little tough with her talk. She implies that Meredith and the Labour Party are no longer in politics for 'high-minded' reasons. In this way, Suzette points out a kind of corruption. She addresses her mother and her political party by saying that "they hate everything

about you. Because you are corrupt” (Hare 2008a: p.27). Meredith also mentions the corruption:

Nobody believes that anyone can choose to be in public life for the public good. And because they don't trust us, they hold us to some ridiculous standard they themselves couldn't possibly meet (Hare 2008a: p.25)

Meredith accepts political corruption. She confesses that the vast majority of British society does not trust politicians. With Meredith's words, David Hare underlines the issue of serious political distrust. The biggest source of this distrust is the New Labour. The Labour Party, the most powerful practitioner of neoliberal policies after Thatcherism with New Labour Perspective, created a great disappointment in British society. For example, when New Labour came to power, they promised to destroy child poverty, and this was well suited to a socialist democrat party program. However, “the number of UK children in poverty has started to rise again since the mid-2000s” (Couldry 2010: p.60). Additionally, Couldry (2010) claims that unequal income distribution remained a noteworthy social problem in the UK during New Labour governments, since it “has followed an ‘enlightened’ neoliberal policy framework” (p.60). Thus, the British lower and middle classes have lost confidence in the Labour Party, which has established the welfare state after World War II. The reason for this loss of trust is ideological. Under the influence of the New Labour philosophy, the Labour Party abandons its socialist policies and adopts neoliberal policies that serve the interests of the upper classes. Hare portrays his criticism via Suzette's debate with her mother. Scene four closes with that debate. Scene five consists of Monique's monologue. Scene six begins in a squash court. Mike Drysdale and Otto Fallon play squash in white shorts and shirts. Although Mike has made more efforts than his rival, Otto wins the game. Then, Lori Drysdale comes in. Mike and Otto sit exhausted. After a while, Mike leaves the room, and Lori starts a conversation with Otto. Otto asks questions Lori about her profession. He already knows that Lori has left the teaching profession and prefers being a street performer. Otto finds this choice very strange. However, Lori's life choice also increases Otto's interest in Lori. Otto asks Lori if she can find what she has believed to find out. Lori answers: “people nowadays don't believe in anything” (Hare 2008a: p.35).

With Lori's answer, Hare refers to a social cynical situation. After dividing cynicism into two main categories as classical and modern, Luis E. Navia (1996) defines modern cynicism as "a social phenomenon from which any and every kind of human aspiration is lacking" (p.VIII). A cynical state of mind may have a general belief or hopelessness in a human species, or it may create an individuality that is motivated by greed, empty, inaccessible, or consequently meaningless and consequently ridiculous opinions. Cappella and Jamieson (1996) draw attention to another side of the topic: Political cynicism. They claim that "cynicism saps the public's confidence in politics and government and encourages the assumption that what we see is not what it seems" (p.72). Political cynicism can logically lead to political withdrawal and effective political desperation. Acknowledging that political helplessness, David Hare composes his play, *Gethsemane*, as an "attack on cynicism" (Nightingale 2008). In some dialogues of the play, David Hare refers to cynicism of politicians. One of these belong to Meredith, who complains about their disrepute as politicians: "Everyone thinks we're cynics" (Hare 2008a: p.52). David Hare thinks most of the English politicians of the Neoliberal era are cynic. This thought can be observed, for example, in the high-dose Tony Blair critique of *Stuff Happens* and *The Vertical Hour*. Similar to these plays, Hare wants to give political messages to the British People. With his dramatization, Hare wants to say that "the British people must take some responsibility for that fact, rather than escape into cynicism and apathy" (Fielding 2009: p.379). In the final analysis, "despite the cynicism, despite the madness, David Hare always pursues the ideals that elude us all" (Dean 1990: p.XI).

In scene six, Lori cannot stand the insistence of Otto anymore, and explains why she left her job and turned into a street performer:

Otto So why did you give up?

Lori I'm sorry?

Otto Why did you leave?

Lori Oh well, it's difficult to explain. I had a sort of Gethsemane (Hare 2008a: p.35)

David Hare uses the concept 'Gethsemane' for the first time in a dialogue. Otto cannot fully understand this word when he first hears it. Thus, Lori explains the

concept. She says it is a night of doubt that Jesus questioned and interpreted his mission on the earth, saving the world. According to Lori, Jesus fully understands and accepts in the garden of Gethsemane that he came to earth for a certain mission. This is the gethsemane moment of Jesus. In this way, Lori implies that she has also experienced some kind of gethsemane moment and preferred to continue her career as a busker.

Otto does not find Lori's choice very convincing. Subsequently, the issue suddenly comes to the current political situation of the Labour Party and Britain. Otto is a fierce advocate of the New Labour movement. Therefore, it finds performance of the Labour Party successful in power. According to Otto, "They accept money. They accept the world" (Hare 2008a: p.37). Saying that they accept the money and understand the world, Otto clearly points to the neoliberalization of the Labour Party. Otto boasts that the Labour Party does not impose a specific program. According to Otto, this is an important stance. This attitude is consistent with the principle of classical liberalism and neoliberalism: Laissez-faire, which projects "maintaining competitive conditions, controlling currencies, protecting property rights, curbing monopoly power" (Peck 2008: p.16). Naturally, Otto is very pleased that the Workers' Party has internalized the 'Laissez-faire' philosophy. Otto is not uncomfortable with the political situation in Britain. According to Otto, everything is going well. However, Lori does not agree with this political stance of Otto:

Otto You mean you disagree with it?

Lori From beginning to end.

Otto Tell me why?

Lori Because, in my view, we're at one of those moments in history. A group of people-yourself included- have taken over the running of things and the rest of us are standing by, powerless, watching, like at a car crash. It's like we're watching a film and we're not enjoying it very much (Hare 2008a: p.45)

Lori draws attention to the existence of a hegemonic ruling class with the expression 'a group of People'. According to Lori, this hegemonic class updates the social field in its own way, while the rest follow this situation without doing anything. Lori's main objection is that neoliberalism is a mechanism that works in the interests of the upper classes. As an upper class representative, Otto approves the Neoliberal tendency of the Labour Party, however, Lori, as a

proletarian representative, is not pleased with this inclination. Otto is not expecting such a reaction from Lori. Thus, he experiences a brief shock, and recovers quickly. Otto tells Lori that he himself was a man of mental rioting. And he adds: "I never joined the establishment. I didn't have to. It joined me" (Hare 2008a: p.46). With these words, Otto implies that neoliberalization was inevitable, and he had to obey the rules of natural flow of life.

Act one ends with a meeting of Suzette, who are experiencing psychological problems, and Suzette's former teacher Lori. Meredith thinks Lori will contribute to resolving her daughter's psychological problems. As expected, Lori succeeds in reaching Suzette, but she is shocked at what she learns. Suzette slept with four men at a party in which she get drunk and shared a political secret about her mother with a journalist. Suzette asks for Lori's help to come up with this problematic situation. Act one closes with this scene.

Act Two begins with Monologue of Monique Toussaint. In the scene eleven immediately following, journalists George Benzine and Monique are seen on a bar scene. George Benzine is a well-known journalist who closely follows politicians and writes everyday articles in a tabloid newspaper. Naturally, George asks Monique, who advises a well-known politician, about his boss. Monique gives a long response to George, criticizing the media industry:

Monique You build them up. You knock them down. The press takes up any damn position they fancy-attack from the left one day, attack from the right the next. Don't look for a reason, don't look for a motive. The game is the reason. The game is the motive.

Geoff Hey you think I'm cynical (Hare 2008a: p.65)

In his autobiographical work, *Writing Left-handed*, David Hare complains about the cynicism of the left. He says that "We have looked. We have seen. We have known. And we have not changed" (2014d: p.27). As a leftist, David Hare presents a self-criticism with these words. However, the neoliberal regime societal cynicism is not just a matter of a political party. In this sense, Hare also refers to the cynical situation observed in the media. Recent studies show that "the framing of news about politics has direct effects on the public's cynicism about government, policy debates, and campaigns" (Cappella and Jamieson 1996: p.83). Neoliberalization is satisfied with the cynicism of masses because when compared to the organised and united masses of people, the cynical

masses are the easier units to manage. To this end, media may rig every kind of democratic elections. The strategic frameworks for electoral coverage mobilize mass cynicism in both the press and the media. As Cappella and Jamieson (1996) states, As the various agenda-setting, framing and preparation studies show, the media coverage can shape what people think about politics.

In scene thirteen, the audience see Alec Beasley, leader of the Labour Party, in a sitting room of a Westminster Apartment. Alec Beasley, good-looking in his forties, stands with Meredith in front of a big sofa.

Both Alec and Meredith's friendship and political comradeship are quite old. For many years, Meredith has served as party member around the same principles as Alec. However, this situation has changed in recent years:

Meredith It was open house. Your children running around. Pizza. You saying, 'oh, let's open a bottle.' And now? Well, now we never see you. 'Anyone seen Alec?' 'oh, Alec's gone up to Hampstead to be with Otto.'

Alec It is work, you know

Meredith I know.

Alec I do go there to work.

Meredith I know.

Alec Who do you think pays for the Labour Party? (Hare 2008a: p.89)

As mentioned earlier, Otto symbolically represents New Labour movement. Meredith says that everything changed after Alec's decision to continue his leadership in Otto's consultancy. According to Meredith's assertion, Alec has moved away from the working class people he represents, and has got a new tendency towards participating in higher class parties held in Hampstead. David Hare symbolically linked this change in Alec with the neoliberalization of the Labour Party. After World War II, "Britain had consequently developed a far more elaborate and all-encompassing welfare state structure" (Harvey 2007: p.55) under the leadership of the Labour Party. However, the Labour Party could not govern the fiscal and inflation crisis of seventies. It had to find The IMF based solutions. That meant that the Labour would face with its traditional supporters who followed the social and economically nationalistic policies of the Labour movement. That contradiction and unsuccessful governance of the Labour Party created an opportunity for Tories who are ready for

implementation of neoliberal policies. Thus, “the victory was pyrrhic” (Harvey 2007: p.58).

In fact, the only influenced political faction in the 1970s, the neoliberal ideology that was rising, was not the conservatives; the Labour Party was also experiencing neoliberalization. As Howard and King (2008) stresses, A new management principle has been observed in the governmental bodies of centre-left and centre-right political parties, “both socialist hostility to markets and conservative unease about market excess have largely evaporated, or have been revalued” (p.148). For example, “generating new venture capital, investing in new technologies, and fuelling research and development” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.70) have been recommended and funded by state apparatuses. In this way, the Labour Party governments imposed a new kind of entrepreneurial spirit.

The Labour Party, in particular during the period of Tony Blair, has made an attempt for some improvements in social policies, such as re-organising National Health Service or reducing unemployment. Yet, “in pursuing these objectives, Blair was largely inspired by Thatcher’s bold, albeit largely unsuccessful, attempts to reform the welfare state by making its administrative functions and procedures more efficient” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.71).

Tony Blair is the chief architect of the Labour Party’s neoliberalization. It is clear that Alec, who was portrayed in David Hare’s cast, was also inspired by Blair. Alec “is a regular kind of guy, in a Tony Blair kind of a way” (Higgins 2008). Theatregoers and critics “mostly focused on the obvious similarities between Hare’s characters and those at the heart of power during Blair’s final days” (Fielding 2009: p.377). Thus, it is clear that Otto Fallon represents Blair’s “Blair’s close friend and former chief fundraiser, Lord Levy” (Higgins 2008).

The A team of ‘the New Labour’ can be seen in the play.

Nick Couldry (2010) asserts on the neoliberalization process:

The UK New Labour government from 1997 provides a particularly interesting example since, on the one hand, its key advisers were unquestionably influenced by market populism and neoliberal doctrine generally; on the other hand, its social democratic history required New Labour, when they continued the neoliberal project, to adopt a

different balance from the Thatcher; Reagan or Bush governments
(p.57)

What Couldry clarifies is the Third Way Doctrine, which was adopted by the Neoliberalized Labour Party under the framework of 'New Labour' and This doctrine was also published as a book by Tony Blair's chief adviser Anthony Giddens in the name of *the Third Way: the Renewal of Social Democracy* (1999). That new approach, basically, aimed at constructing a new way of policy following neither Thatcher's pure market driven policies nor archaic interventionist policies of classical communist parties. However, the Third Way preferred taking some ideological notions of neoliberalism. For example, the Business and Enterprise Secretary of Tony Blair Government, John Hutton clearly stated that Salary systems should be competitive, and inequalities among salaries should not be evaluated as inequality of income. However, "the overlaying of market and social democratic discourse needs careful unpacking" (Couldry 2010: p.58).

In scene fifteen, Otto Fallon, Frank Pegg and Mike Drysdale, Lori's husband and Otto's staff, appear in a kitchen setting on the stage.

Meredith Guest makes a surprise visit as they talk about life, politics and the Labour Party's current politics. The conversation passes in a friendly atmosphere at first. However, in the following minutes of the conversation, there appears a tension between Otto and Mike about the current situation of the Labour Party. Mike works as an assistant fund raiser with Otto Fallon, and he is not satisfied with his job because of some moral reasons. Mike declares that he finds the job he is currently doing as 'tricky'. On this, Otto reacts:

Otto So? Why is that rubbish?

Mike I stand there, I say to them, 'You are bankers, you're businessmen, you know as well as me, democracy can't function unless people are committed to its organisations. And after all, these organisations have to be paid for. They don't pay for themselves.'

Otto Quite right. So?

Mike And then they usually say, 'Yes, I see, well I'd be very happy to help, I'm a big fan of Alec,' they say. 'Remarkable man,' they say. 'Not like the usual socialist.' (Hare 2008a: p.110)

Otto insists on telling Mike's last striking word. Then, Mike tells him that he can no longer keep his job and gives his resignation. Mike talks about a moral

problem and adds: “They are giving us money. But I’m still unclear what we’re giving them” (Hare 2008a: p.111). At that moment, Meredith is involved in the conversation. Mike confesses that he has shocked about how Meredith could be so calm, despite a few problems she has been through:

I don’t know. But we were with a girl who was crying out for her parents. And, what’s worse, what seems worse to me, nobody seems shocked. Nobody’s surprised by your priorities. The episode’s disturbed me. It disturbed me profoundly. Because I’ve begun to think, what is this? What’s going on? Who are we? (Hare 2008a: p.111)

There are two key points under all criticism that Mike leads to Otto and Meredith. The first is neoliberalization of The Labour Party, and the second one is the social cynicism to which the party members also surrender. Mike notes that it is quite problematic to ask for money from bankers and businessmen to continue the democracy. In addition, Mike does not like the praise of donor capitalists for the Labour Party to give up former socialist politics. Mike sees this as hypocrisy. Since, a party that is expected to be the voice of the working class is cooperating with the ruling classes instead of taking its strength from unions or farmers’ organizations. This choice stems from Labour’s neoliberal shift.

Since, “unveiling his Third Way, Tony Blair indeed promised the British people to put an end to the old politics of ‘class warfare’” (Steger and Roy 2010: p.67).

From this point of view, it is clear that David Hare criticized the New Labour perspective created by the Third Way Doctrine through Mike’s criticism. According to Hare, the New Labour Perspective has destroyed the old solidarity spirit of the Labour Party, which founded Welfare State. This extinction has also led to the destruction of social integrity. Individuals forming society have stopped looking for ways of solidarity with each other, and some kind of social cynicism has emerged. Mike’s reaction to Meredith is also a reflection of this social cynicism. Mike knows very well Meredith’s problems with her daughter because Mike’s wife Lori is providing psychological support for Suzette to diminish her psychological problems. However, Mike notes that he has been in a state of shock when Meredith has remained calm in the face of so many

problems and is still not interested enough with her daughter. To Mike, This is a kind of cynicism.

The next part of the conversation goes between Meredith and Mike. Mike insists on knowing what donors have achieved in return for the donations they have made. Meredith explains:

Mike What do get?

Meredith They get low tax. It isn't said, but that's what they get. A business-friendly environment. That means low tax. Put it another way: they give money to keep their money.

Mike I see

Meredith Yes.

Mike It's as simple as that (Hare 2008a: p.115)

Mike is disappointed in what he hears. After saying that politics can create very sad situations, Meredith states that she has reached a resolution. This resolution is that the Labour Party decides to move away from socialist politics and implement neoliberal policies. Meredith implies and adds:

Once they hated us because we were socialists. Now they hate us because we're not. I've discovered a curious kind of freedom. Because whatever you do, they're going to dislike it. So you might as well do what you want (Hare 2008a: p.116)

These words of Meredith are told to explain the reason for the neoliberalization of the Labour Party. This is a kind of defence. However, this defence is thoroughly a cynical confession. This confession is a clear indication of the political cynicism that has settled in Meredith's soul. "Political cynicism is an expression of distrust and a perception of politics being motivated by self-interest" (Mazzoleni et al. 2015: p.223).

Thus, Meredith's definition of her political stance is a clear example of this kind of cynicism. Meredith's cynical political stance is quite similar with Thatcher's 'There is no alternative doctrine', which is one of the main slogan of neoliberalism. Payanota Gounari (2006) regards this doctrine as a great example of political cynicism. The gradual collapse of the public sector has created a weird concept of freedom, which is very individualized and customized. Under the pressure of competitiveness and neoliberal success seeking, the contents of social solidarity have collapsed.

With Meredith’s cynical confessions, the audience experiences Meredith’s “personal own Gethsemane” (Fielding 2009: p.375). To Joseph N. Capella (1996), The causes of political cynicism are uncertain. Some of them search between their origins, the mismatch between promises and surrender, the failure to solve social problems, or the failure of large parties to make real alternatives in government. However, in Meredith’s case, abandoning socialist politics and turning into a reproduction of a Thatcherite apparatus is the main reason for Meredith’s cynicism. Meredith and the Labour Party have locked themselves in the walls of cynicism, rather than looking for democratic means of revolutionary transformation. However, in order to destroy this cynical neoliberal dystopia, they “need to articulate a language of possibility that will construct liberatory discourses and will mobilize specific interventive practices” (Gounari 2006: p.91).

5. CONCLUSION

This work explores the critique of neoliberalism in David Hare's plays. The English playwright David Hare has given a unique cultural and political critique of the British Institutions in his literary works since his first career days. Regarding personal and historical status as a playwright, David Hare depicts social disorders in society and portrays them in a form that demonstrates their cultural, social, ideological and dialectical boundaries. In this respect, it is understandable that the neoliberalism that has dominated world politics for almost forty years has had a place in Hare's drama.

This thesis focuses on certain plays written during periods when neoliberalism has been the dominant ideology over western capitalism. The plays were chosen from those written in the 2000s and contain strong criticism of neoliberal policies. The plays under consideration are: *The Permanent Way* (2003), *Stuff Happens* (2004), *The Vertical Hour* (2008), *Gethsemane* (2008), *The Power of Yes* (2009) and *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (2014). Recognizing that any literary production cannot be studied without considering a larger and more complex social structure, the work tries to learn the dialectic relations between Hare's chosen plays, the societies he reflects, and neoliberalism, which is perceptually dominant in the world. Thus, this work attempted to put David Hare's drama in its historical context and argued that they have been in a dialectical relationship with the society in which they were created.

David Hare does not hesitate to dramatize crucial international political events and their dialectical influences. He criticizes neoliberalism, which undermines the social consensus on the ground by deepening the core values of Western society and economic and social injustices. Thus, this study aimed at analysing how criticism of neoliberalism has contributed to the play of David Hare. David Hare's plays under consideration have been analysed in light of three themes. *Stuff Happens* (2004) and *The Vertical Hour* (2008), were studied under the theme of 'From Neoliberalism to New Imperialism'. *The Permanent Way* (2003)

and *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (2014) were examined under the theme of 'Dissolution of Social Integrity'. *The Power of Yes* (2009) and *Gethsemane* (2008) were analysed under the theme of 'Corruption of Public and Private Institutions'. All of these chapters discuss the results of a cultural materialist analysis of David Hare's chosen plays.

Keynesian policies have challenged international politics for nearly 30 years. The financial and monetary arrangements of Keynesianism have resulted in the welfare state in the United Kingdom, Europe, and even in the US. In the welfare state system, the quality of social services and wages on behalf of the working class has increased. As a result, the shift of the working class towards the middle classes in the advanced capitalist countries emerged. Keynesian policies and buried liberalism had experienced the golden age till the first years of the 1970s. However, alternatives to Keynesianism had begun to be debated among economic circles. In the end, various social theorists from different schools had already noted that the market was about to a catastrophic disaster. The crisis of the 1970s was a recession crisis. The capital accumulation crisis of the 1970s and transnational economic instability led to draconian changes in international monetary and fiscal policies.

Neoliberalism is a historical result of the crisis of Keynesianism. It was seen as Keynesianism, which was the main responsibility of the market failure. Neoliberal theorists have begun to work to integrate principles such as the capitalist world's government policies such as the free market, market competition or capital accumulation. High oil prices, unbearable inflation rates, or problematic relations between government representatives and organized labour stem from policies of Keynesianism. As Keynesianism had been dismantled, the opponents were alternatively arguing for a neoliberal perspective in which the state would play a minimal role in the economy. In addition, the invisible hand of market processes would have the priority of determining the organization of the economy, rather than state interventions or regulations.

Government intervention, which would be affected by institutions such as trade unions or trade lobbies, would reduce the free natural environment of market competition. By breaking down the institutions of the Welfare State in the name

of free market principles, neoliberalism tries to transform society into an entrepreneurial society and to establish the state as a kind of enterprise. The notion of an entrepreneurial society in a neoliberal state can be grasped as an organized group of people providing certain goods and utilities in the name of capital accumulation. For neoliberalism, the freedom of the market means prosperity and wealth. To the Neoliberals, free market means free people. Neoliberals insist that the market has an invisible hand that controls and fixes the economy.

The main starting point for the neoliberals was the market definition of Adam Smith. For them, the market can control everything about the hidden economic processes, and the Neoliberal doctrine was deeply opposed to state interventionist theories like that of John M. Keynes. Market definitions made by different academics agree on the same idea: The market needs to be globalized to work properly. Market globalization was seen as an inevitable process, and the globalization of the market was about to serve the idea of world-wide democracy and ultimate freedom. Neoliberalism implements a preventive process to create labour flexibility against job security. In this way, the ruling upper classes find a way to fend off any possible revolutionary threat or democratic political opposition. This means a kind of neoliberal capitalist exploitation. Upper classes in the neoliberal system tend to see workers as human capital that can be exploited like economic investments. In this context, social rights are relatively destroyed by the neoliberal policies of governments.

Art is at the centre of politics. Art produces worlds and facts. And these facts reproduce historical facts by analysing them according to social constructs such as identity, class or gender. Theatre as an art form has inevitably been shaped by politics in theory and practice for centuries. Moreover, political affairs and ideologies have made such a dramatic impact on drama, and a unique branch of political theatre has emerged about 600 years later. Historically, it is no coincidence that alternative theatres appear on the same days when Keynesian politics collapse. The market system that was established after the Second World War was gradually deteriorated towards the end of the seventies. The collapse of Keynesianism was a crisis for the capitalist classes and thus they managed to seize the crisis and created a new system. While all this was

happening, an alternative theatre movement, in the UK was emerging. In this context, it is clear that the alternative theatre movement is a historical result of restless political times.

Adhering to the principles of the alternative theatre movement, Hare and his colleagues aimed at creating plays that should bring political interest to the audience. They formed Portable Theatre Company for this purpose. Unlike the mainstream theatre, The Portable aimed to reach the working class with a minibus. David Hare's generation's theatrical perspective, including David Hare, Snoo Wilson, Howard Brenton and David Edgar, was called as Fringe Theatre Movement. The Fringe writers were crusaders who were challenging mainstream theatre mentality.

As mentioned, David Hare is a dramatist and director, bringing a historical perspective on most of his plays. Accordingly, cultural materialism is a methodology that focuses on arts such as drama, treating culture as a historical production process.

Williams argues that the economic situation and dominant ideology can influence culture at a certain level; however, culture is more than any socioeconomic analysis can do. In this context, this study aimed at examining David Hare's selected plays with Raymond Williams's cultural materialist analysis. In addition, this study aimed to discuss the limits of the functions between neoliberalism and theatre. Cultural materialism examines the dialectical relationship between social contexts and cultural texts and practices; nevertheless, it distinguishes no text from one another. The texts discussed may vary from religion, law or history to politics or literature. In keeping with this principle, newspaper reports, articles and other literary works related to the topics covered in the plays covered in this study were included in the analyses in this study.

The first play under consideration is *Stuff Happens* in the study. David Hare created *Stuff Happens*, the first anniversary of the military intervention of Iraqi coalition forces led by the United States and the United Kingdom. *Stuff Happens* focuses on the diplomatic path that George Bush Cabinet was pursuing to launch the occupation. David Hare's critique of *Stuff Happens* is based on neoliberal ideology. One of the most important neoliberal elements in the play

is the neoconservative ideology that the Bush administration had claimed. In the play, Bush publicly declares that his divine intervention in US politics and his presidency is in fact connected to an ideology: Neoconservatism. David Hare, voicing Bush's public words, highlights the Bush Administration's new conservative ideological stance. Additionally, Hare's play demonstrates that US Neoconservatism implemented consistent policies with neoliberal ones.

David Hare also stages different neoliberal propaganda techniques that have been used to influence different layers of society. According to Hare, this propaganda device works for a neoliberal illusion. Hare explains that freedom is important when used in the name of neoliberalization processes. Hare also emphasized that there are good freedoms and bad freedoms in terms of neoliberalism. In this way, Hare claims that neoliberal utopias eventually result in violence and authoritarianism. In this context, it is clear that the only way to maintain the neoliberal regime is to use the military force. Thus, Hare implies that Bush had chosen this path.

Hare describes a psychological change that had become a paranoid logic. The greatest cause of this psychological state was the neoliberal ideology that had been applied to the whole world, especially the media organs, for nearly forty years before the Iraqi occupation. Hare gives examples from media propaganda used in the US and the United Kingdom. Hare stresses that any issue that is related to the neoliberal upper classes is supported by media tyrants. In the play, Hare starts a debate on the historical history of US hegemony. Hare stages examples for neoliberalism, giving past issues from the history of US hegemony. The American defeats in Vietnam and as the 1970s market crisis are examples from the history of the US hegemony. David Hare reveals the lies of the Bush Cabinet and presents it to the audience. What Hare wants to emphasize is that even the most absurd lies of neoliberal ideological propaganda can be seen as truth for the sake of neoliberal hegemony.

In *Stuff Happens*, Hare also depicts the support of the Labour Party to Iraqi occupation. According to Hare, the Labour Party, which was neoliberalized under the leadership of Tony Blair, abandoned its old peaceful and egalitarian policies and supported the occupation of the US, the leader country of the international capitalist system. As depicted in the play, Neoliberalism succeeded

in influencing almost all the social units of the developed capitalist world, including the democratic leftist organizations. The working class and the advocate of the interventionist state, the British Labour Party, were manipulated by the main principles of neoliberalism, which had been historically opposed by the centre-left.

The paranoid logic after the 9/11 attacks and the concept of permanent war on terror are the last themes of neoliberal criticism performed in the play. To Hare, the Bush administration used the paranoid social psychology after the 9/11 attacks as a means of consent production. With dialogues, David Hare claims that neoliberalism is not merely an economic program, but also an ideological way to make the market system hegemonic. Neoliberalization may prefer not to integrate its principles and actions into any social mechanism with consent, not primarily with coercion. Hare integrates the 9/11 terrorist attacks into his play because he knows that there is something terrible beyond it. In this regard, David Hare implies that the ideological background of the Iraq invasion corresponds to the 9/11 attacks. This concept of preventive war on terrorism is subjected to serious criticism in the play, since it has been used in to justify the creation of a neoliberal market state in which the administration can do anything.

David Hare has created *Stuff Happens* in light of the new imperialist doctrine. According to Hare, this doctrine is the result of the historical development of neoliberalism. In this sense, *Stuff Happens* is a critique of neoliberalism in all its aspects. In the study, *The Vertical Hour* is the other play that motivates on the historical development of neoliberalism resulting in new imperialism. *The Vertical Hour*, on the traumatic atmosphere after 2003 and after the Iraq War, revolves around opposing ideas depicting psychological relations between the public and the individual. In *Stuff Happens*, David Hare, stages the hypocrisies of western capitalist countries and international institutions within the neoliberal order, on the other hand, in *The Vertical Hour*, he examines the social and political reflections of the Iraq war within the US and UK societies.

As in *Stuff Happens*, Hare places the hegemonic structures of international relations of neoliberal states in *The Vertical Hour*. Hare depicts that The Bush Administration tried to legitimize their military intervention in the name of

neoliberal hegemony and, at the same time, they tried to establish a favourable climate around a coherent set of moral values. However, Hare mostly portrays the reflection of these policies on individuals. For example, in his talk with Nadia, Dutton describes international politics as the protection of freedom and private property. Dutton's behaviour is understandable. Since, Dutton's mind was shaped by the neoliberal propaganda machine of the Bush administration. Dutton's words are the manifestation of neoliberal consent production machine. Dutton argues that every US military intervention is justified as all broadcast channels and educational resources have expressed it. In this sense, *The Vertical Hour* shows how the neoliberal ideology is trying to dominate the structure of the common sense.

Hare discusses social concepts such as 'national loyalty' and 'patriotism'. Nadia is an anti-war academic and does not approve the policies of the Bush administration. However, for Nadia, it is a national duty to go to the White House when called. No matter who the President is, the US citizen must fulfil the national duties when necessary. Nadia calls this 'national loyalty'. Yet, Oliver does not agree with Nadia and criticizes her with a cynical naivety. According to Oliver, such challenging national duties are always carried out by the working class. Oliver reinforces this idea with a historical example. Oliver reminds one of the most bloody wars of history, the Battle of Somme where the ordinary youth of the working class are sent to death under the patriotic mask.

According to Oliver, patriotism has become a historical tool to mobilize the poor in the direction of the ideals and interests of the ruling elites. 'Politics of fear' is another method of manipulation used by neoliberal mind. David Hare depicts this phenomenon on the stage. The Bush administration resorted to a policy of fear to screen authoritarianism and legitimize military interventions. Nadia complains that the US people think nothing but terrorism; this objection is a criticism of Hare's neoliberal propaganda. This is also the main reason why David Hare has named the play as 'The Vertical Hour'. He named the play as *The Vertical Hour* because the play relies on the traumatic atmosphere of the 9/11 attacks and the traumatic shock that was experienced after the war in Iraq.

The third play under consideration is *The Permanent Way* (2003). It is a play that sharply criticizes neoliberal privatization policies on the British national

rail system. As David Hare says, he has made countless meetings to take advantage of the experience of individuals and experts, in the Play's production process. And from the interviews he placed pieces in the play. David Hare claims that railways are ignored by politicians when compared to education and health services. Hare offers an anti-privatization posture in the play. According to Hare, the privatizations made by considering that the trains would serve better did not produce positive results; On the contrary, Hare implies that privatization policies have helped the capitalists increase their profits. Since, privatization is one of the most important economic instruments of the Neoliberal economy.

Thatcherism, seeing neoliberalization as the most important goal, privatized almost every state-owned organization in Britain. To reduce the political power of organized labour, Thatcherism privatized almost all public assets, including key public organisations such as British Rail, British Aerospace and British Steel. David Hare does not approve of this ideological choice of the Thatcher administration. To him, Thatcherism implements privatization to weaken trade union power in the public sector and diminish societal solidarity mechanisms. Thatcher saw Privatization as a tool to reduce working class' size, bargaining power and policy impact.

As Hare depicts in the play, The Thatcher administration did not show mercy to the working class and the fear of unemployment caused by economic conditions created anxiety among workers. The organized labour's retreat led to a clean path to Thatcherism for the implementation of its major politics.

Thus, within eleven years, the Thatcher governments could easily privatize large English industries such as the steel industry, shipbuilding or the national automotive industry. The trade union power of the national character and working class of state enterprises was integrated into the unrestricted free market flow. As Hare stresses, dissolution of social solidarity was the fundamental aim of Thatcherite neoliberalism. And, he discusses the concept of entrepreneurship, which plays a key role in the neoliberalization process. In this sense entrepreneurship is a tool for neoliberal individualism. Entrepreneurship proposes to the working class to work for their individual interests rather than struggle for social gains. The promise of being rich on the easy path is a very

attractive dream for the working class. Success rejects socialist solidarity and reduces social relations to individualism. Hare's emphasis on entrepreneurship can be understood in this respect. With *the Permanent Way*, Hare wants to express that the unequal distribution of income and wealth among the social classes is affecting social harmony negatively.

The fourth play, *Behind the Beautiful Forevers*, also motivates on the relationship between unequal wealth distribution and social consensus. Hare portrays a slum created by migrant workers who once worked in the construction of Mumbai airport. Immigrant workers actually occupied a land belonging to the airport. The play involves dispossessed residents of a shanty town that is the backbone of an architect designed to serve higher class people. Hare focuses on the stories of people who have been living in terrible poverty since the beginning of the play. One of these poor people is Manju, a young girl. Manju dotes upon Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*; yet, Manju says that she cannot understand Clarissa Dalloway's actions such as traveling with a private car or partying. Hare depicts Manju in such poverty; Manju remains too far away from the upper-middle class rituals. That is why she cannot understand the rules or habits of Mrs. Dalloway's world.

In *Behind the Beautiful Forevers*, David Hare underlines the fact that class distinctions are growing among the layers of Indian society. And, to him, the main reason for these differences is neoliberalization. Hare thinks that the new neoliberal class is benefiting from social, economic and political advantages that derive from neoliberalism. Moreover, this different class has tremendous influence on global affairs and has the freedom of action that an ordinary citizen does not have. In Zizekian terms, they are 'the new rich'.

In the play, this new neoliberal class is inclined to manage the poverty of the masses and to use it for their own interests. David Hare shows this through Airport Director's turns. The Airport Director exemplifies how the ruling classes manage poverty. The airport manager says that as the number of poor people increases, 'reserve army of labour' also increases. That is, unemployment and poverty will become more manageable by the ruling classes, as ruled by the executive directors. Airport Director implies that this situation increases the profitability of large capital. Additionally, Hare underlines the

importance of debt creation and management in managing neoliberal order for ruling classes.

As David Hare mentions in the play, poverty is not the only problem for slums. As a neoliberal state, India tends to reduce its budget for social security and health services. Welfare state practices and social security systems have been reduced by neoliberalization. As a result, social security systems have not been established in terms of the mutual interference model of risks. That is, the state does not share the cost of health spending and has to buy citizens' health care. Neoliberalism does not develop any social right; it evaluates social rights in the direction of economic interests. This is a sort of commodification that David Hare denounces in the play.

In the fifth play, *The Power of Yes*, David Hare emphasizes that capitalism has come to a turning point. *The Power of Yes* is a story that focuses on global financial crisis of 2008. The play criticizes the financial crisis harshly, discussing its historical background. Hare, on the other hand, is trying to understand and clarify the financial crisis with all his heart. The vast majority of characters are real persona, such as George Soros, Alan Greenspan or Howard Davies, who have roles in the outbreak of the crisis. Throughout *The Power of Yes*, Hare dramatically portrays Wall Street bankers or western economists' views about the financial crisis. Hare shows that the speculative money accumulation system of the neoliberalism era is the main source of the financial crisis.

Hare places the Labour Party and its leader Gordon Brown into play. When the 2008 financial crisis broke out, Gordon Brown's cabinet was in charge. Unlike an egalitarian and socialist democratic government, Brown's team played a central role in maintaining Britain's neoliberalization. Hare points out that both Neoliberalism and New Labour are the children of the crisis of Keynesian welfare state system. In this context, Hare charges Gordon Brown as responsible for the economic recession of 2008.

He openly criticizes the crisis not to take place under a Tory government, but under a Labour government and sees it as a source of embarrassment for the Labour Party, which once formed the welfare state. Hare, on this occasion, presents a critique of the labour party, which is always hopeful for the

revolutionary side. In the play, Hare makes a comparison between the neoliberal generation that lived in the era of neoliberalization and the last generation. Contrary to the previous generation, the new generation is living in an illusion that does not have a historical consciousness. What Hare emphasizes in this play is the social illusion that neoliberalism creates with concepts such as entrepreneurship, individualism or market competitiveness.

To Hare, Neoliberalism needs to create illusion, since it needs public consent. In this way, Hare emphasizes that international financial institutions of the neoliberal world are corrupt. Another play stressing the corruption of the institutions is *Gethsemane*. *Gethsemane* mainly focuses on the corruption within the Labour Party and British politics. The protagonist of the play, Lori, catches her 'gethsemane' moment and leaves her job to become a street performer. In the play, it is not only for the characters to make radical changes, but for the Labour Party, there appears a Gethsemane moment. The play reflects the cynicism of a working-class oriented political party by describing the individual conflicts and challenges of the characters.

For Hare, the Third Way Doctrine was the Trojan horse of the neoliberalism for the Labour Party. One of the main aims of neoliberalism is that all mainstream political movements become compatible with capitalism. To this end, even if the political parties change, sovereign classes will continue to be in power in all cases. In this sense, Meredith, minister of a socialist democratic party, can easily apply the capitalist principles in his daily life. In this way, David Hare reveals the neoliberalization of the Labour Party and criticizes it. In the final analysis, *Gethsemane* is a theatrical and creative answer to the management class.

Hare claims that the vast majority of British society is in some kind of cynicism. He presents this to the audience in situations where it is given in daily life or in the political arena. For example, some rhetoric of Meredith, who is in the role of a minister of the Labour Party, points to a clear political cynicism. David Hare thinks that most neoliberal English politicians are cynical. This can be seen in the high-dose criticism of the New Labour movement in the thought cast. With this criticism, Hare wants to give political messages to the British people.

Hare wants to say that the British people should take responsibility for this matter, rather than getting rid of cynicism and indifference. Hare implies that the Labour Party should challenge neoliberal ideology integrated with Tony Blair's Third Way and create new hope for lower classes. According to Hare, this will be the Gethsemane point of the Labour Party.



REFERENCES

- Abromeit, H.** (1988). 'British privatisation policy', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 41: 68-85.
- Alonso-Zaldivar, R. and J. Rubin, A.** (2003). 'Cheney Defends Iraq Stance', *Los Angeles Times*.
- Altheide, D.L.** (2017). *Terrorism and the Politics of Fear* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers).
- Altvater, E.** (2009). 'Postneoliberalism or postcapitalism? The failure of neoliberalism in the financial market crisis', *Development Dialogue*, 51: 73-88.
- Andersen, H. C.** (1987). 'The Playwright and His Theatre: Howard Brenton, David Hare and Snoo Wilson', University of Hull.
- Ansorge, P.**(2007). '*Stopping for lunch*': *the political theatre of David Hare* (na).
- Bair, J.** (2005). 'Global Capitalism and Commodity Chains: Looking Back, Going Forward', *Competition & Change*, 9: 153-80.
- Bennett, T.** (1998). *Culture: A reformer's science* (Sage).
- Berlinski, C.** (2011). *There Is No Alternative: Why Margaret Thatcher Matters* (Basic Books).
- Bicat, T.** (2007). *Portable Theatre: 'fine detail, rough theatre'. A personal memoir.* In: *Boon, R. (ed.) The Cambridge Companion to David Hare. Cambridge Companions to Literature* . (Cambridge University Press).
- Billington, M.** (2003). "Up the junction." In.: The Guardian. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2003/nov/17/theatre.transport> (accessed 22 February 2018).
- Billington, M.** (2006). 'A Five-Course Meal after a Diet of Candyfloss': Hare Hits Manhattan', *Rev of The Vertical Hour by Michael Hare. Guardian*, 1.
- Blanchard, O. J., William B., and David C.** (1987). 'Reaganomics', *Economic Policy*, 2: 15-56.
- Bobbitt, P.**(2011). *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace, and the Course of History* (Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group).
- Boireau, N.** (2003). 'Re-routing Radicalism with David Hare', *European Journal of English Studies*, 7: 25-37.
- Boltanski, L., and E. Chiapello.** (2005). *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (Verso).
- Boon, R.** (2003). *About Hare: The Playwright and the Work* (Faber & Faber).
- . 2007a. *The Cambridge Companion to David Hare* (Cambridge University Press).
- Boon, R.** (2007b). *Keeping turning up: Hare's early career* (na).
- Booth, M.R.** (1980). *Prefaces to English Nineteenth-century Theatre* (Manchester University Press).
- Booth, M. R.** (1977). 'East End and West End: Class and Audience in Victorian London', *Theatre Research International*, 2: 98-103.
- Borger, J.** (2002). 'President broadens war on terrorism', *The Guardian*.
- Bremmer, I.** (2009). 'State capitalism comes of age: the end of the free market?', *Foreign Affairs*: 40-55.

- Brenton, H., and D. Hare.** (1973). *Brassneck* (Eyre-Methuen).
- Brenton, H., and P. Roberts.** (2015). *The Romans in Britain* (Bloomsbury Publishing).
- Briggs, A. S. A.** (1961). 'The Welfare State in Historical Perspective', *European Journal of Sociology* / 2: 221-58.
- Brunnermeier, M. K.** (2009). 'Deciphering the liquidity and credit crunch 2007-2008', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23: 77-100.
- Bull, J.** (1984). *New British political dramatists: Howard Brenton, David Hare, Trevor Griffiths and David Edgar* (Macmillan).
- Bush, G.W., and M. Herskowitz.** (2001). *A Charge to Keep: My Journey to the White House* (HarperCollins).
- Bush, G. W.** (2004). "Text of President Bush's Press Conference." In *The Observer*. New York: The New York Times.
- Caceres, L.** (2013). 'Re-imagining Political Theatre for the Twenty-first Century', University of Melbourne, Victorian College of the Arts, Department of Performing Arts.
- Calder, A.** (1992). *The People's War: Britain 1939-1945* (Pimlico).
- Canzoneri, M., Robert C., Behzad D., and David L.** (2013). 'Key currency status: an exorbitant privilege and an extraordinary risk', *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 37: 371-93.
- Cappella, J.N., and Hall Jamieson K.** (1996). 'News frames, political cynicism, and media cynicism', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 546: 71-84.
- Carter, R., and J. McRae.** (1996). *The Penguin Guide to English Literature: Britain and Ireland* (Penguin Books).
- Caudwell, C.** (1944). 'Further Studies Of Dying Culture'.
- Churchill, C.** (2013). *Top Girls* (Bloomsbury Publishing).
- Coates, S.** (1989). 'Alien nation: David Hare's history plays'.
- Couldry, N.** (2010). *Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism* (SAGE Publications).
- Cruddas, J.** (2015). 'Labour must return power to the people', *The Guardian*, 24: 18.
- Dahl, R.A.** (1976). *Politics, Economics, and Welfare* (University of Chicago Press).
- Daniels, G., and J. McIlroy.** (2009). *Trade Unions in a Neoliberal World* (Routledge).
- Darlington, R.** (2005). 'There is no alternative: Exploring the options in the 1984-5 miners' strike', *Capital & Class*, 29: 71-95.
- Darnton, J.** (1996). 'Labor Won't Try to Undo Thatcherism, Chief Says', *LA Times*, 14.
- De Valle Alcala, R.** (2010). 'Towards Cultural Materialism: Criticism and hegemony in Raymond Williams', *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, 18: 67-76.
- Dean, J.F.** (1990). *David Hare* (Twayne Publishers).
- DeLong, J. B.** (2003). 'India since independence: An analytic growth narrative', *In search of prosperity: Analytic narratives on economic growth*: 184-204.
- DeVinney, K. J.** (1993). 'David Hare as screenwriter: The playwright and genre film'.
- Dollimore, J., and Sinfield A.** (1994). *Political Shakespeare: essays in cultural materialism* (Manchester University Press).

- Donesky, F.** (1996). *David Hare: Moral and Historical Perspectives* (Greenwood Press).
- Dorney, K.** (2008). *Top Girls by Caryl Churchill* (Longman).
- Drakakis, J.** (2001). 'Cultural materialism', *The Cambridge history of literary criticism*, 9: 43-58.
- Eagleton, T.** (2002). *Marxism and Literary Criticism* (Routledge).
 ———. 2013. *How to Read Literature* (Yale University Press).
- Edelman, M.** (1996). *From Art to Politics: How Artistic Creations Shape Political Conceptions* (University of Chicago Press).
- Edgar, D.** (1982). *Ah! Mischief: The Writer and Television* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. 1987. *That Summer* (Methuen London).
- Eldridge, E., and J. Eldridge.** (2005). *Raymond Williams: Making Connections* (Taylor & Francis).
- Engels, F., and Marx K.** (2017). *The Communist Manifesto* (StreetLib).
- Engels, F.** (1935). *Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science Anti-Dühring* (CH Kerr & Company).
 ———. 2010. *The origin of the family, private property and the state* (Penguin UK).
- Eskow, R.** (2006). 'Rancho Notorious Meets the Pentagon: Halliburton Shoots U. S. Army in the Face', *the Huufington Post*.
- Evans, E.J.** (2013). *Thatcher and Thatcherism* (Taylor & Francis).
- Fairhall, D.** (2006). *Common Ground: The Story of Greenham* (I.B.Tauris).
- Fielding, S.** (2009). 'David Hare's fictional politics', *The Political Quarterly*, 80: 371-79.
- Foucault, M., Davidson A.I., and Burchell G.** (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College De France, 1977 - 78* (Palgrave Macmillan UK).
- Fougner, T.** (2006). 'The state, international competitiveness and neoliberal globalisation: is there a future beyond 'the competition state'?', *Review of International Studies*, 32: 165-85.
- Fraser, S.** (1996). *A Politic Theatre: The Drama of David Hare* (Rodopi).
- Gaston, G.** (1993). 'Interview: David Hare', *Theatre Journal*, 45: 213-25.
- Giddens, A.** (1999). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy* (Wiley).
- Gómez, J.A.** (2009). *Regulating Infrastructure* (Harvard University Press).
- Gorton, G., and Andrew M.** (2012). 'Securitized banking and the run on repo', *Journal of Financial economics*, 104: 425-51.
- Gounari, P.**(2006). 'Contesting the cynicism of neoliberal discourse: Moving towards a language of possibility', *Studies in Language & Capitalism*, 1: 77-96.
- Gramsci, A.** (1971). *Prison Notebooks* (Columbia University Press).
- Gramsci, A., Buttigieg C., and Callari A.** (1971). *Prison Notebooks* (Columbia University Press).
- Hall, P.A.** (1989). 'The political power of economic ideas: Keynesianism across nations'.
- Hall, S., and O'shea A.** (2013). 'Common-sense neoliberalism', *Soundings*, 55: 9-25.
- Halligan, L.** (2014). 'How did Tony Blair leave the British economy?', *The Telegraph*.
- Hamilton, T. J.** (2007). 'Terrorism, Government and Post-9/11 Docudrama', University of Calgary, Department of Drama.
- Harcourt, B. E.** (2008). 'Neoliberal penalty: the birth of natural order, the illusion of free markets'.

- Hare, D.** (1976). *Fanshen: A Play* (S. French).
 ———. (1978). *Plenty* (Faber).
 ———. (1990). *Racing Demon* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (1991). *Murmuring Judges* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (1993). *The Absence of War* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (1995). *Skylight* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (1997). *Amy's View* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (1998). *Via Dolorosa* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (1999). *Acting Up* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2000). *My Zinc Bed* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2002). *The Breath of Life* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2003). *The Permanent Way* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2004). *Stuff Happens* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2008a). *Gethsemane* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2008b). *The Vertical Hour* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2009). *The Power of Yes: A Dramatist Seeks to Understand the Financial Crisis* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2014a). *Behind the Beautiful Forevers* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2014b). *Obedience, Struggle and Revolt* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2014c). *The Secret Rapture* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2014d). *Writing Left-Handed: Collected Essays* (Faber & Faber).
 ———. (2015). *The Blue Touch Paper: A Memoir* (Faber & Faber).
- Hare, D.** (1975). 'From Portable Theatre to Joint Stock... via Shaftesbury Avenue', *Theatre Quarterly*, 5: 112.
- Harvey, D.** (2003a). *The New Imperialism* (OUP Oxford).
 ———. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (OUP Oxford).
- Harvey, D.** (1989). 'From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism', *Geografiska Annaler. Series B. Human Geography*: 3-17.
 ———. (2003b). 'The right to the city', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27: 939-41.
 ———. (2004). 'The "new imperialism": Accumulation by dispossession', *Actuel Marx*: 71-90.
 ———. (2006). 'Neo-Liberalism as creative destruction', *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 88: 145-58.
 ———. (2009). 'Reshaping economic geography: the world development report 2009', *Development and change*, 40: 1269-77.
- Hazlitt, H.** (1984). *From Bretton Woods to World Inflation* (Ludwig von Mises Institute).
- Heffernan, R.** (2000). *New Labour and Thatcherism: Political Change in Britain* (Palgrave Macmillan UK).
- Higgins, C.** (2008). "Gethsemane: David Hare's satire crucifies New Labour." In.: The Guardian. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2008/aug/13/davidhare.theatre> (accessed 27 April 2018).
- Hinton, W.** (1966). *Fanshen: A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village* (University of California Press).
- Homden, C.** (1995). *The Plays of David Hare* (Cambridge University Press).
- Homden, C.** (1989). 'A war on two fronts: The plays of David Hare 1973-86', University of East Anglia.

- Howard, M., and King J.** (2008). *The Rise of Neoliberalism in Advanced Capitalist Economies: A Materialist Analysis* (Palgrave Macmillan UK).
- Hudson, M.** (2003). *Super Imperialism - New Edition: The Origin and Fundamentals of U.S. World Dominance* (Pluto Press).
- Hull, J. C.** (2009). 'The credit crunch of 2007: What went wrong? Why? What lessons can be learned?' in, *The First Credit Market Turmoil Of The 21st Century: Implications for Public Policy* (World Scientific).
- Innes, C.D.** (1972). *Erwin Piscator's Political Theatre: The Development of Modern German Drama* (Cambridge University Press).
- Jeffery, S.** (2000). "The Hatfield train crash." In: The Guardian. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2000/oct/18/qanda.hatfield> (accessed 14 February 2018).
- Jervis, R.** (2003). 'Understanding the Bush doctrine', *Political Science Quarterly*, 118: 365-88.
- Jessop, B.** (2002). 'Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective', *Antipode*, 34: 452-72.
- Kerz, L.** (1968). 'Brecht and Piscator', *Educational Theatre Journal*: 363-69.
- Keynes, J.M.** (1936). *General Theory Of Employment , Interest And Money* (Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Limited).
- Kirshner, J.** (1999). 'Keynes, capital mobility and the crisis of embedded liberalism', *Review of International Political Economy*, 6: 313-37.
- Klein, N.** (2014). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (Penguin Books Limited).
- Kotz, D. M.** (2009). 'The financial and economic crisis of 2008: A systemic crisis of neoliberal capitalism', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 41: 305-17.
- Lazzarato, M.** (2009). 'Neoliberalism in action inequality, insecurity and the reconstitution of the social', *Theory, culture & society*, 26: 109-33.
- Lockwood, T.** (1987). 'Fielding and the Licensing Act', *The Huntington Library Quarterly*: 379-93.
- Loughlin, S.** (2003). 'Rumsfeld on looting in Iraq: 'Stuff happens'', *cnn.com*, 12.04.2003.
- Lundqvist, L. J.** (1998). 'Property Owning and Democracy-Do the Twain Ever Meet?', *Housing Studies*, 13: 217-31.
- Macherey, P.**(1978). *A Theory of Literary Production* (Taylor & Francis).
- Maier, C. S.** (1977). 'The Politics of Productivity: Foundations of American International Economic Policy after World War II', *International Organization*, 31: 607-33.
- Markwell, D.** (2006). *John Maynard Keynes and international relations: economic paths to war and peace* (Oxford University Press on Demand).
- Marsh, D.** (1991). 'Privatization under Mrs. Thatcher: a review of the literature', *Public Administration*, 69: 459-80.
- Marthaler, B. L., LaNave G., Tan J. Y., McCarron R., Obermeyer D. J., and McGonagle D. J.** (2003). *New catholic encyclopedia* (Thomson Gale).
- Marx, K.** (2004). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (Penguin Books Limited).
- Marx, K., and Engels K.** (1970). *The German Ideology* (International Publishers).

- Mazzoleni, G., Barnhurst K. G., Ikeda K., Wessler H., and Maia R. C. M.** (2015). *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication, 3 Volume Set* (Wiley).
- McLaren, P., and Farahmandpur R.** (2001). 'Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52: 136-50.
- Megson, C, and Rebellato D.** (2007). *'Theatre and anti-theatre': David Hare and public speaking* (na).
- Milner, A.** (2002). *Re-imagining Cultural Studies: The Promise of Cultural Materialism* (SAGE Publications).
- Mirowski, P., and Plehwe D.** (2009). *The Road from Mont Pèlerin* (Harvard University Press).
- Mishkin, F. S.** (2011). 'Over the cliff: From the subprime to the global financial crisis', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25: 49-70.
- Molé, N. J.** (2010). 'Precarious subjects: Anticipating neoliberalism in northern Italy's workplace', *American Anthropologist*, 112: 38-53.
- Moore, R.** (2014). "Margaret Thatcher Began Britain's Obsession with Property." In: It's Time to end it [Online]. The Observer. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2014/apr/06/margaret-thatcher-britains-obsession-property-right-to-buy> (accessed 27 June 2017).
- Mortreuil, L.** (2010). 'The Voices of Enterprises and Political Games: The Corporate World and Its Single Voice?' in, *The Role of Large Enterprises in Democracy and Society* (Springer).
- Moyn, S.** (2014). 'A powerless companion: Human rights in the age of neoliberalism', *Law & Contemp.Probs.*, 77: 147.
- Navia, L.E.** (1996). *Classical Cynicism: A Critical Study* (Greenwood Press).
- Neale, RS.** (1984). 'Cultural materialism: A critique*'.
Nicoll, A. (1921). 'Political plays of the Restoration', *The Modern Language Review*, 16: 224-42.
- Nightingale, B.** (2008). "Gethsemane: Hare's Blair bunch ring scarily true." In: Daily Mail. Available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/reviews/article-1085515/Gethsemane-Hares-Blair-bunch-ring-scarily-true.html> (accessed 1 May 2018).
- Oliva, J. L.** (1988). 'Theatricalizing politics: David Hare and a tradition of British political drama', Northwestern University.
- Pattie, D.** (1999). 'The Common Good: The Hare Trilogy', *Modern Drama*, 42: 363-74.
- Peacock, D.K.** (1999). *Thatcher's Theatre: British Theatre and Drama in the Eighties* (Greenwood Press).
- Peacock, M. H.** (1990). 'Five approaches to political theatre: Howard Brenton, David Hare, David Edgar, Roger Howard, Caryl Churchill and Howard Barker', © Martin Henry Peacock.
- Peck, J.** (2003). 'The rise of the workfare state', *Kurswechsel. Zeitschrift des Beirat für Gesellschafts-, Wirtschafts-und Umweltpolitische Alternativen*, 18: 75-87.
- . (2008). 'Remaking laissez-faire', *Progress in Human Geography*, 32: 3-43.
- . (2013). 'Explaining (with) neoliberalism', *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 1: 132-57.

- Perkin, P.H., and Perkin H.** (2003). *The Rise of Professional Society: England Since 1880* (Taylor & Francis).
- Petras, J., and Veltmeyer H.** (2003). 'Whither Lula's Brazil? Neoliberalism and 'third way' ideology', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 31: 1-44.
- Polanyi, K.** (1957). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Beacon Press).
- Prendergast, C.** (1995). *Cultural Materialism: On Raymond Williams* (University of Minnesota Press).
- Purcell, M.** (2008). *Recapturing Democracy: Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures* (Taylor & Francis).
- Rabey, D.** (1986). *British and Irish Political Drama in the Twentieth Century: Implicating the Audience* (Palgrave Macmillan UK).
- Rebellato, D., and Ravenhill M.** (2009). *Theatre and Globalization* (Palgrave Macmillan).
- Riley, D. J.** (2011). 'Hegemony, Democracy, and Passive Revolution in Gramsci's', *California Italian Studies*, 2.
- Rooth, B.** (2017). "Ten years on, are we safe from another bank crisis?" In.: Manchester Evening News. Available at <https://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/business/business-news/ten-years-on-financial-crisis-13650464> (accessed 17 April 2018).
- Rose, N.** (2000). 'Community, citizenship, and the third way', *American behavioral scientist*, 43: 1395-411.
- Ross, T.** (2013). "Margaret Thatcher: Lingering legacy of hate after battle with 'enemy within' curbed union power and saved economy." In.: The Telegraph. Available at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/margaret-thatcher/9980344/Margaret-Thatcher-Lingering-legacy-of-hate-after-battle-with-enemy-within-curbed-union-power-and-saved-economy.html> (accessed 19 February 2018).
- Ruggie, J. G.** (1982). 'International regimes, transactions, and change: embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order', *International Organization*, 36: 379-415.
- Scharff, C.** (2011). 'Disarticulating feminism: Individualization, neoliberalism and the othering of 'Muslim women'', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 18: 119-34.
- Schmalz, S., and Ebenau M.** (2012). 'After neoliberalism? Brazil, India, and China in the global economic crisis', *Globalizations*, 9: 487-501.
- Sepp, K. I.** (2007). 'From 'shock and awe' to 'hearts and minds': the fall and rise of US counterinsurgency capability in Iraq', *Third World Quarterly*, 28: 217-30.
- Shaw, M.** (1993). 'There is no such thing as society: beyond individualism and statism in international security studies', *Review of International Studies*, 19: 159-75.
- Sinfield, A.** (1992). *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Clarendon Press).
- Skidelsky, R.** (2009). 'Where do we go from here?', *Prospect Magazine*, 151.
- Smith, I.** (2003). 'Britain's Railways—5 years after the Completion of their Privatization', *Japan Railway and Transport Review*, 34: 12-15.

- Smith, R.G.** (2015). *Affect and American Literature in the Age of Neoliberalism* (Cambridge University Press).
- Standing, G.** (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class* (Bloomsbury Publishing).
- Standing, G.** (2012). 'The precariat: from denizens to citizens?', *Polity*, 44: 588-608.
- . (2013). 'Defining the precariat: A class in the making', *Eurozine*.
- Steger, M.B., and Roy R. K.** (2010). *Neoliberalism: A Very Short Introduction* (OUP Oxford).
- Stevenson, H. H, and Carlos Jarillo J.** (2007). 'A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management.' in, *Entrepreneurship* (Springer).
- Sum, N.** (2009). 'Struggles against Wal-Martisation and neoliberal competitiveness in (southern) China—Towards postneoliberalism as an alternative?', *Development Dialogue*, 51: 157-68.
- Summers, D.** (2008). "No return to boom and bust: what Brown said when he was chancellor." In.: The Guardian. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2008/sep/11/gordonbrown.economy> (accessed 2 April 2018).
- Taylor, J. B.** (2009). "The financial crisis and the policy responses: An empirical analysis of what went wrong." In.: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Taylor, L.** (2007). *In opposition: Hare's response to Thatcherism In: Boon, R. (ed.) The Cambridge Companion to David Hare. Cambridge Companions to Literature .* (Cambridge University Press).
- Thatcher, M.** (1987). 'Interview for Woman's Own ("no such thing as society")', *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 23.
- Tikly, L.** (2004). 'Education and the new imperialism', *Comparative education*, 40: 173-98.
- "Timeline: The 45-minute claim." In. 2004. *BBC News*.
- Towers, B.** (1989). 'Running the gauntlet: British trade unions under Thatcher, 1979–1988', *ILR Review*, 42: 163-88.
- Tran, M.** (1999). "26 dead in west London train crash." In.: The Guardian. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/1999/oct/05/ladbrokegrove.transport> (accessed 23 February 2018).
- Turley, R. S.** (1993). 'Gender, myth, and history in recent British playwrights'.
- Usborne, D.** (2003). 'WMD just a convenient excuse for war, admits Wolfowitz', *Independent*, May, 30.
- Wade, L.** (2007). *Hare's trilogy at the National: private moralities and the common good* (na).
- Walker, T.** (2009). "Sir David Hare manages to find beauty in the financial crisis." In.: Available at <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/theatre-news/6262486/Sir-David-Hare-manages-to-find-beauty-in-the-financial-crisis.html> (accessed 01 April 2018).
- Wallace, R.** (2013). 'Public faces, private lives: the drama of David Hare', Ulster University.
- Wandor, M.** (1993). *Drama Today: A Critical Guide to British Drama, 1970-1990* (Longman).
- Wearden, G., Teather D., and Treanor J.** (2008). 'Banking crisis: Lehman Brothers files for bankruptcy protection', *The Guardian*, 15.

- Weeks, S. H.** (1988). *Alternative histories: British historical drama from the left since 1956* (Stanford University).
- White, M.** (2001). 'Let us reorder this world', *The Guardian*.
- Wicke, J.** (1994). "' Mrs. Dalloway' Goes to Market: Woolf, Keynes, and Modern Markets." In *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, 5-23. JSTOR.
- Williams, K. J.** (2009). 'Translating Brecht: versions of " Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder" for the British stage', University of St Andrews.
- Williams, M.** (1986). 'Culture.' in, *Society Today* (Springer).
- Williams, R.** (1958). *Culture and Society, 1780-1950* (Columbia University Press).
- . (1961). *The Long Revolution* (Broadview Press).
- . (1977). *Marxism and Literature* (OUP Oxford).
- . (1985). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (Oxford University Press, USA).
- Williams, R.** (1973). 'Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory', *New left review*: 3.
- . (1976). 'Notes on Marxism in Britain since 1945', *New left review*, 100: 81-94.
- . (1980). *Problems in materialism and culture: Selected essays* (Verso).
- . (1983). *Towards 2000* (Chatto & Windus).
- Williamson, J.** (1993). 'Democracy and the "Washington consensus"', *World development*, 21: 1329-36.
- Wilmarth Jr, Arthur E.** (2008). 'The dark side of universal banking: Financial conglomerates and the origins of the subprime financial crisis', *Conn. L. Rev.*, 41: 963.
- Wolmar, C.** (2001). *Broken rails: How privatisation wrecked Britain's railways* (Aurum Press).
- Woolf, V.** (2013). *Mrs Dalloway (Collins Classics)* (HarperCollins Publishers).
- Wu, D.** (2007). *Hare's 'stage poetry', 1995–2002* (na).
- Zajda, J., and Rust V.** (2010). *Globalisation, Policy and Comparative Research: Discourses of Globalisation* (Springer Netherlands).
- Žižek, S.** (2009). *First As Tragedy, Then As Farce* (Verso).



RESUME

Name Surname: Hakan GÜLTEKİN

Place and Date of Birth: Artvin/ 22.09.1983

Email: hagultekin@gmail.com

Education:

- **Bachelor:** 2007, Ataturk University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language and Education
- **Master:** 2014, Karadeniz Technical University, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of English Language and Literature.
- **PhD:** 2018, Istanbul Aydın University, Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of English Language and Literature.

PUBLICATIONS (INTERNATIONAL)

- BİÇER AHMET GÖKHAN, **GÜLTEKİN HAKAN** (2014). Howard Barker's The Castle: Constructing the Walls of Fear. 8th International IDEA Conference: Studies in English, 31-47.
- ÇIRAKLI MUSTAFA ZEKİ, **GÜLTEKİN HAKAN** (2017). Pause as a Discursive Element in Hemingway's Selected Short Stories. Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature 41 (1), 20.
- **GÜLTEKİN HAKAN** (2017). Pause as a Linguistic Element in Ernest Hemingway's Old Man at the Bridge, The Three Day Blow and The Revolutionist. Journal of Narrative and Language Studies, 30-39.



