CONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION OF THE NATION AND NATIONALITY IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *AN ARTIST OF THE FLOATING WORLD* AND *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

HİLAL DOĞRU BAKAR

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE

DECEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof.Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurten BİRLİK
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK AVCI
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK AVCI (METU, FLE) _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nil KORKUT NAYKI (METU, FLE) _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu TEKİN (Atılım Univ., IDE) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this 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 that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Hilal DOĞRU BAKAR

Signature :

ABSTRACT

CONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION OF THE NATION AND NATIONALITY IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *AN ARTIST OF THE FLOATING WORLD* AND *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

Doğru Bakar, Hilal

M.A., in English Literature

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK AVCI

December 2014, 156 pages

This thesis focuses in a comparative manner on the ways in which the nation and nationality are foregrounded as constructs in Kazuo Ishiguro's *An Artist of the Floating World (1986)* and *The Remains of the Day (1989)*. The ways in which Ishiguro's novels construct and deconstruct "Japaneseness" and "Englishness" will be explored in the light of the theories of Benedict Anderson and Homi K. Bhabha. The thesis will also focus on imperial national identity formation of the unreliable narrators in these novels, both of which conclude by the narrators' disillusionment as a result of alterations in the ways in which the national community is imagined.

Keywords: Kazuo Ishiguro, Nation, Unreliable Narration, *An Artist of the Floating World, The Remains of the Day*

ÖZ

KAZUO ISHIGURO'NUN *DEĞİŞEN DÜNYADA BİR SANATÇI* VE *GÜNDEN KALANLAR* İSİMLİ ROMANLARINDA MİLLET VE MİLLİYETÇİLİK KAVRAMLARININ KURULUŞU VE YAPIBOZUMU

Doğru Bakar, Hilal

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı Programı

Tez Yöneticisi: Yar. Doç. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK AVCI

Aralık 2014, 156 sayfa

Bu tez karşılaştırmalı olarak Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı (1986)* ve *Günden Kalanlar (1989)* isimli romanlarında millet ve milliyetçilik kavramlarının kurmaca olduğunun temellendirilmesi üzerinde durmaktadır. Bu tezde Benedict Anderson ve Homi K. Bhabha'nın teorileri ışığında, Ishiguro'nun romanlarının "Japon" ve "İngiliz" kimliklerini hangi yollarla kurguladığı ve yapıbozuma uğrattığı araştırılacaktır. Tez aynı zamanda bu romanlardaki güvenilmez anlatıcıların ulusal bir topluluk oluşturma yöntemlerindeki değişimler dolayısıyla hayal kırıklığına uğramasıyla sonuçlanan emperyal ulusal kimlik oluşturulma süreçleri üzerinde duracaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kazuo Ishiguro, Millet, Güvenilmez Anlatım, *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı, Günden Kalanlar*

Ömrümün ilk gününden beri bir an olsun elimi bırakmayan, varlıklarıyla onur ve gurur duyduğum, yaşama sebebim annem Suzan Doğru ve babam Mürsel Doğru'ya, tüm zorlukları aşarken varlığı, sevgisi ve ilgisiyle bana destek olup güç veren kıymetli eşim Çağrı Bakar'a ve iyi ve kötü günlerimde hep yanımda olan sevgili anneannem Fehime Güneş ve dedem Ahmet Güneş'e

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak Avcı, whose meticulous feedbacks and inspiring suggestion in every step of this thesis enabled me to write it. She always provided critical and encouraging atmosphere in all sessions we had. It was a great opportunity for me to write this thesis under her supervision.

I also wish to express my gratitude to the jury members, Asst. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı and Asst. Prof. Dr. Kuğu Tekin for their excellent advice, detailed review, and constructive criticism during the preparation of this thesis.

I would like to thank my family for their great support and encouragement. I am indebted especially to my mother, father and my husband for their belief in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

AFW	*An Artist of the Floating World* (Faber and Faber, 2001)
RD	*The Remains of the Day* (Thorpe Publishing, 1990)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Barry Lewis in his *Kazuo Ishiguro: Contemporary World Writers* holds that Kazuo Ishiguro's first four novels are similar to one another and they "can be grouped together in a 1-2, 2-3, 3-4 formation, with each succeeding novel resembling most the book preceding it" as the writer himself also refers to his first three novels as "three attempts to write the same book" (133). According to Lewis "*The Remains of the Day* is like an alternative English 'remix' of attitudes and situations present *in An Artist of the Floating World"* (133), which reveals "a distinctive attribute of Ishiguro's stylistic technique: sequent repetition-with-variation"(133). Similarly, Wong notes that:

> In his books, the main characters search similarly for compensation or consolation from a loss in their lives. Whether the loss is physical or an emotional one, the characters revisit the traumatic events surrounding their past as they move into an uncertain future. Telling the stories might provide catharsis, by allowing them to reconstruct and perhaps comprehend their loss. (2)

Ishiguro's *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* are narrated by first person unreliable narrators who take a mental journey through their pasts in order to reconcile with their past selves and past actions, the weight of which puts a great pressure on their present existence. Both narrators focus on the interwar era and the aftermath of World War II. They re-evaluate the values they hold on to according to which they have shaped their lives, but of course the values and the codes appear to be different from each other as the narrators live in different countries as members of different nations, which proves Lewis' reference to the writer's technique as the "sequent repetition-with-variation"(133). In spite of these variations, the thematic parallelism between the two novels suggests that Ishiguro's aim is

to write about an ordinary man's situation in the world rather than a man belonging to a specific nation, which befits the writer's claim that he is an international writer. Wong writes that in the middle of the 1980s Ishiguro's aforementioned claim about himself was quoted under his picture when the British Council published short leaflets introducing British novelists. The critic stresses the fact that the claim is repeated by many critics who interpret and write about his novels. Wong notes that "the term is a convenient one that addresses both Ishiguro's Japanese ancestry and the kind of broad themes with universal appeal found in his fiction" (7).

The universal appeal may stem from the education the writer received, as he grew up in England and attended schools there due to his father's job although he was born in Japan. He "earned English literature and writing degrees" at the University of Kent in 1978, and he is influenced especially by writers such as Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Franz Kafka, Milan Kundera, Henry James and Samuel Beckett (Wong, 4). Ishiguro himself holds: "I've grown up reading Western fiction: Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Charlotte Bronte, Dickens" (Mason, 4), which shows that Ishiguro's writing has been shaped under the influence of an international group of writers. Salman Rushdie states that Ishiguro employs "brilliant subversion of the fictional modes" when dealing with subject matter such as 'death, change, pain and evil'" *(Salman Rushdie: Rereading*, The Guardian) which are universal topics. Wong also highlights the fact that "Importantly, the main characters in Ishiguro's novels are often self-absorbed, but the readers who engage with their stories will find that their quest for consolation is universal" (5). Ishiguro deals with the toil of ordinary human beings putting an effort to give a meaning to their lives, as Ono and Stevens do. These characters try to achieve the goals they set for themselves yet fail in their attempts, which requires a consolation to be able to continue living in peace with themselves. In *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* Ishiguro also foregrounds the political context in that the novels explore the subject's position in the imagined national narration, which is built on an understanding of the nation and nationalism as man-made artifacts.

The aim of this thesis is to argue that both *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* wrestle with hegemonic national identities in similar ways: they foreground the nation and national identity – "Japaneseness" and "Englishness," respectively– as constructs; and, both texts are narrated by unreliable narrators who come to be disillusioned with their imperial identities as a result of changing national discourses in the novels.

There are many comparative studies of Kazuo Ishiguro's work. His second and third novels, *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day,* are also among the frequently compared novels of the writer. Cynthia Wong (2000), Caroline Bennett (2011) and Megan Marie Hammond (2011) focus on the narrative technique of the novels. They explore the function of his first person unreliable narrators in the novels. Wong discusses the novels as psychological narratives; Bennett studies *A Pale View of Hills* and *An Artist of the Floating World* as trauma narratives while Hammond identifies *The Remains of the Day* as a travel narrative. Wong includes *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* in her book *Kazuo Ishiguro (2000)* under the titles of "Deflecting Truth in Memory: *An Artist of the Floating World*", and "Disclosure and "Unconcealment': *The Remains of the Day*". As the titles also suggest Wong deals with Ishiguro's handling first person narrators and the way they reflect their life stories. She holds that "[t]he narrator's dual roles of reading significance into and then documenting the details of that life are linked to a particular kind of self-deception that interested Ishiguro" (16) as Wong tries to explore the ways the novelist "employs gaps to unveil his characters' pain of suffering" (16). She examines the process of Ono's and Stevens's coming into self-realization and deals with the narrative strategy of using memory.

Caroline Bennett in her "Cemeteries Are No Places For Young People: Children and Trauma in the Early Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro" (2011) studies the first two novels of Ishiguro, *A Pale View of Hills* and *An Artist of the Floating World* as trauma narratives. She explores the novels as a way of

narrative through which the narrators abstain from confronting their past actions and past lives and "behave like children as a strategic evasion of their past responsibilities" (82). The writer argues that it is not easy to distinguish between the past and present selves of the narrators "resulting in generational conflicts in which the presence of the new dominant power, such as the United States, has an infantilizing effect upon" Japan and England, the former imperial centres (82).

Megan Marie Hammond in her "'I Can't Even Say I Made My Own Mistakes': The Ethics of Genre in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*" (2011) studies Stevens's narrative modes as a way of the butler's evaluation of his past life, past actions, share of his story and his way of assigning "value to his years of service and sacrifice" (97). She studies Stevens's unreliability and his disillusionment about himself through his travel narrative in which he "builds his strategy not around plot, but rather around genre" (98).

Brian Shaffer also makes a narratological analysis of *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* like Wong, Bennett and Hammond do, but he aims at a broader study of the protagonists of the novels in his *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro* (1998). The writer holds that the novels of Ishiguro both have common characteristics and significant differences (6) and he focuses on the former as the novels are narrated by first person unreliable narrators who do not have insight into life, and whose faith, therefore, depends on the mercy of the outer world (6). Shaffer considers Ishiguro as "a novelist of the inner character than of the outer world" (8), although he accepts the possibility of historical readings of his novels and argues that "history and politics are explored primarily in order to plumb the characters' emotional and psychological landscapes" (8).

In his *Kazuo Ishiguro* (2000), Barry Lewis makes an autobiographical reading of Ishiguro's novels and establishes a connection between the novelist's situation as a homeless writer, who admits feeling neither Japanese nor English, and his characters in his first four novels as homeless heroes searching for a home to achieve a sense of belonging. For this reason, Lewis

holds “This [homelessness]… will be one of key points traced in” his study of Ishiguro’s novels and explains that he will explore “the struggle between displacement and dignity” (3) as he stresses the significance of dignity in Ishiguro’s novels as a means of feeling “at home” (2). Lewis aims to study the two novels individually, and he examines “the blame” Ono feels in *An Artist of the Floating World* in addition to the filmic structure of the novel and he turns to Stevens’s struggle between his private and public selves by referring to historical events that are instrumental in the butler’s conflicts.

Christine Berbereich, on the other hand, makes a historical and political reading of Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day* in her “Kazuo Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day*: Working Through England’s Traumatic Past as a critique of Thatcherism” (2011). She studies the novel as an indicator of the way the Appeasement Politics were executed in England, which Ishiguro depicts by making use of his temporal advantage. Berbereich explores the role of Lord Darlington as a representative of “active key players in large country houses” and Stevens as a representative of “passive acquiescence of the general populace” in the politics of England.

This thesis will refer to Ishiguro’s biography and establish a connection between his situation as a “homeless” writer and his dislocated characters in *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* in its argument of the novelist’s motives to write the novels and devise characters like Ono and Stevens as Lewis does. It will make use of Shaffer’s analysis in the exploration of the unreliable narrators of the two novels, and it will discuss the effect of political atmosphere in the novels in interpreting the unreliable narrations of Ono and Stevens as Bennett does while studying *An Artist of the Floating World* and Hammond and Berbereich do while studying *The Remains of the Day.* However, it will make its own contribution, as well, through studying the novels and characters comparatively within the light of theoreticians such as Benedict Anderson and Homi K. Bhabha, and it will delve into the depiction of the way a nation and national identity are

constructed mainly through Ono and Stevens in addition to the flux of these constructs, which affects characters' lives.

The first chapter will analyse the critical theories of Benedict Anderson and Homi K. Bhabha. Their conceptualizations of the nation and nationalism as constructs and a way of narration will be instrumental in the analytical chapters. The chapter will also explore the importance of memory in national narration as in both novels there are characters who take their place in national memory as national symbols or are condemned to be forgotten. Moreover, the chapter aims to clarify a significant difference between Anderson's theory of the nation as a horizontal comradeship and Bhabha's theory of national construction through double narration, because double narration will be instrumental in the analytical chapters in the discussion on the construction of hegemonic national identities of the characters in both novels. Finally, the chapter aims to explain Bhabha's emphasis on the function of the landscape in the national narration in the light of which the connections between the landscape and the formation of national identity in both novels will be studied in the upcoming chapters.

The second chapter will analyse the how in *An Artist of the Floating World* the formation of Japanese national imperial identity is dealt with. It will explore Japan as an expansionist country through Matsuda's opinions of Japan which he discusses with Ono. It will explain the ways national icons like the painter Ono construct militarist national identity by making use of national symbols. Focusing on master-pupil relationships established between Ono, his father, who wants his son to pursue the family business and his masters, who want him to stick to their teaching and his pupils who reject Ono's influence, the chapter aims to explore the function of double narration in the construction of national discourse. Finally, through Ono's grandson Ichiro and his son-in-law Suichi the chapter will depict the changing dynamics of national discourse causing the destruction of ideals upon which Ono constructs his nationalism and national identity.

The third chapter aims to portray the construction of mythical "Englishness" in *The Remains of the Day* through Lord Darlington and his butler Stevens. It will focus on Lord Darlington as a representative of Victorian English identity through whom the novel raises a criticism of Thatcher's attempt to revive imperial Victorian values in the 1980s. Pointing out the way Lord Darlington is erased from people's memory, the chapter aims to display the function and importance of memory/forgetting in the national narration. It will also analyze Stevens both as an everyman and as a symbol of "Englishness". The chapter explores Ishiguro's portrayal of a typical "English" butler, which exemplifies the way symbols or icons are used in the national narration, as the writer is able to write a very "English" novel through employing a very "English" character. Examining the pedagogical teaching Stevens receives, the chapter aims to demonstrate the power of double narration in the national discourse. The chapter also focuses on the construction of the imperial national identity through Stevens who believes that he has a role in the "civilizing mission" of his country; and, lastly, examines the ways in which the novel problematizes Steven's reliability as a narrator to reveal at the end of the novel his long-suppressed disappointment about the values and ideals he thinks to be true.

The final chapter aims to summarize the aforementioned chapters in an analytical way. It will wrap up the connections pointed out between the conceptualizations of the nation and national identities in the theoretical work of Anderson and Bhabha and Ishiguro's treatment of the construction, deconstruction and reconstruction of the nation, nationalism and national imperial identities in *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day*.

CHAPTER 2

THEORIES OF THE NATION AND NATIONALISM

It is quite difficult to define what a nation is as Benedict Anderson, in his seminal work *Imagined Communities,* points out:

> Nation, nationality, nationalism- all have proved notoriously difficult to define, let alone to analyse. In contrast to the immense influence that nationalism has exerted on the modern world, plausible theory about it is conspicuously meagre. (3)

Anderson is not the only theorist admitting the difficulty of defining the nation. Hugh Seton-Watson, whom Anderson considers"[the] author of the best and the most comprehensive English-language text on nationalism, and heir to a vast tradition of liberal historiography and social science" (3) holds that "Thus I am driven to the conclusion that no 'scientific definition' of the nation can be devised; yet the phenomenon has existed and exists" **(**qtd. in Anderson, 3)

A brief discussion on the etymology of the word "nation" is useful since it may pave the way for the theoretical framework of this thesis. Guido Zernatto makes an analogy between a word and a coin in his study *On the History of a Word: "Nation"*. Just as one can buy different things in different times with the same coin, a word can correspond to different meanings and may be used to refer to different things or phenomena as time passes. So the value of a coin changes like the value of a word can change or it may differ from one occasion to another or through the course of time:

> A word is like a coin. With a particular coin different men at different times purchase goods of the same or very similar value. With a particular word different men at different times designate the same or very similar value. Every coin in the course of history is subjected to different changes in value; for the same coin may suddenly obtain more or less in exchange.

> Exactly thus does the value of a word change; it can at one time denote more, at another less; a more comprehensive or a more restricted concept.
>
> (Zernatto, 351)

Nation comes from the Latin word *natio* which 'has the same stem as the word *natus* [and] both have the same origin in the word *nascor'* (351) whose actual form is *natus sum* meaning "I am born". So, *natio* has to do with birth. However, Zernatto notes that for Romans *natio* did not have positive connotations. It was used for those who came from different regions and were not Roman citizens; therefore, *nation* was a humiliating word for Romans referring to the Other.

Although natio was employed in a discriminatory way in Rome, Greenfeld points to a change in its meaning. In spite of its usage in Rome the word in time came to signify "unity," suggestive of its contemporary usage: "The word has other meanings as well, but they were less common, and this one- a group of foreigners united by place of origin- for a long time remained its primary implication" (4). In the Medieval period, natio started to be used for the students in Medieval Universities who were foreigners as well and who used the same language or came from the same place. In other words, nation referred to a group of foreigners coming from the same origin. In time, the word gained another meaning. It diverged from its simplistic and plebian connotations and came to be attributed to those who represented universities in the Church councils. Greenfeld writes

> [s]ince the late thirteenth century, starting at the Council of Lyon in 1274, the new concept- 'nation' as a community of opinion- was applied to the parties of the 'ecclesiastical republic' (5)

He also adds that the word underwent a change again and it started to be used for those who had a certain power upgrading the word to a more powerful and worthy position:

> [T]he individuals who composed them [the ecclesiastical republic], the spokesmen of various

> intraecclesiastical approaches, were also representatives of secular and religious potentates. And so the word "nation" acquired another meaning, that or representatives of cultural and political authority, or a political, cultural, and then social *elite*. (5)

The feudal system was replaced by the emergence of a group of wealthy people who gained reputation and power not through noble blood or association with high aristocracy or leading ecclesiastical positions (Zernatto, 23). This newly emerged group became the ruling power, employing a new discourse, especially after the French Revolution. This new political discourse made the public believe that the needs and problems of the ordinary individual were also the needs of their rulers. This discourse contributed to imagining a large, diverse group of people as a unified community with common needs.

Many scholars think that the idea of the nation emerged in the West. The concrete and formal birth of the concept of the nation and nationalism as they are used today is the result of the political and sociological processes gone through in the West. As McLeod puts it, the idea of the nation "emerged with the growth of western capitalism and industrialization and was a fundamental component of imperialist expansion" (68). Although the exact date is not known, after the destruction of the feudal system, in a void created by political, economic and social changes, people needed to unite around a common value or concept in order to feel that they belonged to something, which provided them with a metaphorical shelter resulting in the creation of modern nations. And, according to Anderson, after being created as a concept in the West in the eighteenth century, nation becomes "modular", in the sense that it was "transplanted, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, to a great variety of social terrains, to merge and be merged with a correspondingly large variety of political ideological constellations" (4).

Anderson describes "nation" and "nation-ness" as a "cultural artefact of a particular kind" (4). While calling the nation so, he refers to Seton-

Watson, who holds that a nation exists when a significant number of people in a country consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they are one (Seton Watson, 5). Anderson translates Seton-Watson's "consider themselves" into "imagine themselves" :

> I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community… It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. (6)

Benedict Anderson is not the only theorist conceptualizing the nation as an imagined community. The widely known and accepted idea of nation's constructedness has gained validity among many other critics after Anderson. This notion also informs literary texts such as those by Kazuo Ishiguro. The idea of nation as a construct can be observed in both *An Artist of the Floating World*, which is set in Japan and *The Remains of the Day*, which is set in England.

Ishiguro was born in Japan, but due to his father's job as an oceanographer the family moved to England when he was five because his father was invited to take part in a research project carried out by the English government. He completed his education in England but admits interestingly in an interview that he has always prepared himself to go back to Japan:

> I grew up with a very strong image in my mind of this other country [Japan], a very important other country to which I had a strong emotional tie. My parents tried to continue some sort of education for me that would prepare me for returning to Japan. So, I received various books and magazines…[I]n England I was all the time building up this picture in my head. (qtd. in Oe, 53)

No matter how ready he was to leave England while not cutting his connection with Japan, he grew up in England. This provides the writer with a great opportunity that he is neither a total Englishman nor a Japanese-man, which enables him to maintain a distance to both nations while he is somehow

connected to both in different ways. In this way, he is freed from all the boundaries and ties that might have prevented him from interpreting his environment and dealing with Englishness and Japaneseness from a neutral distance, which enables the application of the theories of Benedict Anderson and Homi K. Bhabha on his *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* through which the writer undermines the nation and nationalism.

Anderson stresses the idea that nation is imagined or constructed as a community and there is a strong, and willingly agreed tie between the people imagining the nation.

> It is imagined community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail each, the nation is always conceived as deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly die for such limited imaginings.
>
> (Anderson, 7)

The interesting point here, which is also underlined by Anderson, is that it is impossible for all the members of a nation to know one another. Probably one can only know or see a few of his/her *comrades*, but still there is a strong tie among them. But if these people have never known one another, how is it possible for them to be so strongly connected to an extent that they can die for the sake of their nation? Ernest Renan calls this hypothetical agreement "plebiscite": by indicating "a nation's existence is, if you will pardon the metaphor, a daily plebiscite, just as individual's existence is a perpetual affirmation of life" (19). Renan refers to the ancient times where *plebiscite* meant a kind of voting held by a group of people on the destiny of an issue or a person. It is a way of vote of confidence in order to legitimize the leading power of a leader, which can also be described as a referendum in our contemporary time.

Anderson points to the homogeneity of the plebiscite and compares the imagining process of a nation to a narration, as he gives the example of

the construction of a realist novel where the simultaneity through which each member of the nation imagines he/she shares the same timeframe or the moment with the rest of the nation creating a sense of unity attracts attention and serves the construction process. He holds that:

> What has come to take place of the Medieval conception of simultaneity-along-time is… an idea of 'homogenous, empty time' in which simultaneity is, as it were, transverse, cross time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment, but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar. (Anderson, 24)

Anderson compares the imagined structure of nationalism to narration as he remarks it may only be possible to understand the imagined form of the nation by studying the structure of realist novels and newspapers, which are forms of imagining as well. He develops a simple novelistic structure where A is a man; B is his wife; C is his mistress, and D is the lover of the mistress. And he draws a time-chart as follows:

Table 1 (Benedict Anderson's table explaining simultaneity in national narration)

Time:	I	II	III
Events:	A quarrels with B C and D make love	A telephones C B shops D plays pool	D gets drunk in a bar A dines at home with B C has an ominous dream

In the time chart it is clear that A and D are not aware of the existence of each other. If C is able to handle the relationships successfully probably they will never have a chance to meet. And there comes the question of what the connection between A and D is, although they have never met. Anderson answers "A and D are embedded in the mind of the omniscient readers" (26). In this way the writer of the novel creates a unity in the mind of the reader

where the reader can see D getting drunk while A and B are dining at home during the time C has a dream and perceives a concept of unity. Anderson states that "It is clearly a device of representation of simultaneity in 'homogeneous, empty time,' or a complex gloss upon the word 'meanwhile'" (25). The theorist underlines the increase in the production of watches in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the number of which extends to about 500.000 annually, which is a sign of importance given to the time and the unifying quality of temporality in the explained way, because Anderson holds:

> The cosmic clocking which had made intelligible our synchronic transoceanic pairings was increasingly felt to entail a wholly intramundane, serial view of social causality; and this sense of the world was now speedily deepening its grip on Western [national] imaginations. (194)

According to Anderson, realist novels and newspapers provided people with a sense of simultaneity, as a consequence of which it became possible to imagine the nation. Anderson holds:

> Serially published newspapers were by then [the last quarter of the eighteenth century] a familiar part of urban civilization. So was the novel, with its spectacular possibilities for the representation of simultaneous actions in homogenous empty time. (194)

A man reads his newspaper while travelling somewhere or sitting at a café. At the same time, another man reads the same newspaper at some other place near or far. Without being aware of each other's existence they know that they are not the only ones reading that same newspaper and getting upset or being happy about what they have read, creating an invisible tie of a horizontal solidarity.

Like Anderson, Bhabha conceptualizes the nation as a narrative; however, for him a pure homogeneity through a nation does not seem possible, because for Bhabha national discourse is "repetitive" and

"recursive" as it does not function under a horizontal temporality only. Bhabha argues that it is necessary to think of people as double-timed or double narrated. He describes the people creating the nation as both the subjects and the objects of the "social and literary narratives" (*DissemiNation,* 292) of the national discourse at the same time:

> We then have a contested cultural territory where people must be thought in a double-time; the people are the historical 'objects' of a nationalist pedagogy, giving the discourse an authority that is based on the pregiven or constituted historical origin or event; the people are also the 'subjects' of a process of signification that must erase any prior originary presence of the nation-people to demonstrate the prodigious, living principle of the people as that continual process by which the national life is redeemed and signified as a repeating and reproducing process. (297)

Discourse is essential in the sense that it defines the characteristics of the nation, keeps it alive and reproduces its values when necessary. People are instrumental and inevitable in this process. They are both the object and the subject at the same time creating the national culture, or its discourse. According to Bhabha people have both *pedagogical* and *performative* roles in the formation of the nation. Discourse should be taught to people first, which makes them historical objects. The codes, myths and symbols constituting the nation are inoculated through different ways, so that a uniting narrative will connect people to each other creating a sense of solidarity. Yet, at the same time people reproduce this national discourse, which makes them performative subjects. As a result, there appears a double narration, which creates a "conceptual ambivalence" (Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 146). He writes:

> The scraps, patches and rags of daily life must be repeatedly turned into the signs of a coherent national culture, while the very act of the narrative performance interpellates a growing circle of national subjects. In the production of the nation as a narration there is a split between the continuist, accumulative

> temporality of the pedagogical, and the repetitious, recursive strategy of the performative. It is through this process of splitting that the conceptual ambivalence of modern society becomes the site of *writing the nation.* (145-146)

According to McLeod, a nation's people being both continuist pedagogical objects, "the nation as a fixed, originary essence", and performative subjects, "the nation as socially manufactured and devoid of a fixed origin", causes noncompatibility in a national discourse (119):

> This is because the performative necessity of nationalist representations enables all those placed on the margins of its norms and limits – such as women, migrants, the working class, the peasantry, those of a different "race" or ethnicity – to *intervene* in the signifying process and challenge the dominant representations with narratives of their own. A plural population can never be converted into a singular people because plurality and difference can never be entirely banished. (119)

Both Anderson and Bhabha emphasize the role of memory in the imagining/fabrication of a nation. Anderson gives an example of the "tombs of Unknown Soldiers", which he sees as a means of creating a historical value and a common past for the nation's people:

> No more arresting emblems of the modern culture of nationalism exist than cenotaphs and tombs of Unknown Soldiers. The public ceremonial reverence accorded these monuments precisely because they are either deliberately empty or no one knows who lies inside them, has no true precedents in earlier times. (Anderson, 9)

Either there is no one lying inside of these tombs or, if there is one, there is no one to identify to whom the bones belong. Still, the tombs are accepted to be holly and religious ceremonies are performed around them. They have a unifying power on the people. "Yet, void as these tombs are of identifiable mortal remains or immortal souls, they are nonetheless saturated with ghostly *national* imaginings" (9). For this reason, most countries build such tombs in

order to create a discourse of nation, because they are their symbols or icons to represent their cultural values. Through repetition and being kept alive, these symbols help people imagine a link between the past and the present. Bhabha, too, holds that the national past is necessary because it is the "anterior space of signification that 'singularizes' the nation's cultural totality" (*DissemiNation,* 317). He states as follows:

> Modernity, I suggest, is about the historical construction of a specific position of historical enunciation and address…It gives them a representative position through the spatial distance, or the time-lag between the Great Event and its circulation as a historical sign of the 'people' or an 'epoch', that constitutes the memory and the moral of the event as a narrative, a disposition to cultural communality (143*).*

Bhabha points to the fact that the construction of the background of a nation is held in the present day.

Memory is important as it has a unifying power, but forgetting is equally important and essential to be able to imagine a community as it also helps create solidarity through the nationalistic discourse. Although these two notions seem to contradict each other, they do not at all. Bhabha and Renan point to the necessity of forgetting in the collective consciousness of the nation by stressing that it is not the issue of historical memory; it is a part of natural agreement.

> To be obliged to forget – in the construction of the national present- is not a question of historical memory, it is the construction of a discourse on society that performs the problematic totalization of the national will. That strange time –forgetting to remember- is a place of partial identification inscribed in the daily plebiscite which presents the performative discourse of the people. (Bhabha, *DissemiNation,* 311)

Both Renan and Bhabha give similar examples in order to depict the essentiality of forgetting or "the obligation to forget" (311). Victories and even defeats unite the community either under the sense of happiness and success or the sense of hatred or baying for revenge depending on the occasion; however, they also make themselves forget the moments or the events of shame. Both Bhabha and Renan give France as an example and hold that the French obliged to forget the Saint Bartholomew Night's massacre[1] (Renan, 11). And, this act of forgetting connects individuals to one another. However, as McLeod also highlights, Bhabha posits the idea that there can never be a wholly homogenous, "one, coherent, common narrative through which a nation and its people can be adequately captured" (*DissemiNation*, 120), although the nation tries to forget or is obliged to forget to remember the splitting factors. McLeod notes:

> Nationalist discourses require essence, origin, unity and coherence, and need to *forget* the presence and the narratives of certain peoples within its imaginary boundaries in order to function. But the ideal of coherence remains forever out of reach due to the disjunctive temporality - continuist *and* repetitive – which splits the nation. (119-120)

Memory is not the only factor in the process of imagining a nation because a nation needs spatial boundaries. Anderson puts forth the notion that "The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them [nations], encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations" and adds "No nation imagines

[1]Saint Bartholomew's Night Massacre dates to 24 August 1572 and it is believed to have been instigated by Catherine de' Medici, the mother of King Charles IX against Huguenots, French Calvinist Protestants. The tensions between French Catholics and Protestants, in the early 1570s, reached to such a high level that the King and her mother decided to prevent a religious civil war by killing the Protestant leaders and nobles. However, the killings didn't stop with the individual assassinations and became a massive massacre against Protestants in both Paris and the countryside, resulting in a death toll of 2.000-70.000 according to different resources *(Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day,* Encyclopaedia Britannica). Such a terrible massacre, which derived from religious matters of Medieval ages, is supposed to be forgotten during the nation-building of modern France.

itself coterminous with mankind" (7). Here Anderson refers to the times when people used to imagine a whole Christian world and join the crusades in order to realize this dream, but he emphasizes that no one dreams of a day when other nations or the rest of the world join his own nation and the world becomes united. Thus nations need boundaries for the sake of their nation in which the individuals of a nation can find for themselves a land to perform their significance and contribute to the nationalist discourse. In *Location of Culture* Bhabha quotes Goethe as the writer who creates a "national-historical time that makes visible a specifically Italian day in the detail of its passing time" (143). In the passage there comes the end of the day when the daily work stops and the workers go their way back home:

> With our perpetual fogs and cloudy skies we do not care if it is day or night, since we are so little given to take walks and enjoy ourselves out of doors. But here, when night falls, the day consisting of evening and morning is definitely over… The bells ring, the rosary is said, the maid enters the room with a lighted lamp and says: 'Felicissima note!'… If one were to force a German clock hand on them, they would be at a loss. (42)

Bhabha explains that Goethe develops such a point of view through which Italian daily, random life is portrayed in a detailed way. The details given in a chronological way constitute a sense of locality, *Lokalitit* in Goethe's original words. As this *Lokalitit* is experienced by any Italian, in all parts of Italy, it creates a unified national discourse through which the experience of people creates simultaneity providing a nation in solitude, because, Goethe's visionary depiction proves to be "the spatialization of historical time, 'a creative humanization of this locality, which transforms a part of terrestrial space into a place of historical life for people'" (Bhabha, *DissemiNation*, 295). The portrayal of landscape turns to be "the inscape of national identity" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture,* 143), as according to Bhabha, nation is not a completely holistic or totalized discourse.

The landscape, which is limited by boundaries, in which a similar, affiliated community, sharing a common past exists, defines a group inside the circle. These boundaries also exclude all living out of these boundaries. The exclusion can only be identified through the necessity of existence of the Other, because there remains the territoriality which creates a sense of common space out of the defined Other. While referring to the common space, Bhabha points out Freud's concept of "narcissism of minor differences" related to the Other question. Freud states in his *Civilization and Its Discontents* that

> Men are not gentle creatures, who want to be loved, who at the most can defend themselves if they are attacked; they are, on the contrary, creatures among whose instinctual endowments is to be reckoned a powerful share of aggressiveness. As a result, their neighbor is for them not only a potential helper or sexual object, but also someone who tempts them to satisfy their aggressiveness on him, to exploit his capacity for work without compensation, to use him sexually without his consent, to seize his possessions, to humiliate him, to cause him pain, to torture and to kill him. (24)

Freud writes that it is not possible to get rid of this inclination to aggressiveness, because people do not feel secure without it.

> It is always possible to bind together a considerable number of people in love, so long as there are other people left over to receive the manifestations of their aggressiveness. (Freud, 26)

Nations develop this narcissism about their small differences "to achieve a superficial sense of one's own uniqueness, an ersatz sense of otherness which is only a mask for an underlying uniformity and sameness" (Hazell, 97). They direct their feelings of hate to the outside of the common landscape. As Bhabha states, "so long as a firm boundary is maintained between the territories, and the narcissistic wounded is contained, the aggressivity will be projected onto the Other or the Outside" (*DissemiNation,* 300), which is a notion contributing to the emergence and continuation of imperialism.

Both Anderson and Bhabha consider the nation as a narration that is imagined by the members constituting it. They both refer to important means in nation's narration such as memory, icons and symbols that shape national discourse. In addition to this, Anderson stresses the notion of simultaneity that unites members of the imagined community under the sense that they share and live in the same moment in different parts of the country without seeing one another. However, while Anderson describes the nation as a homogenous horizontal comradeship, Bhabha does not hold the same idea, because he thinks that homogeneity in a nation is not possible. Bhabha's argument refers to the significance of double narration in which people are both pedagogical objects who are taught how they should behave and performative subjects who perform their subjectivity through their original actions or their own interpretation of pedagogy. At this point there emerges heterogeneity because people do not always stick to the predetermined roles, which results in the diversity in national narration. The aforementioned theories of Anderson and Bhabha will be instrumental in this study of Kazuo Ishiguro's *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* in which the novelist deals with the construction, deconstruction and reconstruction of "Japaneseness" and "Englishness" in addition to hegemonic national identities of characters in the novels.

CHAPTER 3

AN ANALYSIS OF "JAPANESENESS" AS A FABRICATED NATIONAL IMPERIAL IDENTITY IN *AN ARTIST OF THE FLOATING WORLD*

An Artist of the Floating World (1986) is set in Japan three years after the end of World War II. Masuji Ono, the main character of the novel, contemplates over his past life within the period of twenty months between October 1948 and June 1950. He is, in the present time of the novel, a retired painter, who passes his last years with his younger daughter, Noriko, in the family house dealing with daily ordinary occupations like tending his garden, walking around the city and spending time with his old friends. While Ono is trying to find a proper husband for Noriko, his elder daughter, Setsuko, pays a visit to his father and sister with her little son, Ichiro. From what Ono tells his audience and through the conversations between the old man and his grandson it becomes clear that Japan has undergone a great change since the adolescent years of the retired painter. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, it was an imperial power extending from inner China to Korea, from Japan to Manchuria. The country entered World War II in search of new occupations and seems to have achieved this objective until 1943, as the Empire reached Indo-China and today's Malaysia and Indonesia. However, with the United States' involvement in the war and successive victories against Japan, the Empire fell with an unconditional surrender in 1945 (Andrew, 6). As Japan loses the war, Ono, like many others who have worked for the Japanese imperialist war-machine, has to retire and take a backseat quietly. On top of that, Ono and his companions who supported the war are now accused of drifting Japan into war and scourge. This accusation is of such a magnitude that the marriage negotiations of his younger daughter fail when, the Miyakes, the family of the groom learn about Ono's involvement in the war propaganda. Still, Ono is able to arrange another marriage for Noriko towards

the end of the novel, but he sometimes feels the obligation to cover and compensate for his past actions, or at least he thinks it is necessary to find excuses for them.

Ishiguro's "Japanese origin" and his name, when combined with his Eastern look may cause interpretations of his work in terms of "Japaneseness".

> Kazuo Ishiguro's Japanese ancestry often envelops his work with Oriental mystery. His writing is accordingly deciphered in the codes of Japanese aesthetics. The exotic sound of Ishiguro's name to Western ears and the ubiquitous display of his face, both on books written by him and about him, inspire immediate associations of him with Japan. In addition to the physical features and the autobiographic details that occasion the alliance of Ishiguro with Japan, book cover illustrations and the settings of Ishiguro's earlier works, such as early short stories, *A Pale View of Hills (1982*), and *An Artist of the Floating World (1986)*, encourage the reader to regard him as an ethnic Japanese novelist writing in English.
>
> (Cheng, 9)

An Artist of the Floating World, on the other hand, is far from being the depiction of Japan from an Orientalist perspective.

There is no doubt that Ishiguro's "ethnic" name was useful for him in his publishing career, especially after the success Salman Rushdie gained with his *Midnight's Children (1981)*. Ishiguro defines the position of the novel in British literature to be lethargic as drama and cinema took precedence over the novel in the times he grew up. However, in time, the multicultural novel flourished in Britain. In 1979, Margaret Thatcher's Conservative Party won the elections. Walkowitz indicates that the policies Thatcher followed

> encouraged a resurgence of English nativism, xenophobia, and nostalgia for the British Empire's centrality in international affairs. And it tried to contain the impact of immigrant communities on the languages, literatures, and traditions of Britain. While political and economic conservatism flourished, however, the project of cultural containment was

> largely unsuccessful. In the age of Thatcher, immigrant novelists such as Kazuo Ishiguro, Timothy Mo, Salman Rushdie, and V. S. Naipaul were transforming the Anglophone literary landscape. Their fiction brought the international to contemporary British writing. (223)

Ishiguro does not deny that Rushdie's great achievement opened a door for the multicultural writers in Britain because, after Rushdie, they got the opportunity to attract the attention of the reading public and critics in a positive way. The writer holds as follows:

> It was very fortunate to come along at exactly the right time. It was one of the few times in the recent history of British arts in which it was an actual plus to have a funny foreign name and to be writing foreign places… The big milestone was the Booker Prize going to Salman Rushdie in 1981 for *Midnight's Children*… That was a really symbolic moment and then everyone was suddenly looking for other Rushdies. It so happened that around this time I brought out *A Pale View of Hills (1982)*. (qtd. in Vorda and Herzinger, 69)

However, Ishiguro's novels cannot be categorized as multicultural novels, as he has concerns dealing with the whole humanity rather than the history of a specific country or culture. Cheng notes: "Although as a novice Ishiguro capitalized on his Asian heritage, he later endeavoured to reposition himself as an author addressing universal human issues" (10) and adds that the novelist always stresses the fact that Japanese history and culture are only a part of himself and his identity, they are not the main or only factors that shape his writing style and motive. Ishiguro's *An Artist of the Floating World* is a great example for this, because in his novel the writer employs Japanese history as an instrument serving his broader aim of depicting the nation and nationalism as constructed mechanisms. This does not mean that Ishiguro gives the reader a completely hypothetical and imaginary Japan. The point is that the novel is not writing a historical novel. Cheng writes:

> Realism in *An Artist of the Floating World* is illusionary; it blends the real with the imaginary and

> presents the fictional as if it were factual. Ono's city embodies a bewildering conflation; it fuses fictional places, such as Kashuga Park Hotel, Takami Gardens, and Kawabe Park, with actual locations of various Japanese cities. For instances, Arakawa and Izumimachi are in Tokyo and Sakemachi Station in Nagoya, while Negishi Station may be in Yokohama or Fukushima. The Japanese names of these spots attach to Ono's city simulated authenticity even though it assembles the real and imaginary locales in an improbable fashion. (84)

In this way, Ishiguro combines reality with fiction and creates a desirable setting for his novel. By doing so, he provides his readers with a Japan where Japaneseness is only an imagined idea, which sheds light on his broader aim which is to suggest that all nationalisms in the world are synthetic and artificial and can be deconstructed and reconstructed. He fosters this idea by making use of Japanese nationalism in *An Artist of the Floating World*. The aim of this chapter is to analyse the way the novel displays "Japaneseness" as an imagined construct. It will study the novel's treatment of the value system of Japanese nationalism and people's devotion to their national identity, the collapse of the Japanese ideals resulting in the recomposition of all previously held values.

Ono, as a highly talented painter, rises in his career in Mori-san's villa where he has been taking painting lessons for six years a few years before the breaking out of World War II, exactly at a time when the idea and importance of being a nation is stressed through the political powers, especially by the Japanese emperor, most vividly. It may not seem convenient to refer to monarchy when nationalism is being discussed because The French Revolution, which is accepted to be the starting point of nationalism, defends the fact that the people are the real owners of sovereignty. For this reason, a monarch that sees himself above the people seems to be categorically contrary to nationalism:

> Monarchy is frequently depicted as a form of governance systematically and historically opposed to nationalism. The French Revolution, often

> heralded as the origin of nationalism, provides the prototype for this argument that nationalism, the principle of the people as the true bearer of political sovereignty, is a republican movement to repossess, often from a monarch, the institutions of government "of, by and for" the people. (Doak, 83)

However, there is an exception in the case of Japan, because it is not possible to talk about Japanese nationalism excluding the monarch. Doak comments on the issue as follows:

> A complete understanding of the role of the monarchy in modern Japanese nationalism cannot suffice with simplistic reductions of nationalism to the emperor or to the "emperor-system", but requires a familiarity with the wide-ranging debates over the relationship of the emperor to nationalism that still inform nationalist ideals and practices today. (84)

This is because it was the emperor that characterized Japanese nationalism and fostered it especially during World War II, which is critical for Ishiguro's *An Artist of the Floating World*. Anderson notes that "Japan is the only country whose monarch has been monopolized by a single dynasty throughout recorded history," and adds, "The unique antiquity of the imperial house and its emblematic Japaneseness made the exploitation of the Emperor for official-nationalist purposes rather simple" (98). Without doubt, the reason for this is the influence on Japan, the Japan where Ono emerges as a prominent artist, of the international politics of the time. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the international race to find new colonies was at its peak. The American Commodore Matthew Parry arrived at Japan in his warship and submitted the Convention of Kanagawa (1854), which was a treaty of peace and amity between Japan and the US that opened Shimoda and Hakodate ports to the American ships. At the beginning, the convention appeared to be a means in order to provide a port for the American ships to be protected against a possible shipwreck (Blumberg, 92). However, the Americans were supposed to have an economic relation with Japan on an "unequal treaty system", which provided interests and rights to one party of the treaty than the other (Esenbel, 101) and this meant the first economic and

political domination by Americans over Japan, which can be interpreted to be an American attempt to invade Japan indirectly. Japanese people relied on the Emperor, whom they saw as the only one that could defend Japan against the invaders and save it.

> The monarchy became an important political factor in modern Japan due to a growing sense throughout the nineteenth century that only the monarch could save Japan from its host of social, economic and political troubles (84)

holds Doak in order to emphasize the rising power and importance of the Emperor after the Meiji oligarchs[2] who came into power as a reaction against the turmoil starting with the Convention of Kanagawa. They defended and imposed the fact that the Emperor was the only one who could maintain the integrity and dignity of the Japanese nation.

The Japanese Emperor gained more power in time. The aim of defending Japan against colonialist invasions transformed into competing to take place among the leading powers of the world, which pushed Japan to expansionist politics resulting in invasions starting with Manchuria (Young, 21). In the novel, Matsuda, a member of Okada Shingen (New Life) Society, which fosters fascist actions in the country, is a figure representing the idea that Japan should expand under the rule of the Emperor. With this aim in mind he comes to Mori-san's villa, the place where Ono has been sharpening his painting skills for nearly six years under the patronage of Mori-san, to persuade Ono to join their society. This is because he needs men who could be influential over others making them join their society and Ono is suitable for this aim. At first, the painter rejects joining the society but they become friends. As time passes, their friendship deepens and they have discussions about people living in Japan and their life standards. Matsuda thinks that

[2] Japan entered into an era of reformation under Emperor Meiji (reign 1867-1912) after the Tokugawa dynasty, which ruled Japan for more than 250 years between 1603-1857, collapsed. The Meiji Restoration included the opening of Japan to the world politically and economically by implementing educational reforms, and industrial developments. (Saito,7) The industrial development of Japan required raw materials and new markets. This need caused the military expansion of Japan in the beginning of the twentieth century.

Ono's art and view about the situation of Japan in the world is "naïve" (*AFW*, 171) because he does not understand what is going on around him. Matsuda believes Japan must take an action because the people in the country suffer from poverty under the rule of politicians and businessmen, but the Japanese nation deserves better. He employs marginalization in order to convince Ono to join their society and act together by putting the politicians as the other who remain passive when compared to Okada Shingen Society's members ready to take action for the sake of their country. In this sense, Matsuda presents the politicians and the businessmen as abject, or the Other, in order to exclude them from his Society and create a hostility towards them, because presenting someone as the Other creates a collective hostility towards the Other and strengthens the bonds of the group standing against the abject. Matsuda defends this because he holds that the passive politicians and businessmen are the ones who are responsible for the poverty and the suffering in the country. In a discussion with Ono at one of the pavilions he tells:

> The truth is, Japan is headed for crisis. We are in the hands of greedy businessmen and weak politicians. Such people will see to it poverty grows everyday. Unless, that is, we, the emerging generation, take action. (172)

Matsuda first directs his "aggression", as in Freud's words, to the leading figures of Japan, and then puts forward the idea that their only guarantee is the Emperor who is believed to fight against the crisis in the country: "We wish for a restoration. We simply ask that his Imperial Majesty the Emperor be restored to his rightful place as head of our state", because he asserts, "Our emperor is our rightful leader, and yet what in realty has become of things? Power has been grasped from him by these businessmen and their politicians" (173). For people like Matsuda, the only savior is the Emperor as he also represents the Japanese identity and Japan as a nation "as the head of the state" (173).

The Emperor has a unifying role in Japanese nationalism. Maruyama Masao explains the relationship between the Emperor and the nationalism in Japan as follows:

> During the first half of the nineteenth century…the country was under the dual rule of the Mikado (*tenno*), who was the spiritual sovereign, and the Tycoon (Shogun), who held actual power. After the Restoration, unity was achieved by removing all authority from the latter, and from other representatives of feudal control, and by concentrating it in the person of the former. In this process…prestige and power were brought together in the institution of the Emperor. And in Japan there was no ecclesiastical force to assert the supremacy of any 'internal' world over this new combined, unitary power. (4)

After the Meiji restoration, through which the Emperor gains his power back, he directs the country to imperialism, in order to survive in the midst of the race for colonization. *The Imperial Rescript on Education (1890)* that the Meiji Emperor signs in order to declare the government's policy starts as follows:

> Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting, and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire. (*The Imperial Rescript on Education,* isites.harvard.edu)

The quotation above is an example of the distinctive brand of Japanese nationalism that is "a factor contributing to the subsequent development of Japanese imperialism and the country's pursuit of a colonial empire abroad" (Lincicome, 338). The people who supported the Emperor also supported the imperialistic ideas because Japanese patriotism became an extension of Japanese nationalism, which means the national narration is regulated in the sense that being a Japanese citizen requires the love of the country that will be depicted by supporting the Emperor's expansionist politics and being

ready to do what is necessary for this cause. This will also be a means to express the national identity on the target countries that should be invaded which are put forward as the Other, the Other that is supposed to be convinced about Japanese identity and Japanese power. This is because:

> Nationalism asserts itself when a community has become aware of itself, has reached a particular state of mind. People who think they belong to a nation, who think they constitute a nation, indeed do so and behave as such. Their problem is less to convince themselves than to impress their conviction on others.
> (Thornton, 145)

In the novel, through fostering and strengthening the monarchy, Matsuda wants his country to expand its territory and get richer; he believes that Japan, as a strong nation, has to take its place among the world's imperialist countries like England and France, with the leadership of their Emperor. He wants to raise Ono's consciousness towards the stiffening position of Japan in world politics in order to convince him to join their society and take an action by stating that Japan and its people are precious and honourable, and the country has an imminent role in Asia, so it cannot remain passive:

> Japan is no longer a backward country of peasant farmers. We are now a mighty nation, capable of matching any of the western nations. In the Asian hemisphere, Japan stands like a giant amidst cripples and dwarfs. And yet we allow our people to grow more and more desperate, our little children to die of malnutrition. Meanwhile, the businessmen get richer and the politicians forever make excuses and chatter… It is time for us to forge an empire as powerful and wealthy as those of British and the French. We must use our strength to expand abroad.
> (*AFW,* 174)

When Matsuda tells Ono that Japanese people are not "peasant farmers" anymore he refers to the innovations made by the Emperor and his supporters. As Anderson stresses: "The Japanese peasantry was freed from subjection to the feudal *han*-system" (95) after the Emperor gained power as a result of the Meiji Restoration. From then on the country went through economic,

industrial, and political changes and got more powerful. Living in this "new" Japan, Matsuda believes that Japan, now, should expand with the help of its people who will fight for it, because it is "like a giant" and cannot stop. Sim holds that in order to affect Ono "Matsuda echoes social Darwinist rhetoric to justify European expansionism" (37), which only gives a chance to survive to those who are powerful. So, Matsuda holds that in order to survive in an antagonistic atmosphere where the world nations invade each other's lands in order to get more power, Japan, as a country who stands powerful, must not let its people suffer through its humble politics, but it has to fight against other countries in order to secure its position among the imperialist powers. For this reason, when Ono suggests that they can hold exhibitions and help their people through the money they would acquire from the sold paintings under the Okada Shingen Society, Matsuda rejects his offer and reveals the society's real intention, which is to fight against the countries the Emperor identifies as the enemy. He says: "I have misled you if I ever suggested our society wished to be turned into a large begging bowl. We're not interested in charity" (*AFW,* 172).

The sense of antagonism Matsuda and other Japanese people feel is a consequence of imagining another country/nation as the Other and defining it as the enemy for the sake of maintaining the nation's interests. "Nation states have tended to define themselves by generating a sense of the 'Other' as an outsider who does not belong" (101) writes Gundera. This is the idea that thickens the contrast between the strengthening Japan and its neighbouring less powerful countries as the possible targets – a contrast Matsuda depicts through his dwarf-giant metaphor. Through such a hostile discourse the patriotic feelings are exhilarated, and people get ready to fight and die for their country, which Bhabha also defines as the projection of aggressivity onto the Other that is excluded from the nation and thereby configuring what remains inside the borders as the nation. Matsuda succeeds to persuade Ono to join and work for their Okada-Shingen Society that fights for Japanese expansionism. This is because after speaking with Matsuda, Ono imagines

himself to be the member of the type of Japanese nation as imagined in that particular nationalist discourse, which shows how effective it is to generate an Other by such hegemonic nationalist discourses.

With a deep grief, Ono remembers the death of his son Kenji when Japan attacks Manchuria:

> It had taken more than a year for my son's ashes to arrive from Manchuria… Then when his ashes finally came, along with those of the twenty-three other young men who had died attempting that hopeless charge across the minefield, there were no assurances that the ashes were in fact Kenji's and Kenji's alone. 'But if my brother's ashes are mingled' Setsuko had written to me at the time, 'they would only be mingled with those of his comrades. We cannot complain about that. (*AFW*, 57)

What Ono tells suggests that Kenji died because a mine exploded while he was on the minefield with other soldiers, and his body parts having torn apart from his body with the impact of the explosion, scattered around. As there were twenty three soldiers together during the explosion, it was impossible to identify which body part belonged to whom. This portrays an unbearable scene for the family members imagining the death of their relatives. However, Setsuko's comment on the death of her brother depicts the power of nationalism in the sense that she consoles herself by thinking that Kenji died for his country and his ashes were mingled with his comrades who died for Japan, as well. Still, it is remarkable how someone can accept to die for his/her nation and the members constituting that nation without even knowing who they are. As McLeod holds:

> Nations are constructed, defended and (in too many tragic cases) bloodily contested by groups of people. So central to the idea of the nation are notions of collectivity and belonging, a mutual sense of community that a group of individuals imagine it shares. (68-69)

The factor that makes many people agree to give their lives for their nations' sake is the fraternity bond and the "notions of collectivity" they feel. Living

on the same land is not enough on its own to make people feel connected to each other and share the same national identity. If it were so, all the people living on earth would construct one united nation.

As pointed out earlier, a sense of "mutual national belonging is manufactured by the performance of various *narratives, rituals* and *symbols* which stimulate an individual's sense of being a member of a select group" (McLeod, 69). This is a point also highlighted by Anderson and Bhabha, which is connected to the notion of simultaneity. Millions of people living in different parts of a country without getting together can feel they all belong to a single community accepting time simultaneously. In this way, a kind of singularization is achieved and a connection is established.

> For nations aspiring toward political independence, unity, or both, the first challenge was to formulate the geographic boundaries and cultural characteristics of the hypothetical nation. Once there was some consensus about these issues, the twofold task: first to inculcate members of the potential nation with a staunch sense of solidarity and then to advertise a cohesive national identity to the outside World (Facos and Hirsh, 12)

Kenji's death together with "his comrades" can be considered an example of this "staunch sense of solidarity" in that, Kenji and the other soldiers might have come from various parts of the country to fight against the enemy sharing the same feeling for their country. After they die, their ashes are gathered together in the same ashpot. This signifies that "the comrades" die together for the same aim, desire and the nation.

Ono, shaping the identity of the Japanese nation and leading the people to take action for the destiny of the nation through his paintings, is one of those figures contributing to the rise of Japanese nationalism during World War II. His paintings are the milestones for the imposition of the current politics and the *warrior* Japanese national identity. Being aware of the power of the people in the national discourse, Matsuda comes to inform Ono that

Okada-Shingen Society consists of many people believing in the power of their people and nation:

> Okada-Shingen does not exist in isolation. There are young men like us in all walks of life- in politics, in the military- who think the same way... Together, it is within our capability to achieve something of real value. It just so happens that some of us care deeply about art and wish to see it responding to the world of today. (*AFW*, 173)

The reason why Matsuda wants Ono to join their society is that he believes skillful artists constitute one of those iconic groups that can motivate people especially at such a time when Matsuda refers to be "the world of today". This group can direct the people of the nation to support the Japanese cause to expand in order to put Japan to its "rightful" place among the leading powers of the world. However, first, Japan has to gain a fighter identity in order to act as a fighter when necessary. Ono's paintings have a quality that can organize and manipulate the Japanese people to adopt such an identity. Sharing Matsuda's ideas, and getting inspired by a scene while walking around the city with Matsuda, Ono paints his "Complacency*"* and describes it as follows:

> Three boys… stood in front of a squalid shanty hut, and their clothes were the same rags the original boys wore, the scowls on their faces would not have been guilty, defensive cowls of little criminals caught in the act; rather, they would have worn the manly scowls of samurai warriors ready to fight. It is no coincidence, furthermore, that boys in my Picture held their sticks in classic kendo stances. Above the heads of these three boys… that of three fat- well-dressed men sitting in a comfortable bar laughing together. These two contrasting images are moulded together within the coastline of the Japanese islands. Down the right-hand margin, in bold red characters, is the Word "Complacency"; down the left-hand side, in smaller characters, is the declaration: "But the young are ready to fight for their dignity". (168)

Ono's painting draws a contrast between the complacent figures and the aggressive warriors. He identifies combativeness with Japaneseness by

drawing young warriors on the background referring to the Japanese landscape and the country of Japan. The Japanese viewers of the poster are strongly encouraged to identify themselves with the warriors in the painting. As the characters above them are presented in an irritating way, those viewing the painting are motivated to feel closer to the group below, and thereby indirectly accept their warrior quality, because they have no other choice. Especially the word "dignity" sends positive signals and connotes a sense of respect, which makes the group below look more desirable. As the chosen group bear the warrior identity, the ones feeling closer to them get the message that they have to bear the warrior identity as well, because the viewers now belong to that group. For those who hold the opinion that to be able to be a part of the imperialist world, the Japanese nation should be combatant, such visual symbols emphasizing Japan's need for awaking and fighting in order to survive in a hostile environment are essential. "In all circumstances, nation-builders relied on visual codes to establish, support and disseminate their claims" (Facos and Hirsh, 3) because "artists concerned with national identity were equally committed to the expression of a complex iconography through distinctive and often newly devised visual vocabulary" (2). So, Ono devises an identity of a national hero who can act against the complacent men when necessary. In this way, there will be no need for a national hero with special powers, as anybody living in Japan can become so. The poster Ono makes is a way of personifying the nation. As Facos and Hirsh point out, after the French Revolution art had a special quality:

> [W]ar monuments celebrated a single figure, and often a particular event – a king seen in battle or emissaries on a diplomatic mission. But following the French Revolution, imagery emerged, from Gericault's *Cuirassier* (1814) to Karl Friedrich Schinkel's *Kreutzberg Monument* (1822), in which the Everyman as national hero began to appear. (6)

While fabricating bravery as a defining characteristic of Japanese national identity, Ono makes use of a national symbol: samurai. Samurai originally means the ones who serve, but their role is not that simple as they

> were the legendary warriors of old Japan who led noble and violent lives governed by the demands of honour, personal dignity and loyalty. These ideals found reality in the service the samurai rendered to their feudal lords through government and to their commanders on the battlefield. It was a duty that found its most sublime expression in death.
>
> (Turnbull, 7)

Samurai are honorable warriors who are an elite group and iconic for Japanese people. They are also known to have a strong self-esteem. So, Ono employs the samurai especially in order to arouse sympathy for Japanese people and provide motivation for them. Although, after the Meiji Restoration, the samurai class is abolished in order to eradicate the class discrimination among the Japanese people, Ono does not hesitate to make use of the figures of iconic samurai to identify the Japanese youth with dignity, loyalty and combatant samurai character. This will please them and flatter their pride. This is also because of Japan's inclination towards the samurai culture, for the samurai has been inseparable from Japanese history. In this way, seeing the poster Ono painted, people do not feel alienation and they easily identify themselves with the samurai icon, as it belongs to their honourable past and is a part of their dignified historical narration. So the icon functions to singularize Japanese people aiming to connect them to a common ancestry and sentiments.

In the novel, painters are not the only figures that produce iconic artwork which contribute to shaping a Japanese identity. There are also composers who are equally important in this process of national identity construction. Hobsbawm writes that

> Entirely new symbols and devices came into existence as part of national movements and states, such as the national anthem,… the national flag, or the personification of 'the nation' in symbol or image.
>
> (7)

In the novel, the songs Mr. Nagguchi composes are significant in the sense that they contribute to nationalism and patriotism. Ono describes Mr. Nagguschi's effect on the issue when his grandson Ichiro asks about him:

> The songs Mr. Nagguschi composed had become very famous, not just in city, but all over Japan. They were sung on the radio and in bars. And the likes of your uncle Kenji sang them when they were marching off before a battle. (*AFW*,155)

National anthems, songs and symbols are also important as they create the sense of simultaneity Anderson conceptualizes. On the one hand they provide the nation with a cultural present that will be the nation's past in time, which is essential to create an anteriority in the national discourse and preserve its continuity as long as possible; on the other hand, they help to create a sense of unity as long as they are remembered and repeated by the people all around the country as it is in the example of Mr. Nagguschi, whose songs are sung by many different people. People also hearing the songs on the radio and listening to them repetitively participate in the pride of being Japanese and belonging to the Japanese nation, as it can be observed in relation to "the Hirayama boy" in the novel.

Ono indicates that before the war starts a man in his fifties whom people call "the Hirayama boy" (60) sits on one of the walls towards the entrance of Migi-Hidari, a place where Ono and his friends spend most of their time. Without giving harm to anybody, the Hirayama boy sings war songs and mimics the propaganda speeches:

> In three years before and during the war he [the Hirayama boy] became a popular figure in the pleasure district with his war songs and mimicking of patriotic speeches… [B]etween the singing he would amuse spectators by standing there griming at the sky, his hands on his hips, shouting: 'This village must provide its share of sacrifices for the Emperor. Some of you will lay down your lives! Some of you will return triumphant to a new dawn'- or some such words. And people would say, 'The Hirayama boy may not have it all there, but he's got the right

> attitude. He's Japanese.' I often saw people stop to give him money, or else buy him something to eat, and on those occasions the idiot's face would light up into a smile. No doubt the Hirayama boy became fixed on those patriotic songs because of the attention and popularity they earned him. (60-61)

The Hirayama boy probably is not mentally healthy, and he even is not aware of what he is shouting for. Yet, for the people passing by, no matter if he is unconscious of why he is singing or mimicking, he is "Japanese", because "he's got the right attitude". He is the representative of the brave and dignified Japanese identity who can sacrifice himself for the sake of the nation he belongs to. So, in the war years the Hirayama boy becomes a local symbol and also provides people with a sense of unity. This is because different town people pass by the Hirayama boy at different times of the day. They do not see each other or do not know one another's name, but they all see the Hirayama boy and know him. At different times, they share the same feelings which make them come together emotionally and feel part of a community.

Together with the developments in media, the icons and the symbols which represent the national values and project the national identity gain more power and become more and more influential in the process. It can be interpreted that the media makes these figures more eminent in the sense that they have more practical roles in the pedagogical teaching of the national narration because they also have visual power that is more appealing and affective for people to receive the intended message. The media can also be equally influential in the dissemination of heroes, icons of one culture to other cultures, especially if the exporting culture is politically and/or economically powerful. This is illustrated in the novel through Ichiro's interest in Popeye and the Lone Ranger. After Noriko gets married, Setsuko makes a visit to Ono, and when she goes shopping with her sister, Ono is supposed to take care of Ichiro. They decide to go for a lunch during which Ichiro eats his spinach in an unusual way to Ono's surprise. Ono narrates as follows:

> My grandson proceeded to pile as much spinach as possible on to the spoon, then raised it high into the

> air and began pouring it into his mouth. His method resembled someone drinking the last dregs from a bottle… [M]y grandson continued putting more spinach into his mouth, all the time chewing vigorously. He put down his spoon only when it was empty and his cheeks were full to bursting. Then, still chewing, he fixed a stern expression on his face, thrust out his chest and began punching at the air around him. (152)

Obviously Ono does not have any idea about what Ichiro is doing. He seems to be alien to the way Ichiro eats his spinach. Those who watch Popeye, listen to his adventures on the radio which was broadcast between 1935 and 1938, or read his comic books will be accustomed to Ichiro's movements and can understand his enthusiasm in his spinach plate because Ichiro imitates none other than Popeye the Sailorman's way of eating his spinach as he also explains later on. It is not surprising that Ono does not have any knowledge about Popeye, because he is an American cartoon hero, who became a phenomenon around the world, and especially in Japan after World War II, since his first appearance on the press as a comic book and on the television as a cartoon.

Also, Ono is not able to make sense of Ichiro's games in one of which Ichiro role-plays imitating another American icon *The Lone Ranger*. The old painter watches his grandson curiously while he is playing. He narrates his observation as:

> I watched him for a while, but could make little sense of the scenes he was acting. At intervals, he appeared to be in combat with numerous invisible enemies. All the while, he continues to mutter lines of a dialogue under his breath. I tried to make these out, but as far as I could tell he was not using actual words, simply making sounds with his tongue. (29)

Although Ono cannot figure it out, Ichiro mimics the Lone Ranger as he replies Ono's question of who he is by shouting as: "Lone Ranger! Hi yo Silver!" (30) The phrase Ichiro quotes belongs to the famous film star, the American ranger. At the opening scene of all the episodes of the serial film

the Lone Ranger is seen on his horse Silver, and he shouts: "Hi yo Silver!" in order to make his horse gallop. Probably having been so affected by the films, Ichiro pretends to be an American cowboy and fights against imaginary enemies. Although they are represented to the World by the United States, the origins of cowboys go back to the Spanish rule in Central America. In the late 19th century, *los vaqueros*, generally from Native American or Indian-American origin, were hired by criollo land owners to herd their cattle in the plains of Mexico and what is now South-western United States. However, in time

> The image of the courageous, spirited horseman living a dangerous life carried with it an appeal that refuses to disappear. Driving a thousand to two thousand cattle hundreds of miles to market; facing lightning and cloudbursts and drought, stampedes, rattlesnakes, and outlaws; sleeping under the stars and catching chow at the chuckwagon—the cowboys dominated the American galaxy of folk heroes. (Foner and Garraty, 154)

Like Popeye, the American cowboy spreads around the world though comic books and films and he turns to be the legend known by every child. Anderson attracts attention to the point that as the printing press becomes wide spread, the national bonds become more powerful in the sense that it enables the members of a nation to achieve a sense of a simultaneous activity without seeing one another's faces. People read the same magazine or the newspaper at the same time in different parts of the country and sometimes laugh, sometimes cry at the same news or events and share the same emotions. This helps them establish emotional bonds with the other citizens of their country whose names are unknown to themselves. This act of sharing is the fact that also strengthens the sense of simultaneity. As the printing technology develops more, the material published diversifies. This is what makes comic books like *Popeye the Sailorman* become popular. In time, they start to be utilized as a means of disseminating culture abroad like America does in its Popeye and the Lone Ranger examples. However, together with the initialization of broadcasting through the television and the development of

the film sector, media gains a more influential role in the dissemination of culture and cultural values. Ichiro's example and his admiration for the American cartoon hero Popeye and the film icon American cowboy are the best examples that can be given in *An Artist of the Floating World* as the indicators of dissemination of American culture in Japan. With the help of media these icons become the means of the pedagogical training through which America can impose its culture on Japan, and Japanese people who acquire the American culture through such a training turn to be performative subjects of the culture they gain, like Ichiro in the novel.

From Ono's narration it is not possible to determine if Ichiro has watched a Popeye film, listened to it on the radio or read the comic book, because Ishiguro sometimes employs anachrony as in the example of his Godzilla film implication when Ichiro paints the picture of a huge lizard-like monster spreading terror to people while he is walking among the high buildings (*AFW*, 33). The description of the monster is identical to Godzilla, which was shot in 1954 (Hanlon, *Forbes*), making it impossible for Ichiro to see its poster. For this reason, whether Ichiro reads about Popeye or he watches it at the cinema is not obvious. However, it is definite that he has seen *The Lone Ranger* on the screen and directly imitates his movements including his foreign English speech, as Ono indicates that Ichiro makes up words in order to imitate English. Ichiro's admiration for the American film characters is indicative of the effect of a film even on a foreign audience and how the culture can so successfully be transmitted to other cultures. Qi indicates the power of films as follows:

> As one of the most influential art creation and culture dissemination approaches, films have a large number of mass, wide and broad covering areas and most influential of culture during the cross culture dissemination. (387)

Qi also highlights the fact that films "have irreplaceable effect on promoting national culture and thoughts influencing and raising the nation image in the world" (387) because films are the melting pot of art, drama and music, which

makes them more appealing to the people. And they are represented to be the means of imposing a different culture on Japanese identity, because, in the novel, Ichiro is drawn as a character who admires American idols and American culture. His example shows how easily cultures can be blended through media.

Ono's narrative also highlights the importance of tradition in the creation and maintenance of the national identity. Most of the Japanese people in the novel get married through arranged marriages. This is still valid in our contemporary day. Lewis writes that "during the planning of Noriko's wedding, Ishiguro carefully explains the custom called the *miai*, a feature of the arranged marriages common in Japan until recently" (51). In the process the two parents get to know each other through a go-betweener. This mediator first investigates the social status, education level and prosperity of the families. If the families are found equal to each other in these respects, the go-betweener introduces them to each other. "In formal introductions a kind of resume or personal history, with photograph attached, is given to each individual's parents prior to the meeting of the young couple" (Sosnoski, 69) If the parent's opinions are positive, then they inform their children about the situation. And, if the young do not agree to see each other, they are not obliged to do so, but if their opinion of each other is positive like their parents, they have the opportunity to date or the families get together at a dinner. This is how Setsuko, Noriko, Jiro Miyake, the first prospective husband of Noriko and Ono get married. Ono reveals in a conversation with Matsuda when he goes to see him after many years in order to ask a favour from him that Matsuda was the go-betweener in his marriage. Ono and Matsuda think about the happy old days and they refer to Ono's *miai.* Ono reminds Matsuda: "You were to all intents our go-between. That uncle of yours just couldn't cope with the job" (*AFW,* 90). This tradition still continues to be a part of Japanese identity today, and it highlights the Japanese devotion to their traditions as it is a part of their past, as well. Lewis comments as follows:

> Ishiguro handles the build-up to this occasion [Noriko's *miai*] with great dexterity. Indeed, it is so firmly integrated into the plot that the careless reader could easily assume that this episode is proof of the novel's credible Japaneseness. (51)

However, Ishiguro's intention is not to write a Japanese novel, for this reason, his delineation of *miai* should be interpreted as his attempt to depict the importance of maintaining a tradition passing from one generation to the other in the narration of national identity and the construction of national values. As it is in Ono's case, the *miai* tradition is repeated through each generation and becomes an inseparable part of the Japanese marital tradition.

Symbols and traditions which leave a mark in the memory are a means of creating a national discourse as the constructed national identity has to take a place in the memory. Nonetheless, at the same time there might be some events that should be erased from the nation's memory and forgotten in order for that nation to construct a self-confident identity. This seems to be the reason why in his novel Ishiguro deals with the issues of suicides committed frequently in the aftermath of World War II. Tennent underlines that

> [a]nthropologists have consistently observed that the concept of shame and the maintenance of public honor is one of the 'pivotal values' outside the West and can be observed in a wide variety of cultures stretching from Morocco in North Africa all the way to Japan in the Far East. (78)

Public honour is one of the most important characteristics of Japanese culture. This is the reason why many Japanese leaders or those who led the country into the war in 1939 commit suicide through seppuku in order to regain the honour they assumed to have lost by causing the death of many people and bringing the country to such a shameful end (Cerulo, 147).

Seppuku, also known as Harakiri in the Western world, is a kind of suicide which is practiced by disembowelment with a cut in the abdomen from left-to-right. After the disembowelment, a second man finishes the ritual by beheading the suiciding person, but leaving a part of flesh in the front in

order to let the head fall forward in a disposal of shame and apology. For centuries, seppuku has been practiced, especially by the samurai, and it "has been a badge of courage as well as an honour" (Fusé, 57). There are some reasons that can lead a person to commit the seppuku ritual, as being an atonement for failure in battles, an apology from the victims after a crime or a faulty action causes harm, or a demonstration of protest to the lord's decisions, or a compensation for a dishonourable action. Whatever the reason, after someone takes his own life by seppuku, he and his family gain their honour back and their name is cleansed. Also, the ones who end their lives by seppuku are considered honourable and respected people in society (Farina, 31).

Although a feudal ritual, seppuku is also practised in modern Japan. At the end of World War II many commanders and soldiers ended their lives by cutting their abdomens after failing in battles (Cerulo, 147). Ishiguro's novel includes characters who commit seppuku after the end of WWII. Ono meets Jiro Miyake, his previous prospective son-in-law whose marriage to Noriko is cancelled because Ono is infamous for his involvement in the fascist politics of the country before the war. They have a brief conversation during which the young Miyake gives the sad news:

> The President of our parent company is now deceased… [T]o be frank, the President committed suicide… He was found gassed. But it seemed he tried hara-kiri first, for there were minor scratches around his stomach… It was his apology on behalf of the companies under his charge. (*AFW*, 55)

The President of the company feels himself guilty of dragging the country into the war and causing many people to die by supporting the Emperor's politics as Miyake adds: "Our President clearly felt responsible for certain undertakings we were involved in during the war" (55). For this reason, not being able to commit hara-kiri, he commits suicide, because it will be an apology for those who have lost their relatives, family members or friends at the war. Although it will not erase unpleasant memories about war and loss caused by people like the boss of Jiro Miyake, the suicides attempt to ease the

pain of the relatives of casualties. Still, the President of the company has his own interpretation of killing himself. In the light of what Bhabha holds regarding the inevitable variations in the ways people perform the pedagogical teachings the novel seems to suggest that the President had no courage to commit hara-kiri because if it had been his real intention he would have stabbed himself directly in the stomach, but Miyake indicates that there were minor scratches around his stomach, which can be interpreted as the President tried to appear that he wanted to commit hara-kiri in keeping with the pedagogical teaching. This is his way of apologizing to the Japanese people and it is also illustrative of the possibility to modify the pedagogical through the performative.

Committing hara-kiri is not an action that can be imposed on the people directly in the sense that there is not a law ordering that a man should kill himself/herself when he/she feels guilty. It depends on man's will and his/her own feelings about his/her deed. No man can command an order or force a Japanese citizen to commit a suicide by defending that it is for the nation's sake, although committing hara-kiri has settled to Japanese national discourse as a way of saving the Japanese honour. However, there may also be direct attempts to impose sanction on people in the construction of the national narrative, because people have a central and indispensable double role in the narration of the nation as Bhabha emphasizes (*DissemiNation,* 297). People are the objects and the subjects of the narration where first they are taught and then expected to behave as befitting to their predetermined and imposed national identity making them first the pedagogical objects and then performative subjects realizing the implanted role. Ishiguro displays this relationship between the performative and the pedagogic within the scope of Ono's life.

Ono at the very beginning of his life is subjected to his father's strict rules. Starting from his very early age he feels the depressing authority of his father in deciding his future career, which will be a part of his identity. Ono

goes through his father's strict training regarding the family business in their "business meetings":

> In any case, when I reached the age of twelve, the "business meetings" began, and then I found myself inside that room [the reception room] once every week… My father would then begin his talking. From out of his "business box" he would produce small, fat notebooks, some of which he would open so that he could point out to me columns of densely packed figures. All the while, his talking would continue in a measured, grave tone, to pause only occasionally when he would look up at me as though for confirmation. At these points, I would hurriedly utter: "Yes, indeed." (*AFW*, 42)

It is clear that the child Ono does not have any idea about what his father is talking about. He attends the meetings regularly, but he always holds the fear that his father may discover the fact that Ono does not even have a minor clue about what is going on in their "business meetings". Neither does he have the courage to ask his father to speak slowly in the way he can follow the speech and explain the meaning of the densely packed columns to him, as Ono accepts it to be the revelation of his ignorance. However, in time he comes to the conclusion that his father did not want him to understand the whole business. The long formal pedagogical sessions were serving for a different aim:

> Of course, it is clear to me now that my father never expected me for a moment to follow his talk, but I have never ascertained just why he put me through these ordeals. Perhaps he wished to impress upon me from that early age his expectation that I would eventually take over the family business. (42)

Ono's interpretations of his father's deed reveal that what his father was doing was only to make Ono accustomed to their family business. As a passive object Ono listened to his father for years. This was a way of imposing his authority on little Ono as "Ishiguro portrays the father as a traditional patriarch" (Tekin, 127). What his father was doing was probably a way of impressing his son in order to direct him to be interested in the family business

so that in the future he would be willing to follow the family's traditional discourse; that is the child should follow the father's path and hold his business, as well. This is the reason why the father does not let Ono be a painter when he learns from his mother that Ono has decided to be an artist.

It is hard to stand against the authority and digress from the pedagogical teaching when it comes to be the subject of one's own life in the sense that the subject takes his/her own decisions during which he/she is supposed to perform according to expectations. "The father is of the strict opinion that Ono cannot pursue any career other than the family business" (Tekin, 128); therefore, he puts pressure on Ono to deny and get rid of his painting ambition in an insistently dictating and disturbing tone: "Your mother, Masuji, seems to be under the impression that you wish to take up painting as a profession. Naturally, she is mistaken in supposing this" (*AFW*, 44). And, Ono's attempt to digress does not remain without punishment, because wanting Ono to bring all his paintings to the reception room, the father burns them. Ono narrates the event as follows:

> Perhaps it was my imagination, but when I returned to the room a few minutes later… I received the impression the earthenware ashpot had been moved slightly nearer the candle. I also thought there was a smell of burning in the air. (44)

It is not always possible to establish authority on people. Bhabha defends the fact that no matter how ambitious the leaders or the politicians may be to create a holistic nation which will advance in the direction they wish, it is impossible to achieve such an aim completely. This is because there will always be those who stand in the margins causing plurality. Ono, at this point, represents those marginal individuals of the community who defy authority through their choices. For example, he resists his mother's support of his father's insistence to continue the family business. His mother insists by telling her son: "[t]here is much more to a life like your father's than you can possibly know at your age" (47). Bennett holds:

> The undertone of latent disapproval, the parental heavy-handedness and causal disregard of his son's wishes speak of a time of subservience. These episodes [where Ono has quarrels with his mother and father about his future profession] prove that Ono was expected to be a subservient child. Yet, he refuses to comply, and eventually becomes an artist. (89)

Ono rejects her mother's suggestion by stating: "You mustn't misunderstand me, Mother. I have no wish to find myself in years to come, sitting where father is now sitting, telling my own son about accounts and money" (*AFW*, 47). In this way, he breaks the chain his father wants to create for the family succession imitating the national discourse. Through different paths they follow, individuals shape the community and cause plurality.

After he gets rid of the familial objectivation against his being a painter by rejecting his father's authority Ono undergoes another dominant figure who makes Ono his pedagogical object. Ishiguro's second representation of Ono as the performative subject of an authority's pedagogical teachings is when Ono starts to work for the Takeda firm in 1913, the time he starts his painting career. The firm sells authentic Japanese paintings abroad and makes money in this way. Although Ono is happy at his work because he is allowed to paint full time, he cannot paint original paintings due to the firm's demands of orientalist paintings. Ono depicts the working conditions and the style as follows:

> [W]e were all battling together against time to preserve the hard-earned reputation of the firm. We were also quite aware that the essential point about the sort of things we were commissioned to paint- geishas, cherry trees, swimming carps, temples- was that they looked "Japanese" to the foreigners to whom they were shipped out, and all finer points of style were quite likely to go unnoticed. (69)

Ono does not find an opportunity to enhance his painting skills as he is not allowed to try anything new. The firm wants to appeal to the taste of people living abroad; therefore, Ono and the other workers have to paint what seems "Japanese" to the "foreigners" the paintings are sold to. They have to do this

quickly, which turns their paintings to industrial products rather than pieces of art. Not being able to meet the demands of working conditions, Ono's friend Tortoise is abused and bullied by his workmates. As his mock name indicates, Tortoise is slow to paint. Other workers of the firm make fun of him, saying, for example: "Hey, Tortoise, are you still painting that petal you started last week?" (68). Tortoise cannot catch up with the working standards Ono rejects, who likens their performance to the "horses toil under Master Takeda to earn living" (71).

In the next stage of his life Ono becomes the pedagogical object of Mr. Moriyama, who is called Mori-san, together with his friend Sasaki, whom he meets at Mori-san's villa. Mori-san is neither from the family like Ono's father, nor from the business world like Master Takeda: he is an artist who gives painting lessons to a specific student group, and Ono, Sasaki and all other students have to follow the teachings of their master. After leaving the Takeda firm with his friend Tortoise, Ono starts to live in Mori-san's villa and becomes one of his students. Sasaki is the leading pupil of Mr. Moriyama. He is the perfect performative subject of Mori-san's pedagogical training because he is the one who applies all the techniques his teacher teaches in the most perfect way. This is the reason why he is considered the best pupil.

In a way Sasaki is like a teacher or another authority figure in the group consisting of nine other pupils. Ono indicates that sometimes with other students they discuss Mori-san's paintings in order to decide on a matter or catch the technique of their teacher, but when Sasaki comes and makes his comment, the group take it as the final word above all other ideas they have been discussing. So, he is the representative of their master and his authority and he is powerful to such an extent that, if Sasaki finds a painting of a student deviates from Mori-san's technique, that student is punished. Ono indicates:

> Sasaki were to suggest a person's painting was in a way "disloyal" to our teacher, this would almost always lead to immediate capitulation- who would then abandon the painting, or in some cases, burn it along with the refuse. (140)

Tekin also writes that

> Mori-san ironically does not allow his students the freedom that he himself enjoys in his artistic efforts. Under the supervision of his leading student, Sasaki, all the other students are obliged to follow the only path marked by Mori-san. (129)

The punishment given to disloyalty against Mori-san' teachings reminds Ono of the punishment his father had given to him when he learned that he wanted to be a painter. So, in all cases the one who deviates from the taught or pedagogically proper direction is punished in order to lead him/her to the "right" direction. The specific example for this can be Tortoise who "was repeatedly destroying his work" because he produces "work displaying elements clearly contrary to [Morisan's] principles" (*AFW*, 140). In an interview Ishiguro comments on the master-pupil relationship which is highlighted in his novel in different manners as follows:

> I'm pointing to the master-pupil thing recurring over and over in the world. In a way, I'm using Japan as a sort of metaphor. I'm trying to suggest that this isn't something peculiar to Japan, the need to follow leaders and the need to exercise power over subordinates, as a sort of motor by which society operates. I'm giving Western readers to look at this not as Japanese phenomenon but as a human phenomenon. (Mason, 10)

Ishiguro's remark reveals that his broader concern in his portrayals of masters and their pupils is to explore the relationship between exercising power and yielding to power; or, which can also be put as the relationship between the pedagogic and the performative. No matter how loyal to his teachings at first, Sasaki tries new techniques to Mori-san's disappointment and he is dismissed from the villa as a punishment without being able to take his dear paintings with him and is called "traitor" (*AFW*, 143) from behind. The authority marginalizes those who disobey his rules in this way, and gives a warning to those who are left behind in order not to exceed the limitations. Peter Wain indicates that Mori-san's villa "is a different but no less authoritarian environment" and adds "content, form and ideological purity must conform

to the demands of Mori-san" (187), although this time there is no industrial production as in the Takeda firm.

After, Sasaki's departure, Ono becomes Mr. Moriyama's favourite student who applies his techniques well. Yet, Matsuda's arrival changes the smooth going atmosphere and ends with Ono's deviation from Mori-san's technique. However, Ono's parting is more painful because the master tries different ways in order not to lose his obedient pupil. Mr. Moriyama first tries to give time to Ono to come to terms with his teachings:

> It's not a bad thing that a young artist experiment a little. Amongst other things, he is able to get some of his more superficial interests out of his system that way. Then he can return to more serious work with more commitment than ever. (*AFW,* 178)

This is followed by an explicit threat by the angry master: "Of course, you have considered your future in the event of your leaving my patronage" (179). Nonetheless, Ono requests Mori-san's support: "It had been my hope that Sensei would understand my position and continue to support me in pursuing my career" (179). He tries to come to terms with the authority by trying to show that what he is doing is not harmful, but this is a hope in vain. Then there comes the stage of discouragement. Mori-san very cleverly and very kindly threatens Ono as follows:

> Ono, were you less talented, there would be cause for worry. But you are a clever young man… You will no doubt succeed in finding work illustrating magazines and comic books. Perhaps you will even manage to join a firm like the one you were employed by when you first come to me. Of course, it will mean the end of your development as a serious artist, but then no doubt you've taken all this into account. (180)

Mori-san initially reminding that Ono is an artist with great talent, he intends to highlight the fact that Ono's career will be wasted if he leaves the villa. This is a very clever point to put forward, because when the Sensei continues with what is expecting Ono out there, he thinks he draws a dramatic tableau for Ono, a rather disappointing one, which will prevent Ono from risking all

he has and will have in the future as a talented artist who furnishes under the guarantee of this patronage and tutelage.

Yet, Mr. Moriyama fails in his efforts to convert Ono to his own way again, and after leaving the villa Ono becomes an authority himself and establishes his own hegemony. Matsuda takes Ono to the Nishizuru district to show the poverty Japanese people suffer from while he is still at the villa. His intention is to show what Ono has not seen before and leave an impact on him in order to convince him to leave Mori-san and start to perform his art for the sake of his country. Having been affected by Matsuda's fascist ideas, Ono starts to paint propaganda posters fostering Japan's expansion of territory.

The landscape becomes influential in Ono's actions and his paintings. The painter is affected by Nishizuru, a district he walks around with Matsuda, and he describes it as follows:

> As we climbed down to the foot of the steel bridge and began making our way through a series of narrow alleys, the smell grew ever stronger until it became quite nauseous. On either side of us were what might have been stalls at some marketplace, closed down for the day, but in fact constituted individual households, partitioned from the alleyway sometimes only by cloth curtain… After a while I grew increasingly aware of the open-sewer ditches dug on either side of the narrow path we were walking. There were flies hovering all along their length. (167)

Ono describes the district so dramatically that it is impossible even for the reader not to be affected by the narration. People living in miserable conditions who even do not have a proper place to call home prick Ono's conscience, and when the unhealthy living conditions are added to the misery, Ono feels that he has to do something for the people living there because he feels that he cannot be indifferent to the people of his own nation. The scene Ono observes makes him sense that there is a kind of bond between the people he sees and himself: They are his people, and they belong to the same nation. Bhabha identifies the landscape as a unifying power in the national narration.

He refers to Goethe's piece of writing where through looking at the same scene, all people in all parts of Germany share the same feelings and a kind of common locality that is created, which plays an important role in the construction of the nation. The district in Ono's narration serves a similar function. It is not pleasant like Goethe's depiction of a country evening, but it raises the same feeling of belonging to the same land and the same country providing the people with a sense of unity in Ono' world. The people suffering and living in such conditions are Ono's people. Therefore, Ono decides to take an action and do something for the people of his nation, as he feels himself responsible towards them. No doubt that in the novel there are similar scenes all around Japan making the people in Japan share the same ideas with Ono, as they see the same scenes around them. In this way people are convinced to take part in Japan's war against poverty. Also, Ono decides to help these people having been convinced by Matsuda, because humble charity organizations cannot save his people. And, the best way Ono can be useful is no other than painting as he is highly talented in arts. Ono's aim is to lead people to take an action and fight for their own benefit by affecting them with his posters and impose on them the idea that the only way to prevent poverty is to get rich not through the selfish politics of the politicians or businessmen but through fighting in order to expand the lands and the sources of Japanese country. According to Ono, only in this way can the people of Japan get wealthy and lead a life in dignity as befitting the Japanese nation. For this reason first he paints *"*Complacency" (168) in which he depicts the politicians as complacent and the Japanese youth "ready to fight for their dignity" (168) as explained before, and then he paints "Eyes to the Horizon" (169*)*. The second painting is the variation of the first one. Ono describes it as follows:

> The later painting… also employed two contrasting images merging into one another, bound by the coastline of Japan; the upper image was again that of three well-dressed men conferring, but this time they wore nervous expressions, looking to each other for initiative. For the lower, more dominant image, the

> three poverty-stricken boys had become stern-faced soldiers; two of the held bayoneted rifles, flanking an officer who held out his sword, pointing the way forward, west towards Asia. Behind them, there was no longer a backdrop poverty; simply the military flag of the rising sun. The word "Complacency" down the right-hand margin had been replaced by "Eyes to the Horizon!" and on the left-hand side, the message, "No time for cowardly talking. Japan must go forward." (169)

Ono's second painting, when compared to the first one, is more assertive. The painter this time blames the politicians of his country with cowardice. Similar to Matsuda, Ono is highly critical of the politicians, because he, now, directly supports the Emperor's expansionist discourse, which Ono tries to impose on the Japanese people making them the objects of his pedagogy. Masao explains the kind of world view adopted by Ono as follows:

> [W]hen the premises of the national hierarchy were transferred horizontally into the international sphere, international problems were reduced to single alternative: conquer or be conquered. In the absence of any higher normative standards with which to gauge international relations, power politics is bound to be the rule and yesterday's timid defensiveness will become today's unrestrained expansionism (Masao, 139-140)

During that stage of his life, Ono has many followers/students, the most favourite of whom is Kuroda. Kuroda has been faithful to Ono's teachings for sometime. He even paints posters like his master, which displays him as a successful performative subject, who is able to turn the teachings of his master into a "proper" performance. For example, Ono mentions a painting by Kuroda who follows in the future footsteps of his master as follows:

> I have somewhere in this house a painting by Kuroda, that most gifted of my pupils, depicting one such evening at the Migi-Hidari. It is entitled: "The Patriotic Spirit", a title that may lead you to expect a work depicting soldiers on the march or some such thing. *(AFW*, 74)

Yet, at one point, Kuroda, too stands against his master's teachings. Whereupon, Ono snitches on Kuroda when he becomes "the advisor to the Committee of Unpatriotic Activities" (182) as he explains to the officers who come to investigate Kuroda's home after having taken him for the questioning: "I merely suggested to the committee someone come around and give Mr. Kuroda a talking-to for his own good" (183) and adds: "Things have gone much too far" (183). Obviously Kuroda turns to hold anti-militarist ideas after a while, and probably starts to paint pictures standing against Japan's invasions. Ono does not want to harm his student, but he does not want him to go against his teachings, either. The officers go to Kuroda's and take him to prison and "destroy any offensive material" (183). Ono's knowledge has been restricted to his visit to Kuroda's home, but when he goes there years after the war in order to talk to him before Noriko's *miai,* he cannot see Kuroda and talks to Kuroda's pupil Enchi instead. Having known what Ono has done to Kuroda, Enchi angrily reports to Ono what happened to Kuroda as he was in prison:

> I take it you never knew about Mr. Kuroda's shoulder? He was in great pain, but the warders conveniently forgot to report the injury and it was not attended to until the end of the war. But of course, they remembered it well enough whenever they decided to give him another beating. Traitor. That's what they called him. Traitor. Every minute of everyday. (113)

Kuroda is beaten in prison as he goes against the fascist government of the wartime and seriously injured on his shoulder. In order to torture him, the officers hide his injury and continue to beat him for a long time. Ono tells his students that:

> Being at Takeda's… taught me an important lesson early in my life. That while it was right to look up to teachers, it was always important to question their authority. The Takeda experience taught me never to follow the crowd blindly. (73)

Yet he punishes his dear student who does not listen to and follow the teacher's own words. He recommends his students to follow their own way and wants them to be aware of what is going on around them because they are artists and artists should be the ones to question the authority. However, he punishes them if the direction they choose as a result of their free evaluation is different from his own one. As Sim puts it,

> From the self-scrutiny thus engendered, Ono appears to realize [later on] that in his treatment of Kuroda he had repeated the patterns of his own repressive treatment in the hands of a former teacher, as well as his father. (37)

The leaders or the ruling class of a nation may try to singularize the people in order to ensure unity in society. To some extent, this can be achieved through many ways. Nonetheless, as Bhabha suggests, it is impossible to achieve pure homogeneity or a horizontal fraternity because there will always be those subjects who may not follow the predetermined route; and their actions will ensure plurality. For example, the Japanese society Ishiguro depicts in his novel consists of businessmen, industrial workers, orientalist artists, political artists, fascists and anti-militarists that provide the nation with a diversity of viewpoints to enrich it.

Plurality also stems from the changing dynamics of society because as Bhabha underlines, "the knowledge of the people depends on the discovery" (*DissemiNation,* 303), which means that the people will continue exploring as long as they live, because it is in the nature of the human being. People owe their accumulation of culture, technology, knowledge, experience, or in brief, all they have today, to their curiosity, which brings change. Bhabha refers to Fanon to emphasize this idea of change:

> Fanon says 'of a much more fundamental substance which itself is continually being renewed' a structure of repetition that is not visible in the translucidity of the people's customs or the obvious activities which seem to characterize the people. 'Culture abhors simplification' Fanon writes, as he tries to locate the people in a performative time: 'the fluctuating

> movement that the people are *just* giving shape to'. (*DissemiNation,* 303)

Ishiguro highlights the transitory and changing dynamics of the nation when he gives the title of *An Artist of the Floating World* to his novel. And, Ono is the artist of such a world. In an interview with Mason, Ishiguro responds to a comment by Mason on Ono as follows:

> That's why he is the artist of the floating world, just as the floating world celebrated transitory pleasures. Even if they were gone by the morning and they were rebuilt on nothing, at least you enjoy them at the time. The idea is that there are no solid things. And the irony is that Ono had rejected that whole approach to life. But in the end, he too is left celebrating those pleasures that evaporated when the morning light dawned. So the floating world comes to refer, in the larger metaphorical sense, to the fact that the values of society are always in flux (*AFW*, 12).

The Floating world, or *Ukiyo-e* "is a term that demotes the transience of all things", and it refers to the change in society (Lewis, 55). Ono's world is floating because the values, customs, merits and morals are in constant alteration around him.

The change Ono's house goes through is symbolic in that, it reflects society which is constantly in flux. At the very beginning of the novel, Ono mentions the large corridor of his house during the visit of Miss Sugimura, the daughter of the previous owner of the house:

> The house had received its share of the war damage. Akira Sugimura [the owner of the house] had built an eastern wing to the main body of the house, comprising three large rooms, connected to the main body of the house by a large corridor running down by one side of the garden… The corridor was, in any case, one of the most appealing features of the house; in the afternoon, its entire length would be crossed by the lights and shades of the foliage outside… The bulk of the bomb damage had been to this section of the house, and as I surveyed it from the garden I could see Miss Sugimura was close to tears. (*AFW*, 11)

The present state of the house is so dramatic that it hurts the feelings of its previous owner. Having witnessed the devastated corridor, Miss Sugimura comes close to tears as probably she has had many good memories about it. As the war makes a great impact on Ono's world and takes all Ono has from his hands, the bulk of a bomb dropped during the war damages the beauty and glamour of the house.

The house that has lost its captivating appeal symbolizes the idea that nothing can stand forever as in the case of Ono's losing his reputation and powerful influence in society. The change in Shintaro's attitude towards Ono, who has been one of his devout students is another example of the altering values and attitudes in Ono's Japan. When Shintaro is Ono's pupil before Ono retired, he used to think he owed a lot to his Sensei and was proud of being his student. This is not only because Ono was an admirable man in the years he was still painting, but also he helped Shintaro's younger brother Yoshio to find a job by writing a recommendation letter to the State Department, when Shintaro went to his house to ask for a favour. Before leaving the house Shintaro turns to his brother who comes with him, and expresses his gratitude towards Ono by telling Yoshio: "But before we leave, take a good look again at the man who has helped you. We are greatly privileged to have a benefactor of such influence and generosity" (20-21).

After the war ends, Shintaro's pride stemming from being Ono's student vanishes. As the Sensei of Shintaro, Ono has always been his mentor, so he is supposed to consult Ono before planning his career. "The teacher-pupil relationship, which Ishiguro has used in … his novels, is immensely important in Japan."(33), writes Sexton and adds that Ishiguro highlights this fact by noting: "It's more like protégé-patron relationship. Everybody in society has a patron, who you go to consult over all kinds of matters. It's a crucial feature of Japanese society." (33) To Ono's disappointment, Shintaro decides to apply for a post at a high school without asking the opinion of his Sensei:

> Now it is, of course, many years since Shintaro was my pupil, and there is no reason why he should not have gone about such matters without consulting me; I was fully aware there were others now- his employer, for instance- far more suitably placed to act as guarantor in such matters. Nevertheless, I confess I was somewhat surprised he should not have confidence in me at all about these applications. (*AFW,* 100)

This is not the only "betrayal" of Shintaro. He comes one day to Ono's house to ask another favour at the time of his application to Higashimachi High School. Sintaro admits that the committee is uncertain about his involvement in the China crisis. So he wants Ono to write a letter to the committee:

> It is simply to satisfy the committee, Sensei. Nothing more. You may recall, Sensei, how we once had cause to disagree. Over the matter of my work during China Crisis" (102), with which Ono disagrees by saying "The China crisis? I'm afraid I don't recall our quarrelling, Shintaro. (102)

The matter is important for Shintaro as the authorities in the committee do not want to upset the Americans because after the war the American influence and hegemony over the country is sensed deeply. And, Japanese officials do not want to go against the American will as it is hinted by Shintaro, who says, "After all, there are the American authorities to satisfy…" (103). While Ono's reputation as a militarist artist who also had an imminent post in the Interior Department provided an advantage to his environment in the past, it, now, turns out to be a disadvantage after the war. For this reason, in order to get the post, Shintaro has to prove that he did not go against the American army or he did not support Japan's foreign politics, although the case was the exact opposite. It is understood from Ono's testament that Shintaro was able to perform well in the campaign to support the invasion politics of the Japanese Government. But now he comes to dissociate himself from his role he played in the China Crisis so as not to appear offensive to the Americans. "Japan as a country has historically so often been able to perform a complete volte-face without apparent strain" (32), writes Sexton and Ishiguro also indicate in his interview with Sexton:

> The thing about Japanese psychology is they'll fight like a berserk against an enemy as long as that person is identified as enemy. That seems to be very embedded in the Japanese psyche. But once it has been established that whoever it is no longer the enemy but in fact is your conqueror, your new teacher, then the Japanese don't seem to have any kind of mental block about switching completely and becoming very subservient and loyal to this new power. It's a bit like a dog or a horse. (32-33)

Shintaro is among those who change after the American forces invade Japan. Either he believes so, or as he has to, Shintaro feels the obligation to prove himself to be "subservient and loyal" to the new power, because Japan has lost the war causing a great damage to its people. This is also the reason why people who used to applaud the Hirayama boy start to hoot him after the war. Lewis underlines the change in the people's treatment of the Hirayama boy as follows:

> Before the war, Japan was encouraged to aggressively take its place in the world, through military or any other means. This was partly to revive its economy, which had suffered as a result of the global depression in the 1930s, but also to restore its glorious *samurai* warrior past. After the war, it surprised many when the country accepted defeat with as much vigour as it had once urged victory. Imperialist sympathizers were quickly condemned as "war criminals". The best illustration of this U-turn in Ishiguro's book is the fate of Hirayama boy. (Lewis, 49-50)

When Ono drops by Mrs. Kawakami's, a pub that has been popular among Ono's environment during the war years and before, he overhears that the Hirayama boy, who is appreciated due to his mimicking of militarist songs and speeches, is at the hospital as a man at Mrs. Kawakami's indicates: "I hear they took that idiot to hospital. A few broken ribs and concussion... It seems he got beaten up again last night" (*AFW*, 59). Ono is not able to understand or guess the reason why the Hirayama boy was sent to hospital. So, he investigates the event and gets the answer from the same man: "It seems he kept singing one of those old military songs and chanting regressive slogans"

(59). As it is understood, the “guilt” of the Hirayama boy is to continue to sing the songs celebrating the old imperial war of Japan after the war ends reminding people of the days of World War II and Japan's militarist policies that cost the lives of many people and cause the destruction of the families. The man's report also indicates that this is not the first time the Hirayama boy is beaten as the man highlights the boy is "beaten again". So the Hirayama boy is attacked because the time and the conditions change, and the people who used to celebrate the boy because they became exuberant with his songs enhancing the patriotic spirit dominant in the country, are now in a different spirit and opinion about the war. Ono seems to have difficulty in understanding the radical change in people's treatment of the Hirayama boy.

> Nobody minded idiots [like the Hirayama boy] those days. What has come over people that they feel inclined to beat the man up? They may not like his songs and speeches, but in all likelihood they are the same people who once patted his head and encouraged him until those few snatches embedded themselves in his brain. (61)

The consequences of the war were powerful for Japan and many Japanese people accused Japanese policies. The war in Europe ended when the Hitler Germany surrendered, but Japan refused to end the war. In the Potsdam Declaration Allies, Harry S. Truman, the President of the USA, Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of England, Chiang Kai-shek, the Chairman of the Nationalist Government of China, demanded surrender of Japanese troops and warned the country against prompt and utter destruction, but the Japanese government refused it (*Milestones: 1937-1945*, history.state.gov). The atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August, 1945 caused a mass destruction, the pain of which is still felt in our contemporary time. Also, many people died during the battles and attacks before the atomic bombs. The number of casualty was so huge from the beginning till the end of the war. Dower reports that Japanese government officially lists the military deaths of 1,740,955 between 1937–45 and writes,

"Only one third of the military deaths occurred in actual combat, the majority being caused by illness and starvation" (298). Japan accepted to surrender, but it was too late for many people. This can explain the reason why some characters in the novel like Suichi, Setsuko's husband, abhor those who support the militarist action.

Suichi is one of those who change after seeing the effects of the war. Ono indicates Suichi had a compliant and pliable character when they first met in Setsuko's *miai.* He remembers Suichi in Noriko's *miai,* when he sees Taro Saito, the second prospective husband to Noriko, and resembles him to Taro whom he appreciates well:

> I do remember forming immediately a favourable impression of Taro Saito, the young man I was being asked to consider for a son-in-law. Not only did he seem an intelligent, responsible sort, he possessed all the assured grace and manners I admired in his father. Indeed, observing the unworried, yet highly courteous way Taro Saito received myself and Noriko as we first arrived, I was reminded of another young man who had impressed me in a parallel situation some years earlier- that is to say Suichi… And for a moment, I consider the possibility that Taro Saito's courtesy and good-naturedness would fade with time as surely as Suichi's has done. But then, of course, it is to be hoped that Taro Saito will never have to endure the embittering experiences Suichi is said to have done. (*AFW,* 116)

Ono also underlines that the Suichi portrait he draws through Saito is the one before Suichi joins the army and goes to war during World War II. After Suichi comes back from the war his attitude and disposition change completely. During Kenji's funeral hold after his ashes come from Manchuria, Suichi's leaving the funeral in the middle of the ceremony attracts Ono's attention. When he asks Setsuko why Suichi does not attend the funeral, he gets this answer: "I'm sorry, Father, Suichi never intended to appear disrespectful. But we have attended so many such ceremonies this past year, for Suichi's friends and comrades, and they always make him so angry" (57). The real reason why Suichi rejects to attend the funerals is that he gets

angry when he sees the dead body of the young people dying in vain. When Ono defends the idea that their death is courageous, Suichi reacts as follows:

> There seems to be no end of courageous deaths… Half of my high school graduation year have died courageous deaths… This is what makes me angry. Brave young men die for stupid causes, and the real culprits are still with us. (58)

Suichi accuses those who lead the country astray and cause the death of the young men. He sees the deaths as waste because he believes that they die for the sake of the route the leaders or the politicians draw for their own benefits. Suichi finds it unfair that the people who drag the country to the war and cause many deaths walk around freely. Probably Suichi sees them as war criminals. There is even a hint that Suichi's anger is also directed at Ono because he was one of those who supported the militaristic policies of Japan and served for this aim for many years.

Suichi's attitude to America reflects a major outcome of World War II in Japan. As Tekin puts it,

> [T]he defeat toppled all the dynamics of Japanese society, and thus accelerated the process of change. Almost all existing values, norms, traditions, ideologies and social relations were either replaced by new ones or reshaped according to the needs of postwar Japan. (127)

For example, Suichi does not want his son to adopt Japanese idols. He supports Ichiro's admiration for some American idols rather than the Japanese ones. Setsuko tells Ono, who looks after his grandson little Ichiro and gets surprised seeing the child's role-play of the Lone Ranger, that:

> Suichi believes it's better he likes cowboys than that he idolize people like Miyamoto Mushashi [a famous samurai in Japanese history]. Suichi thinks the American heroes are the better models for children now. (*AFW*, 36)

In addition to this, Suichi supports Ichiro's interest in the American icons as he takes him to the cinema to see American movies. Setsuko says, for example: "We took him once to the cinema to see an American cowboy film.

He's been very fond of cowboys ever since. We even had to buy him a ten-gallon hat" (35). Ishiguro's novel reflects the cultural change in the younger generation of Japan through Ichiro who desires what is American as opposed to the conventional Japanese cultural heroes.

After the war ends, people get an opportunity to express their feelings even if this means to protest against a militarist dictator. In the past, people like Kuroda, who stood against the general movement in the country was punished real hard. There was even a legal committee established as "the Committee of Unpatriotic Activities" (*AFW,* 182) in order to detect those going against the current political discourse and eliminate them under the authority of the Government. Dr. Satio, the father to Taro Saito, indicates that while he is on his way before the *miai*, he sees there are demonstrations in the streets:

> It seems there were more demonstrations in the city centre today… I was on the tram this afternoon and a man got in with a large bruise over his forehead. He sat next to me, so naturally I asked him if he was all right and advised him to visit the clinic. But… it turned out he had just been to a doctor, and he was now determined to rejoin his companions in the demonstrations. (119)

People's going out to the city centre and making demonstrations freely, or without getting arrested and being exposed to torture was not common in pre-war Japan. Taro Saito, not fully happy with this change, expresses his concern as well hope for the future:

> [T]hings are getting out of hand now. Democracy is a fine thing, but it doesn't mean citizens have a right to riot whenever they disagree with something. In this respect, we Japanese have been shown to be like children. We've yet to learn how to handle the responsibility of democracy. (120)

The change and the reconstruction of the deconstructed values, traditions and the habits of the Japanese society is also reflected through the portrayal of the landscape in the novel. Especially, the reconstruction of Ono's pleasure district, where the painter used to go frequently to meet his

students under the dim lights of the lanterns hanging from the roofs of the pubs and enjoy himself with the fervent conversations about the topics that excited him, symbolizes the metaphor of the reconstruction of the new order. Ono devotes the last part of his April, 1949 narration to Mrs. Kawakami, in whose pub he spent most of his time with his students before the war and he spends most of his time going there and chatting with Mrs. Kawakami, the owner of the pub, after the war.

> We were as usual alone in the place. The early evening sun was coming in through the mosquito nets on the windows… Outside, the men were still working. For the past hour, the sound of hammering had been echoing in from somewhere, and a truck starting or a burst of drilling would frequently cause the whole place to shake. And as I followed Mrs. Kawakami's glance around the room that summer's evening, I was stuck by the thought of how small, shabby and out of place her little bar would seem amidst the large concrete buildings around us. (126)

The pub represents the old values that are coming to their end, as Ishiguro portrays Ono's narrative under the last lights of the setting sun, which connotes a sense of ending. The mosquito nets support the deserted atmosphere of it. The echo of the machines and men working to build new buildings out of Mrs. Kawakami's pub, refer to the reconstruction of the new Japan. The pub, presenting Ono's world, does not befit the scene that the newly constructed buildings create; therefore, it is destined to disappear.

Ono has a difficulty in accepting the transformation in his world. It is not easy for him, for a man like him who enjoys the reputation and respect due to his deeds in his middle ages, but then who is repressed by the sense of guilt. He rejects the destruction of the past insistently because of the same deeds that used to elevate and provide him with a sense of dignity in his social environment. For this reason, Ono sometimes deliberately tries to hide and sometimes unconsciously tries to forget and deny the imbalance between his past and present conditions stemming from Japan's losing the war. Ishiguro's employment of such an unreliable narrator is instrumental. Lodge underlines

that: “The point using an unreliable narrator is indeed to reveal in an interesting way the gap between appearance and reality, and to show how human beings distort or conceal the latter” (155). In this sense, Ono’s denial and unreliability thicken the reality that the war causes a great change in Japanese national discourse and Japanese identity including the actual ways of living. Ono’s devastation and disillusionment are the solid proof that national values and principles can change as they are constructed by human beings and can be reconstructed according to the needs of time, although they may bring about disillusionment for some people. Ishiguro projects the alteration in Japan as a nation through Ono’s experiences and turns the individual experience into a communal one.

The house Ono owns and the way he buys it function symbolically in the sense that it represents what Ono had before the war, has given importance to throughout his life and tries holding on to after the end of the war. The house is the symbol of prestige and dignity for the artist. Ono describes it in the opening pages of the novel as follows:

> You will not have to walk far before the roof of my house becomes visible between the tops of two gingko trees. Even if it did not occupy such a commending position on the hill, the house would still stand out from all others nearby, so that as you come up the oath, you may find yourself wondering what sort of wealthy man owns it. But then I am not, nor have I ever been a wealthy man. (*AFW,* 7)

Ono delicately gives information about how big and outstanding his house is. At first, he can be considered a humble man when he confesses that he has never had so much money to afford the real price of the house. Nonetheless, Ono’ references to his house throughout the story suggests that being an owner of such a house is a source of prestige and pride for Ono. Wong notes that “During this introduction [of the house and the auction], Ono calls attention to and then tones down his former status, thereby equivocating about the past” (39). The painter explains why this house is so precious as

> [t]he imposing air of the house will be accounted for, perhaps, if I inform you that it was built by my predecessor, and that it was none other than Akira Sugimura. (8)

Ono also adds Sugimura "was unquestionably amongst the city's most respected and influential man" (9), whose house is sold by his daughters after his death in "an auction of prestige" (9). The daughters reveal that "the house [their] father built should pass to one he would have approved of and deemed worthy of it" (9). Ono having been found worthy and prestigious enough for such a prestigious family becomes the new owner of the house. He comments by stating:

> One wonders why things are not settled more often by such means. How so much honourable is such a contest in which one's moral conduct and achievement are brought as witnesses rather than the size of one's purse. I can still recall the deep satisfaction I felt when I learnt the Sugimuras… had deemed me the most worthy of the house they so prized. (10)

So, the "good" character and respect are the values that are most dear to Ono. However, he loses his respectable position in society after the war in the changing national discourse. He has to accept his loss and come to terms with the alteration. If not, he may not be able to survive in a society hostile to what he defended in the past. This may also damage his daughters and pose an obstacle in their future.

As suggested by Ono's detailed description of the house, Ono has been an influential figure in the war time. He also gives inspiration to his students who take their Sensei as an example and proceed in the direction he leads. Nevertheless, the war takes all Ono has, but he still holds onto the pride of the good old days and denies that he is losing his influence. His denial comes to surface especially during the marriage arrangements of his daughter Noriko. Ono tries to arrange a marriage between Noriko and the Miyake boy, but the attempt fails. Ono attributes this to the inequality he imagines to exist between the two families:

> My feeling is that it was simply a matter of family status. The Miyakes, from what I saw of them, were just the proud, honest sort who feel uncomfortable at the thought of their son marrying above his station… No doubt, the explanation is no more complicated than that. (19)

However, after the negotiations are cancelled, Ono meets Miyake in front of his company and the young Miyake implies that he finds Ono guilty of leading the country astray, which is possibly the real reason why the Miyake family break the nuptial negotiations, although Ono denies it. On stating that the President of his company committed suicide, because he finds himself guilty of supporting the militarist actions in the country during the war, Miyake comments: "[T]o be frank, there is much relief around the company. We feel now we can forget our past transgressions and look to the future. It was great thing our President did" (55). Jiro Miyake's remark seems to suggest that Ono should also commit suicide because he is among the group of the President of his company, and like him Ono should find a way to save his honour.

Ono so deeply believes in his own truths and his aim to serve his nation that he does not hesitate to snitch on Kuroda, whom he holds dear to himself, to the authorities, because he sees him as a threat on his way who acts against the way Ono directs other people. The painter causes a great pain both to Kuroda and his mother. At this point he contradicts himself. Simultaneously, he defends the idea that a talented student

> is most likely to see shortcomings in the teacher's work, or else develop views of his own divergent from those of his teacher. In theory, of course, a good teacher should accept this tendency- indeed, welcome it as a sign that he has brought his pupil to a point of maturity. (142)

Ono can be objective when the issue is someone else, because the quotation above is taken from the chapter in which Ono criticizes his own Sensei Mori-san, who sends his favourite student as he believes that he has betrayed himself by diverging from his teachings. But when it comes to his own

situation Ono cannot preserve his objectivity, and he punishes his student Kuroda, who diverges from his teacher's way and chooses an independent path.

In the episodes concerning his career both as a struggling artist and respected teacher, or sensei, Ono slips here and there to indicate how he was unable to explain his own values of independent thinking and judicious decision-making. Many of the decisions that Ono gives were the wrong ones or had devastating consequences. Being aware of this fact, Ono tries hard to cover up their implications for his own failed life. He implies that he tries to depict his life humbly and in the most faithful way to the "truth", but there are always deviations, as Ono also comments, while talking about Tortoise's painting of his self-portrait at the Takeda firm:

> I cannot recall any colleague who could paint a self-portrait with absolute honesty; however accurately one may fill in the surface details of one's mirror reflection, the personality represented rarely comes near the truth as others would see it. (67)

Blanchot also makes a similar comment on one's depiction and reflection of self by stating "[n]o one likes to recognize himself as a stranger in a mirror where what he sees is not his own double but someone whom he would have liked to have been" (64). Ono defends himself by admitting that he has not anticipated such an outcome for Kuroda because what he causes is unforgivable. For this reason, he rejects the responsibility of his actions so as not to appear to be a kind of man he does not wish to seem to the others and even to himself ironically. Yet, being the advisor to the Committee of Unpatriotic Activities, Ono should have and could have thought about the consequences his enunciation might have caused. Although this does not simply mean that Ono is a bad man and he sends Kuroda to torture on purpose, still he abstains from, at least, apologizing to Kuroda as he does not accept the guilt of the damage he has done to Kuroda's career, himself and his family.

All the same, no matter how many excuses he finds for his actions and how rightful he considers himself to be, Ono constantly feels the pressure of his past deeds. Before Noriko's *miai,* he goes to talk to Kuroda, because, although Ono rejects it, it is obvious he knows that his past actions may cause a hindrance to Noriko's marriage negotiations again. Setsuko also warns him against such obstacles and wants him "to take precautionary steps" (48). Wong also notes:

> For, while Ono undertakes 'precautions' advised by his eldest daughter to protect Noriko's negotiations from failing through, he does so in order to remember the person he felt he was and had become. This person, he comes to realize in private but fails to accept in public, no longer fits in with the current state of affairs, and, in this regard, Ono is resurrecting his former self as a process of self-bereavement, as a way of mourning that lost self. (43)

Not being able to talk to Kuroda and ask him not to talk badly of himself, fears that the Saitos may learn about his past deeds and turn back on the *miai.* For this reason, he feels extremely nervous when he meets the Saito family. In this scene, he may also be feeling the remorse for what he has done to Kuroda, which contributes to his hard-pressed psychology. He tries hard to repress and control himself during the *miai*, but he cannot achieve this, because he learns that the younger brother of Taro is a student in Uemachi College, where Kuroda is also teaching. This makes Ono suspicious. He starts to fantasise that the Saitos have learnt Ono's destructive effect on Kuroda's life. When Dr. Saito refers to the demonstrations held at the city centre, Ono interprets this in a wrong way and thinks the Saitos are judging Ono implicitly because of his past, so he becomes paranoiac because of the stress he feels for the fear that the second attempt for Noriko's marriage would also fail. Ono starts to spy on the young Mitsuo imagining that he would reveal the attitude of the Saitos towards himself, as the whole family except for Mitsuo are able to hide their real feelings towards Ono's past. He admits pathetically: "From then on, I took the glancing over at Mitsuo, as though he were the clearest

indicator of what Saitos were really thinking" (*AFW,* 117). Finally, without any explicit reason he outbursts:

> There are some who would say it is people like myself who are responsible for the terrible things that happened to this nation of ours. As far as I am concerned, I freely admit I made many mistakes. I accept that much of what I did was ultimately harmful to our nation, that mine was part of an influence that resulted in untold suffering for our own people. I admit this. You see, Dr. Saito, I admit this quite readily. (123)

Although the people around the table are not talking about Ono's role in the national past, this conduces to Ono's self-declaration and admittance of his past mistakes. Yet, it can be hinted that he is not comfortable, and he feels so guilty that Ono repeats "I admit" for six times during his confession. However, later on he adds:

> I do not pretend certain moments of that evening were painful for me; nor do I claim I would easily have made the sort of declaration I did concerning the past had circumstances not impressed upon me the prudence of doing so. (124)

This fosters the fact that Ono did not make such a declaration only because he is such a dignified and brave man, who accepts the responsibility of his wrongdoings, but rather he pretends to be so by contradicting his previous words given just above:

> Having said this, I must say I find it hard to understand how any man who values his self-respect would wish for long to avoid responsibility for his past deeds; it may not always be an easy thing, but there is certainly a satisfaction and dignity to be gained in coming to terms with the mistakes one has made in the course of one's life. In any case, there is surely no great shame in mistakes made in the best of faith. It is surely a thing far more shameful to be unable or unwilling to acknowledge them. (125)

What Ono says cannot be denied. Yet, the disturbing point is that he accepts that he made mistakes out of fear. Saw finds the confession "insincere

and even hypocritical" (36). Ono also tries to have his own share of the successful *miai* and boasts of his confession by interpreting as follows:

> I would not wish to claim that the whole engagement had hung in the balance until that point, but it is certainly my feeling that that was when the *miai* turned from being an awkward, potentially disastrous one into a successful evening. (124)

Ono has always stayed between his past life when he enjoyed his fame and glorious days and his present where he stands to be an infamous fascist painter. He is not appreciated any more. The new life that the country leads according to the newly shaped values and necessities abhors Ono's values causing a disillusionment for the painter he has to fight against. His state of mind seems to be embodied by the "Bridge of Hesitation" that he frequents:

> I still find myself taking that path down to the river and the little wooden bridge still known to some who lived here before the war as "the Bridge of Hesitation"…We called it that because until not so long ago, crossing it would have taken you into our pleasure district, and conscience-troubled men- so it was said- were to be seen hovering there, caught between seeking an evening's entertainment and returning home to their wives. (99)

Ironically enough, he excludes himself from the group of "conscience-troubled men" as he does not want his readers to take him mistakenly to be one of them that might stem from their misinterpretations when Ono narrates himself on the bridge continually.

> But if sometimes I am to be seen up on that bridge, leaning thoughtfully against the rail, it is not that I am hesitating. It is simply that I enjoy standing there as the sun sets, surveying my surroundings and the changes taking place around me. (99)

Probably the sole reason for Ono's disillusionment and his denial is not that he has difficulty in accepting his past deeds and guilt. He is disturbed by the fact that he is the victim of his lack of insight about the environment he lives in as Ishiguro stresses in his interview with Mason that the novel is "an exploration of somebody trying to come to terms with the fact that he has

somehow misused his talents unknowingly, simply because he didn't have any extraordinary power of insight into the world he lived in" (7). If the conjuncture of the world had let Japan win the war, although the number of casualties was too great, the deaths of the soldiers might have probably been considered for the sake of Japan, and Ono's attempt in the process would have been appreciated. He could even have been a Japanese hero due to his efforts in the national cause, but the war brings such a destruction as a result of the imperialist ambition to expand the national borders and exploit the rights and sources of other countries.

Ono's outburst during Noriko's *miai* is the turning point for himself. Voluntarily or not, the confession at the table provides the painter with a kind of relief because, before that, he has never been able to admit his guilt publicly. From then on Ono is able to reconcile with himself. Towards the end of the novel, he reveals his feelings through Mr. Sugimura, when he remembers him during his visit to Kawabe Park where he takes care of Ichiro while his daughters are shopping. Ono establishes an analogy between himself and Sugimura, though he does not state it openly. The painter states that Sugimura is an admirable man who deserves deep respect, although people start to forget his name, and his influence upon the city is fading away day by day. According to what Ono tells, Sugimura wanted to create cultural areas in the Kawabe Park such as theatres and a graveyard for the animals and turn the park to an open museum. Ono states: "It was, as I have said, nothing less than the attempt of one man to stamp his mark for ever on the character of the city" (*AFW,* 133). Sugimura's attempt "to stamp his mark on the character of the city" is similar to Ono's attempt to mark on the character of his nation. He has done all he has done in the past in order to lead the people to the direction he believes to be right and have his share in the glorious history of the nation he served through his art in order to make it a prominent country of its own time. But he could not estimate what the time and the conditions would bring in the future. So, like Sugimura's aspiration for the Kawabe Park, Ono's aspiration for his country remains unaccomplished. The places prepared for the cultural buildings Sugimura planned for the park

remain empty and looked desolated in the present day. As Ono says Sugimura "loses a fortune on account of his ambitions" (134), and Ono loses his reputation and respect, which is his fortune, on account of his own ambition. So Ono comments on Sugimura's fate as follows, perhaps commenting indirectly on his own life as well:

> For his [Sugimura's] failure was quite unlike the undignified failures of most ordinary lives, and a man like Sugimura would have known this. If one has failed only where others have not had the courage or will to try, there is a consolation- indeed, a deep satisfaction- to be gained from this observation when looking back over one's life. (134)

Living all the things he had to live and facing his mistakes owning their responsibility, Ono has an optimistic point of view towards his own time as a contented old man, who has made many mistakes, but makes them in order to rise above the mediocre. However, he is not able to accomplish his aim because, like anybody else, he lives in a society whose values, codes, norms and traditions are imagined/fabricated and thereby inevitably deconstructed and reconstructed in time.

CHAPTER 4

AN ANALYSIS OF "ENGLISHNESS" AS A FABRICATED NATIONAL IMPERIAL IDENTITY IN *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

The Remains of the Day (1989) is Kazuo Ishiguro's third novel. The novel is widely known around the world due to the impact it has created and its great success. David Lodge, the chairman of the jury for the 1989 Booker Prize, announced the jury's decision holding that the novel is

> a cunningly structured and beautifully paced performance… [that] renders with humour and pathos a memorable character and explores the large, vexed themes of class, tradition and duty.
>
> (qtd. in Howard, 24)

Jordison in *The Guardian* celebrated the novel even many years after its winning the prize by remarking:

> Poignant, subtly plotted and with the perfect unreliable narrator, Kazuo Ishiguro's novel about a repressed servant deserved to rise above the clamour surrounding the shortlist in the year of his Booker triumph. (*Booker Club*: *The Remains of the Day,* The Guardian)

This shows that the novel preserves its effect and fame decades after its first publishing. The "memorable character" of the novel, who is "unreliable" due to his first person narration, is similar to Ono, the narrator of Ishiguro's previous novel *An Artist of the Floating World*. Beedham indicates that at first sight the two narrators, Stevens and Ono seem "completely incomparable" (43), because while Japanese Ono is a creative artist in his floating world painting propaganda posters, Stevens is a typical English butler who devotes his life to serve his master in the most perfect way. However, "the two novels, at their cores, are similar. Both follow a man in the latter stages of his life looking back and trying to reconcile his past with his present" (43) writes Beedham. Yet the similarity is not limited to the first person unreliable narration and the main characters' looking back at their past for reconciliation

as the critics note. Both novels deal with the issue of nationalism, the construction of the national identity and narration of the nation. In *An Artist of the Floating World*, through Ono, Ishiguro portrays how a nation is imagined by making use of icons, symbols, traditions, memory and pedagogical teaching which are means of constructing a national narration and imposing a national identity on the individuals. The writer follows a parallel route in his depiction of Stevens in *The Remains of the Day*, but there is a difference between Ono and Stevens. While Ono is depicted as an individual and his master-pupil relations are handled accordingly, Stevens is depicted as a universal character representing humanity as well as a symbol of "Englishness" representing a nation.

The aim of this chapter is to analyse the construction and deconstruction of the mythical English identity and English nationalism in *The Remains of the Day*. The chapter will focus on the portrayals of Lord Darlington and his loyal servant Stevens as a criticism of Thatcherism. First, it will analyse Lord Darlington's holding onto traditional gentlemanly codes in the country's politics, which leads him to become a Nazi sympathizer supporting Hitler's destructive anti-semitic expansionist politics. Second, it will examine Stevens as the representative of the ordinary man in a national narration. Third, it will study the way Stevens adopts a role in the national narration in keeping with the pedagogical discourse, which causes his life to be spent in vain.

The Remains of the Day tells the story of Stevens, the aging butler of Darlington Hall, who has spent most of his lifetime serving his master Lord Darlington. Stevens's narration begins in 1956, when the house has already been sold to an American businessman, Mr. Farraday. The butler remains in his position in the house upon the wish of the new owner. As Mr. Farraday offers him to take a trip with his Ford, when he is away in America for business, Stevens decides to accept the offer and plans a journey of six days towards the West Country in order to see Miss Kenton, an ex-housekeeper of Darlington Hall, who has married and left the mansion long before. Stevens

claims that his intention in his trip is to see the countryside of England and invite Miss Kenton, or Miss Benn then, to turn back to her previous post, but the trip turns to be an inner journey, enabling Stevens to reminiscence over his past and find a way to reconcile with his present self.

Stevens's retrospective narration portrays the pre-World-War-II political environment in Great Britain, as it is the time he mostly refers to. The political discussions in Great Britain were divided in two directions then. Many people thought that Germany was becoming a dangerous threat after World War I, and it could only be stopped by war, which meant European countries such as England and France should wage war against the developing Nazi Germany. On the other side, some thought that the burden put on Germany's shoulders as a consequence of the Versailles Agreement (1919), which was signed after the war, was too heavy to carry and Germany's aggressive reaction against Europe derived from this agreement and the pressure it caused. In the novel, Lord Darlington is a character who supports the second argument, which is called the "Appeasement Policy" in political history. And the butler, as he admits, believes to serve his country by serving his master. For this reason, he devotes his whole life and energy to serving his lord.

Writing such a novel is not probably what is expected from a writer named Kazuo Ishiguro. Due to the writer's name it might be expected to be a typical "Japonaserie", which is "a word commonly used in art contexts to refer to a representation of Japan through a cluster of conventionalised signs" (Lewis, 52). Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*; however, is a novel representing "Englishness" with typical English characters and settings.

Ishiguro, through his characters' personal life, portrays topics related to the communal life. Through characters and their experiences, the writer demonstrates the way a nation is *imagined.* Both *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* portray the nation and national identity as mere constructs. The two novels show different characters engaging with similar discourses in their own ways. Like Ono, who lives in Japan, Stevens

in England goes through a similar path in the transformation of his national identity through stories and icons. So, the countries and the characters are only a means in these novels, through which the writer examines the construction of national identities and national discourses and undermines these constructs. The writer makes a statement in his interview with Vorda, a similar one he makes on the narration of *An Artist of the Floating World,* revealing his intention behind the way in which England is constructed in *The Remains of the Day*:

> The kind of England that I create in *The Remains of the Day* is not an England that I believe ever existed. I've not attempted to reproduce, in a historically accurate way, some past period. What I'm trying to do here…is to actually rework a particular myth about a certain kind of England… where people lived in the not-so-distant past, that conformed to various stereotypical images. That is to say an England with sleepy, beautiful villages with very polite people and butlers and people taking tea on the lawn… The mythical landscape of this sort of England, to a large degree, is harmless nostalgia for a time that didn't exist. The other side of this, however, is that it is used as a political tool. (14-15)

Thus, similar to Ono's floating world, Stevens's world is not a completely realistic or historical one. Nonetheless, referring to the novel, its setting and its plot as completely imaginary would not be accurate, because there are many references to actual locations in England and to historical events. What Ishiguro wants to emphasize is that his aim is not to write a historical novel with some recognizable characters. His aim is to deal with the sort of England and Englishness which emerged at the time period in which he wrote the novel.

Berbereich stresses that the novel "can be read as a criticism of the way in which mythologies about Englishness are themselves used for shaping the contemporary national consciousness" (124). Although the novel takes place several years after World War II, Ishiguro wrote the novel in 1989, the time of Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of England, who is also known

to be the Iron Lady. Thatcher wanted to revive the glorious days of Imperial British identity, for which she employed "restorative nostalgia", a term used by Boym. It "stresses the return home *(nostos)* and seeks or promises to restore the old world in all its perfection and purity" (Riley, 15). This is because of the decline of the country's imperial power, for which the loss of the Suez Canal can be considered a milestone that also affected and shaped Thatcher's politics. The loss of the canal is so significant that Ishiguro chooses the year the canal is lost as the beginning year of the narration in the novel. Interestingly, there is no direct reference to the Suez Crisis. Yet, it seems that Ishiguro's employing the date is on purpose, as many critics underline it. The date can be interpreted as a symbol for the beginning of the deconstruction of Britain's imperial narration. Furthermore, it also suggests that all national discourses are inevitably shaped and reshaped according to the conditions of time and the world conjuncture. Ishiguro's novel therefore lends itself to a reading in the light of the theories of Anderson and Bhabha who share the same opinion that nations are not organic structures; they are constantly reimagined and reconstructed in time.

After World War II, colonialism went into a rapid decline. The cold war between the United States and Soviet Russia changed the power balance in the world, while England lost many of its colonies, which were the parts of its imperial identity. Darwin notes "Britain has survived and recovered the territory lost during the war. But its prestige and authority, not to mention its wealth, has been severely reduced" (*Britain, The Commonwealth and the End of Empire*). In addition to this downfall "Britain was overshadowed by two new superpowers, the United States and Soviet Union" (Darwin, *Britain, the Commonwealth*), which emerged as leading political and economic leading powers in the world after World War II. However, before the war, during the colonial era, one of Britain's political interests was maintaining and spreading the strength of the nation through colonization, as befitting to its identity as an imperial country. The year 1956, the time the narration begins in *The Remains of the Day*, is symbolical in this respect because it coincides with the year of the Suez Crisis, which broke out as a result of the intervention of the

English and the French to the Canal due to their political interests. The victory Egypt won against these colonial powers is considered a victory won against imperialism. As Tamaya points out:

> The date is July 1956, when President Gamal Abdel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, thus heralding the end of Britain's long reign as the world's foremost colonial power. Not so coincidentally, on that particular day, the narrator/protagonist of the novel, Stevens, the quintessential English butler, sets out on a journey across England and, in the process, recovers the tragic truth of his past, a truth inextricably bound up with the history of his country. (45)

In 1952, King Farouk of Egypt was replaced by a junta after a coup d'etat. Between the army officers who took control in Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser consolidated his control over the government in 1954. Under Nasser's rule, Egypt started to follow a Pan-Arabist, nationalist policy that threatened the interests of imperial powers such as France and Britain, which still had colonies in North Africa and had close relations with Arab states. Gamal Abdel Nasser, wishing to put into practice his nationalist ideas and giving the world a message, nationalized the Suez Canal, which was crucial for Great Britain as it was used as a passage to the Eastern lands of the British Empire, in July 1956. As the biggest shareholders of the Suez Canal Company, Britain and France decided to overthrow Nasser. Britain and France crafted a plan that involved Israel, too. They told the world that

> [t]hey had to invade, to separate Egyptian and Israeli forces, and thus protect the freedom of navigation on the canal. The reality was that the British and French, in top secret negotiations with Israel had forged an agreement for joint military operations. (Brown, *The Guardian*)

After the military operations started, the Allied victory over Egypt was very quick. The plan was implemented proper and on October 29, 1956 Israel attacked the Sinai region (Varble, 9). On October 31, French and British paratroopers invaded the canal zone and gained control over the Suez Canal. Although, the operation was a success for the Allies, the diplomatic reaction

of the superpowers was surprising. Unexpectedly, both the United States and the Soviet Union objected to the occupation of the Suez Canal and wanted the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces from Egypt. The Soviet Union condemned the occupation as it did not want the influence of the Western world in the Arab region to increase. On the other side, the Western ally of the invading forces, the United States, also objected to the invasion, because it did not want the conflict to destabilize the region where the political balances were very fragile (Brown, *The Guardian*).

Facing the opposition of both superpowers, Britain and France were forced to withdraw their forces from the battlefield. This was significant for Britain in the sense that it faced the reality that it could no longer hold its imperial position and could not formulate its national narration on the basis imperialism. Its withdrawal was also the indicator of Britain's declining position in the new world order after World War II.

The Suez Crisis is also instrumental in Ishiguro's construction of imperial Englishness in his novel, because Lord Darlington and Stevens's national devotion and Englishness are the type of national identity Thatcher wanted to revive as a response to the process marked by the Suez Crisis. Thatcher was worried about Britain's position and lamented the decline of the Imperialistic Great Britain, which used to dominate a great part of the world and had a significant role in the world's destiny. For this reason, she wanted to revive the glorious Victorian Britain especially because she felt sorry for the loss of the control over the Suez Canal (Berbereich, 126). Berbereich holds that

> The frame narrative of the novel is set in 1956, the year of the Suez Crisis, which saw the ultimate humiliation of Britain as an imperial power. In the 1980s, the Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher herself seemed to bemoan the irrevocable end of the British Empire. She repeatedly called for a return to Victorian values. (126)

Thatcher strove in order to evoke a sense of nostalgia and admiration for the past glorious days of Victorian England in order to make the people long for

what has been lost and encourage them to regain and restore it. Sigsworth highlights that:

> It is usually suggested that in proclaiming Victorian values Mrs. Thatcher was drawing a contrast for political purposes between a "good" nineteenth century- at least for Britain, then at the height of its economic and political power- and a "bad" twentieth century which she was seeking to put back on a proper direction. (12)

In the 1987 elections, Victorian values such as hard work, self-reliance, self-respect, living within one's income, "cleanliness next to godliness", helping one's neighbor, and pride in one's country were the key elements in Thatcher's election campaign (Himmelfarb, *The Weekly Standard*). They were the values appreciated and defended by Thatcher who said, "I was grateful to have been brought up by a Victorian grandmother" (qtd in Sigsworth, 10). She believed that these were the perennial values that should be held by every Briton. Of course, her approach was nostalgic as "[r]estorative nostalgia is at the core of recent national and religious revivals" (Boym, 13).

The time Lord Darlington lives in is not Thatcher's England, but the parallelism between the two eras can be seen in connection to the values imposed on the people. Furthermore, the national narration adopted by the people in both times is similar in the sense that they both cause destruction on the ground they are adopted. Ishiguro, in this way, undermines Thatcher's national imagination, which can be typical for any nation on earth in terms of structure, if not in terms of the very national identity and national codes. Berbereich writes that the novel

> contains a cautionary subtext that criticizes and warns against the dangerous social and moral regression enacted by the Thatcherite celebration of Englishness and Victorian moral values and its refusal to acknowledge the nation's darker life of the mind. (119)

"British sympathies for the German and Italian fascists have been a fascinating topic for writers since 1920s" (120) states Berbereich. And this is true, as the critic indicates that writers such as Aldous Huxley in his *Point Counter Point (1928)*, H. G. Wells in his *The Holy Terror (1939),* Elizabeth Bowen in her *The Heat of the Day (1949)*, Nancy Mitford in her *Wigs on the Green (1937)* and P. G. Wodehouse in his *The Code of the Woosters (1937)* write about British fascist inclinations in their times (120). However, Ishiguro makes use of his temporal advantage in the sense that he writes about the British Appeasement Politics in 1989. Lord Darlington is a follower of this type of politics which leads him to become a Nazi supporter, while he merely follows perhaps the very Victorian values he believes in such as honour, dignity and moral codes.

Appeasement was the policy adopted especially by England and France towards Nazi Germany during the time of the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in the late 1930s. The policy emerged as a result of the failure of the League of Nations that was set up after World War I in order to maintain the world's peace and prevent another war causing a mass destruction like World War I (Tomuschat, 77).

> As the League of Nations crumbled, politicians turned to a new way to keep the peace - appeasement. This was the policy of giving Hitler what he wanted to stop him from going to war. It was based on the idea that what Hitler wanted was reasonable and, when his reasonable demands had been satisfied, he would stop. (*Chamberlain and Appeasement,* bbc.co.uk)

The process started with Hitler's sending troops to Rhineland, which was demilitarized according to the Locarno Treaties of 1925. The peak of the Appeasement can be considered Hitler's invasion of Sudetenland, a German-populated area within Czechoslovak borders, which became a part of Czechoslovakia under the Versailles Treaty, by encouraging the leader of the Sudeten Nazis to rebel ending up with the land's uniting with Germany. (*Appeasement,* history.co.uk)

> On 15 September, Chamberlain met Hitler at Berchtesgaden. Without consulting the Czech authorities, he pledged to give Germany all the areas with a German population of more than 50 per cent. France was persuaded to agree. Hitler then altered his criteria, demanding all the Sudetenland. At the Munich Conference on 30 September, Britain and France agreed to his demands. Chamberlain was confident that he had secured 'peace for our time'. (*Appeasement,* history.co.uk)

It is eventually understood that Hitler would not stop until he got all he wanted, in contrast to the thought that he would be contented with what he had already been given and would try instead to maintain the lands he has taken leading the world to another destructive war like the first one. However, the policy remained to be the part of the national discourse in England until Chamberlain resigned and Churchill became the new Prime Minister.

Lord Darlington is portrayed as a character supporting the Appeasement Politics of the country. Yet, although the narrative emphasizing the significance of attachment to this policy was a dominant one, it was not the only one. Bhabha argues, it is impossible to form a holistic idea in the national narration. While commenting on the ideas held towards Germany, Stevens indicates that some people accept this policy as they believe that Versailles is too harsh even for a defeated enemy, and some adopt the policy because they believe the pressure put on Germany may cause the collapse of the country affecting the whole Europe. Stevens says:

> Some were gentlemen who felt strongly, like his lordship himself, that fair play had not been done at Versailles and that it was immoral to go on punishing a nation for a war that was now over. Others, evidently, showed less concern for Germany or her inhabitants, but were of the opinion that the economic chaos of that country, if not halted, might spread with alarming rapidity to the world at large. (*RD*, 55)

Stevens thinks that Lord Darlington's support for the policy stems from his belief that what is done to Germany is unfair, and it does not befit the English who adopt honour and dignity as a national code. Lord Darlington is a man

who acts according to the national identity he adopts in that he thinks an Englishman should be honourable, fair, self-respected and ethical, all of which are informed by chivalric codes and the type of Victorian values Thatcher allocates to. However, he has his own way to perform these teachings as Ono chooses his own way to perform what he has thought or made believe to be true.

Stevens's portrayal of Lord Darlington emphasizes a naïve nature and strong belief in his national identity. Stevens stresses that his involvement in Appeasement politics is simply because of this very nature and his sense of justice. Before the conference held in Darlington Hall in 1923, where he stands to defend the idea that there should not be too much pressure on Germany, Lord Darlington undergoes a process of three years which starts with his observation of Germany and evaluating Britain's and Europe's attitude towards the country after World War I according to Stevens. A visit and a friendship are what trigger this process. The butler writes in his memoir as follows:

> As I recall, he had not been initially so preoccupied with the peace treaty when it was drawn up at the end of the Great War, and I think it is fair to say that his interest was prompted not so much by an analysis of the treaty, but by his friendship with Herr Karl-Heinz Bremann. (52)

Herr Karl-Heinz Bremann is a German officer who visits Lord Darlington after the Great War and becomes friend with him. Through this friendship Lord Darlington becomes aware of the deteriorating condition of Germany and the people suffering under the hard conditions. Stevens indicates that in each visit of the officer he sees that his condition gets poorer:

> One could not help noticing with some alarm the deterioration he underwent from one visit to the next. His clothes became increasingly impoverished - his frame thinner; a hunted look appeared in his eyes, and on his last visits, he would spend long periods staring into space, oblivious of his lordship's presence or, sometimes, even of having been addressed. I would have concluded Herr Bremann was suffering from

> some serious illness, but for certain remarks his lordship made at that time assuring me this was not so. (52-53)

For Lord Darlington, Herr Bremann is the representative of the German nation and its people. Probably during the long periods of their meetings, Herr Bremann discusses with Lord Darlington and reveals him the deteriorating living standards in Germany as a result of the Versailles Treaty, which according to Stevens arouses sympathy in the lord.

Shaffer suggests that the sympathy the lord feels towards the German officer may derive from his homoerotic inclinations towards him, as the critic writes: "As for Darlington himself, it is hinted that his 'going to bed with Hitler' (politically speaking) is motivated by his homoerotic feelings for the aristocratic German Herr Bremann" (79). The claim seems farfetched considering that there is no other textual clue about it. According to the Article 231 of Versailles Treaty:

> The Allied and Associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the aggression of Germany and her allies. (qtd. in Kaes, 8)

The article indicates that by signing the treaty Germany would accept the responsibility of having waged war against the Allies and the whole destruction caused by the war. For this reason, the country had to pay reparation at the cost of about 6600 million dollars to the Allies. The amount was beyond Germany's repayment capacity, because the country had already become indebted before the end of the war in order to finance its military troops (Moore, *Why did the Treaty*).

> People's lives were affected particularly, with these reparations, in 1922, because inflation rose dramatically, as Germany announced that they could not afford to pay the second installment of the reparations. Soon Marks, the German currency, became completely worthless. German children

> would use money for building blocks and it would be used to keep fires going. The Germans were in a dire situation and they blamed the treaty of Versailles for this, which made them furious and they built a deep a hatred for the misery and suffering the document had caused. (Moore, *Why did the Treaty*)

As this was the historical case, Lord Darlington's sympathy towards Germany may be simply because he feels sorry for the people of Germany who suffer due to the huge amounts of reparations cause, rather than his homoerotic feelings towards Herr Bremann.

Stevens stresses that Lord Darlington is immensely disturbed by the living conditions of the German people after he visits the country in 1920. The butler remarks his observations about Lord Darlington by stating, "I can remember the profound effect it had on him. A heavy air of preoccupation hung over him for days after his return" (*RD*, 52), and he adds that his lord answers his question as to how his trip was through these words: "Disturbing, Stevens. Deeply disturbing. It does us great discredit to treat a defeated foe like this. A complete break with the traditions of this country" (53). Lord Darlington thinks that the treaty made Germany sign, putting a huge burden on the shoulders of the country and its people leading its economy to collapse is a debasement of English identity and English traditions, according to which an Englishman should be fair and merciful to a defeated foe. Berbereich states:

> He [Lord Darlington] refers to traditional- through, at this point, rather obsolete- notions of gentlemanliness, honour and, potentially, *noblesse oblige.* He considers it his honour as a gentleman not to punish a defeated foe more than is necessary. (122)

The attitude of Lord Darlington towards the Versailles Treaty and its effect on Germany can best be observed during the conference held in Darlington Hall in 1923. Darlington invites the prominent figures and potent political leaders of the European countries and the United States to his home in order to discuss Germany's situation and change French M. Dupont's ideas on Germany, who is thought to be against the Appeasement Politics and is

supposed to have a grudge against the Germans according to some. Among the visitors there is also Mr. Lewis, an American senator, who questions Lord Darlington about his approach towards his enemy, Germany, and his opinions about his ally, France. According to what Stevens tells, Mr. Lewis thinks that, coming from France which was seriously damaged by German attacks during the war, M. Dupont may have a grudge against Germany and its people, which cannot be found strange. Stevens, while referring to the 1923 conference in his memories, notes that the American senator reacts against the attendants of the conference who defend that Germany should be treated fairly through these words:

> I agree with you, gentlemen, our M. Dupont can be very unpredictable. But let me tell you, there's one thing you can bet on about him. One thing you can bet on for sure… Dupont hates Germans. He hated them before the war and he hates them now with a depth you gentlemen here would find hard to understand… But tell me, gentlemen… you can hardly blame a Frenchman for hating the Germans, can you? After all, a Frenchman has good cause to do so, hasn't he? (64)

Mr. Lewis thinks that M. Dupont has a right to hate Germans, because they destroyed his country. Lewis states, "the way the French see it [the war], the Germans destroyed civilization here in Europe and no punishment is too bad for them" (64). The American senator thinks that M. Dupont cannot be found wrong, if he insists on his claim for the fulfillment of the Versailles Treaty without providing any flexibility in the reparations. Yet, Lord Darlington reprimands Mr. Lewis's ideas about the French attitude towards Germany: "Naturally, some bitterness is inevitable. But then, of course, we English also fought the Germans long and hard" (64), and he further adds:

> Most of us in England find the present French attitude despicable. You may indeed call it a temperamental difference, but I venture we are talking about something rather more. It is unbecoming to go on hating an enemy like this once a conflict is over. Once you've got a man on the canvas, that ought to be the end of it. You don't then proceed to kick him. To us,

> the French behaviour has become increasingly barbarous. (65)

Lord Darlington stresses that like France, Britons have fought against Germany, and Germany has caused a great damage to their country, as well. However, he attracts attention to the difference between the attitude France and England hold against their defeated enemy, and he claims that he finds the French attitude barbarous. This is because after defeating an enemy, torturing it as France wants to do so is not an honourable act, and it is against the English sense of dignity and Englishness Lord Darlington believes in.

Nonetheless, Lord Darlington's gentlemanly codes eventually lead him to become a Nazi supporter. Berbereich highlights the fact that

> The subtle trajectory of the novel's play with information and narration suggests precisely how the process of appeasement was able to regress into collaboration with the Nazis. (122)

Lord Darlington blindly follows the national narration and national identity, which prevents him from having a true insight about what is going around him. The way he interprets the national codes makes him an amateur in the world's politics and his lack of insight, like Ono, predestines his devastation. Mr. Lewis reveals at the end of the conference:

> You gentlemen here, forgive me, but you are just a bunch of naïve dreamers. And if you didn't insist on meddling in large affairs that affect the globe, you would actually be charming. Let's take our good host here. What is he? He is a gentleman. No one here, I trust, would care to disagree. A classic English gentleman. Decent, honest, well-meaning. But his lordship here is an amateur… He is an amateur and international affairs today are no longer for gentlemen amateurs. The sooner you here in Europe realize that the better. All you decent, well-meaning gentlemen, let me ask you, have you any idea what sort of place the world is becoming all around you? The days when you could act put of your noble instincts are over. Except of course, you here in Europe don't yet seem to know it. (*RD*, 76)

Mr. Lewis probably foresees that the Appeasement politics would not work well, and Hitler cannot be stopped by giving him all he wants. Or historically looking, it can be said that while there are also other facts lying behind the application of appeasement towards Germany such as the British government's wanting a strong Germany to serve as a barrier against the expansion of the communist Russia, and Britain's army not being ready to embrace another war (*Chamberlain and Appeasement,* bbc.co.uk), the way Lord Darlington and his friends approach the politics sounds so naïve, romantic and even unrealistic. Berbereich also highlights:

> Lord Darlington feels impelled to stand up for the rights of Germany and its people out of a liberal reflex that leans towards the appeasement. It eventually leads, however, to his involvement with the Nazis and fascists. (122)

In his discussion with Stevens when he comes to visit Lord Darlington unexpectedly, the young Mr. Cardinal, the son of Lord Darlington's close friend Mr. Cardinal, who has worked for the Appeasement politics with Darlington before he dies, stresses Lord Darlington slides to be the supporter of the flourishing Nazi Germany without being aware of the fact that he is used by Hitler:

> His lordship is a gentleman. That's what's at the root of it. He's a gentleman, and he fought a war with the Germans, and it's his instinct to offer generosity and friendship to a defeated foe. It's his instinct. Because he's a gentleman, a true old English gentleman. And you must have seen it, Stevens. How could you not have seen it? The way they've used it, manipulated it, turned something fine and noble into something else something they can use for their own foul ends? (*RD*, 163)

Despite his benevolent intentions towards German people, Lord Darlington becomes instrumental in Hitler's saving time in order to achieve his aim that is to strengthen and improve his army and to expand the borders of Germany in order to establish his dream country. With the intention of supporting poor German people, Lord Darlington becomes a Nazi sympathizer day by day, as

his actions end up in firing the Jewish servants under his service, as he remains under the effect of anti-semitic discourses. Lodge holds the idea that "Gradually we infer that Lord Darlington was a bungling amateur who believed in appeasing Hitler and gave support to fascism and anti-Semitism" (155).

Lord Darlington even tries to convince the British Prime Minister to support Germany by changing his negative opinion on Hitler's politics. Young Mr. Cardinal tells Stevens during his same visit:

> His lordship has been trying to persuade the Prime Minister himself to accept an invitation to visit Herr Hitler. He really believes there's a terrible misunderstanding on the Prime Minister's part concerning the present German regime. (*RD*, 163)

As Gurevich indicates, "The initial irony gains momentum as it turns out that Lord Darlington, with his old-fashioned ideals of chivalry, was successfully bamboozled by the Nazis into championing their interests" (*Upstairs, Downstairs*). As a result, Lord Darlington not being able to see the true nature of the running of the world around him, has to face Hitler's true face at the end in the sense that Hitler's expansionism ends up with the outbreak of World War II, which causes a greater destruction worldwide.

Similar to Ono, Lord Darlington falls from favour in the end. People who share his ideas, and support him in his political agenda, turn their back on him as his politics fail. Like Ono, Lord Darlington is also criticized and reprimanded, and then he is forgotten. Stevens tells Miss Kenton, who is Mrs. Benn then, in their final meeting towards the end of the novel:

> The fact is, Mrs. Benn, throughout the war, some truly terrible things had been said about his lordship - and by *that* newspaper in particular. He bore it all while the country remained in peril, but once the war was over, and the insinuations simply continued, well, his lordship saw no reason to go on suffering in silence. It's easy enough to see now, perhaps, all the dangers of going to court just at that time, what with the climate as it was. But there you are. His lordship sincerely believed he would get justice. Instead, of

> course, the newspaper simply increased its circulation. And his lordship's good name was destroyed for ever. Really, Mrs. Benn, afterwards, well, his lordship was virtually an invalid. And the house became so quiet. I would take him tea in the drawing room and, well ... It really was most tragic to see. (*RD*, 170)

While before the war his master was esteemed due to the values he represented, and many people came to visit him in his house, he is left alone and condemned to loneliness after the war ends. This is not a case that is unusual in a national narration, because people do not want to remember or be associated with a fellow citizen who contributes to Hitler's strengthening. In the post war national discourse Lord Darlington appears as a black sheep. Like the people believed to lead Japan astray by supporting its imperialistic motives are tried to be forgotten in *An Artist of the Floating World*, Lord Darlington is neglected by his friends and acquaintances.

The Appeasement politics were successfully followed not only due to the efforts of the upper classes, but also the middle and lower class citizens like Stevens, the hardworking and loyal butler of Lord Darlington, who stays with his master and serves him till the end of his life as he believes this is the aim of his life and his existence. However, it seems, Ishiguro has a specific aim in choosing an ordinary butler to be the chief character of his novel, and this is perhaps because he believes that the butler represents ordinary people, and through making use of such a figure, he aims to represent our role in the national narration in general. Ishiguro remarks in an interview:

> Yet these ordinary characters often are going to get involved in a kind of political arena if it's in a very small way. The reason I chose a butler as a starting point was that I wanted a metaphor for this vehicle. Most of us are like butlers because we have these small, little tasks that we learn to do, but most of us don't attempt to run the world. We just learn a job and try to do it best of our ability. We get our pride from that and then we offer up a little contribution to somebody up there, or an organization, or a cause, or a country. We would like to tell ourselves that this larger thing that we are contributing towards is

> something good and not something bad and that's how we draw a lot of our dignity. Often we just don't know enough what's going on out there and I felt that's what we're like. We're like butlers. (Vorda and Herzinger, 87)

For Ishiguro, the butler is a metaphor representing the everyman. In this respect, Darlington Hall represents metaphorically not only England but the whole where the people like butler Stevens live and believe that they contribute to their nation or a cause by fulfilling their daily tasks. For this reason, Ishiguro's employment of an English butler should not be taken merely literally; it is a metaphor for any citizen of any country in the world through which the writer critically portrays the workings of a figure representing the discourse of nationalism.

Working as a butler, Stevens thinks that his job is to be loyal to his lord and serve him at all times. One night, Lord Darlington calls Stevens to the room where he entertains himself with his two other guests. At that night, Stevens's performance of an obedient subordinate subject of authority displays an ordinary citizen's role in the national narration that is devised for everyman. It also brings to mind Ishiguro's words where he compares all human beings to butlers, as the butler at very night is depicted to be thought to obey the authority and stay in the boundaries designed for himself as an obedient citizen. In this way, he will be the member of the nation whose duty is to serve and be loyal to his leaders. Lord Darlington's friend Mr. Spencer asks a question to Stevens, when the butler arrives in the room:

> We need your help on a certain matter we've been debating. Tell me, do you suppose the debt situation regarding America is a significant factor in the present low levels of trade? Or do you suppose this is a red herring and that the abandonment of the gold standard is at the root of the matter? (142)

This is a question which Stevens is not expected to answer of course and Stevens is clever enough to understand this. The butler explains his consternation and, at the same time, awareness of the fact that the question is asked to him for a deliberate purpose. He even performs a little drama in

which his masters would watch a stupefied poor man, which will please them most. On hearing the question, Stevens explains his situation through these words:

> I was naturally a little surprised by this, but then quickly saw the situation for what it was; that is to say, it was clearly expected that I be baffled by the question. Indeed, in the moment or so that it took for me to perceive this and compose a suitable response, I may even have given the outward impression of struggling with the question, for I saw all the gentlemen in the room exchange mirthful smiles. (142)

So, Stevens simply responds to the question saying "I'm very sorry, sir…but I am unable to be of assistance on this matter" (142). This was the expected answer naturally. The men asking the question to him know that Stevens has nothing to do but to serve his master throughout his life. He has not spared any time in order to read about politics or economy. However, if the group thought for a second, they would come to the conclusion that a man with an ordinary intelligence could learn as much as them about the serious issues concerning the nation and the whole world. The knowledge or ability of the group to interpret the economy and the politics is not an inborn skill or a supernatural talent in contrast to what they want to believe; it depends on the person's desire to acquire the necessary information and have a general idea to be able to interpret it. But the gentlemen put the issue as if it were a privilege attributed to themselves only, as they want to criticize the democratic parliamentary system which enables ordinary citizens to be represented and have a right to speak through delegates they choose for the parliament. This is an obstacle in the way of the gentlemen like Lord Darlington and his friends who believe that men like Stevens should remain subordinate to themselves; otherwise, their monopoly power in their country's politics would weaken. By ridiculing Stevens's response Mr. Spencer comments:

> [W]e still persist with the notion that this nation's decisions be left in the hands of our good man here

> and to the few million others like him. Is it any wonder, saddled as we are with our present parliamentary system, that we are unable to find any solution to our many difficulties? Why, you may as well ask a committee of the mothers' union to organize a war campaign. (143)

The gentlemen want to make Stevens, and those millions like Stevens, believe that he should not have a word on the destiny of the country of which Stevens is also a part. They believe and want to make the ordinary men like Stevens believe that they do not need to comment on nation's destiny as there are more clever men than themselves to say and do whatever necessary on the nation's destiny. Lord Darlington confirms Mr. Spencer's opinions giving another speech to Stevens:

> The man in the street can't be expected to know enough about politics, economics, world commerce and what have you. And why should he? In fact, you made a very good reply last night, Stevens. How did you put it? Something to the effect that it was not in your realm? Well, why should it be? (175)

The group want to make Stevens be sure of his allegedly desperate and irrecoverable ignorance and ensure his role in the society that is only to serve themselves, the authority, unconditionally. Brubaker writes, "Nationhood is not an ethnodemographic or ethnocultural fact; it is a political claim. It is a claim on people's loyalty, on their attention, on their solidarity" (116). This is the way the authority makes Stevens imagine the way himself. And, it becomes successful in the way that Stevens admits his role that is to serve the men serving the nation and civilization through their great knowledge, and his existence will only be meaningful as long as he holds the role and the identity dictated on him. "[I]t is only through his master that Stevens manages to establish his own worth", Gurevich comments in his *Upstairs, Downstairs.* For this reason, when the master loses his power or is replaced by another master, Stevens's identity, his values and his ideals shatter.

In addition to this, the butler is a figure representing the sort of English identity Ishiguro aims to evoke in this very English novel. It is iconic in the

narration of “Englishness” as samurai and geishas are iconic in Japanese culture. Stevens notes while commenting on the nature of his profession by stating that butlering is peculiar to England, because other butlers lack superior qualities of an English butler. So, for Stevens true butlers can be found only in England, and a butler can only be English by nature (*RD*, 32). Tamaya also suggests: “It is no wonder, then, that the English butler has acquired the status of an icon in the popular imagination” (48), for this reason the butler is a symbol of England and Englishness as it is peculiar to England. In addition to this, through Stevens, the novel depicts the way a nation and the role of its members are imagined, which shows a parallelism with Ono’s narration of his story in *An Artist of the Floating World*.

In his daily life Stevens is able to perform the dictated role upon him. However, as Bhabha also suggests it cannot be expected from the people to follow the pedagogical teachings in the exact way they are thought, because it is not possible to achieve a holistic perception in national narration, as people are different from each other and they do not always react towards and interpret in the same way the narratives they are exposed to. Like Ono, Stevens is one of those, who has his own way of performance. He has strict rules in his life with himself and his belief in the importance of dignity, because for Stevens dignity is a defining feature of “Englishness”. For this reason, Stevens adopts dignity as an inseparable quality of his identity and his professional life as a butler. So, he wears his butler uniform like an identity he never rejects in his personal life either, which is a way to reach dignity in his thoughts. The butler comments on the nature of his profession and his way of adopting it as follows:

> And let me now posit this: 'dignity' has to do crucially with a butler's ability not to abandon the professional being he inhabits. Lesser butlers will abandon their professional being for the private one at the least provocation. For such persons, being a butler is like playing some pantomime role; a small push, a slight stumble, and the facade will drop off to reveal the actor underneath. The great butlers are great by virtue of their ability to inhabit their professional role and

> inhabit it to the utmost; they will not be shaken out by external events, however surprising, alarming or vexing. They wear their professionalism as a decent gentleman will wear his suit: he will not let ruffians or circumstance tear it off him in the public gaze; he will discard it when, and only when, he wills to do so, and this will invariably be when he is entirely alone. It is, as I say, a matter of 'dignity'. (32)

Stevens defends the idea that to be professional and great in butlering one should assume the profession as a suit he has to wear all the time. No matter what happens or how he feels in his private life, a butler should always be loyal to his job and find a way to disregard the provocations coming outside that may hinder him from fulfilling his tasks. Stevens finds the opposite way of this attitude hypocritical and disloyal as he refers to it as a pantomime role, which implies the insincerity in one's nature according to butler. For this reason, dignity in performing butlering lies in holding on to the profession in any case and at any cause, because it is the major quality defining his identity as a first quality "English" butler. Stevens notes

> It is sometimes said that butlers only truly exist in England. Other countries, whatever title is actually used, have only manservants. I tend to believe this is true. Continentals are unable to be butlers because they are as a breed incapable of the emotional restraint which only the English race are capable of. Continentals… are as a rule unable to control themselves in moments of strong emotion, and are thus unable to maintain a professional demeanour other than in the least challenging of situations… [Continentals] are like a man who will, at the slightest provocation, tear off his suit and his shirt and run about screaming. In a word, 'dignity' is beyond such persons. We English have an important advantage over foreigners in this respect and it is for this reason that when you think of a great butler, he is bound, almost by definition, to be an Englishman. (32-33)

Stevens, living abide by his aim of acquiring dignity through his profession as a very "English" butler, utilizes his pantry as a means to convey his profession to his private life. He defends the idea that a great butler should

always be professional and behave according to his profession in the public eye, but he does not give up his professionalism in his private life either, in the sense that he does not use his pantry for his private joy or relaxation. Stevens's comments on his own room are not surprising when his opinions and deeds are taken into consideration:

> The butler's pantry, as far as I am concerned, is a crucial office, the heart of the house's operations, not unlike a general's headquarters during a battle, and it is imperative that all things in it are ordered- and left ordered- in precisely the way I wish them to be. I have never been that sort of a butler who allows all sorts of people to wander in and out with their queries and grumbles. If operations are to be conducted in a smoothly co-ordinated way, it is surely obvious that the butler's pantry must be the one place in the house where privacy and solitude are guaranteed. (173-174)

Stevens likens his pantry to a headquarter of a general that clarifies the fact that he does not use his room for his private life. The headquarter of a general is designed especially for a war planning and determining strategies during the combats signifying an intense working hub. However, such rooms, like the one Stevens has, in the great houses are designed especially in order to provide the workers with a sense of privacy where they can enjoy their own life and have a rest out of their working hours, but working never ends for Stevens. He continues to hold his professionalism in his private life out of his working hours, as well. He sees his room as a place where he continues his planning about the house management and other daily works that should be scheduled according to a chart.

Even the light in the room is not enough for a proper a man to live in. Miss Kenton whom Stevens narrates to see often standing in front of the sunny window panes comments on this situation of Stevens's room by saying: "Mr. Stevens, your room looks even less accommodating at night than it does in the day. The electric bulb is too dim" (174) and adds as follows:

> Really, Mr. Stevens, this room resembles a prison cell. All one needs is a small bed in the corner and one

> could well imagine condemned man spending their last hours here. (174)

This interpretation of Stevens's rooms refers to the fact that Stevens captivates himself in his room that is also a metaphor his captivating himself in his whole life under his professional ambition by not letting people in his room and in his life so as not to let them distract his concentration in his headquarter, which also prevents his socialization and hinders him from establishing informal relationships with other workers. Cooper holds the idea that:

> Stevens's memories of Miss Kenton are of her standing in some form of illumination, from her lighted parlour to sunlit windows. Stevens may have limited autonomy, but the light/dark imagery suggests that the butler has enough autonomy to choose between the small choices available to him (113)

Still, Stevens turns back to his opportunity to come into sunlight, as he sticks to his professional butler role that should omit any distractions preventing him from achieving dignity.

Stevens celebrates his performance in especially one case where he thinks that he nearly becomes great and dignified in his father's way.

> In Stevens' case, he is not only the son of a butler, but he also consciously strives to live up to the ideal of service achieved by his father. He narrates, with great pride, one particular incident in his father's life which exemplifies the famed British "self-restrain". (Tamaya, 48)

Stevens believes his performance during the conference in 1923 is the turning point in his career, because it was the time he had the chance to put his professionalism and dignity into a test, as he says: "I can say is that after one has been in the profession as long as one has, one is able to judge intuitively the depth of a man's professionalism without having to see it under pressure" (*RD*, 33).

The conference in 1923 is crucial in the sense that it is held in order to discuss the destiny of the Appeasement Politics as it is explained before. So, it will be a great event that will determine the world's destiny and the whole Europe, and Stevens is aware of this fact. For this reason, the conference is of utmost importance for the butler, who believes that even being indirectly a part of such events is essential, as the greatness of a butler can be evaluated through his services on such occasions in which he plays an indirect minor part in determining the path of civilization: by serving to his master and his prominent guests consisting of the leading bureaucrats of the world, including the French M. Dupont, Stevens thinks that he serves for the determination of world's destiny. The fact which turns this event into a test for Stevens's dignity is his father's deteriorating health condition, because while the meeting is going on downstairs of Darlington Hall, and Stevens is busy dealing with the running of the whole event, his father is dying upstairs. Tamaya comments on Stevens's ironic attitude as follows:

> Some of the most painfully ironic moments in the novel occur when Stevens lives up to the standards set by his father so well that he sacrifices his dying father's needs in order to ensure that Lord Darlington's dinner party runs smoothly. (49)

Miss Kenton warns Stevens for several times by stressing the critical condition of Stevens senior: "Mr. Stevens, he really is in a poor state. You had better come and see him" (77). However, Stevens conditions himself to live up to the rules he has set for himself, and he rejects to go and see his poor father, because he feels obliged to preserve his professionalism as a dignified butler and he continues serving the guests. So, he dismisses Miss Kenton by stating: "I only have a moment. The gentlemen are liable to retire to the smoking room at any moment" (77). However, when Miss Kenton continues to insist that Stevens should see his father, the butler cannot resist anymore and accepts to go upstairs to visit his father for a short time. Stevens narrates his father's situation as follows:

> Indeed, my father's face had gone a dull reddish colour, like no colour I had seen on a living being. I

> heard Miss Kenton say softly behind me: "His pulse is very weak." I gazed at my father for a moment, touched his forehead slightly, then withdrew my hand. (78)

According to the doctor, the father has a stroke, and as it is understood from his appearance he would not stay alive for long. Probably these are his last minutes, but Stevens rejects to stay with him by telling Miss Kenton: "This is most distressing. Nevertheless, I must now return downstairs" (78).

Nonetheless, this does not mean that Stevens is a man without any emotion, or he is heartless. He feels sorry for his father and it is obvious that he does not look well while he is serving the guests, as Mr. Cardinal asks Stevens if he is alright and comments: "You look as though you're crying" (79), but Stevens remarks by stating: "I'm very sorry, sir. The strains of a hard day" (79). Stevens tries to repress his feelings and tries to concentrate on his work by hiding his true feelings from the guests who realize that something is wrong with the butler. Stevens narrates the dialogue taking place between Miss Kenton and himself after he learns that his father has died as follows:

> "Will you come up and see him?"
> "I'm very busy just now, Miss Kenton. In a little while perhaps."
> "In that case, Mr. Stevens, will you permit me to close his eyes?"
> "I would be most grateful if you would, Miss Kenton."…"Miss Kenton, please don't think me unduly improper in not ascending to see my father in his deceased condition just at this moment. You see, I know my father would have wished me to carry on just now."
> "Of course, Mr. Stevens."
> "To do otherwise, I feel, would be to let him down."
> (80)

Stevens cannot leave his work in order to close his father's eyes, which would be probably his last duty towards the poor man. He believes that if he leaves his job, he would betray his father's teachings and his trust towards him to be a dignified butler who holds on his professionalism in any condition. So, he comments on that night as follows:

> Let me make clear that when I say the conference of 1923, and that night in particular, constituted a turning point in my professional development, I am speaking very much in terms of my own more humble standards. Even so, if you consider the pressures contingent on me that night, you may not think I delude myself unduly if I go so far as to suggest that I did perhaps display, in the face of everything, at least in some degree a 'dignity' worthy of someone like Mr. Marshall - or come to that, my father. Indeed, why should I deny it? For all its sad associations, whenever I recall that evening today, I find I do so with a large sense of triumph. (83)

Stevens indicates that he does not claim himself to take his place among the legendary great butlers of his time, but he thinks that in his own standards he comes close to referring himself to be great after the conference night, because he is able to face and overcome a very difficult situation in which an ordinary butler would fail. For this reason, he enjoys the sense of triumph of achieving dignity in his profession by remaining loyal to the service of his master and becoming a part of an important conference for the destiny of the world. Yet, it is hard to believe what Stevens always says and defends, as he is the narrator of his own story, and he reveals his regrets about his past at the very end of the novel. Although he admits to be proud of his achievement at the night his father dies, his comments can be suspected to be true as Gurevich also utters:

> Up until now we had been solidly in Stevens's corner; now there appears to be something disturbing about the pride with which he extols his father's obedience. It is becoming clear that Stevens is not merely contemplating the meaning of butlering, using his father as an example. He is grappling with ways to justify his life, for once you take his professionalism, his dignity, out of the picture, not much is left.
>
> (*Upstairs, Downstairs*)

The greatness Stevens wants to achieve is the quality he also attributes to the English landscape, as he believes that it reflects the qualities an Englishman should preserve. As in *An Artist of the Floating World,* Ishiguro in *The Remains of the Day* employs the descriptions of landscape as a means

of national narration, which also contributes to the sense of simultaneity Anderson theorizes in *Imagined Communities*. In every part of the country people look at the same scene, the borders of which are drawn defining the land within these borders as "the country" for its citizens. People living on this land attribute special values to it reflecting their own qualities, which creates a sense of belonging and establishes a connection between the land and the people. This is an imagined way of bordering the land, because there are no literal lines on earth defining a piece of land in the way people do. However, through such an imagination the land becomes separated from the rest of the world and it can be turned to a specific place, "the country", which is believed to reflect a special meaning and quality for its people. In this way, they share the same image of the country depicted and defined through landscape, and they feel the same as their other fellow citizens feel when they look around as Anderson points out in his discussion on the contribution of the notion of simultaneity to the imagining of a nation. However, Stevens's landscape is different from Ono's landscape that is characterized by the destruction World War II has caused. Stevens portrays the scenery he witnesses on the first day of his trip, when he has a break in his driving course. An old man sitting on a bench praises the picture up the hill and directs Stevens to climb up in order to enjoy the sightseeing. He insists that Stevens will be sorry if he misses the opportunity to see the scenery (*RD*, 19); so, the butler decides to take the advice. He climbs up and narrates the picture he sees as follows:

> Here one was met by a bench - and indeed, by a most marvellous view over miles of the surrounding countryside. What I saw was principally field upon field rolling off into the far distance. The land rose and fell gently, and the fields were bordered by hedges and trees. There were dots in some of the distant fields which I assumed to be sheep. To my right, almost on the horizon, I thought I could see the square tower of a church. It was a fine feeling indeed to be standing up there like that, with the sound of summer all around one and a light breeze on one's face. (30)

Stevens reflects the way he sees his country, and it is obvious that he attributes nationalistic qualities to landscape, which is the definition of "Englishness" for the butler. Stevens seems to be enchanted by the scene he observes. He is so affected by his observation that he admits when he goes to his room where he takes the night in order to get some rest during his car-trip, he can think of nothing but the landscape he has enjoyed in the morning. He writes:

> Now I am quite prepared to believe that other countries can offer more obviously spectacular scenery. Indeed, I have seen in encyclopedias and the *National Geographic Magazine* breathtaking photographs of sights from various corners of the globe; magnificent canyons and waterfalls, raggedly beautiful mountains. It has never, of course, been my privilege to have seen such things at first hand, but I will nevertheless hazard this with some confidence: the English landscape at its finest - such as I saw it this morning - possesses a quality that the landscapes of other nations, however more superficially dramatic, inevitably fail to possess. It is, I believe, a quality that will mark out the English landscape to any objective observer as the most deeply satisfying in the world, and this quality is probably best summed up by the term 'greatness'. For it is true, when I stood on that high ledge this morning and viewed the land before me, I distinctly felt that rare, yet unmistakable feeling - the feeling that one is in the presence of greatness. We call this land of ours *Great* Britain, and there may be those who believe this a somewhat immodest practice. Yet I would venture that the landscape of our country alone would justify the use of this lofty adjective. (21-22)

Stevens admits that, although he does not travel around the world and see other countries through his own eyes, he has seen many of them in the magazines. He claims that there are some other countries which have more spectacular scenery than Britain, but the butler thinks that Britain has a superior quality reflected through its landscape, although it lacks some natural beauties like the grand canyons; it contains in itself the quality of *greatness.* Stevens believes that when an observer looks at the scenery he/she is wound up by the sense of greatness that is the projection of the landscape. And, according to the butler, the greatness of the country lies in "the very *lack* of

obvious drama or spectacle that sets the beauty of our land apart. What is pertinent is the calmness of that beauty, its sense of restraint" (22) that are the qualities the butler adopts in his profession, because these are the qualities Stevens wants to believe to be reflected by the English landscape creating a sense of Englishness. In this way, landscape becomes instrumental in shaping Stevens's national identity, because the characteristics such as calmness and self-restraint the butler attributes to the scene he admires are the ones that Stevens tries to adopt and preserve throughout his life, especially in his profession and professionalism which he also maintains in his private life.

Ishiguro especially gives place to aforementioned qualities that Stevens supposes to be represented by the landscape, as they are the ones that Thatcher holds precious and wants English people to adopt as well in the 1980s to be able to revive the imperialistic Victorian English identity. Thatcher criticizes the permissiveness of the 1960s and states:

> Permissiveness, selfish and uncaring, proliferated under the guise of new sexual freedom. Aggressive verbal hostility, presented as a refreshing lack of subservience, replaced courtesy and good manners. Instant gratification became the philosophy of the young and the youth cultists. Speculation replaced dogged hard work. (qtd. in Sinfield, 296)

In this way, Thatcher explains the main qualities she wants to reconstruct which are "hard work, good education and impeccable manners" (126) according to Berbereich. In this way, the dignity and gentlemanliness are cemented to be derived from" a moral rather than a status title" (126). And this moral is what Stevens holds as a motive in his actions and career planning.

Stevens admits that there is no professional attempt by an authority to define how a great butler should be, but he indicates that The Hayes Society, which only accepts the great butlers to its membership, brings a kind of definition to how a great butler should be through putting some criteria for those who want to be affiliated with the Society. Stevens indicates that the society accepts butlers who are "only the very first rank" (*RD*, 24) as

members. Although the butler does not agree with all the ideas of the Society, he believes in one of its declarations that is

> the most crucial criterion is that the applicant be possessed of a dignity in keeping with his position. No applicant will satisfy requirements, whatever his level of accomplishments otherwise, if seen to fall short in this respect. (25)

Stevens believes that "this 'dignity' is something one can meaningfully strive for throughout one's career" (25), but he has his own interpretation of "professional prestige" (85) that can be acquired through achieving a sense of dignity.

The butler thinks that there is a great difference between the point of view of his generation and the previous generation, because what is important for his generation is dignity and greatness that can be acquired through "professional prestige"(85). The prestige can be evaluated according to the moral worth of one's employer. So, moral worth is important for the new generation, while things like "wages, the size of staff at one's disposal or the splendour of a family name" was important for the old generation (85). Stevens clarifies his ideas as follows:

> Butlers of my father's generation, I would say, tended to see the world in terms of a ladder - the houses of royalty, dukes and the lords from the oldest families placed at the top, those of 'new money' lower down and so on, until one reached a point below which the hierarchy was determined simply by wealth - or the lack of it (85)

The butlers of Stevens senior's generation conceive the world as a ladder. The ladder metaphor stresses the fact that the society of previous generation was a vertical one based on a hierarchical line. For this reason, the aim of the butlers of the previous generation was to climb up the social ladder in the sense that the more meticulous and perfect a butler becomes in managing a household, the higher level of the strata he starts to serve or vice-versa, which upgrades butler's status in the society and among his colleagues. Stevens notes that: "Any butler with ambition simply did his best to climb as high up

this ladder as possible, and by and large, the higher he went, the greater was his professional prestige" (85).

Nonetheless, the situation is not so simple for Stevens who has a different way of interpreting the discipline of butlering, as he describes his generation and himself to be "idealistic"(85). He underlines that:

> For by that time, such thinking [the linear thinking] was quite out of step with that of the finest men emerging to the forefront of our profession. For our generation, I believe it is accurate to say, viewed the world not as a ladder, but more as a wheel. (85)

The butler stresses the difference of point of view between his generation and the previous generation, and explains the wheel metaphor as follows:

> It is my impression that our generation was the first to recognize something which had passed the notice of all earlier generations: namely that the great decisions of the world are not, in fact, arrived at simply in the public chambers, or else during a handful of days given over to an international conference under the full gaze of the public and the press. Rather, debates are conducted, and crucial decisions arrived at, in the privacy and calm of the great houses of this country. What occurs under the public gaze with so much pomp and ceremony is often the conclusion, or mere ratification, of what has taken place over weeks or months within the walls of such houses. To us, then, the world was "a wheel", revolving with these great houses at the hub, their mighty decisions emanating out to all else, rich and poor, who revolved around them. It was the aspiration of all those of us with professional ambition to work our way as close to this hub as we were each of us capable. (85)

Stevens holds that the quality of a butler's services cannot be evaluated according to what kind of a family he serves, or how wealthy and prestigious this family is according to aristocratic terms. The butler thinks that the important decisions concerning the destiny of the English nation, constituting its political and economic direction are taken in the "great" houses, and it is

more prestigious for a butler to work for such houses, although this fact has gone unnoticed by the previous generation. Stevens adds that:

> For we were, as I say, an idealistic generation for whom the question was not simply one of how well one practised one's skills, but to what end one did so; each of us harboured the desire to make our own small contribution to the creation of a better world, and saw that, as professionals, the surest means of doing so would be to serve the great gentlemen of our times in whose hands civilization had been entrusted. (85-86)

The national identity Stevens is proud to have is at the same time an imperial identity. The butler thinks that his nation has to contribute to a "better world", because the destiny of the civilization rests in the hands of his masters, who are supposedly expected to make the world a "better" place. Mann holds

> All European powers claimed to pursue a civilizing project in their colonies from the late eighteenth century onwards. What the English initially called 'improvement' or 'betterment' and, later on 'moral and material progress' will be, therefore, subsumed under the term 'civilizing mission'. This notion and the term is borrowed from French *mission civilisatrice*, which become the latter's imperial ideology and official doctrine in the heyday of imperialism, especially after 1895. (5)

Mann indicates "civilizing mission" is a means of self-legitimation in the colonizing process of any imperial country like England, which claims "to improve the country and to bring the fruits of progress and modernity to the subject people" (5) in order to justify its exploitation of non-white countries. This is also seen as a patriotic "national mission" that is attempted to be attributed to all English people or somehow adopted by many English people devoted to their national identity, like Stevens in the novel. It is seen as a "national mission", because Joseph Chamberlain, the British politician and statesman, holds,

> [i]n carrying out this work of civilization we are fulfilling what I believe to be our national mission, and we are finding scope for the exercise of those faculties and qualities which have made of us great

> governing race (Chamberlain, *The True Conception of Empire*)

referring to England's national identity to be imperial. This is the identity Stevens adopts, as well. "A 'great' butler can only be, surely, one who can point to his years of service and say that he has applied his talents to serving a great gentleman - and through the latter, to serving humanity" (*RD*, 86) writes the aging butler as this is his job definition and the description of his aim in life. So, he admits to internalize imperial national identity, as he believes an English butler can achieve dignity and greatness in his profession by serving humanity by serving his master. Öztabak-Avcı also holds that

> The butler Stevens in Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* is devoted to his master, Lord Darlington, and believes wholeheartedly in the British Empire as a civilizing force in the world; in his eyes, serving a "great" household such as Darlington Hall is equal to serving Great Britain. Stevens, in that sense, is a figure who embodies hegemonic "Englishness"; furthermore, given his lower-class background, it can be argued that he is also emblematic of the incorporation of the lower class in Britain into the imperial/national identity, particularly from the late nineteenth century on. (94)

Stevens's ideas about himself and the world around him are shaped by the pedagogical teachings he has acquired from his father.

> You may think me merely biased if I say that my own father could in many ways be considered to rank with such men [of dignity], and that his career is the one I have always scrutinized for a definition of 'dignity' (*RD*, 25)

writes Stevens. Like Ono has his father to lead him and he has teachers who impose a route to follow on their students, Stevens has his father. Stevens senior is not represented to put pressure directly on Stevens to follow his teachings, while Ishiguro portrays Ono's father forcing him to obey himself by pursuing the family business and his masters trying to make Ono follow their techniques in painting in *An Artist of the Floating World.* Yet, Stevens takes his father as a model and always claims that he is the symbol of dignity

for him: “Yet it is my firm conviction that at the peak of his career at Loughborough House, my father was indeed the embodiment of 'dignity'” (26). For this reason what the father tells him or suggests and how he behaves become influential in shaping Stevens’s identity

Stevens senior teaches his son how to be a great butler through pedagogical narrations and stories in which iconic butlers perform their duties in the most admirable way and take their part in Stevens’s memory shaping his imperial identity. For example, a story Stevens senior tells his son about a servant who follows his master to India to serve him becomes the source of inspiration for both the father and the son. Stevens remembers the tale of his father during his mental journey and narrates as follows:

> One afternoon, evidently, this butler had entered the dining room to make sure all was well for dinner, when he noticed a tiger languishing beneath the dining table. The butler had left the dining room quietly, taking care to close the doors behind him, and proceeded calmly to the drawing room where his employer was taking tea with a number of visitors. There he attracted his employer's attention with a polite cough, then whispered in the latter's ear: "I'm very sorry, sir, but there appears to be a tiger in the dining room. Perhaps you will permit the twelve-bores to be used?" And according to legend, a few minutes later, the employer and his guests heard three gun shots. When the butler reappeared in the drawing room some time afterwards to refresh the teapots, the employer had inquired if all was well. "Perfectly fine, thank you, sir," had come the reply. "Dinner will be served at the usual time and I am pleased to say there will be no discernible traces left of the recent occurrence by that time.” (27-28)

The butler in the story is incredibly cold-blooded and professional according to Stevens and his father. He deals with the tiger under the table as if it were an ordinary daily problem that may occur anytime and as if it were the butler’s natural duty to get rid of such a problem regardless of how he feels on such an occasion. Yet, the significant part of the story is that the butler and the tiger

figures in the story are symbolic in the sense that they have imperialistic connotations. Öztabak-Avcı holds

> The English, represented by the butler, kill the tiger, which is emblematic of Indians, the moment the tiger violates the boundaries between the colonizer and the colonized. This story circulating among butlers from generation to generation can also be interpreted as a manifestation of the British working-class complicity in imperialism. (100)

This is an awe inspiring and epitomic tale for Stevens senior as he reflects his admiration towards the butler through repeating his last sentences. Stevens narrates: "This last phrase - 'no discernible traces left of the recent occurrence by that time' - my father would repeat with a laugh and shake his head admiringly" (*RD*, 28). The father also repeats the tale to Stevens for many times as the butler indicates:

> There was a certain story my father was fond of repeating over the years. I recall listening to him tell it to visitors when I was a child, and then later, when I was starting out as a footman under his supervision. (27)

Stevens stresses that, once more, his father repeats the same story, which he tells his son frequently as an example of the performance of dignity, after he gets his first post as a butler, which stresses the fact that the story circulates "among butlers from generation to generation" as a manifestation contributing to the construction of English imperial identity. As Öztabak-Avcı adds,

> [I]n the story the butler's "dignity"/"Englishness" emerges as a quality performed before an audience of native servants. Particularly in nineteenth century India, it was of utmost significance for the English employers and their representatives, such as butlers, to perform such acts of "dignity" in the household before their native servants since it was assumed that 'an Indian household can no more be governed peacefully, without dignity and prestige, than an Indian Empire"(qtd in. Steel and Gardiner). Therefore, the "dignity"/"emotional restraint" Stevens praises as an "English" quality is actually a

> strategy, rather than an essential characteristic, acquired in a colonial context from which British political authority derived. (100)

Stevens the father is under the effect of the butler in the story he takes as a model, and he becomes the perfect performative subject of this pedagogical training, which demonstrates how powerful the pedagogical teaching could be in national narration and in forming people's identities. As Stevens indicates,

> In any case, it is of little importance whether or not this story is true; the significant thing is, of course, what it reveals concerning my father's ideals. For when I look back over his career, I can see with hindsight that he must have striven throughout his years somehow to become that butler of his story. And in my view, at the peak of his career, my father achieved his ambition. For although I am sure he never had the chance to encounter a tiger beneath the dining table, when I think over all that I know or have heard concerning him. (*RD*, 28)

Stevens senior strives to follow his "ideals". One example is the story Stevens junior tells about his father's reaction to the death of another son, who is killed at the Boer War under the command of an irresponsible General who commands the war "with several floutings of elementary military precautions" (30) causing the soldiers, including Stevens's brother, die unnecessarily. His father even could not find any consolation by thinking that his son died for the sake of his country, because he knows that he died in vain. The most painful part is when Stevens senior is obliged to serve for this General, who is retired after the war and works as a business man, who comes to discuss a profitable business with Stevens senior's employer Mr. Silvers, having known of the situation wants to permit his servant to leave the house during the General's visit, as he guesses it would be hard for him to serve the man who is responsible for his son's death. However, the butler rejects the offer as Stevens narrates:

> My father's feelings towards the General were, naturally, those of utmost loathing; but he realized too that his employer's present business aspirations hung

> on the smooth running of the house party - which with some eighteen or so people expected would be no trifling affair. My father thus replied to the effect that while he was most grateful that his feelings had been taken into account, Mr. Silvers could be assured that service would be provided to the usual standards. (31)

No matter how difficult it is sometimes, duty and commitment to master come first for Stevens's father. He knows that the meeting is important for Mr. Silvers, so he thinks he has to repress his feelings and hatred towards the General. The elder butler insists on serving his master even under very hard circumstances, so he stays at home and continues his job when the General arrives. Meanwhile, optimistically he hopes that when he sees the General's face he may feel a kind of sympathy, but to his disappointment the situation gets worse as the General stands to be an ugly and unrefined man. Nonetheless, the butler does not hesitate to volunteer to serve as a valet for the General, as he does not bring his valet with him, while the General boasts about his military genius not knowing who Stevens senior is and being unaware of how much pain he has given to the butler through employing his allegedly military skills. This is important for him as the butler knows the perfection of his service will honour his master and put him in the eyes of the General more respectable position, which will be effective for their business negotiations. And, he is able to accomplish his task successfully as Stevens continues his narration as follows:

> Yet so well did my father hide his feelings, so professionally did he carry out his duties that on his departure the General had actually complimented Mr. John Silvers on the excellence of his butler and had left an unusually large tip in appreciation - which my father without hesitation asked his employer to donate to a charity. (31-32)

It is hard to compare between the situations of the butler Stevens senior takes as an example who shows courage to kill a tiger for his master and the elder butler who serves the man he probably disgusts most in the world for the sake of Mr. Silvers. However, it is without doubt that Stevens's father's task is not an easy one, although he does not have to risk his life by shooting a tiger, but

this is his interpretation on the pedagogical training he gets through his icon. For a painful father who has lost his son under the command of such a reckless man is not something easy to bear. Yet, both servants had the opportunity to reject their task; actually that were not originally their tasks. The nameless servant in the father's story could have informed his master and left the job of killing the tiger to a professional, and Stevens senior could have accepted the offer of Mr. Silvers and left the house for a while till the General departed. Stevens being aware of this fact comments as follows:

> We may now understand better, too, why my father was so fond of the story of the butler who failed to panic on discovering a tiger under the dining table; it was because he knew instinctively that somewhere in this story lay the kernel of what true 'dignity' is. (32)

Stevens senior takes the nameless butler as an example, because he thinks that his way of serving his master is what can be called *dignified*. He believes that in order to be a professional and dignified in his job, he should follow what his idol has done. Therefore, he represses his feelings and demonstrates a great commitment and loyalty to his master under such a difficult circumstance. To his disgust, he even rejects the tip of the General, as he cannot repress his hatred and grudge against him, but he hides his feelings successfully while fulfilling his duty as befitting a dignified butler. In this way, he performs well as a result of his pedagogical training he gets indirectly through the story of the ideal butler that is somehow told or showed as an example to him. Stevens also mentions several occasions in which his father serves his master in the most loyal and dignified way he knows, which fosters his seeing the father as an ideal contributing to his pedagogical teaching and reinforces his high opinions of his father.

The novel problematizes the notion of dignity onto which Stevens builds his sense of self by revealing his unsuccessful attempts to manipulate/distort both his relationship with Miss Kenton and with his master Lord Darlington. Stevens is a perfect butler or he wants to be so. For this reason, he does whatever he can do to repress his feelings and his real

thoughts. This is because he believes only in this way he can reach greatness in his profession, which is his way of realizing himself. Hammond mentions critics such as Deborah Guth, Kathleen Wall, Bo G. Ekelund and James Phaelan who make Freudian readings of Stevens's repression of his sexuality and political consciousness. The critic admits the persuasiveness of the arguments raised by these critics but also points out the "risk of reducing Stevens's substantial narrative work to a web of symptoms" (96) in their approach because

> [t]o label Stevens's engagement with the painful episodes of his past as unconscious robs him of what little agency he has, while absolving him from responsibility for his part in the infamous history of Darlington Hall. (96)

Stevens's actions seem to be conscious and intentional, as he deliberately narrates his deeds and refers to his reminiscences, mostly about his father who is an idol for him, in order to support his narrative, although he fails to hide his disappointment at the very end. Yet, his actions and life in which he tries to repress his feelings are not the undesirable results of his *unconscious* repression of sexuality or emotions; his repression of these feelings is the result of his attempts at being professional and "dignified" in his job in the best way he knows. "Stevens is clearly aware that he has spent his life playing a role that strives to mask any traces of non-professional identity, as he demonstrates when he says that a worthy butler has to inhabit his role, utterly and fully" (96) holds Hammond. So, his idealist attachment to his profession is not a means to deny his sexuality; on the contrary, he deliberately tries to suppress his emotions and sexual desires in order to fulfill his task in the most perfect way. Hammond underlines the fact that:

> Stevens's self-knowledge is not so stifled that we must attribute his "hidden narratives" to a repressed unconscious. In fact, upon his release from the material and mental confines to Darlington Hall, he actively tries to communicate his life story in a way that justifies decades of self-restraint and "butlarian" role playing. He wants to explain the events of his life in a way that validates his choices and confirms the

> correctness of his worldview, which depends on his understanding of dignity. (96)

Parkes holds that "Stevens's preoccupation with professional dignity, which is reflected in his efforts to maintain a controlled and reserved narratorial demeanor, serves to repress personal feelings" (45) and adds that this repression can be felt most intensely "in Stevens's relationship with Miss Kenton, the romantic nature of which he never admits to himself until it is too late" (45). Although Stevens never has the courage to admit his love towards Miss Kenton throughout his narration, or either he has not realized the fact that he has special feelings towards her, there is no doubt that he likes her. At the very beginning of the novel Stevens fails to hide his feelings from the reader when he reveals his enthusiasm to turn back to the book of Mrs. Symons:

> I recall that shortly after Miss Kenton's departure to Cornwall in 1936, myself never having been to that part of the country, I would often glance through Volume III of Mrs. Symons's work, the volume which describes to readers the delights of Devon and Cornwall, complete with photographs and - to my mind even more evocative - a variety of artists' sketches of that region. It was thus that I had been able to gain some sense of the sort of place Miss Kenton had gone to live her married life. (*RD*, 11)

Stevens tells that he is interested in reading the books by Mrs. Symons who writes about England and describes its beauty to her readers. There is nothing wrong or suspicious in his interest towards such books, as Stevens never has the opportunity to travel around the country due to his job. However, the point that attracts attention is that he feels the desire to turn back to the volume which describes the district Miss Kenton moves after she gets married to her husband. Stevens tries to narrate his interest in the volume involving in Cornwall chapter to be natural and ordinary, yet in his curiosity towards the place Miss Kenton, who becomes Mrs. Benn then, there is a sense of romantic longing for a lover. Of course, this is a feeling Stevens is unlikely to accept at the beginning of his mental journey, but this does not mean the reader

would not notice when all other signals Stevens displays supporting that he has feelings towards Miss Kenton are taken into consideration.

However, the butler rejects to accept his feelings and does not allow Miss Kenton to come into his world, although she has feelings towards him, as well. This is because Miss Kenton is a threat of distraction for him and an obstacle in his process of reaching dignity in his life. Like Stevens does not regard Miss Kenton's criticisms about the dimness of his room, he does not let her change the atmosphere of his pantry through the flowers she brings by saying "Mr. Stevens, I thought these would brighten your parlour a little" (37). The butler rejects the flowers which is also the symbolism of womanly feelings Miss Kenton tries to introduce to Stevens, by telling her that he is happy to have "distractions kept minimum" (37).

Before a particular event that change their relationship, Stevens and Miss Kenton have cocoa sessions in Stevens's pantry during which they exchange their ideas about the planning of the week or the next day, and these sessions are professional according to Stevens's claims naturally. Miss Kenton desperately tries new ways in order to make Stevens confess his feelings towards her. She thinks that jealousy would trigger his passion towards her, and he would reveal his repressed feelings towards Miss Kenton for fear of losing her. For this reason, she starts to see a man and breaks her habit of not taking her day offs, which she believes to be noticed by such a meticulous man as Stevens. And, she achieves her aim as Stevens thinks on his own:

> I must admit, I found it hard to keep out of my mind the possibility that the purpose of these mysterious outings of Miss Kenton was to meet a suitor. This was indeed a disturbing notion, for it was not hard to see that Miss Kenton's departure would constitute a professional loss of some magnitude, a loss Darlington Hall would have some difficulty recovering from. (123)

Nonetheless, Stevens does not admit that he is worried about losing Miss Kenton to another man. Instead, he disguises his concern by pretending that

if she has a lover and gets married to him one day the works of the house would be hindered, and this is why he is worried. Yet, he never asks if Kenton has a lover. He represses his anxiety and focuses on his work. He only wants to know the days Kenton wants day off so as not to let a failure in the staff plan. For this reason, he asks Kenton when she will go out. Kenton responds enthusiastically:

> Oh, Mr. Stevens, it's just someone I knew once when I was at Granchester Lodge. As a matter of fact, he was the butler there at the time, but now he's left service altogether and is employed by a business near by. He somehow learnt of my being here and started writing to me, suggesting we renew our acquaintance. And that, Mr. Stevens, is really the long and short of it. (124)

It is not what Stevens asks what Miss Kenton will do or to whom she will meet at her day off, but as if it were the question Kenton explains her plans in detail in order to arouse Stevens's curiosity, and she mentions the man she is going to meet. Yet, Stevens does not show any interest in the little play not because he understands what Kenton wants to do, but because he is always busy with the daily tasks in Darlington Hall and they have always been his priorities. Stevens is able to preserve his repression and fails to react or prevent Miss Kenton's allegedly romantic relationship which ends up in her marrying the man and leaving the Hall as a result of her desperateness about Stevens's love. Stevens could have changed her mind about getting married to Mr. Benn, but instead of attempting to do so he congratulates her upon hearing her decision to marry: "Miss Kenton, you have my warmest congratulations. But I repeat, there are matters of global significance taking place upstairs and I must return to my post" (159). Gurevich comments on the issue as follows:

> Miss Kenton the housekeeper informs Stevens that she is about to accept a proposal of marriage. Earlier, she made amorous advances toward Stevens that he was afraid to recognize, and now, again, he does not— or will not—react; such considerations get in

> the way of his own modest contribution to realpolitik in the making. (*Upstairs, Downstairs)*

As usual, Stevens has works to do, and as it is in his father's case he cannot hold the opportunity to do something for himself and his life, because he devotes himself to his profession and conditions himself to follow his job no matter what happens in his private life. Once more, Stevens rejects to behave as he wants and loses Miss Kenton to his regret later on, but he cannot confess this until it is too late for them.

Stevens also restrains his humanly intimate relationships and emotions in addition to his sexual and amorous emotions. He learns before Kenton marries that her only relative in the world, her aunt, has died as he brings the letter giving the news to her in his own hands.

> I paused out in the corridor, wondering if I should go back, knock and make good my omission. But then it occurred to me that if I were to do so, I might easily intrude upon her private grief. Indeed, it was not impossible that Miss Kenton, at that very moment, and only a few feet from me, was actually crying. The thought provoked a strange feeling to rise within me, causing me to stand there hovering in the corridor for some moments. But eventually I judged it best to await another opportunity to express my sympathy and went on my way. (*RD*, 128)

Stevens knows that her aunt is like a mother to Miss Kenton. He can guess how much she is grieving. However, as Kenton wants to be left alone, Stevens leaves her without giving any consolation. Yet, after leaving the room he notices that Kenton is probably crying inside her pantry, which breaks his heart and raises a wish to stand by her and share her pain maybe. This is what makes him feel strange, because this is a feeling Stevens has never felt before or never let himself to feel before. Still, this does not make any change in the butler's attitude, as he decides to stay away from Miss Kenton for that moment fearing that his getting closer to her would damage his professionalism and may cause intimacy between them that may lead their relationship to the direction Stevens is unwilling to go, as it would cause him lose his professionalism and his dignity in his profession. This will be

something unacceptable; therefore, Stevens deceives himself by inseminating himself to wait for another opportunity to show his sympathy towards his "colleague".

Stevens's devotion to his understanding of dignity and professionalism does not remain limited with his restriction of his emotional, sexual and humanly feelings. It causes his blind obedience to his master. As Stevens defends that political knowledge is beyond his apprehension, he does not question the deeds of Lord Darlington. Having been affected by the Nazi sympathizers and due to his close relation with the supporters of Hitler, Lord Darlington decides to fire the two Jewish servants, Ruth and Sarah, and asks Stevens to do this on his behalf. Shaffer writes that

> Stevens's political capitulation might have remained insignificant, at least morally speaking, were it not for Lord Darlington's flirtation, in the early 1930s, with anti-Semitism. And his decision… to fire two maids from his staff strictly on the grounds that they are Jewish. Naturally, it falls to Stevens to do the firing. (79)

Stevens does not find any flaw in the services of the servants his master wants to fire, yet he thinks that it does not befit a dignified butler to question the order of his master; therefore, the butler stresses:

> [Y]ou will appreciate I was not unperturbed at the prospect of telling Miss Kenton I was about to dismiss two of her maids. Indeed, the maids had been perfectly satisfactory employees and - I may as well say this since the Jewish issue has become so sensitive of late - my every instinct opposed the idea of their dismissal. Nevertheless, my duty in this instance was quite clear, and as I saw it, there was nothing to be gained at all in irresponsibly displaying such personal doubts. It was a difficult task, but as such, one that demanded to be carried out with dignity. (106)

Stevens admits the fact that he is opposed to the idea of dismissing the servants just because they are Jewish, yet he also thinks that doubting the master's decision does not make any sense, as he sees himself inferior to Lord

Darlington whose knowledge and experience about the issues concerning the time is profound when compared to his. Cooper also highlights:

> Stevens insists that a butler should not express his views to those with political power. Because he is powerless to change his society, he claims that he has therefore no moral obligation to question its beliefs. (107)

Cooper is right to interpret Stevens's silence towards his master and his acceptance of his decision in spite of the fact that he disagrees with him as Stevens's admission of being powerless towards authority, because the butler tells Miss Kenton who goes against the decision by stating: "Miss Kenton, I have just this moment explained the situation to you fully. His lordship has made his decision and there is nothing for you and I to debate over" (*RD*, 106). Although Miss Kenton threatens Stevens by quitting her job, because she cannot bear the injustice, Stevens holds firm to his decision and determination on firing Ruth and Sarah. He reprimands Miss Kenton by telling her: "Miss Kenton, I am surprised to find you reacting in this manner. Surely I don't have to remind you that our professional duty is not to our own foibles and sentiments, but to the wishes of our employer" (107). Ono, resists against the authority as much as he can. He makes his own choice after he interrogates his options, but Stevens, without asking any questions, willingly accepts and obeys the authority and its pedagogical discourse which makes him more than a mere object. Actually, his actions make him a perfect servant of the authority. Cooper, while commenting on Kathy in Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go (2005),* also refers to Stevens and writes:

> Both Stevens and Kathy offer up their memories as evidence of the representative "success" of their lives within autonomy-denying social systems, and foreground that the narrator's capacity to determine his own actions and beliefs is limited. (107)

Anyhow, the world Stevens lives in changes and must change, like the world Ono lives in also changes. This is a change neither Stevens nor anyone else can prevent, because it is inevitable. As it is in *An Artist of the Floating World*, World War II causes a great alteration. After the war Great Britain

loses its power and influence on the world and the United States and Soviet Union become the prominent countries shaping the world's politics. "In an age increasingly dominated by the American and Soviet superpowers, the Britain of the mid-1950s entered the twilight of global influence" (McCombe, 79). This is also hinted at the change in the novel.

The change Darlington Hall goes through is symbolic of the change England goes through. Like the country losing its power to America, the new owner of the house is an American gentleman, Mr. Farraday. Stevens notes down explaining the new situation as follows:

> Once the transactions were over – transactions which had taken this house out of the hands of the Darlington family after two centuries – Mr. Farraday let it be known that he would not be taking up immediate residence here, but would spend a further four months concluding matters in the United States. In the meantime, however, he was most keen that the staff of his predecessor - a staff of which he had heard high praise be retained at Darlington Hall. (*RD*, 7)

The new owner of the house also wants Stevens to reduce the staff number working in the house when he suggests that Stevens should "give it a go with four" (7), which symbolizes England's losing its colonies. This means the alteration in the traditions of Darlington Hall as Stevens comments:

> [T]his house might be run on the present staff of four - that is to say, Mrs. Clements, the two young girls, and myself. This might, he [Mr. Farraday] appreciated, mean putting sections of the house 'under wraps', but would I bring all my experience and expertise to bear to ensure such losses were kept to a minimum? Recalling a time when I had had a staff of seventeen under me, and knowing how not so long ago a staff of twenty-eight had been employed here at Darlington Hall, the idea of devising a staff plan by which the same house should be run on a staff of four seemed, to say the least, daunting. (7-8)

Stevens finds the new order challenging as he is used to working with a great number of personnel under him through which he is able to deal with the usual running of the house management. Yet, now, he has to get used to working

with very little staff and he should devise his staff plan accordingly. However, the reduction in the staff number does not make an effect as strong as wrapping some sections of the house does. It is symbolic in the sense that it signals the closing of an era, an era according to which Stevens regulates his life and his ambitions about his profession. Nonetheless, the old traditions, values and codes remain under the dust-sheets of Darlington Hall.

The new system that comes with the arrival of Mr. Farraday is different from Lord Darlington's time. It is more informal than the old type of conduct Stevens is used to. For example, the butler has a great difficulty in understanding and catching up with Mr. Farraday's inclination towards bantering, which represents the new value system and the alteration of the traditions in England and in Darlington Hall. When Mr. Farraday offers Stevens to take a trip around England, the butler accepts it by telling his master that it can be a good opportunity to visit an old member of staff, Mrs. Benn, and invite her to work with them, because he learns that one of the four staff members will go to another house in order to work there reducing the staff in Darlington Hall. Mr. Farraday banters saying: "My, my, Stevens. A lady-friend. And at your age" (13). His new master's attitude disturbs Stevens who is used to a more formal relationship with his previous master:

> This was a most embarrassing situation, one in which Lord Darlington would never have placed an employee. But then I do not mean to imply anything derogatory about Mr. Farraday; he is, after all, an American gentleman and his ways are often very different. (13)

The change and his difficulty in catching up with it are the facts that intimidate Stevens and direct him to think over his life, his past actions, his ambitions and his values, because Stevens slowly realizes that his time has passed and nothing much remains to him to hold on to after Lord Darlington has passed away. So, probably he is willing to review his life in order to see what he has done with his life. Early in his narrative Stevens notes:

> [Y]ou will agree that such is often the way with matters one has given abiding thought to over a period

> of time; one is not struck by the truth until prompted quite accidentally by some external event. (9)

The butler's life used to be under control and Stevens used to feel secure while Lord Darlington was alive and the World he served was the same, but World War II changes Stevens's reality as in the case of Ono in *An Artist of the Floating World*. According to Stevens, it is Kenton's letter that leads him to review the way of his life or the staff plan as his life is also based on his staff plan he has devised for himself. However, as Stevens continues, it becomes explicit that it is rather the change in the general social and political atmosphere that has actually directed Stevens to make an assessment of his life.

Stevens claims that he accepts Mr. Farraday's offer in order to see Mrs. Benn and invite her to work at Darlington Hall. The trip actually provides an opportunity for the butler to think over his past. However, as Wong points out:

> Like… Ono, Stevens the narrator takes the reader into his confidence and promises a perspective of clear meditation. But, Stevens's declared enlightenment is a false one and promises nothing in the way of a spiritual consolation. (52)

Wong holds that Ishiguro employs "the strategy of using two levels of narrative voice" (53) one of which is extradiegetic narration where Stevens is "above" the story he tells and the other one is homodiegetic narration where Stevens becomes part of his own narration. Although Stevens "wants the tale he is now sharing to reveal that his participation derived from living a life of the highest moral and professional virtues" (53), his narration fails from time to time in fulfilling his intention. Wong notes down:

> Like Etsuko [in *A Pale View of Hills (1982*)] and Ono who wanted their listeners to believe in their naïve participation in past affairs, Stevens also casts himself a both progenitor of a virtuous life and victim of inexplicable physical or historical circumstances; in his homodiegetic role, he hopes to cultivate a listener's sympathy. Like Ono he comes to believe full in his version of events. (53)

However, the distance between the extradiegetic and the homodiegetic voices enables the reader see the unsuccessful attempt of the elderly butler to hide/repress how he actually feels about his past. As it can be hinted in the bantering example, Stevens starts to realize that the ideals he holds on to no longer exist in the new world order represented by Mr. Farraday, which creates a vacuum in his life. Moreover, the changing values invalidate his way of living and his beliefs causing disillusionment at the end of his life, which Stevens tries to hide from his reader till the end of his story.

Similar to Ono, Stevens tries to deny his own share in his actions; Wong raises a question which is an ethical one that is encountered in *An Artist of the Floating World*, as well: "is Stevens a conspirator of failures now present in his life, or has he been an innocent victim of the exaggerated ideals of his profession?" (54). Stevens towards the end of the novel defends himself by saying:

> I carried out my duties to the best of my abilities, indeed to a standard which many may consider 'first rate'. It is hardly my fault if his lordship's life and work have turned out today to look, at best, a sad waste - and it is quite illogical that I should feel any regret or shame on my own account. (*RD*, 147)

It is hard to put blame on him, but Stevens hides behind his learned helplessness. This is also one of the reasons why he refers to his father's tales and his father's life which set an example for Stevens's actions. Tamaya stresses the fact that:

> The brilliance of Ishiguro's narrative strategy is such that, just as Lord Darlington has convinced Stevens of the importance and nobility of his diplomatic maneuvering, the intimate tone of the narrative beguiles the reader into a curious complicity with Stevens' point of view; this enables one to emphatize with Stevens even as the butler is completely taken in by Lord Darlington. (50)

However, the novel has clues suggesting that Stevens is not actually fully "taken in" by Lord Darlington. For example, on the second day of his journey while he is near Dorset, his car breaks down and he drives around in order to

search for a chauffeur or a garage which can tell what is wrong with the car. So, he enters the garden of a Victorian house where he meets a batman who serves for the Colonel, and now, who tends the house till the Colonel sells it. The two men exchange some words, and the topic of the chat comes to where Stevens works. The butler indicates that he works at Darlington Hall, and the batman remembers it: “Darlington Hall. Must be a really posh place, it rings a bell even to an idiot like yours truly. Darlington Hall. Hang on, you don't mean Darlington Hall, Lord Darlington's place?" (*RD*, 88). At first he cannot notice which Darlington Hall it is, but then he quickly remembers the place and wants to be sure if it is the same place where lord Darlington lives, who is now infamous for his being a Nazi supporter, especially after Hitler lost the war causing utter destruction to the whole world both directly and indirectly. Not wanting to be associated with Lord Darlington, whom he defends, Stevens rejects working for his previous master by saying: "Oh no, I am employed by Mr. John Farraday, the American gentleman who bought the house from the Darlington family" (89).

Stevens admits that this is not the first time he rejects his connection with Lord Darlington when he tells:

> In any case, I have now come to accept that the incident with the batman is not the first of its kind; there is little doubt it has some connection - 'though I am not quite clear of the nature of it - with what occurred a few months ago during the visit of the Wakefields. (89)

Wakefields are Mr. Farraday’s friends from Kent, who come to visit him in the new house he has bought and is proud to be really English one. After walking around the great manor Mrs. Wakefield reveals her curiosity about Lord Darlington and asks Stevens: "But tell me, Stevens, what was this Lord Darlington like? Presumably you must have worked for him." (91), but Stevens denies working for him by responding to her simply: "I didn't, madam, no" (89). As pointed out above, Stevens’s attempts to foreground Lord Darlington’s importance and nobility stem rather from his attempt to give meanings to his own life.

At the end of the novel, the aging butler comes to the realization that his mistakes are now irredeemable. His hopes to get Miss Kenton back fade away when they meet at the end of his journey. Miss Kenton admits being unhappy at first, when she noticed that she is a married woman from then on, but later on she reveals that she has got used to her life. She even has a daughter, Catherine, who is now expecting a baby and she will be a grandmother. She confesses: “One day I realized I loved my husband. You spend so much time with someone, you find you get used to him. He's a kind, steady man, and yes, Mr. Stevens, I've grown to love him” (173) and adds that it is too late for Stevens and herself:

> But that doesn't mean to say, of course, there aren't occasions now and then- extremely desolate occasions - when you think to yourself: 'What a terrible mistake I've made with my life.' And you get to thinking about a different life, a better life you might have had. For instance, I get to thinking about a life I may have had with you, Mr. Stevens. And I suppose that's when I get angry over some trivial little thing and leave. But each time I do so, I realize before long - my rightful place is with my husband. After all, there's no turning back the clock now. One can't be forever dwelling on what might have been. One should realize one has as good as most, perhaps better, and be grateful. (173)

Mrs. Benn accepts that there are times she misses Mr. Stevens and wonders how her life would be if she had married to him, but then she realizes that she has done the right thing with marrying her husband, because she knows deep in her heart that Stevens would not have changed no matter how long she would have waited for him. She knows that living upon expectations that will never come true does not make any use for her life. So, she tries to be happy with her husband and cheers up with the idea that she is about to be a grandmother. However, Stevens is not as lucky as Mrs. Benn, and he is aware of this. This is because he constructs his life upon ideas which have lost their validity for the time being, and moreover, he admits that the mistakes he has made now turned his life to a waste were not even his own mistakes, while Ono has the privilege to own up to his mistakes and finds a way to reconcile

with his past. Yet, Stevens is not so lucky as Ono, as he finally realizes and dares to admit that there is no "dignity" in the way of life he has decided to lead:

> Lord Darlington wasn't a bad man. He wasn't a bad man at all. And at least he had the privilege of being able to say at the end of his life that he made his own mistakes. His lordship was a courageous man. He chose a certain path in life, it proved to be a misguided one, but there, he chose it, he can say that at least. As for myself, I cannot even claim that. You see, I trusted. I trusted in his lordship's wisdom. All those years I served him, I trusted I was doing something worthwhile. I can't even say I made my own mistakes. Really - one has to ask oneself - what dignity is there in that? (176)

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In *The Remains of the Day*, young Mr. Cardinal tries to exchange some words with Stevens after the conference in 1923 ends. He admits that people in the world are complacent about the nature around them and adds:

> Treaties and boundaries and reparations and occupations. But Mother Nature just carries on her own sweet way. Funny to think of it like that, don't you think?… I wonder if it wouldn't have been better if the Almighty had created us all as - well - as sort of plants. You know, firmly embedded in the soil. Then none of this rot about wars and boundaries would have come up in the first place. (80)

Young Mr. Cardinal attracts attention to the futility of humanly attempts when compared to the smooth running of nature. Through young Mr. Cardinal, Ishiguro's novel suggests that all issues such as wars and boundaries concerning the nations are mere constructs. As Ashfort and Mael indicate:

> According to Social Identity Theory, people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories, such as organizational membership, religious affiliation, gender, and age cohort. As these examples suggest, people may be classified in various categories, and different individuals may utilize different categorization schemas. (20)

National narration can be considered a way of social categorization, because people feel a sense of belonging to a particular nation, which provides them with a reference point according to which they can define themselves and shape their identity according to some predetermined codes. For example, Ono as a devoted nationalist dedicates his life to serve his nation in the way he thinks the best, and similarly Stevens shapes his entire life to serve his master and thereby his nation. Actually, what these characters both do seems to stem from a basic human tendency to think of ourselves as part of some

larger social categories. Stets and Burke write that "the self is reflexive in that it can take itself as an object and can categorize, classify, or name itself in particular ways in relation to other social categories or classifications" (224). For this reason, national identity can be considered an example of these social categories through which the self can identify himself/herself and according to which he/she can regulate his/her life. This is another way of saying that nations are imagined by man and the national discourses created by the national values, codes, icons and pedagogical teachings are narrated, in that the nation and nationalism are fabrications which are constantly in flux.

Ishiguro underlines: "I'm interested in this business of values and ideals being tested, and people having face up to the notion that their ideals weren't quite what they thought they were before the test came" (Swift, 36). In both *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* World War II is presented to be the test. Ono believes that it is important to work for his emperor who sees the salvation of Japan in expansion, because the Japanese Emperor becomes the representation of Japanese nationalism. The course and ideals he draws for the country are adopted by the citizens as the national discourse. Therefore, Ono rejects to follow his father's and master's ways and employs his art for the sake of Japanese expansion politics, which turns to be prostituting his art for the fascist activities. He does not give place to any opposition by the others, as he dares to devastate the life of his dear student Kuroda for this cause by snitching him to the committee that runs against the antimilitarist actions. However, the ideals upon which Ono shapes his life shatter and fall into pieces after Japan loses the war. All national codes, values and the way the nation is narrated change at the end of the war. And while Ono's son in law Suichi and his grandson Ichiro stand to be the representatives of the change in the country in front of Ono's eyes, the painter tries to resist the alteration and denies seeing it, because it creates a great disillusionment in the old painter, who uses his narration as a way to validate his actions or as a shield that would protect him from fronting the reality. Yet, he gives up towards the end of his narration and owns up to his mistakes,

which provides him with a sense of relief giving him an opportunity to reconcile with his past.

Lord Darlington also goes through a similar process with Ono, and his life shows a significant parallelism with that of the old painter. Because while trying to live up to his ideals, Lord Darlington contributes to fascist activities and supporters in his country and he turns up to be disillusioned at the end of World War II, which invalidates his ideals and destroys his fame, although his intention was perhaps only to be honourable and being fair to a defeated enemy.

Finally, Stevens is not presented to have a different share from Ono or Lord Darlington at the end of the war, as the war invalidates and destroys his ideals together with his life. This is because Stevens is probably the most desperate one among the three. Like Ono and Lord Darlington, he establishes his whole life on some ideals and for the sake of maintaining them. He lets his father die alone, rejects emotional relationships and misses the opportunity of establishing a family, which aggravates his disillusionment about his past and makes it hard to reconcile with himself. Ono is able to hold onto his family after the war ends, and he makes himself busy with the marriage negotiations of his younger daughter and looking after his grandson by his elder daughter, which provides Ono with an opportunity to look for ways in order to reconcile with himself, as he still has strong reasons that clings him to life hopefully. Moreover, when he looks back to his past, Ono has the privilege to admit that he has made his own mistakes, because he walked on the path he believed to be true. Stevens, on the other hand, does not have a family to hold on to, or he does not have any children or grandchildren unlike Ono. While Miss Kenton finds a way to be hopeful and happy about her future life thinking of her daughter and the grandchild who is on its way, the old butler remains without such a support that will cheer him or help him to be hopeful about his future. In addition to this, he cannot own up to his own mistakes, because believing that he could not have an active role in the politics of his country or he could not have a word on his

own on his destiny, he followed Lord Darlington and served him on all occasions. For this reason, although Ono and Lord Darlington made their own mistakes and risked their lives for the sake of their own belief, Stevens had to make the mistakes of his master believing that he had to obey all his orders and his ideals in order to achieve his aim in life and give a meaning to his own existence in his nation. So, the change in his life that is felt intensely with the arrival of Mr. Farraday makes Stevens disillusioned as he realizes that the values and ideals to which he dedicates himself, are condemned to vanish in the new world order leaving him hopeless about himself and his future, as it is too late.

Both *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Remains of the Day* are founded on an understanding of the nation as an imagined construct/narration as theorized by Anderson and Bhabha. Ishiguro portrays three characters, Ono, Lord Darlington and Stevens, whose ideals and values are strongly shaped by the pedagogic narratives of the national identities they have. All these characters' blindness to the "floating" nature of the nation and national identities is largely responsible for the shared feeling of disillusionment they suffer at the end of their lives.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and the Spread of Nationalism,* London: Verso, 2003. Print.

Andrew, Stephen, *The Japanese Army 1931-45*, Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002. Print.

Appeasement, http://www.history.co.uk/study-topics/history-of-ww2/appeasement, 14.10.2014.

Ashforth, Blake E., Fred Mael, *Social Identity Theory and the Organization,* The Academy of Management Review, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), pp. 20-39. Print.

Bhabha, Homi K., "DissemiNation", in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha, London and New York: Routledge, , 2000. Print.

The Location of Culture, London and New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Beedham, Matthew, *The Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*, Palgrave, 2010. Print.

Bennett, Caroline, "Cemeteries Are No Places For Young People: Children and Trauma in the Early Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro", in *Kazuo Ishiguro: New Critical Visions of the Novels*, ed. Sebastian Groes & Barry Lewis, Palgrave, 2011. Print.

Berbereich, Christine, "Kazuo Ishiguro's The Remains of the Day: Working Through England's Traumatic Past as a Critique of Thatcherism", in *Kazuo Ishiguro: New Critical Visions of the Novels*, ed. Sebastian Groes & Barry Lewis, Palgrave, 2011. Print.

Blanchot, Maurice, "Michel Foucault as I Imagine him" in *Foucault/Blanchot*, trans. Jeffrey Mehlman and Brian Massumi, Zone Books, 1987. Print.

Blumberg, Rhoda, *Commodore Perry in the Land of the Shogun*, HarperCollins, 2003. Print.

Brubaker, Rogers, *In the Name of the Nation: Reflections on Nationalism and Patriotism,* Carfax Publishing, Citizenship Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2, June 2004, 115–127. Print.

Boym, Svetlana, *Nostalgia and Its Discontents*, http://www.iasc-culture.org/eNews/2007_10/9.2CBoym.pdf , 22.10.2014.

Brown, Derek, *1956: Suez and the end of empire*, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2001/mar/14/past.education1, 15.10.2014.

Cerulo, Karen A., Never Saw It Coming: Cultural Challenges to Envisioning the Worst, University of Chicago Press, 2006. Print.

Chamberlain and appeasement, http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/history/mwh/ir1/chamberlainandappeasementrev1.shtml 15.10.2014.

Chamberlain, Joseph, *The True Conception of Empire*, http://www.bartleby.com/268/5/14.html 21.10.2014.

Cheng, Chu-chueh, *The Margin Without Centre: Kazuo Ishiguro,* Germany: Peter Lang, 2010. Print.

Cooper, Lydia R., "Novelistic Practice and Ethical Philosophy in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*" in *Kazuo Ishiguro: New Critical Visions of the Novels*, ed. Sebastian Groes and Barry Lewis, Palgrave, 2011. Print.

Darwin, John, "Britain, the Commonwealth and the End of Empire", http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/british/modern/endofempire_overview_01.shtml, 20.10.2014.

Dover, John W., *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1987. Print.

Esenbel, Selçuk, *Japanese Interest in the Ottoman Empire in The Japanese And Europe: Images and Perceptions,* ed. Bert Edström, Curzon Press, 2000. Print.

Facos, Michelle, Sharon L., Hirsh, *Art, Culture, and National Identity in Fin-de-Siecle Europe,* Cambridge University Press, 2003. Print.

Farina, Nicholas, *The Last Movement of a Loyal Life: Hara-kiri and Honor Ideology in Meiji Japan*, 2010, http://hdl.handle.net/10066/5404. 01.11.2014.

Foner, Eric, John A. Garraty, *The Reader's Companion to American History, H*oughton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 1991. Print.

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, trans. James Strachey, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1962. Print.

Fusé, Toyomasa, *Suicide and culture in Japan: A Study of Seppuku as An Institutionalized Form of Suicide*, Social Psychiatry, 1980, Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 57-63. Print.

Greenfeld, Liah, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, Harvard University Press, 1993. Print.

Gundera, Jagdish S., *Societal Diversities and the Issue of 'The Other',* in Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 16, No. 1 (1990), pp. 97-109. Print.

Gurevich, David, *Upstairs, Downstairs: A Review of the Remains of the Day by Kazuo Ishiguro*, http://www.newcriterion.com /articles.cfm/ Upstairs--downstairs-5593, 15.10.2014.

Hammond, Meghan Marie, "I can't even say I made my own mistakes: The Ethics of genre in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*" in *Kazuo Ishiguro: New Critical Visions of the Novels*, ed. Sebastian Groes and Barry Lewis, Palgrave, 2011. Print.

Hanlon, Patrick, *Godzilla: What is it About Monsters?*, Forbes, May 14, 2014, 01.11.2014.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude, *The Victorian Lady: Margaret Thatcher's Virtues*, The Weekly Standard, Friday, November 7, 2014 http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/victorian-lady_716278.html 16.10.2014.

Hobsbawm, Eric, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions" in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, Cambridge University, 1938. Print.

Howard, Philip, *A Butler's Tale Wins Booker for Ishiguro*, Times, 1989. Print.

Ishiguro, Kazuo, *An Artist of the Floating World*, Faber and Faber, 2001. Print.

The Remains of the Day, F. A. Thorpe Publishing, 1990. Print.

Jordison, Sam, "Booker Club: *The Remains of the Day*", The Guardian, 26 November, 2010 http://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog, 23.10.2014.

Kaes, Anton, *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*, University of California Press, 1994. Print.

Lewis, Barry, *Contemporary World Writers: Kazuo Ishiguro*, Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000. Print.

Lincicome, Mark E., *Nationalism, Imperialism, and the International Education Movement in Early Twentieth-Century Japan*, The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. 58, No. 2 (May, 1999), pp. 338-360. Print.

Lodge, David, *The Art of Fiction-Illustrated from Classic and Modern Texts*, Viking Penguin, 1993. Print.

Mann, Michael, "Torchbearers Upon the Path of Progress: Britain's Ideology of a 'Moral and Material Progress' in India" in *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India,* ed. Herald Fischer-Tiné, Michael Mann, Wimbledon Publishing Company, 2004. Print.

Masao, Maruyama "Theory and Psychology of Ultra- Nationalism," (1946), translated and reprinted by Ivan Morris ed., Maruyama Masao in *Thought and Behaviour in Modern Japanese Politics,* Oxford University Press, 1963. Print.

Mason, Gregory, "An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro", in *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*, ed. Brian Shaffer and Cynhtia Wong, University Press of Mississippi, 2008. Print.

Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day, Encyclopaedia Britannica, http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/516821/Massacre-of-Saint- Bartholomews-Day, 05.11.2014.

McCombe, John P., *The End of (Anthony) Eden: Ishiguro's "The Remains of the Day" and Midcentury Anglo-American Tensions,* Twentieth Century Literature, Vol. 48, No. 1, Spring, 2002. Print.

Milestones: 1937-1945, in US Department of State Office of the Historian, http://www.history.state.gov/milestones/1937-1945/potsdam-conf 15.10.2014.

Moore, Angelina, *Why did the Treaty of Versailles Hated by German People,*-Humanities360, http://www.humanities360.com/index.php/why-did-the-treaty-of-versailles-hated-by-german-people-40059/, 15.10.2014.

Oe, Kenzaburo, "The Novelist in Today's World: A Conversation" , in *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*, ed. Brian Shaffer and Cynhtia Wong, University Press of Mississippi, 2008. Print.

Öztabak-Avcı, Elif, "An 'Ideological Servant'?: A Study of the Servant Figure in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day"*, Interactions, Vol. 22.1-2, 2013. Print.

Parkes, Adam, *Kazuo Ishiguro's The Remains of the Day*, New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 2001. Print.

Renan, Ernest, "What is a Nation?" in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha, London and New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Riley, Matthew, *Edward Elgar and the Nostalgic Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.

Qi,Yang, "Analyze the film Communication under Internet Circumstances" in *Proceedings of the 2012 International Conference of Modern Computer Science,* ed. Zhyenyu Du, Springer, 2013. Print.

Rushdie, Salman, "Salman Rushdie: rereading The Remains of the Day by Kazuo Ishiguro", The Guardian, Friday 17 August 2012, 2.10.2014.

Saito, Osamu, *Early Meiji Japan: a developmental state?,* http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~eniugh/congress/fileadmin/eniugh2011/dokumente/Visible_Hand_and_Saito_2011_03_25.pdf, 30.10.2014.

Shaffer, Brian W., *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro*, United States of America: University of South Carolina Press, 1998. Print.

Sigsworth, Eric M., *In Search of Victorian Values: Aspects of Nineteenth-century Thought and Society,* Manchester University Press, 1988. Print.

Sinfield, Alan, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989. Print.

Sosnoski, Daniel, *Introduction to Japanese Culture*, Tuttle Publishing, 2013. Print.

Steel, Flora Annie, G. Gardiner, *The Complete Indian House Keeper and Cook, Giving the Duties of Mistress and Servants, the General Management of the House, and Practical Recipes for Cooking in all its Branches,* London, 1989. Print.

Seton-Watson, Hugh, *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism,* Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1977. Print.

Sexton, David, "Interview: David Sexton Meets Kazuo Ishiguro", in *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*, ed. Brian Shaffer and Cynhtia Wong, University Press of Mississippi, 2008. Print.

Stets, Jan E., Peter J. Burke, *Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory,* Social Psychology Quarterly, Vol. 63, No. 3 (Sep., 2000), pp. 224-237. Print.

Sim, Wai-chew, *Kazuo Ishiguro*, London and New: York Routledge, 2010. Print.

Swift, Graham, "Shorts: Kazuo Ishiguro", in *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*, ed. Brian Shaffer and Cynthia Wong, University Press of Mississippi, 2008. Print.

Tamaya, Meera, *Ishiguro's "Remains of the Day": The Empire Strikes Back*, Modern Language Studies, Vol. 22, No. 2, Spring, 1992. Print.

The Imperial Rescript on Education, http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1392009.files/THE%20IMPERIAL%20RES CRIPT%20ON%20EDUCATION.pdf, 15.10.2014.

Tekin, Kuğu, "Tradition and Innovation in *An Artist of the Floating World"*, *in Proceedings of the 19th METU British Novelists Conference 12-13 December 2011*, ed. Hülya Yıldız Bağçe, Özlem Türe Arabacı, Şule Akdoğan and Şermin, Sezer, Ankara: British Novelists Series, METU Faculty of Education Department of Foreign Language Education, 2012. Print.

Tennent, Timothy, *Theology in the Context of World Christianity : How the Global Church is Influencing the Way We Think About and Discuss Theology*, Zondervan, 2007. Print.

Thornton, A. P., *Imperialism in the Twentieth Century*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980. Print.

Tomuschat, Christian, *The United Nations at Age Fifty: A Legal Perspective*. Martinus Nijhoff LOL Publishers, 1995. Print.

Turnbull, Stephen, *Samurai: The World of the Warrior*, Osprey Publishing, 2003. Print.

Varble, Derek, *The Suez Crisis 1956*, London: Osprey Publishing, 2003. Print.

Vorda, Allan, "Stuck on the Margins: An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro" in *Face to Face: Interviews with Contemporary Novelists*, ed. Allan Vorda,. Houston: Rice University Press, 1993. Print.

Vorda, Allan and Kim, Herzinger, "An Interview with Kazuo Ishiguro", ", in *Conversations with Kazuo Ishiguro*, ed. Brian Shaffer and Cynhtia Wong, University Press of Mississippi, 2008. Print.

Wain, Peter, "The Historical-political Aspect of the Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro" in *Language and Culture,* 1992. Print.

Walkowitz, Rebecca L., "The post-consensus novel: Minority culture, multiculturalism, and transnational comparison", in *The Cambridge Companion to the Twentieth-Century English Novel*, ed. Robert L. Caserio, Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.

Wong, Cynthia F., *Kazuo Ishiguro*, Devon: Northcote House Publishers, 2005. Print.

Young, Louise, *Japan's Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism*, University of California Press, December 1997. Print.

Zernatto, Guido, "Nation: The History of a Word", in *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, ed. J. Hutchinson and A. D. Smith, Routledge, 2000. Print.

TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Barry Lewis *Kazuo Ishiguro: Çağdaş Dünya Yazarları* isimli kitabında Ishiguro'nun ilk dört romanı arasındaki benzerliğe dikkat çeker. Lewis özellikle yazarın *Günden Kalanlar* isimli romanının *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı*'nın yeniden düzenlemesi olduğunu vurgular. İki romanda da anlatıcılar aktardıkları yaşam öyküleriyle kendi geçmişlerine doğru zihinsel bir yolculuğa çıkarak geçmişteki benlikleriyle barışmak için yollar ararlar. Romanlar arasındaki gerek tematik benzerlikler gerekse yazım tekniğindeki benzerlik evrensel konulara değinmeyi hedefleyen yazarın asıl amacının belli bir ulusa ait insan figürünü resmetmekten ziyade, insanın ulusal kurgu içindeki yerinin evrensel olarak ele alınması ve okuyucuya sunulması olduğunu açıkça ortaya koyar. Bu tezin amacı Kazuo Ishiguro'nun *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı* ve *Günden Kalanlar* isimli romanlarında milliyetçilik olgusunun kuruluş biçimini ve bireylere kazandırılan ya da dayatılan hegemonik ulusal kimlik kurgusunu incelemektir. Bu tez bu bağlamda iki romanda da değişen ulusal söylem içerisinde benimsedikleri emperyal kimlikler konusunda hayal kırıklığına uğrayan güvenilmez anlatıcıların temsil ettiği "Japonluk" ve "İngilizlik" olgusunu birer kurmaca olarak incelemeyi amaçlar. Bunu yaparken Ishiguro ve romanları üzerine otobiyografik, biçimsel ve politik incelemeler ve eleştiriler yapan Cynthia Wong, Caroline Bennett, Megan Marie Hammond, Brian Shaffer, Barry Lewis ve Christine Berbereich gibi yazarlardan faydalanmanın yanı sıra, bahsi geçen iki romanı Benedict Anderson ve Homi K. Bhabha'nın milliyetçilik teorileri ışığında ele alacaktır.

Tezin ilk bölümünde Benedict Anderson ve Homi K. Bhabha'nın millet ve milliyetçilik teorileri açıklanıp, milliyetçiliğe bakış açıları tartışılacak ve bu doğrultuda milliyetçilik kurgulanırken faydalanılan öğeler üzerinde durulacaktır. İkinci bölümde bu teoriler ışığında yazarın *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı* isimli romanında, romanın anlatıcısı ve ana karakteri olan emekli ressam Ono üzerinden Japon milliyetçiği ve "Japonluk"

kurgusunu ele alış şekli üzerinde durulacaktır. Aynı şekilde üçüncü bölümde Anderson ve Bhabha'nın teorilerinden faydalanarak efsanevi "İngilizlik" kimliği incelenecek, romanda Lord Darlington'ın temsil ettiği, Margaret Thatcher dönemi eleştirisi olarak da vurgulanan Victoria dönemi İngiliz kimliğinin yanı sıra, romanın anlatıcısı ve baş karakteri olan kahya Stevens'ın gözler önüne serdiği tipik İngiliz kimliğinin kurgulanışı incelenecektir. Sonuç bölümde ise romanların analitik özetlerinin yer alması amaçlanmaktadır.

Millet tanımı yapılması oldukça zor bir sözcüktür. Evrilmesi ve günümüzde kullanılan anlamını kazanması ise oldukça uzun bir zaman alır. Benedict Anderson millet ve milliyetçiliği kültürel birer kurgu olarak tanımlar ve milleti hayali bir cemaat olarak nitelendirir. Çünkü kendilerini millet olarak addeden insan topluluğunun, o topluluğu oluşturan ve yoldaş ya da arkadaş olarak görülen diğer milyonlarca bireyi tanıma imkanı yoktur. Anderson bu bireyleri bir arada tutanın ortak homojen bir plebisit olduğunu iddia eder ve millet kurgusunun tıpkı bir roman kurgusuna benzediğinden bahseder.

Anderson bu noktada hayali cemaatin oluşması ve bireyler arasında bir bağ kurulabilmesi için toplumu oluşturan bireyler arasında bir eşzamanlılık hissinin oluşması gerektiğini savunur. Bu eşzamanlılık romandaki farklı karakterlerin yaşamı kurgulanırken kullanılan eşzamanlılıkla aynıdır. Romanda her karakter bazen birbiriyle ilintili bazen de birbirinden habersiz kendi yaşamını sürdürürken, romanı okuyan okuyucu farklı karakterlerin anlatısına aynı anda hakim olabilir ve romana dışarıdan bakma imkanı olduğu için tüm kurguyu bir bütün içinde algılar. Milleti oluşturan bireyler ve onların eylemleri için de benzer bir durum geçerlidir.

Anderson gibi Bhabha da milleti ve milliyetçiliği romanlardaki anlatıya benzetir fakat Anderson'dan farklı olarak Bhabha, milliyetçiliğin yatay bir çizgi doğrultusunda oluşup gelişmek yerine, kendini tekrarlayan ve bu tekrar esnasında homojenliğini kaybeden özelliğine dikkat çeker. Çünkü Bhabha'ya göre millet çift yönlü bir anlatıdır, yani milleti oluşturan bireyler önce bu anlatının pedagojik nesneleri olarak ortaya çıkarlar ve kendilerine

öğretilen ya da empoze edilmek istenen değerler doğrultusunda eğitilirler. Daha sonrasında ise bu öğretinin edimsel özneleri halini alırlar, yani öğretileri uygulamaya başlarlar. Fakat bu noktada her bireyin kendisine öğretilen ve kendisinden beklenen şekilde davranış sergilemesini beklemek imkansızdır ki bu durum millet içinde heterojenliği ve çeşitliliği doğurur.

Milliyetçiliği bir anlatı bağlamında ele alırkenki fikir ayrılıkları bir yana, iki teorisyen, milliyetçiliğin kurgulanmasında ulusal hafızanın önemi konusunda ortak bir noktada buluşurlar. Hem Anderson hem de Bhabha ulusal hafızada yer alan, milletin kültürünü oluşturan ve milleti oluşturan bireyleri birbirine bağlayan ortak bir tarihe sahip olmalarına imkan veren sembollere, ikonlara ve gelenek-göreneklere değinirler ve bunların birleştirici gücüne dikkat çekerler. Fakat buna ek olarak Bhabha bazı değerleri hatırlamanın millet için hayati değer taşımasının yanında bazı olayları unutmanın da toplumu birleştirici bir gücü olduğunu ve bu unutuşun da ulusal hafızanın bir parçası olduğunu vurgular.

Anderson ve Bhabha'nın hemfikir olduğu bir diğer nokta ise milletin mekânsal sınırları olması gerektiğidir. Anderson *Hayali Cemaatler* isimli kitabında milletin mekânsal olarak sınırları olması gerekliliğine değinirken, Bhabha, bu sınırlar içinde kalan topak parçasının, milleti oluşturan bireyleri birbirlerine ve ortak bir mekana bağlı hissettirmesi bakımından birleştirici bir unsur olduğunun altını çizer. Buna ek olarak, bu sınırların dışında kalan diğer bireyler ve onların oluşturdukları topluluklar ise "Öteki" olarak adlandırılır ve milleti ortak bir düşman karşısında birleştiren bir diğer unsuru oluşturur. Anderson ve Bhabha'nın millet ve milliyetçilik üzerine bahsi geçen söylemleri Ishiguro'nun *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı* ve *Günden Kalanlar*'ının incelemesinin bel kemiğini oluşturur.

Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı İkinci Dünya Savaşından sonra Japonya'da geçer. Romanın anlatıcısı emekli ressam Ono yirmi aylık bir süreç içinde bir yandan küçük kızı Noriko'yla paylaştığı günlük hayatına dair meşgalelerinden bahsederken bir yandan da ara ara hafızasında canlanan anıları sayesinde kendi geçmişine doğru bir yolculuğa çıkar. Ono, küçük kızı

için evlilik hazırlıkları yaparken büyük kızı Setsuko oğlu Ichiro'yla birlikte babasını ziyarete gelir. Ono'nun Ichiro'yla olan diyaloglarından anlaşıldığı üzere Japonya İkinci Dünya Savaşından sonra büyük bir değişim geçirmiştir ve artık Ono'nun bildiği eski Japonya değildir. 1930'ların sonunda Japonya yayılmacı politika izleyen bir ülke halini alır, sınırlarını Çin'den Mançurya ve Kore'ye kadar genişletir. Bu yayılmacı politika ülkeyi yenilgiyle sonuçlandırmak zorunda kalacağı İkinci Dünya Savaşı'na kadar sürükler. Ülke savaşı kaybetmeden önce birçok insanın yaptığı gibi Japonya'nın yayılmacı politikasını destekleyen ve bu konuda oldukça aktif bir rol üstlenen Ono, savaş sonra erdikten sonra geri plana çekilmek zorunda kalır. Savaştan önce Ono'yu destekleyen ve ona hayran olan çevre artık onu ülkeyi savaşa sürüklemekle suçlar olmuştur. Bu suçlamalar Noriko'nun genç Miyake'yle olan evlilik planlarını suya düşürür. Bunun üzerine Ono kızı için ikinci bir evlilik görüşmesi planlar fakat bu planlar sırasında kendi geçmişiyle yüzleşmek zorunda kalacaktır.

Bu bölümün amacı romanda Japon kimliğini, bu kimliğin ele alınış, kurgulanış, yapıbozuma uğratılış ve yeniden kurgulanış biçimini incelemektir. Bu bağlamda romanda ulusal Japon değerlerinin nasıl kurgulandığı, Japon toplumunu oluşturan bireylerin bu değerlere yaklaşımları, "Japonluk" kimliğini benimseyişleri, bu kimliğin yıkılışı ve sonuç olarak bireylerin yeni kimlik edinimlerinin incelenmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

Romanın başarı yakalamasında Ishiguro'nun etnik kökeni oldukça etkili olmuş olsa da *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı* oryantalist bir roman olmaktan ziyade evrensel bir roman özelliği taşır. Çünkü Ishiguro bu romanında Japonya'yı tarihi bir biçimde ele almak yerine onu milliyetçi bir kimliğin ve milliyetçilik kavramının kurgulanabileceği yarı gerçekçi yarı kurgusal bir mekan olarak kullanmayı tercih eder. Yazarın amacı milliyetçi bir kurmaca olan "Japon"luk olgusunu resmetmek, bu yolla evrensel milliyetçiliğin Anderson'ın da dediği gibi "hayali" bir olgu olduğunu ortaya koymak ve bireylerin bu kurmaca içindeki konumunu incelemektir.

Ono resim konusunda altı yıldır eğitim aldığı Mori-san'ın villasında kalırken hayatını değiştirecek olan Okada Shingen Derneği gönüllüsü Matsuda ile tanışır. Matsuda Japon imparatoruna ve onun inandığı yayılmacı politikaya gönülden bağlıdır çünkü hem imparator hem de ona inanan birçok insan gibi Matsuda da Japonya'nın emperyalist dünya düzeni içinde hak ettiği yeri almak için yeni toprak arayışına girmesi gerektiği görüşünü destekler. Bu amaçla Ono'yu derneğin de desteklediği bu politikaya destek vermesi konusunda ikna eder. Bunu yaparken Japon milliyetçiliğini yüceltmek için Japon halkının "Öteki" milletlerden daha üstün olduğunu, bu üstünlüğü korumak için de Çin ve Kore gibi kendisinden çok daha geri olan ülkeleri fethetmesi gerektiğini ve bunun Japon milliyetçiliğinin bir parçası olduğunu iddia eder.

Ono, Japonya'nın topraklarını genişletmek için savaşması konusunda Japon halkını birleştirmek, onlara Japon olmanın anlamının ülkenin dünya konjonktüründe hak ettiği yeri alabilmesi için gerekiyorsa hayatlarını vermekten geçtiği fikrini benimsetmek ve insanlara bu doğrultuda bir Japon kimliği aşılamak için sanatını kullanır. Savaş propagandası posterlerinde ülkenin hem tarihi hem de insanları açısından oldukça önemli değerleri temsil eden samuraylardan ve onların sembolik güçlerinden faydalanır. Böylelikle Japon halkındaki ortak aidiyet hissini güçlendirir ve onları ortak amaçları etrafında birleştirir. Sanatıyla ve savaşa teşvik eden posterleriyle büyük kitleleri etkilemeyi başaran Ono'nun kendisi de zaman için sembolik bir değer kazanır ve halkı etkileme gücü gittikçe artar. Ono'nun hem kendisi hem de posterlerinde kullandığı figürler ülkede emperyalist milliyetçi bir kimlik oluşturma ve bu kimliği toplumu oluşturan bireylere empoze etme konusunda tarihi ve kültürel sembollerin ne kadar önemli olduğunu ön plana çıkarır.

Ishiguro romanında emperyalist milliyetçi kimliğin oluşturulmasında Ono'nun görsel sanatının ve ikonlarının yanı sıra bestekar Mr. Nagguchi gibi halkı duyusal olarak etkileme gücü olan figürlere ve onların besteledikleri, halkı coşturan ve savaşma konusunda isteklerini güçlendiren ve insanların dilinden düşmeyen milliyetçi marşlara ve şarkılara da yer verir.

Medyanın gelişmesiyle birlikte ulusal kimliğin oluşmasına katkıda bulunan semboller ve ikonların toplumu etkileme gücü de gittikçe artar. Ono'nun torunu Ichiro ve onun Amerikan kültürünün sembolleri olan Yalnız Kovboy ve Denizci Temel Reis gibi figürlere olan düşkünlüğü, onları taklit etme konusundaki istekliliği ve hatta bu uğurda Japon kültürel değerleri olan samuraylardan vaz geçmesi medyanın kültürel yayılma konusundaki etkisini açıkça gözler önüne serer.

Ono'nun anlatımı Japon milli kimliğin oluşturulmasında gelenek ve göreneklerin yerini de vurgular. Japon toplumunun uzun yıllardır korunmakta olan *miai* geleneği, yani evlilik çağındaki çiftlerin evlenmeden önce birbirlerini görücü usulüyle tanımaları, hatta ailelerin çocuklarını evlendirecekleri adayları çocuklarından önce tanımaları, onların ve ailelerinin sosyal statüleri ve eğitim seviyeleri hakkında bilgi sahibi olmaları ve eğer uygun görürlerse çocuklarının tanıştırmalarına izin vermeleri birçok Japon tarafından günümüzde bile uygulanmaya devam edilen ve kültürel bir değer olarak muhafaza edilen bir uygulama olarak romanda da yer almaktadır.

Romanda milli hafızaya kazınmış semboller, ikonlar, gelenek ve göreneklerin yanı sıra hafızadan silinen ya da silinmek istenen olaylar da milliyetçiliğin kurgulanmasında önemli rol oynar. Noriko'nun ilk nişanlısı Jiro Miyake diğer birçok insan gibi Japonya'yı İkinci Dünya Savaşı'na sürükleyenlerin ve ülkenin büyük can ve mal kayıplarının sorumlusu olanların Japonya'nın onurlu tarihini kirletmeye ve hafızalarda böylesine utanç verici bir leke bırakmaya hakları olmadığı görüşündedir. Fakat böylesi bir olayı unutmak veya hiç olmamış gibi davranmak mümkün olmadığı için Miyake en azından buna sebep olanların Japon toplumuna bir özür borçlu olduğunu savunur. Noriko'yla olan evlilik görüşmelerinin sona ermesinden sonra Ono'yla yolda karşılaşan Miyake yaşlı ressama kendi patronunun hara-kiri yapmayı deneyip başaramaması üzerine kendini gazla boğarak intihar ettiğinden bahseder ve Ono'ya ülkeyi savaşa sürükleyenlerden biri olarak hatasını en azından bu yolla telafi etmeye çalışmasının onurlu bir davranış olduğunu ima eder.

Ono çocukluğundan başlayarak çevreden gelen pedagojik öğretilerin baskısı altına alınmaya ve bu öğretilerin nesnesi haline getirilmeye çalışılır. Örneğin ilkin babası Ono'yu kendi aile işlerini sürdürmesi konusunda zorlar ve ressam olmak isteyen Ono'ya şiddetle karşı çıkar. Onun cesaretini kırmak için resimlerini yakmak gibi çeşitli yollara başvurur. Dahası babasına karşı çıkmanın oldukça zor olduğu bir yaşta olan Ono annesinden de destek göremez ama yine de ailesinin kendisine dayatmak istediği geleceğe razı olmayarak ressam olma yolunda ilerler.

Fakat Ono bu sefer de ressamlık hayatına adım attığı ilk firma olan Takeda'da otoritenin baskısı altına girmek zorunda kalır çünkü firma yurt dışına otantik Japon tabloları satar ve bünyesinde çalıştırdığı ressamların yaratıcılığını ve sanatsal tercihlerini göz etmeksizin onlardan kendi istekleri ve beklentileri doğrultusunda seri üretim tablolar yapmalarını bekler.

Takeda'da patronunun öğretilerini takip etmeyi reddeden Ono, oradan ayrılarak Mori-san'ın villasında Mori-san'dan sanat eğitimi alarak yaşamını sürdürmeye karar verir ama bu sefer de Mori-san diğer öğrencilerine yaptığı gibi Ono'nun kendi yolunu çizmesine engel olarak ona sanat konusunda kendi bakış açısı ve tekniğini dayatmaya kalkar. İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda önce Matsuda'nın da etkisi altında kalarak ülkesini daha yakından tanıyan ve kendi toprakları üzerinde yaşayan gerçek insan manzaralarına tanık olan Ono ise Japonya'nın ezilmemesi, çağdaş dünya ülkeleri arasında hak ettiği yeri alması için savaşması ve yeni topraklar ele geçirmesi gerektiği kanısına varır. Ono Mori-san'ın yanında daha fazla kalamayarak villayı terk eder ve Japon halkını derinden etkileyecek ve ona agresif ve savaşçı bir kimlik empoze edecek tablolarını yapmaya başlar.

Sanatında ilerleyen ve tablolarıyla oldukça tanınmış bir savaş propagandası figürü haline gelen Ono'nun kendisi de zamanla kendi öğretilerini öğrencilerine dayatma çabasında olan otoriter bir figüre dönüşür. Hatta bu uğurda çok sevdiği öğrencisi Kuroda'nın hayatını istemeden de olsa mahvetmekten geri kalmaz.

Ishiguro hem röportajlarında hem de romanında millet ve milliyetçilik kavramının geçici olduğunu vurgular. *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı*'da Ono'nun geçirdiği bu süreç ve yaptığı seçimler ise bunun kanıtıdır. Bu bakımdan Ono'nun tanık olduğu değişim süreci sembolik bir değer taşır. Zaman içinde değişen ve savaş sırasında atılan bombalardan zarar gören evi, savaştan önceki Japonya'nın konjonktüründe Ono'ya saygı ve hayranlık duyan öğrencisi Shintaro'nun savaştan sonra Ono'yla olan bağlarını koparmak istemesi, ülkenin yayılmacı politikalarını destekleyen ve imparatorun agresif tutumunu alkışlayan insanların birden bunlara karşı çıkar olması ve hatta Ono'nun damadı Suichi'nin oğlu Ichiro'nun Amerikan kültürü etkisinde büyümesini desteklemesi Japonya'da görülen büyük değişikliğin kanıtları olarak karşımıza çıkar.

Ono bu değişimi kabullenmekte oldukça zorlanır çünkü değişen Japonya'da artık eski ününü ve saygınlığını kaybetmiş, savaştan önce yaptığı her şey artık değersiz ve unutulası gereken anılar olarak kalmıştır. Dahası Japonya savaşı kaybetmeden önce Ono'yu savaş taraftarı propagandaları için takdir eden insanlar artık ona kötü gözle bakar olmuştur. Bu durum Ono'ya oldukça zor geldiği için yaşlı ressam gerçekleri görmezden gelerek onları reddetme hatta birçok yerde gerçeklerden kaçma yoluna gider. Ono Noriko'ya zarar gelmemesi ve Miyake'yle olduğu gibi genç Saito'yla olan evlilik görüşmelerinin bozulmaması için artık lekeli sayılan geçmişini mümkün olduğunca gizlemeye çalışır. Fakat *miai* sırasında hissettiği büyük baskı ve endişenin de etkisiyle konuşmaları yanlış anlayarak geçmişte yaptığı ve bütün roman boyunca bastırmak için büyük çaba sarf ettiği hatalarını kendisine ve bütün ailesine itiraf eder. Bu romanda bir dönüm noktasıdır çünkü Ono bu noktada geçmişiyle açık açık yüzleşmeyi ve geçmiş yaşamıyla barışmayı başarır. Artık her şey farklı olsa da Ono önceden yaptığı her şeyi doğru olduğuna inandığı için yapmıştır fakat o durumda hayati olan öngörülere sahip olmadığı için durum onunu aleyhine sonuçlanmıştır.

Kazuo Ishiguro'nun üçüncü romanı *Günden Kalanlar* büyük bir ün kazanan, oldukça etkileyici bir romandır. İlk bakışta *Değişen Dünyada Bir*

Sanatçı'yla aralarında büyük farklar var gibi görünse de iki roman da birbirine çok benzer. Biri Japonya'da bir ressamın hayatını biri İngiltere'de bir kahyanın yaşamını konu almasına rağmen iki roman da geçmişleriyle yüzleşmek zorunda kalan güvenilmez anlatıcılar tarafından anlatılır ve buna ek olarak millet ve milliyetçilik olgularına değinir. İki anlatıcı/karakterin yaşamı da milliyetçi kimliklerinin etrafında örülmüştür fakat Ono öğretmen-öğrenci bağlamında daha bireysel bir milliyetçiliği resmederken, *Günden Kalanlar*'ın kahramanı Stevens milliyetçiliği daha evrensel ve ulusal bağlamlarda ortaya koyar.

Bu bölümün amacı Ishiguro'nun *Günden Kalanlar* isimli romanında efsanevi İngiliz kimliğinin kuruluşu, yapıbozumu ve yeniden inşasını incelemektir. Bu bağlamda Lord Darlington ve Stevens'ın milliyetçi kimlikleri birer Thatcher eleştirisi olarak ele alınacak, önce Lord Darlington'ın temsil ettiği efsanevi "İngilizlik" olgusu incelenecek, daha sonrasında kahya Stevens ulusal ve evrensel milliyetçiliği temsil eden bir karakter olarak ele alınacaktır.

Günden Kalanlar, tüm hayatını Darlington Malikanesi'nde efendisine hizmet ederek geçirmiş ama artık yaşlanmakta olan kahya Stevens'ın 1956'da geçen araba gezisini konu alır. Lord Darlington'ın ölümünden sonra malikaneyi satın alan Amerikalı iş adamı Mr. Farraday Stevens'a, kendisi bir iş seyahati için Amerika'da olduğu sırada arabasını alarak kısa bir geziye çıkmasını teklif eder. Stevens bunu evden uzun zaman önce ayrılmış eski bir hizmetçi olan Mrs. Kenton'ı ziyaret etmek ve onunla Darlington Malikanesi'nde çalışmaya dönmesi için konuşmak için bir fırsat olarak görür ve Mr. Farraday'in teklifini kabul eder. Bu yolculuk onun için hem bir seyahat hem de geçmişine doğru zihinsel bir yolculuğa çıkmak için bir fırsat olacaktır.

Etnik ismi ve kökeni dikkate alındığında Ishiguro'nun İngiliz bir kahyanın İkinci Dünya Savaşı öncesine göndermeler yaparak aktardığı seyahatini konu alan böylesi tipik bir roman yazması oldukça şaşırtıcı olarak görülse de evrensel konularla, yani sıradan insanlar, onların günlük yaşamlarındaki durumları ve acılarıyla ilgilenen yazarın tüm insanlığı temsil

eden Stevens'ın milliyetçi kimliği ve milliyetçilik olgusu içinde yaşadığı çelişkileri anlatan bir roman yazması pek de olağan dışı sayılamaz.

Berbereich romanın, İngiltere başbakanı Margaret Thatcher'ın da bir dönem yeniden canlandırmaya çalıştığı efsanevi "İngilizlik" olgusunun bir eleştirisi olduğunu iddia eder. Ishiguro direkt olarak bundan bahsetmese de romanın başlangıç tarihi oldukça dikkat çekicidir. Stevens anlatımına Süveyş Krizi'nin çıktığı tarih olan 1956 yılında başlar. Bu tarih İngiltere tarihi açısından çok önemlidir. Mısır başkanı Nasır İngiltere'yi doğudaki kolonilerine bağlayan Süveyş Kanalı'nı millileştirmek ister. Fakat bu kanal İngiltere için hem politik hem de ekonomik bakımdan hayati değer taşır. Dolayısıyla İngiltere Fransa'yla birlikte kanalın millileştirilmesine karşı çıkar ve kanala bir operasyon düzenler. Operasyon her ne kadar başarılı geçse de Amerika ve Rusya'nın da müdahalesiyle İngiltere kanal üzerindeki etkinliğini kaybeder. Bu emperyal bir ülke olan İngiltere'nin gücüne indirilmiş büyük bir darbedir ve tarihe İngiltere'nin emperyal gücünün düşüşünü simgeleyen önemli bir olay geçer. Margaret Thatcher ise bu olayı esefle hatırlayarak seçim propagandalarında Victoria Dönemi İngiltere'sinin emperyal gücünü hatırlatmaya ve o dönem İngiltere'sini yeniden yaşatmaya olan gerekliliğe vurgu yapar. Thatcher'ın İngiliz halkının hafızasında canlandırmaya çalıştığı "İngilizlik" olgusu, romanda Lord Darlington karakterinde hayat bulur.

Lord Darlington Thatcher'ın desteklediği efsanevi milli İngiliz kimliğini temsil eden oldukça nüfuzlu bir İngiliz lordudur. Birinci Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra gerek Alman arkadaşlarının etkisi gerekse Almanya'ya yaptığı gezilerden edindiği izlenimler sonucunda Almanya'nın yenilgisi sonucu imzalamak zorunda kaldığı Versay Antlaşması'nın yükü altında ezildiği ve onurlu bir İngiliz vatandaşı olarak bunun haksızlık olduğu kanısına varır. Çünkü İngilizler tarihleri boyunca düşmanlarıyla savaşmış fakat yenilen düşmana asla eziyet etmemiştir. Bu yüzden Lord Darlington İngiltere başbakanı Neville Chamberlain'in Hitler'in yayılmacı politikasına ve dolayısıyla Almanya'ya karşı uyguladığı, ülkenin üzerindeki baskıyı hafifleten Yatıştırma Politikası'nın romandaki temsilcisi olarak karşımıza

çıkar. Darlington 1923 yılında evinde düzenlediği bir konferansta Fransız M. Dupont başta olmak üzere çeşitli ülkelerden gelen politikacıları ve temsilcileri etkileyerek Yatıştırma Politikası'nın uygulanmasını kolaylaştırmayı ve onlar aracılığıyla dünya kamuoyunu bu politikaya destek vermeye ikna etmeyi amaçlar. Onun bu tutumu politika ve özellikle de Hitler'in tutumu konusunda oldukça profesyonel davranan Amerikalı senatör Mr. Lewis tarafından sert bir şekilde eleştirilir. Mr. Lewis Lord Darlington'ın onurlu ve dürüst İngiliz kimliğinin gerekliliği olarak Almanya lehine savunduğu görüşleri son derece amatör bulur ve bunun olumlu bir sonuç doğurmayacağı öngörüsünde bulunur ki bu görüşünde de haklı çıkar. Yatıştırma Politikası Almanya'ya faydalı olmaktan ziyade Hitler'in faşist uygulamalarını güçlendirmeye yarar. Bu durum İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın çıkmasıyla son bulur. Lord Darlington ise tüm dünyanın savaşın eşiğine gelmesine sebep olmuş Hitler sempatizanı bir politikacı olarak kınanır ve unutulur gider.

Yatıştırma Politikası'nın uygulanmasında Lord Darlington kadar Thatcher'ın canlandırmaya çalıştığı değerlerin bir başka temsilcisi olan Stevens da önemli bir rol oynar. Kahya Stevens romanda tüm insanlığın temsilcisi "everyman" olarak göze çarpar ve kendisinden beklendiği gibi otoriteye sorgusuz sualsiz itaat eder.

Bunun yanı sıra Stevens İngiliz milliyetçiliğinin ve İngiliz kimliğinin de temsilcisidir. İşini iyi bilen, gerçek kahyaların sadece İngiltere'de var olduğunu çünkü yalnızca İngiliz kahyalarının son derece profesyonel ve mesleklerinin gerektirdiği üzere vakur olabileceğini savunur. Tüm yaşamanı hatta özel yaşamı için ayrılmış olan kendi odasını bile mesleğine uygun olarak oldukça profesyonel bir şekilde dekore edip kullanır.

Stevens Lord Darlington için de hayati önem taşıyan 1923 yılındaki konferansı hayatının ve mesleğinin dönüm noktası olarak görür çünkü bu konferans Stevens'ın mesleğinde tam bir profesyonelliğe en yakın olduğunu hissettiği zamandır. Stevens ne olursa olsun bir kahyanın işine ve efendisine sadık olması ve dışarıdan gelen hiçbir şeyin onun dikkatini dağıtmasına izin

vermemesinin gerekliliğini savunur. Kahya 1923 konferansı sırasında babası ölüm döşeğindeyken bile onun yanında olmak yerine salonda, görevinin başında kalıp konuklarla ilgilenerek inandığı değerlere sadık kalmasının gururunu yaşar ve ancak bu yolla bir kahyanın gerçekten büyük bir kahya olabileceğine inanır.

Stevens kendisi için oldukça önemli bir değer olan yücelik/büyüklük ya da azametin İngiliz kimliği taşımaktan kaynaklandığına inanır. Yolculuğu sırasında İngiltere'ye ve İngiliz topraklarına uzaktan bakma şansını yakalayınca bu topraklara milliyetçi özellikler atfeder. İngiltere'nin ne kadar azametli göründüğünü düşünerek ülke topraklarının İngiliz karakterini yansıttığına inanır. Zaten kendisi de tüm hayatı boyu böyle bir karakter geliştirebilmek ve bu karakteri korumak için uğraşır çünkü sosyal statü atlamayı ve toplumda daha saygın kişilere hizmet etmeyi amaç haline getirmiş bir önceki kuşak kahyaların aksine Stevens, önemli olanın vakur bir şekilde insanlığa hizmet eden efendilere dolayısıyla da tüm insanlığa hizmet etmek olduğunu savunur. Bu yolla Stevens milliyetçi emperyal bir İngiliz kimliği de kazanmış olur çünkü Stevens'ın tüm dünyaya hizmet etmekten kastı, İngiltere'nin emperyalizm bazında benimsediği kendisinden daha geri kalmış ülkeleri daha uygar bir hale getirmek için çalışma misyonunu da benimsemiş olur.

Stevens'ın hem kendisi hem de mesleği konusunda benimsediği fikirler pedagojik öğretilerin sonucudur çünkü Stevens babasının kendisine anlattığı profesyonel ve vakur kahya hikayeleriyle büyür. Dahası kendi anlattığı hikayelerdeki figürleri benimseyen baba Stevens da oğluna örnek teşkil ederken milliyetçi kimlik oluşturmada pedagojik öğretinin kuvvetli etkisini bir kez daha vurgular.

Babasını ve onun öğretilerini baz alan Steven kendi hayatında bu öğretilerin kusursuz uygulayıcısı haline gelir. Mesleğini mükemmel bir şekilde yapabilmek ve vakur bir kahya statüsüne erişebilmek için evin hizmetçilerinden olan Miss Kenton'a olan duygularını asla açığa vurmaz ve

onu sevmesine rağmen ne cinsel ne duygusal olarak hayatına girmesine izin vermez.

Stevens'ın içinde yaşadığı ve inandığı değerler İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın çıkmasıyla yerle bir olur. Savaşın sonunda Stevens'ın tüm dünyası değişir. Lord Darlington'ın ölümüyle artık efendisi Lord Darlington'dan oldukça farklı bir mizaca sahip olan Amerikalı iş adamı Mr. Farraday'dir ve Stevens bu yeni efendiye ve onun temsil ettiği değerlere alışmak zorundadır. Her ne kadar hayal kırıklığına uğradığını ve kendini adadığı değerlere uygun yaşadığı için yaşlılığında tatmin olmaktan çok mutsuz olduğunu kabul etmek istemse de Stevens'ın romanın sonunda artık Mrs. Benn olan Miss. Kenton'la olan buluşması gerçekleri bütün çıplaklığıyla yaşlı kahyanın yüzüne çarpar. Stevens mesleki profesyonellik ve vakar olarak inandığı bütün değerlerin aslında düşündüğü gibi olmadığını geç de olsa kabul eder fakat hayatı boyu savunduğu yanlışlıkların ve yaptığı hataların bile kendi seçimi olmadığının bilincindedir.

Ishiguro birçok röportajında asıl amacının evrensel konulara ve sıradan insan hayatına değinmek olduğunu tekrar eder. Romanlarında insanların benimsedikleri değer ve idealler üzerine kurdukları yaşamları ve bu değer ve idealler teste tabi tutulduğunda yıkılan hayalleriyle yüzleşmek zorunda kalışları üzerinde durduğunu vurgular. Bu durum hem *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı* hem de *Günden Kalanlar* için gereçlidir. Ono tüm hayatını Japon imparatorunun savunduğu yayılmacı politikaya hizmet etmeyi amaçlayan milliyetçi kimliğine uygun yaşamaya adarken Steven da yaşamını insanlığa hizmet ettiğine inandığı efendisine kusursuz bir şekilde hizmet etmeyi amaçlayan gerçek bir İngiliz kahyası olarak geçirmeye adar. Fakat her ikisinin de inandığı ve bütün yaşamlarını üzerine kurduğu değerler İkinci Dünya Savaşı'yla birlikte yerle bir olur ve Ono geçmişiyle barışıp daha pozitif bir tutum sergilemeyi başarırken Stevens geçmiş hatalarının pişmanlığı altında ezilir. Hem *Değişen Dünyada Bir Sanatçı* hem de *Günden Kalanlar* hayatları ve milliyetçi emperyalist kimlikleri pedagojik öğretilerle

şekillenen anlatıcıların değişen milli değerlere ayak uyduramamaları sonucu yaşadıkları hayal kırklıklarıyla sonuçlanır.

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : DOĞRU BAKAR
Adı : HİLAL
Bölümü : İNGİLİZ EDEBİYATI

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : CONSTRUCTION AND DECONSTRUCTION OF THE NATION AND NATIONALITY IN KAZUO ISHIGURO'S *AN ARTIST OF THE FLOATING WORLD* AND *THE REMAINS OF THE DAY*

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ■ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın. ☐
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ☐
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) ■

Yazarın imzası ..... Tarih .....