Jerome Meckier

LOOKING BACK AT ANGER: THE SUCCESS OF A COLLAPSING STANCE

There were several purely sociological causes for the decline of the Angry Young Men. For one thing, they could not stay young forever,[1] even if they could stay angry. Then again, the fantastic success these writers enjoyed[2] threatened almost immediately their stance as critics of the Establishment, whether they aimed their barbs from outside (Osborne, Sillitoe, Braine) or from within (Amis, Wain).[3] Moreover, the drift towards Mr. Wilson's Labor government and perhaps the fortune amassed by the Beatles[4] combined to undermine the contention that certain types and certain views found life harder than others.

Artistic reasons can also be offered. Although some of the Angries reopened novel and stage to environments and characters unfamiliar since Dickens and the early H. G. Wells, they were generally less interested in experimentation. Avoiding Joyce and Woolf, they returned for their models to Edwardians, Victorians, and the picaresque novels of the eighteenth century.[5] Newness of content, unaccompanied by new techniques, eventually proved self-defeating once the content lost its novelty. Like the Romantics, the Angries relied heavily on their own experience, but soon discovered they were exhausting their material faster than they could live it. Once Osborne looked back, it became harder to do so a second time, unless one invented an historical Angry Young Man, as Osborne did in *Luther* (1961). Sillitoe's Arthur Seaton works a lathe in a factory, as did Sillitoe. In *Key to the Door* (1961), Sillitoe tells the story of Arthur's brother, Brian, who, like the author, spends time as a radio operator in Malaya. This amounts to making oneself brothers while using up different parts of one's autobiography in different books, a process that cannot continue for very long.[6]

However, the situation in several of the novels by Angry Young Men is unique. It can be shown that the stance adopted in these novels was collapsing even as their authors assumed it. This, in fact, appears to be in large part what the novels are about. The novelists in question were subtle enough to show not only the release anger affords but its ultimate futility. Anger never wins; or, when it gets its way, the prize is not worth the effort. In some cases the author alone realizes how incomplete anger is as an approach to life. In others, he shares this insight with one or more of the major characters. Paradoxically, the novels written from this collapsing stance—a tension between the need for rage and a growing scepticism about its efficacy—remain fresh and re-readable, even though the conclusions they come to make additional novels along the same thematic lines impossible and unnecessary.

I

Jim Dixon, anti-hero of Amis' *Lucky Jim* (1954), hates the smugness, the stuffy, hypocritical complacency of the Establishment. Though of lower-class background, Dixon pursues a middle-class profession as a university professor. From the Establishment's point of view, he does everything wrong. The scene in which Dixon, totally inebriated, gives his iconoclastic lecture on Merrie England (22) remains a touchstone for judging comedy in modern fiction. Dixon not only makes a shambles of, in this instance, a moribund public occasion, but effectively destroys the myth of Merrie England, a myth that in many different forms has been the Establishment's image of itself in more than one historical period. The charge against Amis' novel is that it builds to no convincing conclusion, that Dixon merely proves the truth of his sobriquet by landing a job with Gore-Urquhart.[7]

On second look, however, there are signs that more than luck is involved. At a crucial point in the novel, a change in Dixon's attitudes and conduct makes this work more complex than any Amis has written since. Easily overlooked in a continuously comic novel, this serious change results in the defeat of the obnoxious Bertrand Welch, the liberation of Christine Callaghan, and the job with Gore-Urquhart.

Jim's transformation occurs in Chapter 12, the book's midpoint. Like Sillitoe's Arthur Seaton, Dixon is often consumed by "anarchic fury" (1) at the phoniness and stupidity of people; but his anger remains mental, internalized, and he burns it up in a succession of fantasies no more reliable than those of Waterhouse's Billy Liar. During his hair-raising ride with Professor Welch in the opening chapter, Dixon "pretended to himself that he'd pick up his professor round the waist, squeeze the furry grey-blue waistcoat against him to expel the breath, run heavily with him up the steps, along the corridor, and plunge the too small feet in their capless shoes into a lavatory basin, pulling the plug once, twice and again, stuffing the mouth with toilet paper". Despite the richness of detail here and the careful step by step instructions, Jim never acts out this or any other fantasy during the first eleven chapters. Frustrated rage is his and Amis' *forte*. In Chapter 12, however, two things happen that reverse the pattern of events prior to this point. First, Dixon for once reacts positively to someone. He reacts so positively to Christine that Carol tells him he must be in love. Secondly, he acquires a mission that a true medievalist would find appropriate. Carol insists: "you've got a moral duty to perform. Get that girl away from Bertrand". Thus Jim is, on the one hand, a comic knight saving Christine from Professor Welch's monstrous son, while on the other he is for once saving someone instead of having to be rescued. Previously, he has had to be saved from one situation after another by a variety of devices including the planned telephone call from Bill Atkinson that recalls him from a weekend at the Welches (7).

After rescuing Christine from Bertrand at the Summer Ball, Jim engages her in a conversation that is more honest than any he has had for some time. In this chapter (14), and all through the book, the words *luck* and *lucky* recur. Jim feels "lucky" to have Christine with him. But for once he switches from passivity and defense to a plan of action: "For once in his life Dixon resolved to bet on his luck", to try for Christine. Jim has always been lucky, but only when he bets on or cooperates with that luck does he taste success.

Dixon now formulates two new rules for himself. The first stipulates that "nice things are nicer than nasty ones" (14) and signifies the substitution of happiness for revenge as his ultimate goal. Anger, Jim appears to realize, is not a self-sufficient way of life. When he meets the Welches for the last time in the novel, he responds to them with laughter instead of rage (25). The second asserts that "Doing what you wanted to do was the only training, and the only preliminary, needed for doing more of what you wanted to do". Admittedly not earth-shaking maxims, these nonetheless are quite different from Jim's previous code. Luck remains a vital part of the novel, but Jim wins out because at a critical point in the book he changes in ways that permit him to cooperate with the good things that come along. He senses the novel's change in tempo. At the start, Jim seems to be the misfit. Gradually, however, potential allies for Jim appear: Bill, Carol, Christine, Gore-Urquhart. From being a minority of one, Jim becomes instead a genuine person who has been trapped in a crowd of boobies and fakers. He is fortunate that allies and opportunities for escape arrive, but when they do he capitalizes on them.

One other comment that Carol makes to Jim deserves more attention. "Another thing you'll find", she says, "is that the years of illusion aren't those of adolescence, as the grownups try to tell us; they're the ones immediately after it, say the middle twenties, the false maturity if you like, when you first get thoroughly embroiled in things and lose your head. Your age, by the way, Jim" (12). This passage strongly indicates that Amis sees that the years of anger and rebellion "when you first get thoroughly embroiled" are not only an illusion but a necessary stage one inevitably outgrows. Like those of other Angry Young Men, Amis' novel is not solely about anger; it also deals with that emotion's inadequacies and eventual collapse.

Wain's *Strike the Father Dead* (1962) focuses even more intensely on the "false maturity", the "years of illusion". Possibly Wain's best novel, it serves as *locus classicus* for anger as both a generating force and a collapsing stance. The novel's benevolently ironic point occurs to the hero, who makes it explicit, shortly after the reader formulates it for himself.

Wain's novel experiments mildly with multiple viewpoints as the telling of the story is divided up among Alfred Coleman, professor of Greek and father of the central figure, his sister Eleanor, and his son Jeremy, the jazz pianist. The different viewpoints underline the theme of a struggle between generations. Throughout the novel, Jeremy deliberately defines himself in opposition to his father, who at first appears to symbolize rather woodenly the established values. "I wanted, actually *needed*", says Jeremy, "to think of myself as a rebel, bravely acting out a pattern that was the reverse of what I had been taught, experimenting with an upside-down and inside-out system of values" (Part 6, "Jeremy"). Where Alfred Coleman professes Greek, one of the oldest disciplines, Jeremy chooses jazz, one of the newest. But the more he defines himself in opposition to his father, the more circumstances force him to perceive similarities. Then comes the major irony: Jeremy began playing jazz in the '40s but by the '50s it is the era of rock and roll, and jazz to Jeremy's surprise, has become as esoteric a discipline as Greek. Wain deals with the generation gap and the angry revolt of a young man. However, he sees this revolt as something cyclical, not a phenomenon of the '50s. "I saw now", observes Jeremy in the final pages, "that my way was really the same as the old man's. You played music as you studied the classics, because you had chosen it as your own particular skill, the contribution you were going to make, the thing you were good at".[8] In fact, a generation earlier, Alfred Coleman's decision to study Greek was also a revolt. His father, a clergyman, wanted to see him in a pulpit. But Alfred decided one could not believe in

God in 1910—his father could because he belonged to the 1880s—so Alfred abandoned religion for the "ancient secular wisdom" of the pagan Greeks (Part 1, "Alfred").

Both Amis and Wain try for something larger than the anger of their respective heroes, for a larger viewpoint in which anger is seen as a phase in the individual's growth or part of a cyclical process in which sons reject but nevertheless come to resemble their fathers. Although anger receives sympathetic treatment in both novels, its inadequacies and, most of all, its transitory quality form a major part of one's final impression. Amis and Wain portray the incompleteness of anger as an approach to life. Fortunately, life is benevolent enough in both works to accept the angry prodigal once he has outgrown his false maturity. In two important works by Sillitoe and Braine, anger meets defeat as Arthur Seaton and Joe Lampton find their passage through "the years of illusion" more painful.

II

A summary of Arthur Seaton's activities in the initial chapter of *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (1958) suggests that Sillitoe, far from identifying completely with Seaton, is actually being satiric. Arthur falls down a flight of stairs, vomits all over Alf's best suit, and sleeps with Jack's wife. The ending of the novel's first paragraph, where Arthur falls "from the top-most stair to the bottom", foreshadows his eventual defeat. No matter how much Sillitoe admires Arthur, he never rates him as highly as Arthur does himself.

Difficulties with *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* begin with its title: is the "Sunday Morning" section (Part 2) a time of reconciliation with life and one's class, or is it the morning after the night before, the day of reckoning and conformity that comes for all? Some feel that Sillitoe regards class as fate and that his hero discovers himself when he accepts the solidarity of his class.[9] For such critics, Arthur's impending marriage is no defeat but an acceptance of a class role and the responsibilities that go with it. Arthur does subside into his class. However, the persistently comic, occasionally satiric tone maintained towards Seaton suggests that Sillitoe sees Arthur as a character who never achieves complete self-discovery, who ultimately illustrates the paradoxical vitality-futility of anger. Arthur's revolt makes him more appealing than the more complacent members of his class, but it ends in defeat because he knows much too little about himself and other people. Saturday evening is "a violent preamble to a prostrate Sabbath", the collapse into conformity.

The novel's imagery prevents one from arguing that Sillitoe is chronicling a young man's move towards acceptance of life within his class. The fact that Doreen works in "the hairnet factory" (11) is important. She nets Arthur easily, despite his inflated image of himself as a lion or tiger loose in the jungle of the working-class world. Part 1 ends with the "big Goose Fair", and that is precisely what society gives Arthur the rebel. Events at the Fair are sufficiently ominous. First, it was "a tradition that every young man took his lady" to the Fair. Traditional Doreen wants to go with anarchistic Arthur. Though he takes Brenda and Winnie instead (two married women), tradition has its eye on Arthur. Secondly, he "narrowly" misses "castration on the steel post invisible in the crush of people" at the Fair's entrance (11). Formerly a loner, Arthur is nearly emasculated by group contact. On the Ghost Train ride, he terrifies Alf and Lil by changing from his car to theirs and identifying himself successively as Boris Karloff, Dracula, and Jack the Ripper. Seaton is basically a sincere but comic-book villain whose exploits pose no threat to "the bastards" who run the factory where he works and the country at large.

The most significant ride for Arthur, the Helter Skelter, sums up the directionless quality of both his life and his opposition to authority. Sliding down it, Arthur "felt like a king", but soon he "sped along the smooth curving chuteway, round and slowly down, drawing nearer every second to an ocean of which he would soon form another drop of water" (11). Arthur approaches the ocean of conformity. At the bottom, two swaddies, one of them Winnie's husband, are waiting. Although he escapes them temporarily, they catch him later that evening. While recovering from the beating they administer, he succumbs to the shrewd Doreen.

Throughout the novel, Arthur pictures himself as a lion or tiger. His fall in the first chapter leaves him resting in the shadow of two aspidistras "that curved out over him like arms of jungle foliage". The wood he takes Brenda into "smelled of primeval vegetation" (3). He fears that "after his triumphant night with Winnie the forces of righteousness were closing in, spoiling the fangs and blunting the claws of his existence" (7). The working-class world is truly a jungle in which the young man is eventually deprived of fang and claw. However, the scene in which Doreen enters Arthur's bedroom to see how he is recuperating becomes pure comedy. "When wounded, Arthur liked to be alone in his lair, and he felt intimidated by her visit, as if he would have to pay for it with his life" (13). His pose as the wounded lion does not intimidate Doreen and Arthur pays for this visit with his life as an Angry Young Man. Doreen informs Arthur of her recent trip to the movies where she saw "Drums in the Jungle". She knows all she needs to about capturing Arthur. He violates his inmost rule about lying until others are forced to believe. He confesses his past exploits, particularly his adventures with Brenda, and Doreen thus symbolically deprives him of his strength.

Sillitoe undercuts one animal image with another. Arthur thinks he is a lion or "a bloody billy goat trying to screw the world" (15), but one suspects he is more of a fish. The Sundays Arthur spends fishing by the canal put him in contact with his real self. "On long summer evenings", Arthur "sat on the front doorstep with a penknife and a piece of wood, carving the replica of a fish for his float" (9). The net Doreen symbolizes works even more readily on fish. On the final page, Arthur throws back the first fish he catches but reels in the second. He, too, has had two chances. First there was his adventure with Brenda; now, Doreen reels him in permanently.

Sillitoe cannot convince himself that what happens to Arthur is not both sad and comic at the same time. Arthur decides that "if he was not pursuing his rebellion against the rules of love, or distilling them with rules of war, there was still the vast crushing power of government against which to lean his white-skinned bony shoulder, a thousand of its laws to be ignored and therefore broken" (15). Arthur has never opposed the government effectively. These are the thoughts of a man who realizes that one of the fronts on which he has been fighting, namely love, is lost forever. Seaton's sexual escapades have been his only successful acts of political rebellion. His real enemy is not the government but the conformist traditions that exist at all class levels of society. Will the "white-skinned bony shoulder" shift the crushing power even slightly; or is the image that comes to mind that of a working-class Sisyphus who does not fully comprehend his plight, Sillitoe perceives that Arthur's stance could not but collapse, that a day of reckoning and conformity lies in wait for all, and that Arthur's demise as an Angry Young Man has comic as well as tragic aspects.

III

Joe Lampton's problem in *Room at the Top* (1957) is that he is a working-class, male version of Emma Bovary. Like her, he misunderstands the nature of happiness. He equates it with a definite geographic place, in this case the top, and that makes him vulnerable to Braine's satire. The first-person narration abets the satire as it allows Joe to reveal the quality of his mind: his naiveté, conventional ideas, lack of taste, and unawareness of the unfavorable impression he often makes on the reader.[10] There are some sharp blows reserved for society, as was the case in Sillitoe's novel, but Lampton's approach to life is one of the main targets, as was Seaton's.

Right from the first chapter, Joe's repetition of words such as "best", "cost", "expensive", and "big" becomes annoying. A self-styled man on the make, Joe is really a hopeless conformist who dresses smartly but never so much as to offend. He records his admiration for Mrs. Thompson's home by comparing it to "an illustration from *Homes and Gardens*" (1). What appeals to him most about Susan Brown, his future wife, is "that she was conventionally pretty" (4). He used his time in a POW camp to pass his accountant's exam, an indicator of how desperately he wants to belong and how consistently he concerns himself with money and costs. Like Clyde Griffiths or Jay Gatsby, his American prototypes, Joe clings to the notions of happiness, wealth, and style that are conventionally agreed upon by a meretricious society. As he climbs upward, he displays more vitality and even more single-minded honesty than many who stand in his way. However, he seldom realizes his own inadequacies. Crying out for "an Aston-Martin", "a three-guinea shirt", "a girl with a Riviera suntan" (3), he assumes that things generate happiness. Joe becomes a bundle of contradictions: he will defeat the upper classes and infiltrate them by conforming as totally as he can to the standards of the Haves. But the joke, a sad one, is on him. He fights his way into a society not worth penetrating. Braine sees the plight of the ambitious Have-Not in a double light. The lower-class individual is compelled to push upward and perhaps be corrupted in the process. Yet the prizes he strives for (and has been taught to strive for) are suspect. To realize his false idea of himself and of happiness, Joe ironically passes up the real versions of both.

The Lampton-Lufford Report on Love, an accountant's eye-view of love and marriage, is a case in point. Joe and Charles Lufford worked out a grading system for women in which the better-looking ones always belong to the men with higher salaries (4). At best, Joe theorizes, he can hope for a Grade Six wife, whereas Susan is at least Grade Two. Braine finds the Report incredibly naive. Still, a certain amount of half-truth emerges from it. The world is just similar enough to the Report to make Lampton's theory a satire on a society where love and marriage are a matter of class and economics. In this working-class version of *Brave New World*, Grade One women, Grade Two or Grade Six replace Alphas, Betas, and Epsilons. People are cemented into place by birth and wealth just as mechanically as the artificial breeding creates a caste system in Huxley's novel. Joe's idea of beating the system, however, is not to oppose it by marrying for love but rather to force society to yield him a wife several grades higher than he had anticipated.

As Joe becomes increasingly honest about himself, a process the first-person narration assists, sympathy shifts towards him, even though he remains Braine's target for a series of ironies. Lampton emerges as an individual involved in an operation too complex for his slender abilities. Neither Sillitoe nor Braine feel their heroes are shrewd enough to outwit society. Joe controls where he is going but not what happens to his personality as he negotiates his ascent. The most pervasive irony in the book involves Joe's growing awareness of an ever-widening gap between what he has always wanted and what he learns will actually make him happy. Always he had assumed these two would coincide.

Joe hates the privileged classes for their wealth and advantages, yet wants desperately to be like them. It is difficult to want to become what you hate. Braine remorselessly exposes this contradiction in Joe's philosophy. At times Lampton calls his superiors Zombies; at other times, he sees those above him as Princes and Princesses, while picturing himself as a swineherd (7). His desire to wed Susan, to join Princess to swineherd, becomes, among other things, an antidote for inferiority. Joe both hates and envies Jack Wales, a Cambridge graduate and Susan's original fiancée. He resolves: "All right, . . . I'll pinch your woman, Wales, and all your money won't stop me" (7). Ironically, Wales also pinches Joe's woman. Mr. Brown, Susan's father, informs Joe about Alice's affair with Jack (28). This occurs at the conference during which Brown urges Joe to marry Susan, promising him that "there's always room at the top".

The final irony in the novel overrides all others, as Joe, having triumphed by the tactics he devised for himself, becomes the only person in the book dissatisfied with his success. He is allowed to marry the impregnated princess, Susan. Braine takes his final shot at society by showing it in approval of Joe's rise, while the gap between success and happiness becomes too wide for Joe to span. Indirectly he has caused the death of Alice, the only person who brought him happiness, and, with hers, the demise of his genuine self.

If society neglects to punish Joe in *Room at the Top*, it makes up for this oversight in *Life at the Top*, a sequel Braine published in 1962. Living at the top proves harder than the ascent. Now thirty-five, with two children, and ten pounds overweight after nine years of marriage, Joe confesses: "I felt weighed down by things" (1). His father-in-law turns out to be tougher than Joe expected; Susan sleeps with other men; Joe catches her in bed with

Mark (13) and learns that his daughter, Barbara, is not his child (14). Nearly all the things Joe did to society in *Room at the Top* are done to him in this sequel, the analogue to Sunday morning in Sillitoe.

As did Emma Bovary, Joe still thinks of happiness as an actual place, as a state of being that becomes permanent once one arrives. "It seemed" to Emma "that certain portions of the earth must produce happiness—as though it were a plant native only to those soils and doomed to languish elsewhere".[11] Similarly, as he watched Susan act with the Thespians in *Room at the Top*, Joe stated: "it seemed at any moment there'd be an annunciation which would transform existence into what it ought to be, hold, as it were, to its bargain the happiness which Warely had promised me" (4). Joe associates happiness with the town he has come to, Warely, but not with Dufton, the place he left behind. Being happy, Braine concludes, is a state one must seek for oneself whether one is Grade One or Grade Seven; transition from one grade to another will not automatically produce it. Joe eventually learns that happiness is something that must, and can be, attained repeatedly, though it never lasts. His conviction that things generate happiness and that a rise to the top would make such a state permanent was incredibly naive. Braine's final irony is that Joe's misconception of happiness as an unchanging state saves him, for he has not, as he previously thought, forfeited his only chance by turning his back on Alice.

John Stuart Mill argued that "if by happiness be meant a continuity of highly pleasurable excitement, it is evident enough that this is impossible". But, he continued, if happiness is "not a life of rapture", it can be "moments of such in an existence made up of few and transitory pains, and many and various pleasures . . . and having as the foundation of the whole not to expect more from life than it is capable of bestowing".[12] Having made peace with Susan and his children, Joe is in the kitchen making tea. As he cuts a slice of lemon—therefore under the most banal circumstances—he experiences what Mill writes about, since "with no warning, through no conscious effort", he becomes "happy, happier than I had been since childhood. It could not last, it was already evaporating as I began to be grateful for it; but I knew it would come again" (26). Joe's arduous living begins from this point of he resolves to insure the reappearance of moments similar to the one he just experienced. This may seem a nineteenth-century solution to Lampton's problems, but, like the Romantics, Braine tests this resolution on Joe's pulses and finds it trustworthy.

IV

The best of the Angry novels were never simply enraged outbursts against an unfair social order. The novelists involved seldom spared society, but simultaneously they exposed the limitations of anger and its inevitable collapse as an approach to life, thus making their novels and the protagonists in them more complex than is generally granted. Anger collapses as a stance in Amis and Wain when their heroes perceive that it can never be more than an early stage in their relationship to society. Although Sillitoe and Braine explore tragi-comic ironies, neither denies society's ability to absorb their heroes with relative ease and even with some benevolence. Arthur's anarchism and Joe's infiltration precipitate no changes in society, though both heroes are forced to change. All four novelists endorse their heroes' discontent but are subtle enough to depict life as something more intricate than the individual who rejects, opposes, or tries to take it by storm. At their best, the Angries simultaneously criticized their society while realistically questioning the ability of their young heroes to defeat it in any permanently meaningful way.[13]

1. Amis is now 49, as is Braine. Osborne is 41, Wain 46, and Wesker 39, to mention only a few. It has been seventeen years since *Lucky Jim*, thirteen since *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*, and fifteen since *Look Back in Anger*.
2. *Room at the Top*, for example, sold half a million copies in paperback after being made into a movie.
3. Amis went to Oxford and later lectured at Cambridge. Osborne was expelled from school at the age of sixteen. Wain also attended Oxford and later lectured at the University of Reading. Sillitoe left school at fourteen to work in a factory. The university men present somewhat Prufrockian Angry Young Men who feel stifled by their environment. Sillitoe and Braine draw heroes who feel life and its privileges belong exclusively to the upper classes.
4. See for example the Beatle lyric "Getting Better":

   Me used to be a angry young man
   Me hiding me head in the sand
   You gave me the word
   I finally heard
   I'm doing the best that I can
   I admit it's getting better
   A little better all the time

5. See the opening chapter of Rubin Rabinovitz, *The Reaction Against Experiment in the English Novel,* 1950-1960 (New York: Columbia University Press,

1967), or James Gindin, *Postwar British Fiction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), p. 11.

6. Sillitoe and Braine continue to write novels but not from the stance of an Angry Young Man. See Braine's *The Jealous God* (1964) and *The Crying Game* (1968) and Sillitoe's *The Death of William Posters* (1965) and *A Tree on Fire* (1967).
7. See Ralph Caplan, "Kingsley Amis" in Charles Shapiro, ed. *Contemporary British Novelists* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965), p. 15.
8. Compromise is also evident, less convincingly, in Wain's *Hurry on Down* (1953) when Charles Lumley becomes a comedy writer, a job he considers neutral in respect to class, and in *Living in the Present* (1960), in which Edgar Banks returns to his job as a schoolteacher.
9. See Paul Maloff, "The Eccentricity of Alan Sillitoe", in *Contemporary British Novelists*, pp. 95-113.
10. Yet G. S. Fraser argues that Braine identifies almost totally with Lampton and never sees how shallow Susan is. See "The Novel in the 1950s" in *The Modern Writer and His World* (Baltimore: Pelican Books, 1964), p. 181.
11. Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary* (New York: Modern Library, 1957), p. 45.
12. See *Utilitarianism* in Max Lerner, ed. *Essential Works of John Stuart Mill* (New York: Bantam, 1961), pp. 200, 194.
13. Texts used throughout this essay have been the popular paperback editions: Signet for Sillitoe and Braine, Compass for Amis, and Penguin for Wain.