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**Abstract**

This thesis is based on an archival study of Barry Hines’s unpublished or ‘lost’ works. Hines donated his archive to the University of Sheffield’s Special Collections in November 2008, shortly after being diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease. Like the author’s career, the material donated by Hines is extensive and varied. The Hines Papers contain television, film and play scripts; manuscripts; draft; proofs; research material; reviews and newspaper articles; photographs; and personal correspondence. In 2015, the School of English invited candidates to apply for PhD studentship entitled: “The Lost Works of Barry Hines – An Archival Study”. I was very fortunate to be awarded the opportunity to research Hines’s lost works. Hence, this thesis stems from the initial considerations outlined in the studentship which stated that the research should be based on the contextual and critical analysis of ten screenplays and prose works which have remained unperformed and unpublished.

Drawing on my interest in gender, and in particular, constructs of masculinity in literature, my approach to the archive offers a reading of the ever-changing landscape of masculinity, principally, working-class masculine narratives across five decades. Taking into consideration the outline of the studentship, and owing to the breadth of artefacts contained within the Hines Papers, this thesis narrowed its focus and concentrates on the analysis of the representation of unspeakable masculinity in Hines’s unpublished works. Hines is known for voicing the struggles of South Yorkshire working-class life. Yet, the material found in the archive reveals that some working-class masculine narratives were not permitted to give voice to the author’s perception of working-class society, while others took precedence and were allowed into the public arena. This thesis undertakes to question why some masculine narratives were thought to be fit for public consumption and why others have remained submerged and dormant within the archive.
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**Introduction**

This introduction outlines the structure of the thesis. First, it explores Barry Hines’s writing career from its opening to its close, drawing on material held in the University of Sheffield’s Special Collections. Within the Hines Papers are: television, drama, and film scripts; novels; draft manuscripts; proofs; programmes; reviews and cuttings; private correspondence; and photographs. The second section of the introduction explores Hines’s unpublished works which are also held in Special Collections. The third section of the introduction deals with the question of how to articulate the differing concepts of “lost” when investigating the contents of the Hines Papers. It also provides a reasoning of how unspeakable masculinities function within in the texts analysed within the thesis. The fourth section details a brief discussion of why this thesis has elected to concentrate on Hines’s representation of masculinity in both his published and unpublished texts. Lastly, the introduction breaks down how each chapter of the thesis will investigate the properties and functions of the masculine narratives discussed here.

This introduction begins by tracing the origins of Barry Hines, and gives a brief overview of the trajectory of his writing career. This may seem unnecessary owing to Hines’s popularity and familiarity in the public’s cultural memory, especially in the Yorkshire area; and notably, since the author’s death in 2016, which has prompted a revival of interest in his body of work. Yet, the popular image of Hines has been linked with and is reliant on his connection to the film *Kes* (1969). On a personal note, when people ask me what my research is about, I usually state that I am researching the works of Barry Hines. Most reply: “What? Do you mean, *Kes*?” I then go on to explain that Hines wrote other texts as well as *Kes*, and then I complicate matters by adding that I am working on his “lost” works. From this anecdote it can be gleaned that writing *A Kestrel for a Knave* and the adaptation of the film, *Kes*, had an enormous impact on Hines as an author. Yet, this study does not deny that *A Kestrel for A Knave* deserves its status, and it acknowledges the novel’s importance in the canon of northern, working-class literature. However, the ethos of this thesis is to look beyond Hines’s most renowned text, and to develop a field of study which takes into consideration the author’s body of work as a whole.

**Barry Hines and his Published Works**

Barry Hines was born in Hoyland Common, near Barnsley in 1939, at that time a mining village. Hines’s father and grandfather were both miners. Mining, and the politics of the coal industry, would be a subject that Hines would regularly return to during a creative career which spanned over forty years. His childhood was a happy one – in a Hoggartian sense, it was typically northern and working-class. Hines grew up at a time when a two-tiered education system was in place, and while his younger brother, Richard, failed his 11-plus exam, Hines passed his in 1950, and was enrolled at Ecclesfield Grammar School, on the outskirts of Sheffield. Like many working- class writers, Hines found that his time at grammar school had a polarising effect on his adolescence. During his time at school, Hines underwent a form of social isolation brought about because he attended a different school from his friends who had not passed their 11-plus. As the author observed himself in an interview he gave to the *Telegraph Magazine* in 1998, those who went to grammar school in his community were branded as “snobs” – “even though they’d been to the same primary school and they might live a few doors away”.[[1]](#footnote-2) In the collection of previously unpublished writing, *This Artistic Life* (2009), in his essay, “Fiction in the Classroom”, Hines admits that the only subjects he was interested in at school were “games and physical education.”[[2]](#footnote-3) Unlike his first masculine protagonist, Lennie Hawk, from *The Blinder* (1966), Hines was not torn between academic success and the lure of footballing fame: first and foremost, Hines was a sportsman.

Hines was obviously bright, but he did not appear to be academically inclined. At school, he felt that he “never fitted in”[[3]](#footnote-4) and he did not thrive in the grammar school environment. After five years of study, he left at the age of sixteen and rather than joining his father and grandfather as colliers, he started training as an apprentice mining surveyor. Yet, as Mark Hodkinson, states: “He was regularly admonished by the miners in the mines he inspected, ““for not using his brains’”.[[4]](#footnote-5) Hines was eventually persuaded to return to school. Whilst at sixth form, he successfully completed his A-Levels in history, economics, and geography, and matriculated to Loughborough Training College to study Physical Education.[[5]](#footnote-6)

One of the first books he claims to have read while at college was George Orwell’s *Animal Farm* (1945). Orwell’s classic Marxist fable was a perfect choice for the working-class student. The novel’s political allegory captivated Hines, who went on to read Th*e Road to Wigan Pier* (1937) shortly after.[[6]](#footnote-7) Yet, it was another writer who would capture his imagination and prompt Hines to pick up the pen himself: Ernest Hemingway. As Hines told journalist John Hall in 1970: “I’d never heard of Ernest Hemingway, but when I read his stories I realised there was something special about this simple style.”[[7]](#footnote-8) For Hines, Hemingway’s style had clarity and was unpretentious yet, as he explained to John Hall, there was something “underneath it.”[[8]](#footnote-9) Hines was therefore evolving an attentiveness to the craft of writing, and his first attempt at an extended piece of creative writing took the form of a dissertation. Rather than writing the “usual thesis” based on “esoteric subjects such as role of the intercostal muscles in weightlifting”,[[9]](#footnote-10) he instead wrote it in the form of a novella, which he entitled “Flight of the Hawk”.

Hines graduated and started his life as a physical education teacher in London. Eventually, he returned home to Barnsley in 1963, to work as a teacher, and began to write in his “spare time”. This would be a frenetic period for Hines, teaching in the day-time, while writing in his spare time. In this early stage of his career, he concentrated on two writing projects: *Billy’s Last Stand*, a radio play, and *The Blinder*, a novel, both analysed in this thesis. He was discovered by Alfred Bradley from BBC Northern Region, who worked on *Northern Drift* which “provided an outlet for poems, songs and stories”, written by aspiring northern writers. *Northern Drift* aired on Sunday 25th October, 1964.[[10]](#footnote-11) Bradley also produced the radio play for the BBC’s Third Programme and it was aired in February, 1965. In the middle of 1965, a fellow writer and Hines’s mentor, Stan Barstow, along with Bradley, encouraged the publisher, Michael Joseph, to read the manuscript for *The Blinder*, and it waspublished in 1966. This set in motion the long relationship between the author and Michael Joseph, who would go on to publish all of Hines’s work until he stopped writing after being diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease in 2007.

Alfred Bradley played a pivotal role in developing Hines’s writing career. As David Forrest and Sue Vice suggest: “following the broadcast [of *Billy’s Last Stand*], the play’s producer, Alfred Bradley, persuaded the BBC’s Northern Region to award the 25-year-old Hines a bursary to develop his writing, giving him the time and space to write *A Kestrel for a Knave*.”[[11]](#footnote-12) This award would prove the catalyst which ignited Hines’s career. It should be noted that Hines was still working as a teacher in Barnsley at the time of writing *A Kestrel for a Knave*. Because of the bursary from the BBC Hines was able to take a break from teaching and to retreat to the island of Elba with the intention of finishing his second novel.

*A Kestrel for a Knave* was completed and published in 1968. Yet, both the author and the publisher were unsure as to how the novel would be received by critics or the general public. The novel’s initial success has since been eclipsed by its cinematic sibling - the film adaptation of the novel, *Kes* (1969). However, as Hines observes in the afterword to the Penguin Classics edition (2000), “The film *Kes* was a great success and it helped to popularize the novel […].”[[12]](#footnote-13) Shortly after publishing *The Blinder*, and in the wake of the success of *Billy’s Last Stand* on BBC radio, Hines met another television producer, Tony Garnett, who had previously produced the seminal BBC television drama, *Cathy Come Home* (1966), directed by Ken Loach. He was prompted to meet Hines by Alfred Bradley. Garnett, who was also working-class, and politically motivated, was taken with the young writer’s work and asked him to write a play for television. Hines was “positive”[[13]](#footnote-14) about the offer being made by Garnett, yet he declined it, stating that he had got a “book going round” in his head, and that he had “to write it.”[[14]](#footnote-15) Garnett responded by asking the young writer if he and Ken Loach could look at the manuscript when it was completed. By July 1967, Barry Hines had signed over the film rights of his as yet unpublished novel to Tony Garnett and Ken Loach’s newly founded production company, Kestrel Films. While Garnett had initially asked Hines to write a play for television, after reading the manuscript, he decided that *A Kestrel for a Knave* should be “made for cinema.”[[15]](#footnote-16) Hines went on to write the screenplay for the film, and also made production decisions, alongside Garnett and Loach, such as casting the actors for the film from the local area. This would be the start of a rewarding collaboration between producer, director and writer.

The 1970s saw the ascension of the author’s writing career. Hines had already adapted his radio play *Billy’s Last Stand* for the stage, and later for the small screen. During his interview with John Hall in 1970, Hines revealed that he was developing a new novel; this would be published as *First Signs* in 1972. *First Signs* is possibly the least known of all Hines’s novels. After the publication of this, his third novel, Hines decided to leave teaching at secondary school and was appointed at the University of Sheffield as a fellow of creative writing in 1972. Hines returned to the subject of comprehensive education on which he had focused in his previous text, *A Kestrel for a Knave*, in *Speech Day*, a television play broadcast as part of the BBC’s Play for Today strand, on 23rd March, 1973. Though the drama was written for an adult audience, it was revived in October 1977 when it was broadcast for the “newly launched English Programme for Schools.”[[16]](#footnote-17) Shortly before Hines started writing his fourth novel, he left his position at the University of Sheffield. The publication of *The Gamekeeper* followed soon after in 1975. This book is a study of the working year of the eponymous gamekeeper, George Purse. After the novel’s publication, Hines yet again went on to collaborate with director Ken Loach on the drama *The Price of Coal* (1977)*,* a two-act television play, for the BBC’s ‘Play for Today’ strand. Hines proceeded to adapt the screenplay into a novel which was published towards the end of the decade in 1979. A year later, *The Gamekeeper* was adapted for the small screen, and was broadcast on ITV.[[17]](#footnote-18)

The 1980s saw Hines mature as a writer, yet he revisited the concerns that had punctuated the narrative of *A Kestrel for a Knave*. Like *The Price of Coal*, *Looks and Smiles* was written in novelistic form after the screenplay, and published the year before it appeared on television in May 1982. Hines’s screenplay is a coming of age narrative which elucidates the plight of school leavers in the wake of mass unemployment of the early 1980s. Two years after the completion of *Looks and Smiles*, Hines returned to a subject which was of great interest to him: education. Hines had worked at both the University of Sheffield and Sheffield Hallam University as a creative writing lecturer, and it would be these intellectual environments which would go on to inspire the author to write his seventh novel, *Unfinished* *Business* (1983). This book concentrates on the academic achievements of Lucy, a wife and mother who enrols at a university in Sheffield. Hines’s seventh novel is also studied in this thesis. Family and the destruction of family life would also form the basis of his next work, an artistic venture would go on to become as notable as his most famous text, *A Kestrel for a Knave*. The television drama *Threads* (1984), would prove to be a pivotal text for Hines. The plot follows the plight of two families in Sheffield, the Kemps, a working-class family, and the Becketts, a middle-class family, during a nuclear blast and its after-effects.

After what seemed to be a fallow period following the critical acclaim of *Threads*, Hines’s footballing drama, *Shooting Stars*, marked the start of the author’s reintroduction into commercial television. The television play was broadcast on Channel Four, on 17 May, 1990. Two years later, another football-centred television play, *Born Kicking*, directed by Mandie Fletcher, aired on BBC television on 20September 1992. Echoing the narrative schema of Hines’s first published novel, *The Blinder*, this later script, by contrast, centres on a young woman, Roxanne, who is both an excellent footballer and academically gifted. After another two-year gap, Hines published his penultimate novel, *The Heart of It*, in 1994. The novel’s plot was seeded during the Miners’ Strike of 1984 to 1985. Hines frames his plot by casting his protagonist, Cal Rickards, in the role of a returning native.[[18]](#footnote-19) The narrative is set a few years after the strike (no exact date is given in the text), and this gives Hines the freedom of expression to detail the impact de-industrialisation has had on the community which is represented in the book. Hines carried on this theme in his final novel, *Elvis over England*, which was published four years after *The Heart of It*, in 1998. *Elvis over England* has a multi-stranded, complex plot. Following the pattern of a “road” or “journey” narrative, the text relays the journey of a steel-worker who has been made redundant, to Prestwick airport in Ayrshire, Scotland, so that he can visit the place where Elvis Presley stopped over while journeying to Germany.

**The Archive and Hines’s “Lost” Works**

The author donated the Hines Papers to the University of Sheffield’s Special Collections in November, 2008, shortly after he was diagnosed with Alzheimer’s disease. Such is the extent of the collection that it could be construed that the author had been gathering together and retaining his research materials from an early point in his writing career, possibly when he started working at the University of Sheffield in the early 1970s. The material held in the archive for Hines’s first novel, *The Blinder*, for instance, only comprises the author’s university dissertation entitled “The Flight of the Hawk” and a few pieces of correspondence, including a letter from Stan Barstow. By contrast, the materials connected to his last novel, *Elvis over England*, are diverse and multiple. Naturally, the unpublished texts in the archive contain Hinesian themes and interests, such as coal mining and the relationship between humans and animals. One such thematically recognisable text is *Last Shift*, which can be found in a file of “Other Scripts”, a draft script which details the retirement of pit ponies working in a South Yorkshire colliery. *Tom Kite*, an unpublished novel, and *Springfield/Springwood Stars*, a film synopsis, both concern football. *Looking at the Sun*, an unperformed radio play, and *Private Fears*, an unproduced film script, like *The Price of Coal*, have an industrial accident as the nucleus of their plot, but rather than concentrating on the coal industry, they focus on nuclear energy production. In contrast, another script found in the file entitled, “Other Scripts”, is the proposed television play, *Promise.* It centres on a mother and daughter who are waiting for their landlord to call and collect the rent money. The script differs thematically from Hines’s other texts since it deals in what could seem to be an anachronistic manner with the intersection between disability and sexuality. The script is catalogued as being written in the early 1970s, although its style has a generic similarity to texts from the British New Wave period. *Promise*’s disabled male figure, Mr Price, has a complex masculine representation which has been coded by the author to be opaquely queer. Mr Price’s masculine narrative is unique among Hines’s body of work. Thus, *Promise* is an important text because it open lines of enquiry about why the text was never produced for public consumption in the 1970s, or indeed, why Hines would never develop a text about disability again during his career.

The archive also contains a collection of scripts which have been described as Hines’s lost “Miners’ Strike Plays”. Hines visited many picket lines during the strike of 1984 to 1985 and documented the actions of both the police force and the striking miners. Hines tried to reimagine the atmosphere of the industrial disruption, as well as the animosity felt by those miners involved in the strike towards the Conservative government in the first of these scripts, *After the Strike*, which was written shortly after the strike ended, in 1985. Although Hines’s apocalyptic drama *Threads* had aired on BBC One a year earlier, it was followed by a “fallow” period in Hines’s writing career. This can be explained when looking at the chronology of the strike plays. Hines was working on the scripts during a five-year period, none of which was ever produced. There are, however, two versions of *After the Strike*, which focus on a representation of the Battle of Orgreave and how Eddie, a striking miner, and his family deal with and come to terms with the consequences of the strike. The second version of *After the Strike* differs slightly from the first version, as it ends with the death of a young miner, Scott, who dies while coal picking. The date of the screenplay *Slate* is contested, since the archive defines it as being written in 1990s; however, on further investigation, Hines seems to have written the screenplay in 1987. *Slate* is based on a historical industrial dispute which took place in a slate quarry in Bethesda in Wales in the early 1900s. In this text Hines transforms his miners’ strike themes and places them in the context of a different occurrence. *The Diggers* was written ten years after the miners’ strike, and, as he did with *After the* *Strike*, Hines wrote two versions of the screenplay. The two screenplays similarly deal with the traumatic events of the Battle of Orgreave, but in this case, Hines’ narrative focuses on the relationship between the members of the eponymous pop group, The Diggers. The band contains two miners and the story of the strike is filtered through their experiences on the picket line. The story also echoes a returning native narrative as band member Matthew returns home after becoming an international star. The phrase “returning native” originated in Ian Haywood’s book, *Working Class Fiction*: *from Chartism to Trainspotting*. This motif gives Hines the opportunity to recall events of the strike from a retrospective viewpoint. There are also foreshadows of *The Heart of It’*s plot as Matthew discovers that he has a daughter that he had never met – the novel’s protagonist, Cal Rickards, is given the opportunity to contact his daughter Rebecca because he has returned home to see his family.

**The Purpose of the Thesis and Determining the Meaning of “Lost”**

The function of this thesis is to examine the “lost” masculine narratives found within Barry Hines’s archive, with a view to explaining why they were never published, broadcast or performed. As mentioned above, there were periods when it appeared that the author was not writing. However, as the archive reveals, in these “unproductive” phases Hines was indeed writing industriously. The archive allows us to witness how the lost texts were turned down by his publisher, Michael Joseph. One such text, *Springfield/Springwood Stars*, was extensively reworked by Hines yet it was never published. It would seem that from reading the correspondence held along with draft manuscript, that there were several issues in terms of the manuscript’s genre and contents.[[19]](#footnote-20) Also, the archive reveals how film and television producers and directors were instrumental in certain scripts being left unperformed. For example, *Slate* was rejected by Channel Four. A note attached to this material states rather enigmatically in Eleanor Hines’s handwriting that there was, “Trouble with the Welsh TV mafia”[[20]](#footnote-21) during *Slate’*s development and it was never made. Because *Slate* was such a dramatic departure for Hines, who had never written a historical screenplay before, there might have been a possibility that the producers of the drama were reluctant to film the drama. The archive also highlights how lost narratives were rejected by the author himself. For instance, the story of Jack, Eddie Brooks’ stepfather in a preliminary narrative, was changed by the author while *Elvis Over England* was being written. The thesis asks whether the lost status of a masculine narrative relates to an editorial strategy of omitting material; the impact of the political climate at the time of composition; lack of interest from Hines’s publishers or whether Hines’s depiction of the masculine figure itself forged a lack of interest in the subject. It is therefore important to define the meaning of “lost” in the three texts placed under scrutiny in this thesis: *Promise*, *Elvis over England*, and *Billy’s Last Stand*.

“Lost” may appear to be a simple term in relation to an archival study which endeavours to examine new material. However, in Hines’s archive the lost masculine narratives are in differing states of presence and absence. One type of lost state may be due the omission from the finalised text. Alternatively, the text could have been rejected altogether by artistic forces such as film makers, or editors, so the text was never heard or seen by an audience. Or, a manuscript may have part of the masculine narrative crossed out and written over and/or re-written. Because of this thesis’s argument it is important to outline where the lost masculine narratives were found among the archival material and what state they exist in within this material. For instance, one type of lost masculine narrative can be found in the file marked “Other Scripts”. The lost masculine narrative found in *Promise* belongs to Hines’s disabled landlord, Mr Price. *Promise*’s provenance cannot be determined; the only information given by the archive about the script is that it was written for television in the 1970s. Moreover, there is no correspondence or other documentation attached to the text, and it was never discussed in any of interviews given by the author. It may also appear as being lost because thematically it is anachronistic in nature and for modern audiences its narrative may be thought to be distasteful. However, this script and the masculine narrative detailed within it is lost because the script was never put into production by any television companies and was left unperformed.

A different “lost” masculine narrative can be unearthed in the drafts of a published text, Hines’s last published novel, *Elvis over England*. This masculine narrative can be found among the author’s preliminary research for this novel. Written in note form and incorporated into a rough hand-written draft, Hines transcribed a masculine narrative from a secondary source called *Welcome Home* which he used when researching *Elvis over England*. The narrative transcribed focused on a prisoner of war held in Germany, yet it does not feature at all in the final version of the novel. Thus, this narrative is lost because the author chose to replace it with another version of a masculine story which focuses on a soldier who took part in the Burma campaign during the Second World War.

Another lost masculine narrative can be found in the omitted material from the radio script, *Billy’s Last Stand*. This drama was adapted for stage and television by the author after it aired on radio in 1965. The original text, however, contains a large section of exposition which divulges the background of both its principal characters, Billy and Darkly. This contextual material was not included in the script as broadcast in 1965, or in the future texts that were developed for stage and television. This omitted material, which was in this case removed by the author himself, alters the tone of the piece and dilutes the surreal properties of the masculine characters found in the play.

**Why Masculinity?**

Four years ago I wrote a thesis proposal for a scholarship entitled “The Barry Hines Studentship Award” which focused on the author’s lost works. In my proposal I stated that there were two facts which I thought were key to understanding my interest in the representations of masculinity held within Hines’s published works. The first was that Hines’s male characters were all northern, working-class and straight. Thus the archive provided a very specific sample of literary masculine types. I additionally stated that, owing to the length of Hines’s writing career, the archive contains a “time capsule of masculinity”. Therefore, the masculinities confined within the documentation were time specific.

Most readers of Hines’s work would associate him with a persistent focus on working-class life and a specific interest in the mining community. Moreover, as critics such as David Craig argue, Hines’s political purpose was “a matter of being loyal to a class”, and he saw it “as political work to present the dilemmas and qualities of the underprivileged.”[[21]](#footnote-22) As Craig observes, Hines’s works have a political intent and most of masculine figures in his works act as platforms for his political leanings. But, as Susan Bardo observes: “actual men are not timeless symbolic constructs, they are biologically, historically and experientially, embodied beings”.[[22]](#footnote-23) As Bordo claims, Hines’s masculine narratives are mutable, they adapt and transform over time along with the changing nature of British working-class society. In studying Hines’s entire corpus from its infancy to its close, it is possible to trace a trajectory of the construction or the representation of masculinity in Hines’s works; and how this representation had recalibrated and transformed. However, what must be taken into consideration is that Hines’s published masculine narratives were thought to be palatable and fit for consumer consumption. The lost masculine narratives by being held in an archive are both “hidden” and on “display”, thus they exist in a sort of literary limbo.

**What Men Are: The Function of Masculinity in Hines’s Published Works**

The thesis starts with a chapter that explores Hines’s “typical” masculine narratives (a breakdown of the chapters contained within the thesis follows this section). In comparing the published masculine narratives or Hines’s typical masculine representations, with those that are found in the lost works, the published works reflect quintessentially heteronormative working-class masculine attitudes and desires. In both his novels and performed works, Hines explicitly echoes prescribed gender scripts from which he builds his plot lines. Hines’s typical masculine types are tonally acceptable and non-threatening and their benign representation permits them to become products that are fit to be consumed by his readers. His published masculine narratives are fundamentally recognisable types such as: fathers, sons, brothers, lovers, workers (miners, game keepers and teachers, for example), soldiers, schoolboys, classmates and sporting teammates. Fathers in Hines’s published works, for instance, are bread winners who work or have worked in industrial settings such as mines or in the steel industry. They, for the most part, tend to be taciturn, non-tactile, stoic, and almost emotionally stunted. Yet, they are always charged with a strong moral outlook and a sense of themselves as being a patriarchal entity. These traits paint a picture of the recognisable symbol of noble working-class masculine figures who work tirelessly to provide for their family. The author would place the family at the nucleus of narrative in works such as *First Signs*, *Threads* and *The Heart of It,* to name a but a few*.* For example, the author’s first novel, *The Blinder* (1966), centres on the relationship between a father (Mr Hawk), a mother (Mrs Hawk), and their son (Lennie). They are a working-class family living in a non-disclosed small town in the North. The father’s role in the family is that of patriarch and provider, while the mother’s is also straightforward since she provides domiciliary care in the private sphere. She, like most of Hines’s mothers, never ventures far from the domestic setting contained within the novel. This triptych narrative model places a lens on the tensions that arise in the family dynamic when the parents have polarised aspirations for their son. However, Hines also disrupts this representation of the working-class family by situating Mr Hawk in an industrial dispute which leads to him not being able to support his family. Lennie, therefore becomes the breadwinner. This focus on the shift in patriarchal function catalyses a disruption in the status-quo of the family and causes the breakdown of Mr Hawk’s masculine identity. However, even though Mr Hawk’s crisis prompts a brief bout of domestic violence, although shocking by modern standards, this does not detract from the perception of normative masculine traits within this narrative. As a result, Hines ostensibly portrays Mr Hawk as the victim of the strike owing to his loss of identity as a provider. Similarly, Jud, the brutish elder brother of Billy Casper in *A* *Kestrel for a Knave*, is also cast as having violent tendencies. However, unlike Mr Hawk, his violence towards Billy is sustained throughout the novel. By representing Jud in this way, the author constructs him as being a hyper-masculinised version of the working-class young man. Jud is also the breadwinner in this family alongside his mother. His violence also correlates with his appetite for sex which appears to be voracious. Hines’s depiction of this type of masculine figure’s behaviour is unsympathetic and bolsters sympathy for Billy Casper. Billy Casper’s masculine construction is the polar opposite to that of his brother Jud, as his devotion to his kestrel, Kes, displays his leaning to a more nurturing, feminine sensibility. Billy’s fluid narrative in *A Kestrel for a Knave* emphasises that the author already had an interest in a broader spectrum of masculine identities. In this thesis, I will explore Hines’s typical and non-typical masculinities, but I will pay particular attention the unconventional or unspeakable masculine figures found in Hines’s archive.

**Men Behaving Badly – The Purpose of Unspeakable Masculinity in Hines’s Lost Texts**

**Queer Types**

Discussed in chapters two and four of this thesis are two of Hines’s lost texts: *Billy’s Last Stand* and *Promise*. Whereas in his published works Hines’s masculine narratives are seemingly heterosexual, what sets apart the masculine narratives in these two texts is that they represent queer types. Chapter two, “Discovering the Mutability of the Outcast in *Billy’s Last Stand*”, analyses the omitted material connected to this text. This material reveals that Hines censored the script himself and removed a large section of text from third act of the play. In the censored material Darkly, one of the two characters in the script, is cast as being both a virgin (because he has never slept with a woman whereas Billy has) and metaphorically sleeping with his mother because he cannot “cut the apron strings” (thus indicating that he is a mummy’s boy). In relation to describing this antithetical construction of Darkly’s sexual nature as unspeakable, the author implies, in this unusual fashion, that his character is symbolically emasculated and therefore, a non-masculine type or queer. What this representation of Darkly’s masculinity adds to the narrative is a sense not only of unease, but of deviance or of wrong-doing. It could be argued, that symbolically his representation is a threat to Billy’s virtue as masculine type and this is why Hines omitted this part of the narrative from the text itself. Essentially however, Hines forms Darkly as a miscreant outcast: one who lies beyond the realms of normative masculine depiction because of his sexuality or lack of it is unspeakable in the sense that it could not be represented at the time the play aired on radio.

Chapter four in the thesis scrutinises the representation of Mr Price, one of the main characters in the television drama, *Promise*. Notably, both *Billy’s Last Stand* and *Promise* were written in the first ten years of Hines’s writing career. This way of writing masculine narratives would not be seen again in Hines’s later works. Mr Price, like Darkly, is also emasculated. Yet the author does this visually by fashioning him with a stiff leg owing to his contracting polio when he was a child. However, Hines also strongly points toward Mr Price being both homosexual and, in contrast, as being heterosexual and predatory. This is because he preys on female tenants who do not have the means to pay their rent to him. Again, like Darkly, this illustration of Price’s sexuality is a polarised one. Evidently, for Hines, writing characterisation in this manner allowed him licence to generate not only a sense of unease within text, as in the case of Darkly, but again to use the notion of deviance as a symbolic tool, if what might seem a somewhat blunt one. This perception that the character’s sexual nature is not spoken but is symbolically rendered allows Hines the liberty to provide Darkly and Mr Price with the power to cause dramatic tension through repulsion.

**(Un)militarised Types**

Altogether different from Darkly and Mr Price is the representation of Jack Brookes in the draft material for *Elvis over England* (discussed in chapter three), because Hines casts him as soldier, who sacrificed much for his country. Jack is therefore fashioned by Hines to express manly qualities such as valour, stoicism and chivalry. From reading Hines’s research material for the novel alongside the novel itself, and material found in the archive connected to other writing projects, it is apparent that the author was very much taken with the potential of a narrative which would underscore the sacrifices men faced when fighting for their country. Moreover, the research notes for *Elvis over England* divulge that Hines wished to place Jack in a concentrationary setting from the outset, thus de-militarising him rather than characterizing him as a militarised masculine figure. In tracing the trajectory of Jack’s characterization, we can plot how the facets of his masculine identity and his function changed in the text or were discarded by Hines during the course of his research. Initially, Jack’s narrative involved his being captured and imprisoned in Europe. Later research notes, however, reveal that he was to be captured and imprisoned by the Japanese, in Burma. Yet, these narratives never appeared in the published novel. Moreover, there are no written notes by Hines in the archive which provide details of why he changed his mind and did not include this narrative in the final novel. However, one explanation can be put forward. I argue (and as the chapter elucidates) that it is probable that the emotional weight of delineating a realistic interpretation of such traumatic events would have overburdened Jack’s narrative potential. Thus, Hines discarded his prisoner-of-war and replaced it with one that could emphasise his political viewpoint without obstruction.

For the purpose of this analysis I have categorised the lost masculine figures found in the Hines’s archive under the classification of the “unspeakable”. I have chosen this term in light of Julia Kristeva’s essay on the expression of language in *The Semiotic and the Symbolic* and her theory of the abject in *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection.* For Julia Kristeva, the artistic impulse, the semiotic, is based upon fracturing the structural, rule bound practices by way of the articulation of the “unspoken experience”.[[23]](#footnote-24) As Anne-Marie Smith explains, the semiotic is the way that, “poets and artists strive to express in their attacks against and modification of traditional forms”[[24]](#footnote-25) and reveal unmentionable truths. The text is a “speaking” object which conforms to the social order, yet, Hines’s rendering of unspeakable masculine forms shows the impulse to reveal subjects which have to be suppressed. Thus, they cannot be articulated or shown. The unspeakable nature of the masculinities discussed in this thesis are manifested by the author by the means of symbolism, suggestion, projection from other characters, subtextually or are only enacted and are never discussed openly in dialogue, while, some were written and then discarded owing to editing decisions. Therefore, the unspeakable takes many forms. Invariably, the term “unspeakable” articulates the experiences of trauma. However, for the objectives of this study, it delineates the contrast between Hines’s published masculine types whose function it was to promote a seemingly normative perspective on masculinity and those masculine narratives which did not make their way in the public realm and were forced to remain silent. Thus, certain editing decisions removed taboo tropes such as homosexuality and incest. Other texts containing unspeakable masculine narratives were rejected or never considered for publication because they may have been thought to be unsuitable for Hines’s readers and did not fall into line with a Hinesian ethos. Or the author himself made the decision to reject masculine narratives because they were not able to manifest his political discourse within the text itself.

Therefore, the concept of “unspeakability” analysed in this thesis is used in relation to the material that was edited out of Hines’s works, or went unpublished, on the basis that it was socially or culturally unutterable at the time of writing.

**Finding “Lost” Masculine Narratives in The Hines Papers**

What follows is a description of how each chapter will discuss the topic concerned:

**Chapter One**

**Reading Typical Men in Hines’s Novels: Origin, Motivation, Desire**

The first chapter of the thesis explores Hines’s published novels so that it can define narrative types. It uses a case study approach and focuses on a fictive masculine type from each decade of Hines’s career. The chapter starts by looking at Lennie Hawk from Hines’s first novel, *The Blinder*, published in 1966, and discusses his construction as an “Anxious Adolescent”. It then moves on to the 1970s and explores the representation of the “Family Man” in *The Gamekeeper* (1975). Next, the chapter considers the nature of “The New Man” in Hines’s novel, *Unfinished Business*, published in 1983. Last, the chapter focuses on Hines’s interpretation of the “Returning Native” in his penultimate novel, *The Heart of It* (1994). So that the chapter can define “typicality”, each case study explores the origin of the text discussed; Hines’s motivation for writing the text; and how desire is used as a dramatic convention in the text.

**Chapter Two**

**Discovering the Mutability of the Outcast in *Billy’s Last Stand***

This chapter concentrates on the typescript for *Billy’s Last Stand* designated BLS3 in the Hines Papers. The typescript BLS3 shows Hines’s own alterations and omissions to the script. The chapter questions if the omissions alter the construction of the central characters Billy and Darkly and if this transformation alters the spectator’s perception of their dramatized masculine narratives. I argue that in the performed play the intersection of masculinity and the performance of social crisis allows a particular construct of the masculine other to be witnessed by the spectator. With this in mind, I argue that the crisis generated by the arrival of Stark, a rival worker, further disturbs and destabilises Billy’s identity, rendering him as the dehumanised and docile other. Hines’s thematic and tonal approach to writing Billy’s and Darkly’s negotiation of crisis illustrates that in casting Darkly as the sinister stranger, a different mode of otherness is available to him – that of the uncanny. In the final section of this chapter I analyse Hines’s omissions alongside Julia Kristeva’s theory of the abject. I argue that if the missing material had remained in Hines’s script, Darkly would have been perceived as an abject masculine subject and not, as he appears in the final version, as a dramatized figure of the uncanny.

**Chapter Three**

**Liberating the Prisoner of War in *Elvis over England***

Hines’s last novel, *Elvis over England,* was published 1998. The material related to *Elvis over* *England* held within the Hines Papers is extensive, and includes Hines’s notes and notebooks; proofs; a typescript; two draft manuscripts; correspondence relating to the novel; reviews of the novel; and a copy of novel itself. The novel details a road journey taken by its protagonist, Eddie Brooks. However, this chapter focuses on Eddie’s confrontation with past events. The archive shows that at the beginning of the novel’s development Hines had a great interest in incorporating the trope of the prisoner of war within the text, although this masculine narrative only exists in its full form in the drafts and research material. In the chapter I explore why Hines may have refrained from using much of the research material he collected concerning the prisoners held in Burma in World War II in relation to *Elvis over England*. I argue that Hines omitted Jack’s initial masculine narrative because of the fear of altering the political message that was to be contained within the text.

**Chapter Four**

**Articulating the “Limping Man” in the Lost Television Drama *Promise***

In this chapter I question the significance of the limping man within Hines’s unperformed screenplay *Promise*. Price is first emasculated, then he is queered by Hines and finally depicted as a sexual predator. I ask in what ways this depiction of Price’s conflicted sexuality is significant when considering disabled masculinity in a post-war society. I then trace Price’s masculine construction by way of the polarised points of view of Karen and Karen’s mother, Freda, the only female characters in the drama, asking if we perceive Price’s sexuality in a generational sense, and whether it is significant that this polarised account comes from two female characters.

The conclusion will discuss and summarise the nature of the masculine narrative found within lost works. It will also explore the author’s sustained literary interests, recurring themes and motifs in both published and unpublished texts. It will then turn to a brief exploration of other lost texts; and other lost male figures found in Hines’s oeuvre. To finish, the conclusion will review the role of the archive in this analysis and the archive’s ongoing development.

**Chapter One**

**Reading “Typical Men” in the Novels of Barry Hines: Origin, Motivation, Desire**

**Introduction**

So that this thesis may evaluate the “lost” masculine narratives held in the Hines Papers, we must first determine why other masculine identities could “speak” and were able to give voice to Hines’s commentary on the struggles of working class life. The masculine narratives found in Hines’s lost works lay dormant and unheard, while the men in the author’s published narratives have remained, for the most part, in the public imagination. The moded of masculinities discussed in this first chapter are recognisable textual types, and some have been used by other writers as well as Hines. For example, the “Returning Native” is the focus of Raymond Williams’s novel, *Border Country* (1960) and *Pasmore* by David Storey (1972). I argue that these masculine types reflect specific phases in Hines’s writing career. Moreover, some of them echo Hines’s own biography. Notably, the typical men found in the author’s oeuvre are not as sexually complex as Hines’s lost masculine figures, and they do appear to have a normative view of themselves as a masculine self. With that in mind, some of Hines’s male characters could be defined as being the hyper-masculine or a macho “man’s man”. By contrast, others are codified within commercialised modes of representation such as the “football prodigy”, or the “working class hero”. As Richard Dyer observes, stereotyping acts as a “mass ordering system” that allows “societies to make sense of themselves.”[[25]](#footnote-26) However, in a more material sense, Hines’s published masculinities epitomise a set of meanings and values which go beyond this cognitive process. They project what Dyer states is a “mode of characterisation.”[[26]](#footnote-27) Bound together with the notion of type, however, is a set of narrative functions which were thought to be *palatable* for public consumption and had the possibility of achieving commercial success.

My title has been influenced by Andrew Spicer’s 2001 book, *Typical Men: The Representation of Masculinity in Popular British Cinema*. Spicer’s book strives to rectify film scholars’ “neglect” of this subject matter during the “resurgence of interest in popular British cinema.”[[27]](#footnote-28) As Spicer says, his book offers a “theoretically informed cultural history of the changing images of men in British cinema from the Second World War to the present.”[[28]](#footnote-29) I argue that Hines’s corpus as a whole (including published and unpublished works) also presents the opportunity to analyse the changing landscape of masculinity. Divided into a “detailed analysis of significant male cultural types”,[[29]](#footnote-30) Spicer’s analysis concentrates on film, whereas this study centres specifically on the novel. In terms of the difference between generic form, my thesis also explores time-specific representations of the masculine experience.

While Hines’s corpus does not have the same generic scope as Spicer’s study, it has the same chronological breadth as *Typical Masculinities,* because it similarly spans nearly fifty years. Moreover, Hines’s novels are considered to be cinematic. Thus, they are written to engender a visual experience. For David Forrest and Sue Vice, Hines’s prose is “image-led”[[30]](#footnote-31) in nature. Hines was able to draw on the working-class experience and reimagine it cinematically. As Tony Garnett has observed, Hines used “words” to create a “believable world”.[[31]](#footnote-32) Garnett also goes on to say that Hines’s skills as a writer were based on “detailed observation”.[[32]](#footnote-33)

As this study of Hines’s body of work will show, the author was inspired by his upbringing in South Yorkshire and the community which he was a part. Moreover, Hines’s archival material provides substantive details of his writing process. This resource material supplies this thesis with invaluable information about how Hines shaped his images of masculinity either by providing detailed accounts of his research or indeed, by offering ethnographical information. Hines saw himself as working class first and foremost, and explicitly wrote about the hardships of working-class life. The author’s body of work reveals his own sense of displacement. Hines saw himself as being part of the working-class struggle, yet, his university education, and his profession as a teacher, then as a writer, changed his status and transported him, if reluctantly, into a bourgeois milieu. A sense of the author’s rootlessness resounds in the protagonists of novels such as *First Signs* (1972). Undeniably, in writing such texts Hines was trying to project an unresolved notion of himself as a symbolically uprooted masculine figure. Hines’s published novels reveal how working-class masculinity was mutable in terms of class status, and sometimes unstable as opposed to being fixed and secured within the patriarchal system. For example, his novel *Unfinished Business* published in 1983, concentrates on a female protagonist. The novel tries to expose how the shifting determination of working-class womanhood in the time of an economic slump ran parallel to the ongoing demand for women’s rights.

The chapter is divided into four separate case histories which analyse one individual novel from each decade; and each case history studies one particular masculine figure in the chosen text. Starting in the 1960s, the first section explores the representation of “The Anxious Adolescent”, in the form of Lennie Hawk from Hines’s first novel, *The Blinder*, published in 1966. Some of the content in *The Blinder* could be seen as a hyper-realisation of Hines’s own biography. Hines himself went to grammar school and played football as a schoolboy at national level. Lennie is written as a young man who is on at the point of making a life-changing choice between playing football professionally or enrolling at university. In the novel, the author leads Lennie through a series of dilemmas which highlight how his protagonist is at the centre of two opposing stresses.

Moving on the to the 1970s, the second section deals with the representation of George Purse as “The Family Man” in *The Gamekeeper,* published in 1975. This novel, Hines’s fourth, can be seen as a commentary on family life, as it focuses on a working-class married couple, George and Mary Purse, and their two sons. This novel, unlike Hines’s earlier works, contemplates the meaning of domesticity and the supposedly mundane nature of married life. The third section focuses on the 1980s and explores the construction of “The New Man”, namely Phil Downs in *Unfinished Business* (1983). This novel can be viewed as being female-centric, but Hines’s representation of the mutable properties of working-class masculinity is an invaluable piece of social commentary produced in narrative form. Focusing on the shifting nature of married life, Hines re-casts a father in role of care giver, while his wife, Lucy, studies at university. Finally, the last section considers the depiction of “The Returning Native”, Cal Rickards, in Hines’s penultimate novel, *The Heart of It*, published in 1994. *The Heart of It* was the second Hines novel to depict this masculine narrative. In this novel Hines endeavours to draw together competing narrative strands which focus on The Miners’ Strike which ran from 1984 to 1985. His construction of the returning native, thus, becomes a platform for Hines to articulate the decimation of industrial masculinity in the 1980s.

Each case history takes the form of three separate lines of enquiry. In order to determine and to evaluate its typicality, each section looks first at the origin of the text. Second, it considers Hines’s motivation for writing the text. Finally, it asks how the author portrays the intersection between masculinity and desire in that particular text. By using Hines’s archive, I aim to determine the layered literary origin of each text. Hines’s archive reveals that his first novel *The Blinder* originated from his university dissertation. Moreover, the author was also a consummate researcher and many of his resource materials and the details of the sources he used are held in the collection. In tracing the origin of the texts, this study takes into account context and the historiographies involved. As discussed above, many of Hines’s masculine narratives stem from his own sense of being or possessing a displaced masculinity.

Closely linked to the origin of texts is the author’s motivation for constructing them in the first place. Notably, Hines is thought of foremost as being a socialist writer whose creative intentions were politically driven. Yet, some of Hines’s works were fashioned to lean towards ambiguous positions. One such example is Hines’s fourth novel. *The Gamekeeper* (1975) does not present a political motivation in the customary way as Hines’s other works had done previously. This text instead broadly paints the inequalities between the privileged aristocratic elite and their working-class employees. The setting of the novel is also unusual. The novel has an unspecified rural setting, yet, its South Yorkshire location is clear. Moreover, Hines departs from placing his protagonist and his family in a mining environment. The coalfield settings witnessed in other novels gave the author the capacity to articulate the state of industrial relations, often in the present tense. In contrast, *The Gamekeeper* is set away from the coalfields and its timeless-seeming plot illustrates how the author was able to coalesce a representation of a pastoral location with a narrative which portrays the injustices of land ownership. Thus, this awareness of the inequalities working-class life projects a sense of timelessness which confuses an obvious contemporary political discourse. This text therefore appears to be in conflict with Hines’s other works which are characterized by a more obvious progressive political purpose.

Finally, each case history looks at how the author imagines desire. In the works of Barry Hines, the concentration on desire and sex is largely ignored or taken for granted by critics.[[33]](#footnote-34) For the author himself, however, one of the essential dramatic components of his writing methodology was the representation of sexual desire. In terms of social meaning, Hines’s typical masculine figures are robustly heterosexual, although there are traces of the depiction of homosexuality in the author’s lost works, as well as what could be called lost queer traces in his published ones. For instance, Mr Brook, the P E teacher in Hines first novel, *The Blinder*, takes an extracurricular interest in his student, the novel’s protagonist, Lennie Hawk. Most of Hines’s male protagonists are sexually confident, and some are notably sexually voracious. Cal Rickards is one such sexually active masculine figure. In *The Heart of It* Hines portrays in unsparing prose the sexual proclivities of his male protagonist. Like most of Hines’s prominent male figures, Cal is a sexual narcissist. The theme of sexual narcissism can be witnessed throughout Hines’s corpus. Indeed, another example of this trait can be found in Hines’s first novel, *The Blinder*. The novel’s young protagonist’s view of sex is that it is for his own gratification. This impulse can be seen in his affair with Mrs Rowley. In an altercation between the lovers which takes place towards the end of the novel, Mrs Rowley questions him when Len is about to leave her without finishing “it” and that he “can’t leave” her “like this”, when he has to go home to study. “It doesn’t matter about me, then?”, she says. Len replies obliquely, “You like it, don’t you?”.[[34]](#footnote-35) By paying attention to the erotic drives of his protagonists, sexual conquests in the texts studied in this chapter are specifically imbued with notion of outlining the power dynamics between a masculine subject and his object of desire. This is because Hines depicts sexual scenarios, in the main, exclusively from a male point of view. The exception to this approach to narrative can be seen in *Unfinished Business* which focuses on a central character who is female. As this chapter will show, Hines’s representations of masculine desire follow a pattern which illustrates fluctuations in that desire owing to the relationship status of the masculine figure in the novel. Yet each still functions within patriarchal models. For example, in the section which studies the formulation of the “The Family Man”, desire, for the most part, is absent. As we will see in this chapter, sexual desire is an important or even necessary element of a publishable masculine identity.

**The 1960s**

**The Anxious Adolescent: Lennie Hawk in *The Blinder***

**Jack Barlow: Narration and Subjectivity**

The genesis of Lennie Hawk’s characterisation in Hines’s first novel *The Blinder*, can be found in the work Hines produced while studying physical education at Loughborough Training College. Hines’s dissertation was entitled “The Flight of the Hawk” and this extended piece of writing reveals an early creative instinct. Hines had already decided “to be a writer”[[35]](#footnote-36) while in his third year at the college. Because of Hines’s sporting background, the dissertation – written as a piece of fiction - can be described as loosely autobiographical. Like his young protagonist Jack Barlow in the dissertation, Hines had played football at a high level as a schoolboy; and was himself a reluctant scholar, despite having passed his eleven plus. Hines later observed that “the thesis was a dry run”[[36]](#footnote-37) for the novel which would eventually become *The Blinder*. Jack Barlow in *The Flight of the Hawk,* like his descendant Lennie Hawk, is a scholar and an accomplished footballer. However, what is revealed in this early version of the novel, is that the author offers the reader a more self-reflexive and anxious protagonist than the one that is witnessed in his first novel. In the preface to his dissertation, the author wrote the following declaration: “I am deeply concerned and interested in the physical and mental sides of man, believing that the two are equally important for the full development of personality”.[[37]](#footnote-38) In this comment, Hines crystallizes his method of portraying how the equilibrium of the masculine self is manifested within the text. Like Lennie Hawk, Jack Barlow is portrayed as a young man entering adulthood. Hines approaches this imminent transformation by placing emphasis on the emotional upheaval caused by such a change in identity and the sense of trepidation that accompanies it. Although written in the third person, the narrative is interwoven with sporadic streams from Jack’s consciousness. For a young writer this was an experimental style of writing he would not repeat in his later works, owing to the fact that Hines went on to adopt a more “simple style”.[[38]](#footnote-39)

The use of free indirect discourse permits the reader to recognise the protagonist’s heightened emotions. In one part of the text, Jack and his mother, who is unnamed, argue about a fight he has been involved in with another boy at school. Hines uses the technique of allowing his reader to hear Jack’s thoughts to counterpoint his reaction to his mother’s questioning. After the argument is over Jack’s response to it is detailed by the narrator thus:

Jack dug into his plate, head down looking at the food thinking hard what to talk about with his dad before his mother came back. He could hear her clattering about and he didn’t want her to go on because she really got worked up sometimes and started saying things she really didn’t mean, then he would start answering back and there’d be a real palaver all over a bit of blood on a shirt.

It’s typical, bothering about a thing like that, she gets her head down and starts worrying about trivialities, makes you mad when all you’ve got to do is look around you a bit and you find much more important stuff to fill your mind. [[39]](#footnote-40)

In the first passage, the third person narrator depicts Jack’s external responses. By contrast, the change to second person narration in the succeeding passage is a manifestation of Jack’s internal emotional response to the argument. Hines’s modification in technique creates a distinction between how Jack is behaving physically; his conscious emotions; and his instinctive reaction. Jack is sullen and detached after his mother questions his behaviour at school. But what is most apparent in the first extract is its focus on the Jack’s silence. Hines’s understanding of the silence in the first passage reinforces how the author saw one notable aspect of adolescence. This physical reaction to the argument illustrates Jack’s regression as he stares intently onto his plate and avoids eye-contact with his parents, especially his mother. Hines’s third person narrator makes the reader aware that this reaction is like the response of a child who has just been admonished. The first extract also highlights how Jack vocally distances himself from the fight with the other student. The narrator confides that the argument between Jack and his mother happened because of “a bit of blood on a shirt”. Hines’s narrator, in removing the personal pronoun “his”, shows that Jack linguistically disowns his shirt and thus separates himself from the consequences of the fight. His apparent immaturity is revealed via this stylistic distancing technique.

Then again, allowing a stream of consciousness to permeate the narration, as shown in the second passage, ultimately disrupts the third person narrator’s description. In contrast, Jack’s internal response denotes frustration. This alternative form of narration permits Jack to form his own voice within the narrative. By using the second person pronoun “you” Hines communicates Jack’s internal instinct. This narrative device is shaped by Hines’s use of polyptoton, as the second person places stress on the person pronouns: “you”, “your”, and “you’ve”. Hines’s technique allows the rhythm to become almost lyrical, and this reinforces Jack’s expression while simultaneously disrupting the reader’s impression of Jack’s embodiment. Hence, the author’s perlocutionary device in the second passage encourages the reader to empathise with Jack because they place themselves within the narrative and enter into the character’s internal emotional state; they are forced to become “you”. Simultaneously, Jack’s unconscious tries to rationalise the fight by denying its importance. By formally juxtaposing the third person narration with interior discourse, Hines contradicts Jack’s physical response to the fight. The function of the indirect discourse form is to articulate Jack’s emotional state of flux as he tries to negotiate between his physical response as an adolescent and his mature, if not cynical, unconscious reaction, from a burgeoning adult who believes the fight is unimportant.

**Reading Jack’s Anxiety**

Hines composed his dissertation in such a way that the transition from childhood to manhood for Jack appears to be imminent. As Jack observes: “I don’t feel ready to settle down into a job that I might be doing for t’rest of my life, it depresses me”.[[40]](#footnote-41) Not only does Hines experiment with different forms of narration in the piece, but an experimentation with style can also be seen in Hines’s use of imagery. One example can be witnessed in an early part of the text, as Hines writes: “His blazer was added to the great mound of coats behind the kitchen door crowned with his dad’s pit cap”. The imagery here acts as a synecdoche which puts forward the idea of a difference in status. It defines Jack as being potentially socially mobile while simultaneously connoting the significance that his father is the opposite. Jack’s school blazer is a reminder of middle class white-collar working practices and this symbolism conflicts with the “pit” cap’s connection to manual labour. For Ian Haywood, the author’s early work explores “the lack of real opportunity for working-class youth in modern Britain”.[[41]](#footnote-42) This is a pertinent point, but it does not take into account the thematic structure of Hines’s dissertation, the author’s first novel *The Blinder*, or indeed later works such as *Unfinished Business* (1983). “The Flight of the Hawk” shows Hines’s early interest in how a grammar school education was connected with social mobility, and the pressure this places on those young individuals who had the potential to cross class boundaries. Hines’s imagery constitutes an instance of prolepsis as it anticipates how Jack’s adult life will be different to that of his father, who is a miner. Richard Hoggart in *The Uses of Literacy* observes that the grammar school student, or in his words the “scholarship boy”, from the outset of his education is “emotionally uprooted from their class”.[[42]](#footnote-43) Hines himself felt a sense of “inferiority” whilst at Loughborough because the other students, who were from middle-class backgrounds, were “well read” while the author in the main thought that he was not.[[43]](#footnote-44) The scholarship boy is at “the friction point of two cultures”, according to Hoggart, and this conflict is reflected in the dissertation.[[44]](#footnote-45) In creating Jack and his subsequent scholar/footballer, Lennie, Hines generates a conflict between the body and the mind and this increases the anxiety that already characterizes the prospect of entering into manhood. Jack is seen to be torn between two possible paths.

**Is Lennie Hawk the epitome of the “Angry” Young Man?**

Hines’s first novel carries forward the same thematic schema seen in his college dissertation. In this text, the author grapples with the complexities of an evolving masculine identity. *The Blinder* ultimately recognises the difficulties faced by a young man on the verge of manhood. Notably, the text was published just after the “Angry Young Men” phase had come to an end, yet, *The Blinder’*s tone and themes echo those seen in texts identified as belonging to this post-war genre. As David Forrest and Sue Vice suggest, the novel has an affinity with “the earlier cycle of British working class fiction.’[[45]](#footnote-46) One of the main reasons for this similarity is that Lennie Hawk’s characterisation bears some of the traits of “typical” masculine figures in the new wave cycle. As an intelligent young man on the cusp of manhood, Lennie is aware of his “class status”; and is frustrated by the social mores and the prohibitions that surround working class identity. This is similar to Jimmy Porter’s representation in one of the first texts to be classified as an angry young man work, John Osborne’s *Look Back in* *Anger* (1956). In *The Blinder*, Hines’s young protagonist has relationships with Jane and Mrs Rowley who are both “women of a higher social standing”[[46]](#footnote-47). This scenario is reminiscent of John Braine’s plot which focuses on Joe Lampton’s and Susan Brown’s and Alice Aisgill’s love triangle in *Room at the Top* (1957). Lennie’s relationships with Jane and Mrs Rowley provide an insight into his underlying frustration with his own social position. Thus, Lennie shares one key trait with the angry young men because he is poised between two possible futures.

**Lennie’s Two Possible Futures**

Andrew Spicer suggests that the “forerunner” to the angry young man was the “scholarship boy”.[[47]](#footnote-48) Again, like the thematic foundation established in the author’s dissertation, the narrative of *The Blinder* is founded upon conflicting realities: one plot focuses on Lennie’s trials as a young footballing prodigy and the possibility of becoming a professional footballer, while the other plot concentrates on his academic prowess, and this presents a “scholarship boy” plot. Ian Haywood notes that working-class novels of the early 1960s were characterized by progressive masculine “anti-hero” archetypes who struggled against the “social limbo” imposed by society.[[48]](#footnote-49) *The Blinder’s* formal construction does allow Hines the creative freedom to explore the concept of the masculine self being torn between class stagnation and the chance of social mobility. This class-related conceit is similar to the foundation of New Wave texts such as *Room at the Top* (1957). Yet, by placing his protagonist in a dilemma based upon the aspiration to play football for Hawk’s hometown, Hines disrupts the straightforward “scholarship boy” narrative. Hence, Lennie’s aspirational desire is torn between the glamour of football and academic achievement. This aspirational desire is not, however, related to advancement on the social scale by having a relationship with woman of a higher status. As Lennie states himself: “Folk always expect too much of me”.[[49]](#footnote-50) This narrative stream is counterpointed by Hines’s football plot, which offers the chance of affluence and “provincial success,”[[50]](#footnote-51) yet, the reader is aware that Lennie as a masculine construct would remain in reality a class-bound “commodity”[[51]](#footnote-52) if he does eventually become a footballer.

**Lennie and Sexual Hubris**

Looking at Hines’s oeuvre in its entirety reveals that, unsurprisingly, the author had a continued interest in the working life of miners and mining lineage (many of Hines’s protagonist’s fathers are miners, even when the protagonists go on to work elsewhere); mining and industrial action; how education impacts upon young people and their adult destiny; social inequality; and, a subject matter he would frequently return to, that of football. *The Blinder* draws on all of these elements. However, one theme that is often overlooked in Hines’s work, possibly because *A Kestrel for a Knave*, the author’s best-known text, is thought to be written for a teenage market, is an interest in sex and sexual intimacy. In his exploration of *The Blinder*, Luke Spencer suggests Lennie’s identity as an adolescent is constructed as follows:

In short, he behaves very much like a typical male of his age, too preoccupied with his own self-fulfillment to notice much – or care much, if he does notice – about how other people, especially his sexual conquests, are feeling. Yet, despite having established Lennie’s self-regarding machismo quite persuasively, Hines sidesteps the cultural and psychological issues this might raise.[[52]](#footnote-53)

For Spencer, Hawk is a “typical” male adolescent. This description of his being a representative of the normative adolescent male is a mistaken one, because for one so young Lennie appears to have an atypical, unrelenting sexual self-confidence or hubris. Being sexually hubristic in the context of this novel can be defined in terms of a masculine figure who blithely believes in his sexual power (or magnetism). However, this sexual confidence in relation to the narrative structure only leads to a downfall and a physic breakdown. In representing Lennie’s sexual nature, Hines captures all the vibrant sexual machismo witnessed in earlier texts such as *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning* (1958). This stance permits Hines to explore the concept of anxiety without relying on narrative structures found in the new wave cycle. The young author in representing his school boy protagonist fashions him in such a way that he appears to be a sexual “veteran” in terms of relations with women, rather than a “learner” (p. 85). Spencer observes that Lennie’s masculine identity is defined by his “machismo”, that is, an overpowering self-assurance, and self-determination; and this is shown by his lack of interest in others, especially his female sexual partners. Hines constructs Lennie as being sexually aware and experienced beyond his years in furtherance of exploring the transition from adolescence to manhood. Yet Lennie’s sexual confidence only leads to anxiety and self doubt.

In respect of Lennie being a masculine subject, his libidinous drives are important in understanding his characterisation. David Forrest and Sue Vice note that the novel’s depiction of sexual relationships recalls that of the “regressive sexual politics”[[53]](#footnote-54) seen in the post-war texts. Notably, however, this emphasis on sexuality is not witnessed in Hines’s dissertation which was written at the height of the angry young men cycle. One reason for this may be due to the young author not having the confidence to write about sex at this stage of his nascent career. In its depiction of sex, the novel itself is hubristic as the very opening contains a sexual scenario. *The Blinder*’s opening takes place between two different settings, the school hall, in which the headmaster Dr Bennett is presiding over a school assembly; and the outside of the school, where Lennie and a girl called Jenny are “celebrating” (p. 8) on the school field. Hines uses this disparity between spaces to signify the dichotomy of Lennie’s masculine identity and its “split interests.”[[54]](#footnote-55) The conflict between body and mind, or between football field and academia, thus highlights the pressure that will be placed on Lennie throughout the text. Lennie’s split masculine representation is bolstered by the notions of his attaining perfection in two different fields of accomplishment. Yet again, this heightens the pressure. The beginning of the novel is as follows:

“And finally, Upper Sixth: Hawk! Those people will report for detention straight after school tonight.”

The school turned round to have a look at him, but Hawk wasn’t there.

“I have news however of a much more pleasant nature concerning Hawk. It seems that he had another successful outing with the England youth eleven last night, and managed to score four times in their five nil victory over Wales. This, I am led to believe, is a quite an achievement.”

Again the school turned round to have a look at him, but Hawk wasn’t there. He was in the bushes at the side of the school field. (p. 7)

In this short opening passage Hines manages cinematically to combine the key themes which underpin Lennie’s characterisation in the novel: education (notably, sixth form education), football and sex. Thus, the reader witnesses how the facets of Lennie’s masculine identity will function in the novel. Moreover, the reader is given a sense of Lennie’s accomplishments as a footballer as he has been playing for his country. Yet, this understanding is juxtaposed with the awareness that Lennie has received a detention in his absence. Hines also crucially implies that Jenny and Lennie have had sex whilst the assembly is taking place. I argue that having sex outside is an act of rebellion. The school as a symbol in the beginning of the text signifies that Lennie is still considered to be a child rather than a man by those in authority. Thus, being in the “bushes” with Jenny allows him to assert his manhood on school premises where he is still thought of as a child.

This initial encounter with Lennie allows his sexual hubris to be displayed from the outset. Yet, the continued focus on the conflict between adolescence and manhood can be seen in the author’s construction of Lennie’s love interests. One of Lennie’s relationships is with Mrs Rowley, while the other relationship is with Jane, a teenager who becomes pregnant. The love triangle scenario offers an understanding of the class politics at play within the text. Spencer notes that Lennie is representative of other typical masculine figures found in working class texts. He describes Lennie’s generic characterisation as being born out of the “insubordinate working class male versus the system”[[55]](#footnote-56) mould. Hawk in this capacity is cast as a figure who rails against the social order. However, this reaction to authority, or in other words, Lennie’s assertion of his adult masculine identity within the fabric of the novel, is only achieved via his own libidinous agency, since the outcome of the narrative is ambiguous.

This representation also places emphasis on Lennie’s sexual prowess as he is able at such a young age to satisfy two women simultaneously. Yet it should also be remembered that it is Lennie’s libidinous drive that causes this crisis, as his academic prowess collapses when Jane tells him she may be pregnant, just before an exam. Lennie reacts to this news incredulously: “You can’t be! Not the first time!” (p. 184), he says to Jane. However, this hubristic attitude foregrounds the young man’s naivety and, more essentially, his immaturity. In representing an adolescent in transition and on the cusp of manhood, Hines delves into how a crisis such as a pregnancy outside marriage in the 1960s stimulates anxiety. He is also the victim of a violent attack in which his feet are slashed with razors; Hines implies that Jane’s father may have instigated this act of violence. Given that the narrative places great emphasis on Lennie as a polarised figure, Hines, in fashioning the crisis, manages to rupture both of Lennie’s potential futures.

**Reading the Oedipus Complex in *The Blinder***

Lennie’s libidinous drive is divided between two objects of desire: Mrs Rowley and Jane. The Oedipal dynamic is evident in the relationship between Mrs Rowley and Lennie. Hines forges the perception that Lennie’s masculinity is in a state of flux. Freud, Connell notes, “increasingly saw the “Oedipus complex” as a tangle of middle childhood involving desire for one parent and hatred for the other, as the key moment in development”.[[56]](#footnote-57) Lennie as an adolescent has already undergone middle childhood, yet, the anxieties which arise from this developmental stage lie dormant in the unconscious. Hines’s method of writing Lennie’s dialogue reveals the sexual impulses connected to the Oedipus complex in the novel.

In constructing Lennie as a masculine figure conducting an affair with an older woman, Hines reveals his protagonist’s burgeoning anxiety, and this emotion surfaces because of the pressure of his conflicted state. Thus, in terms of the Oedipal dynamic found within the text, Mrs Rowley represents the mother figure. Throughout the text, the narrator never refers to Mrs Rowley by her first name, thus emphasising her married/mother identity. This stylistic approach highlights her status as a married woman. But it also symbolically implies she is of the same standing as Mrs Hawk because she is never referred to by her first name either. Mr Rowley, Lennie’s history teacher, on the other hand, symbolises the role of the hated father within the complex. Mr Rowley’s attitude towards Lennie veers from one of frustration at Lennie’s attitude towards school to open hostility. He considers Lennie to be a “fool” (p. 39) because the schoolboy has academic talent, however, he has a cavalier attitude towards his school work. For most of the novel, Rowley is the only character connected to Lennie who admonishes him. His history master’s antipathy leads Lennie to feel repressed in the school environment, and Rowley’s control and authority fuels his fear of castration. He sees Rowley as a threat because of the power he can exert over him while at school. Although Lennie’s internal sentiment is not described textually, Hines does verbalise his antipathy and resentment; Lennie calls Mr Rowley a “fat bastard” (p.30), states that he looks like the “Michelin man” (p. 30), and that he feels sorry for Mrs Rowley being “married to a twat like that” (p.19). Lennie’s comments about his teacher are a manifestation of his anxiety. Lennie’s derogatory remarks make obvious reference to Rowley’s appearance. Lennie thus seeks to degrade Rowley and this is a response to his fear of castration. By contrast, Mrs Rowley is symbolically constructed as a mother figure within the power dynamic between Mrs Rowley, Lennie and Mr Rowley.

In the latter part of the novel, an argument takes place between Mrs Rowley and Lennie concerning his relationship with Jane:

 “You’re making a fool of me! You’re just having me on!”

 “You knew that we hadn’t finished.”

 “You are finished! You are! Her father stopped it all.”

 “Hey! Don’t tell me what I am and what I’m not, you’re not my mother, you know.”

She spun on him her arms raised and fingers clawed. Lennie dodged behind the settee and faced her with his hands resting on the back and his legs spread wide.

 “I didn’t mean it like that, honest.” (pp. 181-182)

Lennie’s slip of the tongue, “you’re not my mother, you know”, may seem to deny his desire for the mother object. Yet, the act of uttering it in the heat of the moment reveals that this is a manifestation of his unconscious. Moreover, Lennie’s almost instantaneous apology reiterates his desire for the mother, as it discloses his anxiety. In addition, Hines’s choreography of the physicality of the lovers foregrounds the pair’s conscious impulses. Lennie is depicted as withdrawing behind the “settee” facing Mrs Rowley “with his hands resting on the back and his legs spread wide”, showing that Hines tries to illustrates how precarious Lennie’s psychological state is. In one respect, the physical depiction of the young protagonist in this conversation may seem to denote Lennie’s passivity; he has realised that he has said something wrong and is trying to placate Mrs Rowley. Mrs Rowley’s reaction to the “slip”, the raising of her hand ready to “claw” across the face, is not the action of a mother admonishing a child, but of an angry lover. This exposes her underlying anxiety that Lennie may have another motive in forming a relationship with her.

**Anxiety and Transition**

Lennie is not in the “middle childhood” stage of his development, as he is on verge of manhood; however, his interactions with Mrs Rowley reveal how his manner fluctuates between immaturity and maturity while engaging in sexual relations with her, as is clear below:

 He pulled her down and rolled over. Mrs Rowley moaned and hung on as the balance shifted. Then they lay still with the fire down one side.

 “I thought you said you liked it the other way.”

 “I do, but you can’t beat the old position in the end. It’s like Nutgalls mintoes, original and best.”

 “Don’t talk about it like that, Len, you spoil it.”

 “I’m only joking.”

 “It can’t mean anything if you joke about it, it’s making fun of it.”

 “Hey! What are you getting all serious about?”

 “It is serious to me, Len.” (pp. 140-141)

Much of the dialogue attributed to Lennie in this conversation shows him to react to the couple’s love-making in an immature fashion. As the conversation unfolds, Mrs Rowley asks Lennie what sexual position he prefers and this prompts Lennie to make the flippant comment: “It’s like Nuttalls mintoes, original and still the best”. This expression evinces Lennie’s regressive state while in the presence of Mrs Rowley as the simile equates Lennie’s preferred sexual position with his favourite sweet. The symbolic meaning of this comparison reduces the emotional intensity of the couple’s sexual relationship and, more significantly, it confirms Lennie’s unconscious response to their sexual intimacy. As Mrs Rowley says herself: “It can’t mean anything if you joke about it”. Such a dissimilarity in emotional reaction signifies Mrs Rowley’s maturity. However, Lennie’s dialogue vacillates between the mature and the immature. Lennie fluctuates between comforting Mrs Rowley and rebuking her for her reaction to his attitude towards their relationship. This shift in conduct strengthens the notion of Lennie’s transition from adolescence to adulthood. On the one hand, Hines’s protagonist tries to assert his adult masculinity in taking Mrs Rowley as a sexual partner. On the other hand, this immature reaction is manifest because of Lennie’s anxiety about entering into manhood.

**1970s**

**The Family Man in *The Gamekeeper***

**George Purse**

Robert Nye of the *Guardian* noted at the time of publication that *The Gamekeeper* voices “The feel and texture of working class life.”[[57]](#footnote-58). However, *The Gamekeeper*’s working-class masculine figures differ from those seen in the author’s previous novels, which had shown him to be fascinated with young, working class men, and coming of age narratives. The majority of the men in Hines’s fourth novel are older members of the working class and it can be presumed that they are married. This text thus makes a study of a more mature form of working class masculine subjectivity. Later in the novel Hines introduces the upper-class masculine figures; this introduction of another form of masculinity places a lens on the hegemonic codification of the power relations illustrated in the text. Hines’s fourth novel undertakes to detail the day-to-day routine of a working-class family man away from the industrial setting of the colliery or, indeed, the steel mill. *The Gamekeeper’s* narrative follows the pattern of the working year, and “captures the avicultural season[s]”[[58]](#footnote-59) for the lowland keeper, that is, George Purse, a former steelworker, who works “on a north country ducal estate.”[[59]](#footnote-60) The publisher’s “blurb” for the novel reads thus:

The gamekeeper works through the season, raising the pheasants from the egg to the chick, counting the losses as he turns them out as poults into the coverts. He works with the upland keepers who burn the old heather to cultivate the young shoots to feed the grouse. In his lowland woods he treasures his own birds, feeding them as they answer his whistle.[[60]](#footnote-61)

What is striking about this bucolic description of the gamekeeper’s occupation is that it communicates a sole purpose – rearing pheasants; with a sole guardian in charge of that process, the gamekeeper. Thus, this solitary and time-consuming, labour-intensive occupation can almost be perceived as somewhat like a vocation. The birds are George’s “treasures” and within the text act very much like currency. Such is the care and attention lavished upon the “birds”, it seems antithetical that they will be killed at the end of the season. Hines therefore bases his plot on an acute paradox. The seasonal narrative structure is arranged in order to focus the reader’s interest on the shooting party scenario at the end of the novel. In light of this, *The Gamekeeper*’s narrative leads the reader through the cycle of rearing the pheasants and ultimately to their death by “the guns”, at the Duke’s shooting party. But, not only does the novel show the working life of the gamekeeper; it presents a thoughtful illustration of the nuances of northern working-class family life in the mid-century. Hines’s protagonist, George Purse, is married to Mary, who works part-time as a cleaner. However, Mary spends most of her time in the home. Though no ages are given for couple it can be assumed that they are in their thirties. They live in their tied cottage with their two sons, Ian and John.

Even though *The Gamekeeper* was published in 1975, Hines’s fourth novel is imbued with a sense of pastness. I argue that *The Gamekeeper’s* representation of gender politics offers a reflection based on past familial values. The novel’s focus on the masculine working-class self, selfhood, and the interaction with other members of the Purse family is an important factor in understanding Hines’s novel’s timelessness. One aspect of this perception is that the novel’s awareness of isolation and separateness allows an understanding of patriarchy in the text. Hines’s text has a virtually hermetically sealed countryside setting in an enclosed and compact location. The action takes place in the Purses’ cottage, on the Duke’s estate and in an unnamed village. No one visits the family; no extended family is represented in the text; and the family do not visit the nearby council estate. Only George is allowed by the author to visit all three locations. Mary remains entirely in two domestic settings: the kitchen-cum-dining room in their home and kitchen of the “Big House”, the Duke’s ancestral home. Society therefore appears far removed from the Purse’s consciousness as the family give the impression of being self-contained.

**The Possible Origin of George’s Characterisation**

The origin of George Purse’s masculine identity may at first sight seem to stem from Hines’s young protagonist in his second and best-known novel, *A Kestrel for a Knave*. Owing to *The Gamekeeper’s* concentration on working class mentality and its intersection with nature, and more particularly, on the rearing of birds, the novel gives the impression that it mirrors the motif found in Hines’s most famous work. Indeed, in discussing the two novels’ relationship, Luke Spencer notes that:

Both Billy Casper and George Purse experience the futility of trying to pit the personal resourcefulness against the social forces ranged against them. Their love of nature and rapport with birds in their keeping are callously disregarded: Kes is killed by Billy’s brutalised brother, Jud, and George’s pheasants are blasted by the guns of his employer’s shooting party.[[61]](#footnote-62)

Spencer points out that a sense of “futility” encompasses both of the novels’ narratives. In essence, the compulsion to nurture is at the root of Spencer’s observation. This opinion goes against the supposed prescribed codes of masculinity seen in Hines’s novels which the criticism evaluates. As Spencer notes himself, Jud is represented in *A Kestrel for a Knave* as being characteristic of a ‘brutal’, hyper-masculinised working class subject. Characters such as Jud in Hines’s early novels conform to socially acceptable norm of masculinity; one which provides a main source of income, and therefore holds authority in the domestic sphere. In contrast, Billy, by being portrayed as nurturing, appears to be non-masculine or, indeed, emasculated. Thus, this symbolic maternal connection with nature has no potential. Hines as an author was renowned for structuring the narrative arc of his novels in such a way so that their specific trajectories only led to an ambiguous, or even to a fruitless outcome. For Spencer, the sense of futility which shadows the texts’ endings (which is signified by the birds’ deaths) abnegates any chance of resolution, or any prospect of emancipation from the class-bound realities for the principal masculine figures. The fact that *A Kestrel for Knave* and *The Gamekeeper* place emphasis on Kes’s and George’s pheasants’ pointless deaths defines a clear connection between the texts. George Purse, *The Gamekeeper’s* protagonist, thus could be read as symbolising the evolution of Billy Casper’s incarnation in *A Kestrel for a Knave*.

**Land Ownership and George’s Identity**

Of course, by reading the novel from this perspective, Purse, as one who typifies Hines’s fashioning of a working-class family man in his published works, could have carried forward Billy’s story. Yet, the source material used by Hines to write *The Gamekeeper* contradicts this. I argue that this material leads to the conclusion that Purse’s representation is more complex than Spencer’s observation brings to light. Moreover, by analysing this methodology, the author’s approach to the philosophy of *The Gamekeeper* is revealed. Detailed on the fifth page of Hines’s text is a quotation from Anthony Sampson’s book, *The New Anatomy of Britain*:

 The countryside is the stronghold of most myths

about free enterprise, independence, self-reliance,

but it may be, in the end, that the wheel will turn

full circle – that the common land which was

grabbed and enclosed by the landlords in the

eighteenth century will be given back to the public

and the the whole land of Britain will come to seem

so precious that the public will insist on having it

for themselves. [[62]](#footnote-63)

We do not know from which edition of Sampson’s text this quotation was taken, as Hines does not state it in the novel and there is no record of the text found among the papers in his archive. This is also complicated by the fact that Sampson rewrote his text over forty years under slightly different titles. As this extract was taken from an edition with the original title and as the novel was written in early to mid 1970s, we can presume that Hines used the first or second edition. In Sampson’s discussion concerning “Land”, the source outlines the intricacies of the hierarchies involved in “private land ownership”[[63]](#footnote-64) by mapping the topography of possession. The extract, quoted in *The Gamekeeper*, provides a glimpse of far-reaching ramifications of the appropriation of land and the misuses of power by the bourgeoisie in the eighteenth century. Moreover, Sampson’s chapter unveils the complexities of land ownership as well as its explicit imbalance and the injustice within this system of power. But on closer investigation, this extract also reveals an awareness of the “trespasser”. As Sampson writes: “The present generation of walkers and car-owners are easily intimidated by farmers or gamekeepers, and meekly leave the fields when they are told to: the word “trespasser” still has an awesome sound, even though trespassers are not easily prosecuted.”[[64]](#footnote-65) What we can extrapolate from Sampson’s chapter is the desire for the freedom to roam and the “craving” for open space on behalf of the general populace, on the one hand. However, the chapter also makes the reader aware of the intention for land owners to keep their lands free of trespassers, on the other hand.

When comparing Sampson’s chapter on land ownership with the novel, Hines seems to infuse an egalitarian ideology within the narrative of *The Gamekeeper*. One example of Hines’s narrative reiterating Sampson’s discourse on ownership can be found in the middle of *The Gamekeeper* when George visits the pub in the village, near the Duke’s estate. While eating his lunch, George and some of the locals discuss the ethics of poaching and trespassing, in relation to a local man who has been given a prison sentence for poaching:

 “I know, but bloody hell, a year for a few brace of pheasant. It’s a bit stiff, isn’t it?”

 “He shouldn’t have been trespassing. He knew what to expect.”

“Trespassing. And where did they get their land from in the first place, anyroad? They just grabbed it didn’t they? Or the king dished it out to courtiers and pimps and royal bastards born on the wrong side of the blanket. That’s where they got it from, so don’t talk to me about trespassing, George.” (p. 82)

The tone of this dialogue is adversarial. George appears to be perplexed at the idea that the sentence for poaching may be unjust. Hines uses the verb “grabbed”, the same expression used by Sampson. He thus traces the nucleus of Sampson’s argument and places it within George’s and his opponent’s dialogue. In this extract, for all intents and purposes, George acts not only as defender of the social order’s actions; he also acts as the protector of the Duke’s land in his absence. Rather than writing George as an advocate for the redistribution of land, Hines casts him in opposition to this. George is shown to be in alliance with a “class-system based on ownership”.[[65]](#footnote-66)

*The Gamekeeper* was written during what would be the start of Hines’s most politically charged writing phase. In quoting from Sampson’s book at the very beginning of the novel, the author reveals its politicised purpose. Thus *The Gamekeeper* has a different objective to that witnessed in *A Kestrel for a Knave*. It may seem to some that Purse’s representation within the novel would be infused with the same egalitarian viewpoint which is explicit in Sampson’s second extract. This conceit is repeated later in the novel when George half-heartedly suggests to a farmer that the “land” should be nationalised and that “they” – the landowners - should be “got rid of” (p. 111). George’s statement seems to contradict his previous stance of siding with the landowner. Yet the reason for this change in attitude exposes the multifaceted nature of Purse’s characterisation as the family man. As a custodian of the Duke’s land, George protects it from poachers. Poaching as a motif in the novel, however, has rather a more complex implication in terms of social discourse. For George, the trapping of rabbits is a means of supplementing the household income and keeps the family above the poverty line. When he visits a butcher’s shop in the village and only pays for “half” of a pork pie but receives “three quarters” of it, as the narrator states: “The favour would be returned” (p. 77). Even though it is not revealed how the favour will be “returned”, it can be concluded that George provides some sort of game in return for money. Thus, the motif of poaching within the novel relates to both a covert and necessary enterprise owing to the fact the gamekeeper himself poaches in the “Duke’s wood” (p. 41). Within the text, the noun “trespasser” has a dual meaning. For George, the terms trespasser and poacher are interchangeable. The novel slowly reveals George’s ongoing battles with trespassers and with poachers but the purpose of his engaging with the trespasser is twofold. On the one hand, George protects “his” stock of game and his family’s income. On the other hand, he protects the Duke’s land from *other* poachers. Other poachers’ trespassing on the Duke’s land undermines George’s status as the main provider for his family. Therefore, if the land was nationalised this would not affect George’s ability to poach on the land himself and, in turn, to provide for his family. The irony here is the reverse of the old saying, the gamekeeper would himself turn poacher. Hence, Purse’s characterisation is more opaque than that of such characters as Billy Casper. Rather than constructing George as an advocate for free access to the land within the novel, Hines instead fashions Purse as a sentinel against trespass.

**Articulating Authority and George’s Deference in the Public Sphere**

According to David Forrest and Sue Vice: “The novel’s real focus on class through the activity of killing is revealed through its delineation of George’s ambiguous role as facilitator or “keeper” of the shoots.”[[66]](#footnote-67) Killing and the futility of killing is the lens through which the class structures in the novel are identified. George is working class and he acts as “facilitator” of the shoot. However, he does not take part in the killing himself; that privilege is set aside for the elite class alone. Such a representation allows Hines to explore Purse’s private persona alongside his public one. George’s persona in the company of the privileged classes, is one founded on long-practised deference: he is, as the narrator suggests, “openly subservient during the shooting season” (p.28). One example of this can be seen in a latter part of the novel during the shoot, when the guns are choosing their butts. George does not know which gun he has to load for so he stands and waits thus:

Rather than just stand there, he called his spaniel, and started to disentangle goose grass seeds from the matted hair behind its ears. Then the Duke noticed him. Why was he crouching there grooming his dog when everyone else was preparing to move off? Curious. Ah!

 “Ah, George!”

 The gamekeeper walked forward smartly and touched the peak of his hat.

 “Good morning, your Grace.”

 “Good morning, George, nice to see you again.” (p. 159)

Even though George acts as facilitator at the shoot, he takes a liminal position on the day. George’s deference is revealed here through his body language. The action of tending to his dog while waiting for the Duke to acknowledge him reveals his discomfort and his alienation. By tending to his dog, he displaces himself from the unpleasant experience of being on the periphery and being ignored. By “crouching down” Hines’s protagonist’s body language gives the appearance of kneeling. In positioning his protagonist in this way, Hines reveals George’s unconscious reaction to someone of a higher status than himself. Further, in relation to George being separate from the elite, he does not acknowledge the Duke because the Duke does not acknowledge his presence. Hines thus makes visible an unconscious reaction to class difference. Barbara Masam notes in her review of the novel that “staff are expected to be seen but not heard.”[[67]](#footnote-68) Silence and remaining silent is an important factor in this scenario. The action of stroking the dog allows George to come to the attention of Duke without saying a word because it appears that he is procrastinating. As this extract reveals, Hines uses free direct discourse to reveal the duke’s irritation, since he believes Purse is “crouching” in a submissive position purposely so that he cannot be seen instead of going about his business and starting the shoot. Yet George pacifies the Duke by touching “the peak of his cap”. By choreographing this act, Hines reinforces George’s impulse to be subservient.

**Reading Authority in the Private Sphere**

Whereas Hines represents George as being subservient in certain social settings, in the private sphere Purse is seen to be authoritative. In taking a job as a “respectable” (p. 26) gamekeeper on the Duke’s estate, George has more authority and independence than he would do if he returned to work in the steel mill. As the narrator recounts: “The gamekeepers liked to be thought of as men of independence, brave and open in their dealings” (p. 28). The desire for “independence”, and the ability to work with some degree of autonomy, are the main reasons why Purse left the steel mill in the first place. Autonomy and independence in the work place are crucial factors in forming George’s masculine working-class identity in the text; and more significantly, in bolstering his self-worth. Autonomy in the work place also extends into the domestic reality of the novel, as George appears to have total authority in this sphere and is portrayed as the “breadwinner”. This position within the family allows Hines to juxtapose this authoritative attitude in the domestic space with his protagonist’s seeming deference to his “betters” in the public sphere. In terms of reading George’s masculinity, by polarising his public and private personas the author places his protagonist at the point of an internal conflict much like that of his first protagonist, Jack Barlow in “The Flight of the Hawk”.

In writing Mary’s characterisation as wife and mother, Hines portrays her as being ancillary in terms of the of the plot. She remains integral to the family dynamic, remaining stable, raising the children and looking after the home, yet, she has little authority in own right. Mary is responsible for all of the domestic tasks. The reader witnesses Mary solely cooking and cleaning, and, as the narrator confides, George: “never considered helping his wife even though she had a lot of work to do and would still be doing it at bedtime” (p. 25). Moreover, the only time she is seen outside the house is once when she is hanging the washing out and at the end of the novel, when she is shown peeling potatoes in the Duke’s kitchen, after the shooting party has finished. Much to Mary’s dissatisfaction, the family are set apart from their peers. Thus, a sense of seclusion influences the tone of the text, especially in relation to Mary’s representation. At the beginning of the novel, Hines expresses Mary’s ongoing struggle with the isolated setting, and she states that she: “did think it was romantic when” when they first moved in (p. 67). Isolation as a theme in the text symbolises Mary’s marginalisation and her lack of earning power. In the early stages of the novel she says to George: “And where do I go? I go cleaning up at the House three mornings a week, and shopping in the village” (p. 67). After living in the cottage for a while, Mary feels “a profound disenchantment with the family’s circumstances.”[[68]](#footnote-69) Hines’s later works such as *Unfinished Business* (1983), for example, evidence his interest in working class femininity and aspiration. However, this interest is not perceived in terms of the text’s plot; Mary works part-time as a cleaner, and is shown to have little ambition or aspiration to do anything else, although she seems dissatisfied. Whereas George’s cyclical narrative is foregrounded, Mary’s narrative is also seen as being repetitive, and follows the pattern of her domestic tasks. We learn that George was the prime instigator for the move to the country and we can conclude that Mary had little choice in the matter. As David Forrest and Sue Vice state, “George and his wife have little financial security and are dependant on ‘employer’s goodwill’”.[[69]](#footnote-70) Owing to the socio-economic reality of existing on the profits of a rural economy, Hines reveals that moving to the country has caused the family to exist in reduced financial circumstances and Mary bears the brunt of this decline, but in terms of being having the ability to earn money she has no power to alter it.

**The Family Man and Desire**

The novel displays a distinct absence of desire between George and his wife, presenting their relationship as almost sexually neutral. This narrative strategy is in complete contrast to Hines’s previous novels *The Blinder* and *First Signs*. By concentrating on family life, Hines voices not only Mary’s disenchantment about moving to a rural area, but also her dissatisfaction with marriage. Hines allows the reader a brief glimpse of Mary’s embitterment as she tries “to make sense of the promise of it all” (p. 25). Even though Mary’s puzzlement seems to be ambiguous, it is also ironic. In allowing the statement to be ambiguous, Hines does not at first reveal its meaning. His use of “promise” as a noun signifies the notion of potential. Yet, this is counterpointed by the statement’s ironic tone. Thus, the statement speaks of Mary’s disillusionment with her marriage to George. This is also reinforced while Mary is alone in the house, clearing away the breakfast things whilst listening to the radio, as the narrator reveals: “She hummed the tunes, and joined in the words when she knew them. All those songs about love, love, love” (p. 25). Here, Hines’s use of epizeuxis does not voice Mary’s desire, but instead communicates the gulf between the couple and a growing sense of loss of their “love”. In repeating the word “love”, Hines foregrounds an unconscious knowledge of the sense of lack and disconnection from her husband. Mary’s desire for him is shadowed by this disconnection.

George, on the other hand, is shown in the novel to have desires. One desire is the passion for his work. The novel permits a brief insight into how George’s fulfils his desire by revealing a fleeting attraction to another woman, Lady Harley. This glimpse of the family man’s illicit desire for another woman takes place towards the end of the novel while he is acting as a loader for Lord Dronfield, on the grouse shoot. In this meeting Lady Harley is dressed in a black “velvet suit” modelled on a “traditional knickerbocker design but hers has less material in the leg, and a waisted jacket” (p. 167). The narrator’s description of Lady Harley’s clothes has a familiar connotation; her outfit mirrors what George is wearing himself. Thus, Lady Harley’s clothes have a masculine appearance, yet simultaneously they are sensual and feminine. For George, she is the personification of the exotic when placed against the other women on the shoot who are wearing dull “tweed skirts” (p. 167). George has a physical reaction to Lady Harley, and the “smell of her” makes him want to “keep smelling” (p. 167). This sensorial attraction gives the first awareness of George’s desire. Notably, Lady Harley is of a higher status than he is, but this is not a Mellors and Lady Chatterley scenario, in which class boundaries are transgressed. Hines, in contrast, denies the prospect of sexual desire by making its object a fleeting fantasy. George by being ultimately portrayed as a family man has a duty to his wife to retain a state of monogamy and in doing so the family remains intact, thus, overall making George’s desire for Lady Harley unfulfilled and transitory in turn. In order to make the moment of seeing last longer, George procrastinates by making an “excuse of calling his dogs so that he could turn round and look at her for a bit longer” (p.167). This impulse deflects attention from himself. This again acknowledges that George’s procrastination is an unconscious reaction to being seen by those of a higher status. Not only is George struck by the difference to the other women on the shoot, he also notices how different she is to Mary, his wife. Lady Harley and Mary are the same age; however, she looks “ten years younger than Mary Purse” (p. 167). As the narrator pointedly observes: “and in ten more years the difference would be more significant. She would be still an attractive woman; Mary Purse would just be another mother” (p. 167). As Richard Hoggart observes:

It is evident that a working-class mother will age early, that at thirty, after having two or three children, she will have lost some of her sexual attraction; that between thirty-five and forty she rapidly becomes the shapeless figure the family know as “our mam”.[[70]](#footnote-71)

It would seem, that like Mary, George has romantic ideals about his object of choice, however unattainable it may be. In accordance with Hoggart’s observation, the narrator also makes explicit that George sees his wife as a “mother” and not as an object of desire. For the family man, the lack of desire in his marriage is a sign of the pressure of the banal nature of working class life. Sex, in this respect, is only for the procreation of children. What Hines’s fourth novel exposes is that desire can only be enjoyed by the leisured classes.

**1980s**

**The “New Man” in *Unfinished Business* (1983**)

**Phil Downs**

In her adroit and revealing examination of *Unfinished Business* (1983), Hanna Behrend observes that Phil Downs, the primary male subject in Barry Hines’s novel, is the epitome of the “[Mr.] Everyman”.[[71]](#footnote-72) With a view to understanding Behrend’s term in connection to masculinity, we must consider how Phil is represented at the beginning of Hines’s text. Phil is married to the novel’s female protagonist, Lucy, a twenty-nine-year-old housewife, and they have two children together. Phil is constructed as a symbol of a traditional form of working-class masculinity. However, while Hines was writing the novel, the shape of working-class masculinity was changing. Yet, Hines constructs Phil as a man in a traditional working class mode. As a charge hand welder at Bowes Engineering, Phil is given a degree of authority in the work place.

In the early part of the novel, Hines illustrates Phil’s conventional views on gender roles thus: “He liked [Lucy] to be at home, to take and collect the children from school, to keep the house clean and to have his dinner ready for him for when he came home from work”.[[72]](#footnote-73) Hines’s use of the personal pronoun “[H]e”, articulates how this representation of the domestic space is Phil’s ideal, not his wife’s. Moreover, Phil’s understanding of how a family unit should be maintained is demonstrated by the use of punctuation, which drives the momentum of Phil’s “inventory” and illustrates how Lucy is trapped in a daily cycle of domestic chores. The narrator’s tone, furthermore, denotes the permanence of Lucy’s position as wife and mother. This outlook is profoundly patriarchal. He expects Lucy to be a homemaker and look after all his comforts and desires in the domestic sphere single-handed, without any intervention from him. Explicitly, Phil’s attitude towards his family is imbued with the sense that he is head of the household. Returning to Richard Hoggart, and his assessment of the how realities of the working-class family informed masculinity in the 1950s, in looking at Hines’s depiction of a working-class family unit in *Unfinished Business* the dynamic is not a dissimilar to Hoggart’s depiction of the family at the time of writing *The Uses of Literacy* (1957). In reflecting on the role of Phil as a working-class husband and father in the home, he is, as Hoggart observes, the “boss there” and he is thus the “master of his own house”.[[73]](#footnote-74) Yet, Phil is not exceptional in holding traditional principles on the roles of men and women in modern times, since, as Hanna Behrend suggests, he is an “everyman”. Thus, Behrend’s term describes the notions of a masculinist society at the time the novel was published.

At the outset of Hines’s seventh novel the writer’s “new man” is not apparent as the novel focuses primarily on its female protagonist, Lucy. At the beginning of the novel Lucy is a housewife, but Hines makes explicit from the start her determination to enrol at university as a mature student. Lucy was a bright pupil at school, yet she did not “stop on” (p.25) to do her A Levels as her headmaster, Mr Parkhouse, wanted her to.[[74]](#footnote-75) But, the narrator reveals that she has taken several night-school courses and has gained the qualifications which enable her to study at university. Hines also stresses that Phil is against Lucy enrolling at university. When Lucy tells him what she intends to do he says: “What do you mean, go to university? Which university?” (p. 10). Phil’s indignation is foregrounded in this statement as he fears that this change in circumstances would ruin *his* domestic idyll, and, more importantly, his ideal of what a home should be. Lucy’s emphatic decision to read English Literature at university goes against his wishes and causes friction between the married couple. The implication of Lucy’s decision in terms of her identity as a working-class woman is that she is represented from the beginning, by Hines, as longing for some degree of autonomy. Written while Hines was a Creative Writing fellow at Sheffield Polytechnic in the 1980s, the novelist never specifically mentions Sheffield as the setting for the novel. In writing this novel, Hines deviates from his usual settings of the semi-rural South Yorkshire pit village. Instead he opts to place his domestic setting in a sprawling city. Lucy and Phil live in one of the city’s new suburbs with its “modern detached houses and dormer bungalows” (p. 5). Phil has to travel to work in a car, unlike the manual labourers in Hines’s previous texts who could walk. Hines therefore gives a distinct feeling of separation between the work place and the domestic setting in the novel.

For a politically driven writer such as Hines, Lucy’s transformation from house-wife to scholar enables the author to examine how “much of patriarchy’s links to capitalism remain in place”[[75]](#footnote-76) apropos the “modern” working-class family. In relation to patriarchy, the representation of home for Lucy, in the novel, epitomises a domestic prison, in which the sentence is to “do full justice” (p. 32) to her family by completing a never-ending cycle of domestic tasks. In using a metaphor which relates to the moral implications of studying and leaving the home, Hines illustrates how Lucy while attending university would transform simply into a “part-time” wife and mother instead of a full-time one. This semi-absence from the home in terms of patriarchy highlights how gender in society was not based on equal terms at the time of writing the novel. Hines, therefore, places a lens on the outrage felt by those closest to Lucy because of her absence from the home. Lucy perseveres; and the end of the novel details how Lucy’s existential choice leads to a freedom of expression and releases her partly from domestic exploitation.

In returning to a previous incarnation of a working-class mother, like Mary Purse in *The Gamekeeper*, Lucy’s locus, at first, is firmly fixed in the private sphere, whereas Phil’s domain is very much centred in the world of work: the public sphere. In the first part of the novel, Hines establishes the specificity of gender roles: Lucy is a “non-earning” wife and mother, while Phil’s function is that of provider. Phil works “all day” (p. 8), while Lucy stays at home looking after the house and children. “Bringing up children did not count as work. Not real work anyway. Real work was done outside the home, for wages” (p.8), observes the narrator, channelling Lucy’s outrage at the discriminatory nature of the domestic sphere. “Modern relationships”[[76]](#footnote-77) in the text are examined [by Hines] as part of the capitalist economy. Instead of going to university, Phil suggests that Lucy should “get a little job” in order to earn some “pin money” (p. 12). Phil’s utterance symbolically illustrates Lucy’s inconsequential and marginalised status in relation to the capitalist system. The “little job” will allow her a minimal amount of agency, yet she cannot equal her husband’s power to earn. “Women’s increased oppression is caused by their exclusion from waged work”, observes Heidi I. Hartmann.[[77]](#footnote-78) Lucy’s value as a mother who does not work is not weighed against her power to earn in the labour market but in her function as the mother object. As a self without the capacity to be involved in the mode of production, she remains subordinate in the patriarchal system. However, Phil as the breadwinner maintains control over the family. The “family”, as Hartman stresses, is “often thought as the primary source of women’s oppression.”[[78]](#footnote-79) She goes on to say in terms of the family and oppression that:

In a Marxist-feminist view, the organisation of production both within and outside the family is shaped by patriarchy and capitalism. Our present social structure rests upon an unequal division of labour by class and by gender which generates conflict, tension and change.[[79]](#footnote-80)

The novel reflects Hartman’s observation by illustrating how Lucy matriculating to university would disrupts the dynamics of the family. Phil’s suggestion of “getting a little job”, ignores Lucy’s dissatisfaction with her existence as the wife and mother in the family dynamic.

A part-time job would allow Lucy a little independence but she, like Mary, would still be tied to the private sphere. Hines’s text splits Lucy’s narrative into two plots: one which takes place in the public sphere, while the other takes place in the domestic space. Her matriculation to university “in the field of English Literature”[[80]](#footnote-81) permits her into the public sphere and to mix with the with people from the middle classes. Her tutor, Dave Pybus, sees her as an intellectual equal and not as a working-class housewife. This leads her to develop a burgeoning sense of her self-worth and individualism. Furthermore, it is Lucy’s affair with Pybus, and the realisation that after graduating her sterile home life would remain the same, which causes her at the end of the novel to leave Phil and her children, and to end her affair with Dave Pybus as well.

Phil, in contrast, is content to have achieved a little more than his parents by living in a “better” house. Hines portrays him as being settled in his blue-collar job and, unlike Lucy, he has little aspirational drive. Thus, in terms of Phil as a representation of working-class masculinity within the context of the novel, the “good home”, like the “good” wife for that matter, are symbols which reinforce his self-worth as working class husband and father. In titling Phil as the everyman, Hanna Behrend discloses that the family structure in the novel adheres to conventional values. If left to Phil, these values would be allowed to endure. During the course of the novel, however, Hines gradually illustrates the slippage between the conventional gender roles. While Lucy spends more time studying, and for the most part, deliberately stays away from the marital home, Phil is forced to take over some of her domestic “duties”. *Unfinished Business* is unusual in Hines’s oeuvre in having a female protagonist through whose eyes we see events.[[81]](#footnote-82) However, Hines punctuates the narrative with a series of episodes showing Phil’s successes and failures in the domestic sphere. Moreover, it is by way of this intentional interruption of Lucy’s narrative that we see the public and private roles gradually reverse and the way in which Phil is transformed from patriarch to new man is unveiled.

**Phil as the Epitome of the Contemporary Stressed Working-Class Man**

The backdrop to Hines’s *Unfinished Business* is a society suffering from the extreme anxiety caused by mass unemployment. The election of the Conservative government in 1979 marked a sea-change in post-war British history, and resulted in a drastic reshaping of the British working class.[[82]](#footnote-83) This state of uncertainty is reflected in Phil’s representation as a working-class masculine subject. For Phil, who works fulltime, the threat of being made redundant is ever present. His role as a charge hand welder holds a certain amount of responsibility in the works because he is in charge of inspecting the other welders’ work. The narrator explains how this responsibility initiates Phil’s stress in the workplace:

Phil often argued that there was enough work for two more welders in the fabrication shop. This would give him more time to check the quality of the work produced, instead of having to spend most of the time on the job himself. (p. 71)

The welders are under pressure to produce more quality goods, yet the firm is short-staffed and this discrepancy leads to the manufacture of goods that are below standard. Thus, a lack of manpower triggers Phil’s stress. As an overseer, his responsibility is to keep standards high. Hines reveals that the stressful working conditions are intensified because the works have been taken over by “a global conglomerate”,[[83]](#footnote-84) Falco Fabrications “based in Seattle, in the United States” (p. 71). At a textual level, this voices the greater implications of the *laissez-faire* economy of the 1980s on the working-class and those in the labour market. Hines, therefore, articulates how job security for the working class in the rise of Thatcherism was precarious. As the first draft of *Unfinished Business* observes, people were “becoming demoralised and increasingly fearful for their jobs.”[[84]](#footnote-85)

Hines writes that the welders in Phil’s works “were under severe pressure” (p. 71) to complete an order. Working class masculinity is signified by the male subject’s ability to be a mode of production. The narrator states that Phil is “exhausted” from the burden of completing the order, yet, the fear of unemployment forces him to carry on working in order to provide for his family. The novel recounts the instability of Phil’s position in the works: “Labour costs had to be kept down to encourage investment” (pp. 71-72). Again here Hines points out the larger implications of a capitalist system on the working-class male body. As a manual worker, Phil’s body is subjected to a series of repetitive and systematic actions during his working day. A note made by Hines while he was developing the novel, found among a collection of rough research notes, outlines the impact of a labour-intensive work. It delineates how Phil would suffer from “Deafness, eyes, going due to concentration fumes from flux”,[[85]](#footnote-86) owing to the working practices of the firm. By drawing attention to the impact on two of the senses, hearing and sight, Hines severs the working-class body from the sensory processes and foregrounds how Phil’s working environment affects his cognition. This disabling of the senses disconnects Phil from his environment and again causes stress as it disorientates him. Shifting the focus from the working-class body to the head and mental strain, Hines focuses on the psychological stress caused by manual labour. Phil’s self-contained narrative discloses a working class masculine subject who is subjected to two competing tensions. One stress is the anxiety related to the public sphere and ongoing fear of being unemployed, whilst the other is caused by Lucy’s absence from the private sphere.

**Phil and the Potential to Change**

 The text is largely narrated from Lucy’s point of view, yet it begins by offering Phil’s perspective on working-class society. The opening of the novel follows a similar pattern seen at the beginning of Hines’s first novel *The Blinder* (1966). Phil Downs is first witnessed driving through the area where he used to live as a child. Morley Street, Phil’s old street has “been knocked down” (p. 5) and he observes that, “All the familiar landmarks had disappeared: lamp posts, corner shops and the covered entries which had punctuated the terrace” (p. 5). In *The Blinder* Hines exploits the same narrative technique of placing his male protagonist, Lennie Hawk, in a specific space. Hines’s conscious distinction between the inside and outside spaces, the school hall and the playing field at the beginning of *The Blinder*, symbolises the polarised nature of Lennie as a masculine subject; his being torn between playing professional football and going to university. In terms of Phil’s masculine construction, Hines’s trope outlines the basis of his masculine subject’s potential to change. Like the “modern new houses” (p. 5) that will be built on the newly flattened land, thus changing the landscape, Phil will eventually transform into a “new man” within the text. Phil views the demolition of his old street as “progress” (p. 5). As Lucy’s education is driven by her need to better herself, so are Phil’s ventures into the realm of domesticity. Hines’s conceit expresses the author’s intention not only to show Lucy’s self-awareness and growth but Phil’s also. As a consequence of aligning the narrative trajectories, Hines consolidates the “painful process”[[86]](#footnote-87) of both finding their identities altered.

**Phil’s Reaction to Change**

Phil’s response to the realisation that his wife has chosen a different path to the one that he as patriarch thinks is appropriate for her, is for the most part an internalised reaction. Unconsciously, he is anxious that he may have to take on some of the domestic responsibilities and that he will be perceived, albeit symbolically, as wife and mother instead of the patriarch. Hines writes that Phil feels “apprehensive and threatened by what she was doing” (p. 30). Phil’s sense of apprehension and threat is incited by the “turmoil of not knowing” (p. 30). Phil’s insecurity is built upon the fear of emasculation. By entering the public sphere, Lucy threatens Phil’s patriarchal status. Thus, his masculinity by corollary is “threatened”. Phil fears a loss of cohesion in his home life and a loss of control. He is afraid that her going to university might make a “difference” (p. 31) to their relationship and “spoil it” (p. 31). Hines constructs Phil as a masculine self who fears disorder in the domestic space, since, as the narrator informs us, “Untidiness distressed him” (p. 21). Although the domestic sphere in the early part of novel is designated as a purely a feminine space and Lucy’s domain, Phil as patriarch is anxious to keep control of home life and in turn, of his wife. “Untidiness” disrupts his notion of control. If Lucy is away from home and Phil away at work, his home life will become disordered and chaotic. Hines’s male subject’s fear of disorder sustains Phil’s patriarchal standing in the home. Lucy at this stage of the novel’s development recognises Phil’s anxiety in regard to obsessive control impulses and tries to placate him. For Hanna Behrend, part of Lucy’s “duties” as a wife is to fulfil Phil’s “sexual need and pleasure.”[[87]](#footnote-88) As Hines’s narrator recounts:

She kissed him urgently on the face and mouth and Phil responded to her unexpected ardour by pushing her onto her back and rolling on top of her. There was no preliminary coaxing or caressing or gentle exploration, he just prised open her thighs with his knee and thrust his way inside her. (p. 30)

Hines implies that sexual relations in this marriage are usually initiated by Phil; Lucy’s “ardour”, as the narrator suggests, is “unexpected”. She kisses her husband “urgently”, and the adverb deceptively gives the impression that Lucy’s desire is immediate and overwhelming and more essentially, genuine. Yet, even though Lucy initiates sexual relations, for her this liaison is on a purely transactional basis, as it based on her obligation as the less dominant spouse to reassure him that their home life will remain the same. Hines thus indicates that keeping their marriage stable is essential at this stage of the novel. Moreover, Lucy is willing to put aside her own sexual needs in pursuance of placating Phil. From Hines’s description, it appears that sexual desire in Phil’s and Lucy’s marriage is a patriarchal privilege. The narrator adds that: “Phil would not wait for her” (p. 31). In reciprocating Lucy’s “desire”, Phil mirrors her fabricated eagerness. His quest for the “monogamous orgasm[s]”[[88]](#footnote-89) overrides for that instant his unconscious anxiety as he enjoys “his gasping, spurting pleasure” (p. 31).

**“Educating” Phil**

Phil’s transformation into the new man does not happen instantaneously. Phil’s “education” follows the pattern of Lucy’s lapses from the domestic sphere. The more Lucy is away from home because of her studies, the more Phil is forced to look after his own needs. Moreover, he also has to adapt to looking after his children after work even though he still works full-time. As a result, as much as Lucy endeavours to educate herself, Phil is also compelled to educate himself. His education starts in the kitchen. At first he refuses to cook for himself, yet, because of Lucy’s absence he is forced to cook for his children, Tracey and Mathew. The narrator observes thus:

Phil made them beans and toast. He forgot to stir the beans, and when he scraped them out of the pan, he scratched the non-stick surface with a spoon. They still smelled appetising though, and the children did not seem to care that the sauce had boiled dry and that they were stuck together like mashed potato. (p.75)

This description draws attention to Phil’s inadequacies as a nascent care giver. Self-consciously, instead of creating a sense of harmony, Hines’s cluster of sibilants, witnessed here is this sentence: “He forgot to stir the beans, and when he scraped them out of the pan, he scratched the non-stick surface with a spoon”, gives the impression of discord. The tone of this description is melodramatic. It also is founded upon pathos as Hines shows how Phil is out of his depth in the domestic sphere and does not, at this point, emulate the mother object. Yet the children do “not seem to care” (p. 75) and happily eat his “beans and toast”. Phil takes “pleasure”[[89]](#footnote-90) in seeing his children eat what he has cooked. His emotional impulse to nurture his children is exposed by the narrator. “By the late seventies research was further demonstrating both desire and capacity in fathers to care for their young children, suggesting that there were - or could be - more similarities than differences in the way fathers and mothers relate to their infants,”[[90]](#footnote-91) argues Lynne Segal. What Segal brings to light, in essence, is a reshaping of the perception of the role of father and a partial turning away from the doctrine of patriarchy. At this point in the novel, Hines contradicts conventional gender roles by representing Phil as both father and mother. Indeed, Phil’s compulsion to preserve a sense of unity in the family overrides the patriarchal conditioning to which working-class masculine subjects were exposed from birth. The novel’s view of masculinity in this period recognises that patriarchy and patriarchal values were potentially fragile.

As the novel progresses, Phil is obliged all the more to look after himself and the children as Lucy spends more time at university. As Phil says to the children: “I don’t know why your mum doesn’t take a bed and sleep at the university” (p. 75). Phil’s image removes Lucy from the domestic sphere. Thus, the author illustrates how Phil and Lucy’s conventional gender roles are being gradually eroded. What is more, Phil’s phrase ironically reveals Lucy’s affair with her tutor. Here, Hines replaces Pybus with the signifier “university”. Suggestively, Phil’s unconscious fear that Lucy is sleeping with another man is manifested via the metonym. The text’s structural parallelism is what Hanna Behrend argues underscores the power of “emancipation” for both sexes within the novel. Although he does not fit into the role of the new man easily, Phil is resolved to educate himself in order to care for his children effectively, away from the judgmental gaze of the 1980s masculinist society. The image of books in the novel is a motif which operates as a signifier of self-determination. The trajectory towards Phil’s transformation into the new man starts with his disapproval of Lucy’s books. In one scenario which takes place just after Lucy starts at university, the couple argue about Lucy’s books. The narrator describes the encounter thus:

 Lucy was studying the record cover when Phil came into the kitchen carrying two books clamped closely together in one hand. He dropped them noisily on the table, making Lucy start and look round.

 “Bloody books. They’re all over the house. You can’t move for them.”

 “Stop exaggerating, Phil.”

 “It’s true! It’s like living in a bookshop. They’re in the kitchen. In here. Upstairs…”

 He made them sound like a plague of mice. (p. 57)

Hines’s simile at the end of this extract signifies Phil’s unconscious anxiety. By likening Lucy’s books to a plague of mice, he exposes how the dynamic of household is “infested” by Lucy’s aspirational desire. His first thought is to remove this infestation from their lives. As Lucy says herself, he exaggerates, yet this exaggeration is part of the process of transformation. However, the simile has a more ominous connotation. The noun “plague” not only voices Phil’s fear of change, in addition it foreshadows the “death” of their marriage. Hines implies that Phil will eventually be transformed into a single father and take sole charge of his children in the place of Lucy.

Behrend observes that, “In tiny steps forwards and backwards he sheds his patriarchal shell.” This adept observation recognises Phil’s potential to transform from the entitled patriarch seen at the beginning of the novel into the liberated new man. As Behrend notes, this process is not straightforward, yet Phil’s determination to succeed outweighs his disappointments. Later in the novel, Hines describes how Phil buys a cookery book called *Great Dishes of the World*, and Lucy thinks he has bought it for her:

 “I’m afraid I’m not going to be able to do much justice to that.”

Phil continued to smile.

“You? It’s not for you. It’s for me.”

Lucy stared at him in disbelief.

“Well, if I’m going to cook, I might as well do the job properly, hadn’t I?” (p. 117)

What this interaction brings to light is a reversal of roles. The buying of books in the novel has been up to this point Lucy’s privilege but now Phil also takes pleasure in doing the same. Phil’s pleasure shows a potential to adapt. It also in broader terms reflects the shifting face of the role of the father at the time of mass unemployment. As Segal notes: “Unemployment certainly creates a greater involuntary home-centeredness.”[[91]](#footnote-92) The new man, as Segal suggests, spent more time in the domestic space than he had done in previous eras. He therefore was born out of the reshaping of the patriarchal parameters in working-class society. Phil, although not unemployed, is the personification of working-class masculinity and embodies the crises which befell many men at this time. The new man as a type was a contradictory figure which was built upon the conflicting tenets of women’s liberation and working-class struggle.

**1990s**

**The “Returning Native” in *The Heart of It* (1994)**

**Cal Rickards**

Barry Hines’s penultimate novel, *The Heart of It* was written in 1994. This novel centres on many of Hines’s recurring literary interests. Focusing retrospectively on the Miners’ Strike of 1984-85, the novel manifests competing narrative streams through the eyes of the screenwriter, Cal, piecing together the tumultuous events of the strike. In other words, Hines returns to the established masculine narrative of the returning native which he had first introduced in 1972, in his third novel, *First Signs*. The novel follows Cal’s unravelling of what happened to his father and mother during the strike. Rickards has to return home to South Yorkshire because his father, Harry, suffers a stroke. The stroke robs him of his speech and immobilises him. His mother, Maisie and his brother, Joe still live in the area. The novel’s multi-stranded narrative takes place some time after the strike. One strand documents the details of the strike, while another strand details Cal’s reconciliation with his family, and his finding his daughter, Becky. After this event, Cal has to reveal to Maisie that she has a grand-daughter. This plot device allows her to reveal that she had a son before Cal was born to an Italian prisoner of war held in Britain. A further strand retrospectively delineates Cal’s difficult relationship with his father before he left home for university.

Hines, like many other scholarship boys, went away to university but returned to his place of birth in later life. There is in many of his works a sense of his own dislocation. He writes either through “[T]he eyes of an outsider”,[[92]](#footnote-93) or indeed, from a retrospective position: the recurring motif of the General Strike (1926) which appears throughout his works attests to this. Although Hines was “proud about writing about his class”, even on returning home he did this from the position of an “observer”.[[93]](#footnote-94) As Philip Dodd suggests, the scholarship boy by leaving the manual classes finds their own “masculinity problematic”.[[94]](#footnote-95) This is because of the scholarship boy’s sense of being uprooted and being displaced from his original class status. For Dodd, this crisis of identity leads the writer to become preoccupied with writing about what is absent from their own existence in class terms. Therefore, he is compelled to recreate the masculine identity he has lost.

This being said, in Hines’s “returning native” narratives, the “native” is always compelled to return home owing to a crisis, one that is either personal or family-related. Hines’s “returning native” is typified as one who was first attracted to the “pull” effects of social mobility. In order to be socially mobile, the native must “migrate”; and in *The Heart of It* the chance of a university education is at the crux of this compulsion to escape. This affords the reason for Hines’s native to leave his family; and it provides the means to escape what Cal thinks of as his “father’s bullying arrogance and political rigidity”.[[95]](#footnote-96) Caught up in a two-tiered educational system which prized the academically elite, Hines himself was obliged to go to grammar school after passing his eleven plus. This was a challenging passage in Hines’s life story as he found himself isolated from other boys of the same age from his village, including his own brother. In *The Heart of It*, the theme of return becomes a plot device which provides the impetus for Hines’s narrative.

Cal feels duty bound to return home to an unnamed town in the north of England after his father Harry Rickards suffers a stroke. The novel’s time scale concentrates on the present day and Cal’s homecoming. But, crucially, the narrative presents the events of the strike as witnessed by members of community and this is told retrospectively. Members of the local community, including Cal’s mother, Maisie, and his brother, Joe, are convinced that he will never be “the same again (somehow)” (p. 38). Hines implies that the stroke was caused because Harry “was badly beaten up” (p. 109) by the police while he was in their custody after being arrested during the strike. Harry’s state mirrors the gradual disintegration of the coal industry due to market forces and the policies of Conservative Government of the time. Hines’s fictional screenwriter arrives home at a time when working-class communities in Britain were being dispossessed after the decline of heavy industry. Cal’s father’s body symbolises the decay of the coal industry in its shattered form. Cal discovers that the place of his birth was changed by the experience of industrial action, and this also impacts greatly on the members of the community. As Cal’s brother Joe tells him: “The strike knocked the stuffing out of the place” (p.14). An ongoing theme of the dissolution of working-class communities is foregrounded by Hines in his works of the 1980s and 1990s. David Forrest and Sue Vice note that this perception of dissolution in *The Heart of It* and other texts such as *Looks and Smiles* (1981) and *Threads* (1985) acknowledges, “Hines’s increasingly pessimistic analysis of class relations and the barbarism of the free market in Thatcher’s Britain.”[[96]](#footnote-97) *The Heart of It* represents the decay and fragmentation of working-class communities in an embryonic post-industrial north of the early 1980s. Joe’s choice of words succinctly denotes the combative nature of the strike. This turn of phrase renders an image of a community that had become disembodied after its defeat by Conservative policy. In this novel the author scrutinises how industrial unrest had transformed the dynamics of northern working-class societies, which were shifting from a sense of collectiveness to a state of individualised decline.

*The Heart of It* was published in 1994, but Hines had been documenting and writing about the contentious issues of the strike from its inception, in the early part of 1984.[[97]](#footnote-98) This focus on the factual aspects provides a realist portrayal of the events of the strike. During a ten-year period, Hines would write three screenplays which all focused retrospectively on the miners’ strike: *After the Strike*, *Slate* and *The Diggers*. This phase of Hines’s writing career would prove to be both intense and unsatisfying as the author failed to gain any recognition for his works on the strike. “[I]t is surprising that it was not until 1994 that his published work addressed the pivotal 1984-1985 miners’ strike”,[[98]](#footnote-99) observe David Forrest and Sue Vice. By contrast, *Threads* was broadcast during the first year of the strike in 1984. Hines’s apocalyptic drama received critical acclaim. Yet, “[T]he events [of the strike] proved so resistant to Hines’s efforts to represent them that none of the three plays he wrote in the wake of strike was ever produced.”[[99]](#footnote-100) Because of this lack of recognition, the narrative of *The Heart of It* strives to put forward a cohesive and forthright viewpoint on the injustices of the miners’ strike through the medium of Cal’s growing impetus to write something meaningful. The author’s methodology when composing the novel’s dialogue is experimental: the narrator articulates the action in the third person, while using free indirect and free direct discourse to convey the characters internal and sometimes external expression. Indeed, this method works alongside a disregard for quotation marks. Instead of creating a polyphonic effect, the lack of speech marks unifies and places emphasis on the “solidarity” (p. 108) of the voices when depicting Harry’s role in the strike via their dialogue. In this way, Harry’s involvement in the strike is represented, and the characters involved speak with one voice which constructs the conviction of a collective consciousness. As Graham Holderness observes, Hines’s novels are “politically and artistically progressive,”[[100]](#footnote-101) and this perspective affords a reflection of class consciousness within the social world of the novel.

This collectivist model is achieved by Hines’s using selected modes of dialogue which reiterate that Harry symbolises the power of the strike within the text. For example, Tommy, an ex-miner, who is portrayed as a jack-of-all-trades, states: “Brilliant man your dad, Karl. He was a leading light at our pit during the strike” (p. 65). This point of view is echoed by Jack Collins, the manager of the local supermarket, another former miner. Jack says of Harry: “You couldn’t find a better man anywhere to fight your corner than Harry” (p. 106). Both interlocutors adopt a stance which elevates Harry’s position in the mining community. Although the superlatives in the comments are different, they both represent Harry in an exemplary light. But they also symbolically suggest that in the context of the novel, Harry is the personification of a noble working class masculinity from the past.

Just as the trope of return is imperative to Hines’s narrative, so too is the opposing image of exile. Significantly, Hines’s novel features many exiles: Cal’s father Harry, for example, was imprisoned in HMP Armley after being arrested outside a “scab’s house” (p. 109) during the strike in 1984. He was arrested because of his insistence on going to speak “to the scab, Phil Walton” (p. 109) in order to dissuade him from breaking the strike again. Harry’s imprisonment leads to a sort of social ruin, because he is removed from the support of a political network. Furthermore, imprisonment fractures the homosocial bonds that have been forged in the political network and those that are at the heart of the fictional, closely unified mining community, if only for a short time. In the context of the novel’s theme of industrial unrest and its aftermath, exile by imprisonment damages the progress of the miners’ direct action by extracting its most radical “agitator” (p. 19), who was known for his “oratory powers” (p. 106). Another exile witnessed in the text is Cal’s brother, Joe, who is “arrested during the strike” (p. 16) at Orgreave. As part of his bail conditions imposed by the magistrate, he has to stay “outside the Yorkshire coalfield and away from the picket line until the date of his trial” (p. 45). Joe therefore goes to live in Scarborough. Christine, Joe’s ex-wife, divulges that his exclusion from the community was much like the “internal exile” (p. 45) method used in the Soviet Union. Again, Christine’s terminology articulates Hines’s political rhetoric. Ironically, however, Hines uses a mode of expression which refers to a communist form of social control, although in the novel it is used by a right-wing government.

What arises from this reflection of internal exile is that, in correlation with Harry’s exile which culminated in time spent in prison on remand, Joe is similarly separated from his family and, more significantly, his wife. This form of social control not only ruptures familial bonds, it dissolves marital unions as well. In this part of Hines’s narrative Joe falls in love with Lisa, whom he meets “at a disco” (p. 45) while exiled in Scarborough. This scenario highlights, in broader terms, how being away from the home and from the community because of government policy encourages the breaking of marital bonds, again shattering a family’s and a community’s solidarity. Both Harry and Joe as masculine figures have been deprived of this opportunity to provide for their families in two ways: the first by being imprisoned, and the second by striking. Yet they were prompted to strike because of the fear of losing their jobs. In his discussion of the representation of miners in George Orwell’s works, Ben Clarke suggests that working-class masculinity constructed in novels concerning mining narratives is based upon the tenets of “manual labour, physical courage and endurance, political radicalism and virile heterosexuality.”[[101]](#footnote-102) The act of separating the exile from their community strips this masculine construct of the foundations on which their identity is grounded. Thus, the stability of the masculinity is weakened and is instead replaced with the “rootless existence”[[102]](#footnote-103) of the exile.

The theme of exile is introduced on the first page of *The Heart of It* as the narrator describes the exhilaration felt by Cal after leaving the anonymous South Yorkshire town:

He turned down Attlee Way. When he had left home and gone to university in London, he hadn’t even known the people who lived in the same house. He had loved it. The freedom. He had been so pleased to escape. (p. 1)

 Like this one, many of the opening sections of Hines’s novels draw on the sense of place to symbolise the emotional landscape of the masculine protagonists. Much of this description is given in retrospect. Cal, in the present, has just returned home to the street where his parents still live and where he lived when he was young, yet one of his first memories focuses on the time when he left for university. Though the image of the exile in this extract may seem obscure, the narrator makes explicit Cal’s desire to be free of his stagnant “northern” working-class life when he was young. Hines consolidates this first impression of Cal, as the narrator tells us that on seeing his father for the first time after his stroke that:

Seeing his father in such a helpless state depressed him. The house depressed him. The place depressed him. He had only been back for only a few hours and he wanted to leave already.

 (p. 3)

Cal’s response here is for the most part understandable. Yet, at the heart of this statement is the exile’s innate desire to flee. Cal, as one of Hines’s returning natives, can be characterised as a self-imposed exile owing to the fact that he has no desire to return to his birthplace: he is satisfied with living elsewhere. Indeed, in this description Hines outlines Cal’s self-conscious state of mind in the instant of returning home. Hines’s reliance on the repetition of the adjective “depressed” outlines Cal’s abject state of mind and his escalating sense of despondency. Cal immediately feels the after-effects of the strike at an unconscious level. Hines thus gives the impression that the economic reality of the town is psychically experienced by Cal. Hines’s protagonist’s mood aligns with what Ian Haywood terms an “anxious revisiting of his roots’.[[103]](#footnote-104) For Cal, returning home has to be forced on him by a crisis. In fleeing his “roots”, Cal has escaped from theinevitability of the working-class reality which his father, mother and brother have endured. Richard Hoggart states, in detailing the elemental factors of the “Scholarship Boy”, of which Cal is an example of in Hines’s works, that those on entering further education find themselves “at the friction point of two cultures”.[[104]](#footnote-105) Cal has gone through this process by leaving home and attending university. But for him, the “self adjustment”[[105]](#footnote-106) to an aspirational way of life has caused him to separate himself from his working-class origins. Rather than splitting himself between two supposedly opposing cultures and oscillating between classes, Cal opts to “cut himself off” and transforms himself into what his father calls a “bourgeois opportunist” (p. 86). Harry’s turn of phrase again returns to his feeling that Cal has not written anything that reflects the day-to-day struggles of the working-class. For Harry, Cal’s ability as a writer should be put to better use by expressing the “fragmentation of working-class labour” instead of writing superficial scripts for productions in Hollywood.[[106]](#footnote-107)

**Cal the Stranger**

The concept of the returning native is complex when looking at Hines’s masculine protagonist from the perspective of the writer’s exclusive fictional community. According to Hines, Cal returns from exile in order to “tidy up the past” (p. 132). Cal expects to make “a flying visit”, yet he is drawn to the town and its community because “everything has changed” (p. 79) and by his desire to discover why this is so. Hines, by casting Cal as the “lost brother” (p. 107), reveals the disintegration of the mining community through the eyes of what appears to be a stranger. He is aware of the town’s transformation during the strike, since it “ripped” the “people” and the “place” apart (p. 80). In distancing Cal from the others in the text, Hines cements his protagonist’s alienation. In one part of the novel, Cal complies with this sense of anonymity by pretending to be someone else in order to gain information about his father’s involvement in the strike. When talking to Jack, who was once a miner himself, and who now manages the local supermarket, Cal assumes the identity of a “friend” of Cal’s from university who is investigating Harry Rickards’ arrest and imprisonment. Jack does not seem to question this pretence, as their exchange shows:

What’s his name?

Who, my friend?

No. The bloke who was put in prison.

Harry Rickards.

Harry Rickards? Oh, I know him. Everyone knows Harry around here. (p. 106)

Hines’s narrative allows Jack to believe that Cal is who he says, a friend looking to help the Rickards family, but this is only possible because Cal mentions Harry’s name. The naming of Harry Rickards, a man of some stature in the community, dispels any suspicion on Jack’s part. By affiliating his invented persona with an irreproachable member of the small community, Cal is able to adopt the role of the stranger in order to glean information. If Cal admitted his real identity to Jack, this information would not be forthcoming because Cal might be thought of a class traitor who did not support the action of the strike. By impersonating a friend of the Rickards family, Cal is given the opportunity to act as an objective observer and outsider. He stands apart from a community he once was a part of but is also able to infiltrate the community owing to the very fact that he was once part of it.

**Cal the Outsider**

By constructing Cal as a stranger, Hines places his protagonist in a difficult position in relation to the narrative and its setting in the close-knit community. As one who has left the community and then returned, Cal sees himself as an outsider. This concept may seem to be ironic, yet Cal’s exile has left him irrevocably changed culturally and possibly ideologically also. In an early part of the novel, Cal reimagines a scenario which takes place between his father and a fellow miner, George Moody, who are trying to find out who the strike breaker is during the strike. As a screenwriter, Cal plots his imaginary scenario as if writing a script. The scenario starts with the premise that George and Harry “had identified the scab by following the NCB van from the pit” (p. 53). Cal records the imagined dialogue on a cassette recorder:

Slow down, they’re stopping.

…Well, bugger me! Look who it is: the phantom fitter.

It’s incredible. The idlest man at the pit. He’s been sacked once for absenteeism. And to think that the union fought to get a sod – (no cunt. His father would have said cunt). And to think that the union fought to get a cunt like that his job back.

Cal switched it off, then played it back. His accent sounded stagey, like a southern actor playing a northerner. He believed the dialogue, though. (p. 53)

Hines uses this scenario as a piece of metafiction by placing the embryonic scene of the novel Cal proposes to write encapsulated within his own novel. Again, Hines’s choice of methodology reflects his own difficulty in representing the strike from the observer’s point of view. Cal’s falseness, his sounding “like a southern actor playing a northerner”, signifies what Hoggart points out is the temptation of “self-dramatization.”[[107]](#footnote-108) This impulse reflects Cal’s desire to reintegrate into his working-class identity. Yet this cannot be achieved fully because Cal oscillates between classes: he is neither working-class nor fully middle-class. Thus, in re-imagining this scenario, he acts out his desire and fleetingly becomes part of one class.

Furthermore, Hines uses imitation to articulate the notion of betrayal. Even though the extract at first sight seems comic, within the fabric of this sober piece of work, as David Forrest and Sue Vice note, that the extract embodies the “traumatic and indelible marks of the strike.”[[108]](#footnote-109) Rather than diluting the importance of the message which is woven into Hines’s vignette, comedy functions in order to make the reader focus on the essence of the unjust tactics at the time of the strike. In Cal’s dramatization he tries to imitate his father’s character through his voice. Cal’s imitation is ironic, owing to Harry being left almost mute after the stroke. However, he does not quite achieve this in his version of his father’s manner of speaking, due to Cal now being an outsider. He changes the softer profanity “sod” for the stronger, dissonant expletive “cunt”, to sound like his father, and to reproduce Harry Rickards’ impassioned temperament. This change in expression shows that Cal’s ventriloquism, in one sense, appears fabricated owing to his being away from the community for a long time and Cal corrects himself for the sake of accuracy. Thus, in another sense, in correcting himself he wants to put forward the accuracy of this account, so that it gives the impression of being factual and not fictional. Establishing the “strike stories” and their authenticity, is a narrative device which shows Hines’s determination to give validation to the injustices of the strike.

As noted earlier, Cal appears different, if not exotic, to those in the community. Hines foregrounds the motif of the outsider by making explicit from the start of the novel Cal Rickards’ cultural difference. Cal’s parents had called their first-born son Karl, after the German philosopher Karl Marx. On leaving his home town, Hines’s protagonist has adapted his name, changing it from Karl to Cal. The narrator observes that Cal’s mother “objected bitterly to him being called Karl” (p. 21). Yet, Cal’s father saw it as his patriarchal right to name his “two sons” (p. 21): Karl after Karl Marx and Joe after Joseph Stalin, another one of Harry’s idols. Cal wastes no time in discarding his birth name after leaving his home town. It had caused him to suffer “many a playground beating” as a school boy. This adoption of another name, however similar to his own, again highlights Cal’s desire to rid himself of his name’s communist affiliation and, more significantly, of his northern identity. Thus, Cal no longer identifies as his father’s son. In this way, we see that Cal equates his birth name with his father’s political leanings which he believes were foisted upon him from an early age. The change of name causes symbiotic confusion on his return, since Cal has assimilated into a new bland, “bourgeois” persona. For example, while Cal recognises his old school friend, Charlie, who is the barman at the hotel he is staying in, it takes time for Charlie to realise who he is:

It’s Charlie Thomas, isn’t it?

The barman looked surprised. Cal didn’t look like anybody he would know.

Cal. . . Karl Rickards.

The barman gave him a long, hard look. Well bugger me! So it is. (p. 7)

Charlie’s sense that “Cal didn’t look like anybody he would know” demonstrates that Cal is perceived as an outcast in the novel’s close-knit community. To be not “like anybody” that you would know in the area where Charlie and Cal were born is not to be a “local” and to be almost other or “them”. For Hoggart, working-class people have their roots strongly in the “homely”, the “personal” and the “local”.[[109]](#footnote-110) In adopting a “southern” persona, Cal is seen as being one of “them” and not one of “us” – a member of their community.[[110]](#footnote-111) Charlie does eventually acknowledge Cal. However, Cal has to revert to his birth name, “Karl Rickards”, in order to convince the barman about who he is. By reverting to his birth name Cal is able to reinsert himself into the community.

**Cal the Son**

Cal is compelled to return to his home town because of his father’s illness. Hoggart notes that on leaving his community, the scholarship boy “cannot go back”[[111]](#footnote-112) because he has crossed a cultural divide For Cal, this “self adjustment” occurs while in exile. In terms of masculinity, the scholarship boy leaves a potentially “hard”, labour-intensive life behind, in favour of a “softer”, intellectual existence. As Hoggart goes on to argue, one part of the scholarship boy “does not want to go back to a homeliness which was often narrow”, while another part himself “longs” for the membership he has lost.[[112]](#footnote-113) In other words, and in relation to Hines’s narrative, within Cal’s unconscious there is a suppressed desire to return home.

At the beginning of the novel, Cal appears resigned to coming back to see his father (and mother), nevertheless, he is reticent and conflicted by incidents that happened in his youth, during which his relationship with his father had been strained and difficult. Hines makes the reader aware of Harry’s deep-seated antipathy towards his son. The first words that the father exchanges with his son, after such a long time apart are, “W-w-when-are-you-going-to-write-something-that-matters?” (p. 6). As noted above, Cal has been working as a screenwriter before returning home. Hines’s use of ellipsis stresses the emotional weight contained within this remark. Apparently mute after his stroke, the narrator confides that the words “stumbled” (p. 6) out of Harry’s mouth. The broken rhythm of this statement shows Harry’s eagerness to speak to his son. Moreover, Harry’s statement reflects the creative mood in which this novel was written. Hines had been grappling with writing about the ramifications of the strike for over ten years, and this had taken a toll on author’s confidence in his work. By placing such an emphatic statement at the beginning of this novel, which is the product of creative frustration, Hines exposes his own awareness of the difficulty of putting forward a representation of the strike.

Recorded in a flashback is an altercation between Cal and his father which demonstrates the origin of their enmity. The flashback retells an incident which occurred on one of Cal’s vacations from university. It focuses, somewhat bathetically, on a Hungarian bottle of wine, bought at the local Co-op which Cal places on his parents’ kitchen table. On seeing that the wine is from Hungary, Cal’s father demands that he “pour” it down the sink, but Cal does not want to and demands: “Why, because of the Hungarian uprising?” The argument continues thus:

 He didn’t answer. He didn’t have to. Cal rehearsed a crack about Château Stalin 1956, but thought better of it in case his father hit him with the bottle.

 They were traitors. They had to be crushed.

 What do you mean, traitors? They were Hungarians. It was their country. They didn’t want to be a Soviet state, that’s all.

 But you’ve got to look at the time. It was the height of the Cold War. Russia had to maintain a strong buffer against the advance of Western Imperialism.

 Cal had heard it all before. But he had never dared oppose it openly. His new-found freedom had given him confidence.

 (p.26)

Ian Haywood notes that during the 1950s “[M]any British communists were disenchanted by the clampdown in Budapest.”[[113]](#footnote-114) Historically, what Haywood’s observation exposes is British communists’ tangible “sense of disillusionment” with Stalinist ideology. Hines writes that Harry had joined the “Communist Party as soon as he was demobbed” (p. 215) from the army. During his war service, Harry had become “interested in politics” (p. 215). But after the war ended, like many others in Britain he felt “tremendous optimism” that people like him would get a fair crack of the whip” (p. 215). In broader terms, owing to the institution of the Welfare State in Britain, and the rise of consumerism, the standard of living for the working class was higher than before the Second World War. On the surface, the novel’s “Hungarian wine” scenario may seem incongruous. However, this scenario elucidates how the author plays with his life-long anti-capitalist sentiment. Opaquely evidenced in *The Heart of It*’s political discourse is the fact that the measures put in place for social reform in the post-war period were not radical enough for a confirmed communist such as Harry Rickards. Harry’s representation within the novel embodies Hines’s long-standing political belief in working-class autonomy. It is Cal’s exile and education that allows him the intellectual scope to argue against his father’s rigid political beliefs. Yet in Harry’s eyes, Cal “has sold out” (p. 237); and the narrator suggests that he finds his son’s “opposition” intolerable because Cal was destined to be his “political heir-apparent” (p. 26).

The flashback additionally details a politicised lexicon based upon Cal’s apparent “defection” from the communist cause:

As the voices grew louder, his mother came out of the kitchen to see what they were shouting about. She stayed out of the argument, but neutrality was no defence in her husband’s eyes, and when he denounced Karl as a turncoat, a revisionist and a bourgeois opportunist, he hurled insults in her direction, as if in some way she was to blame for their son’s betrayal. (p. 27)

This scenario is filtered through the eyes of Cal’s mother, Maisie, who remains “neutral” and voiceless throughout the argument. Once more Hines reveals the split interests of a mother and a father. In Hines’s first creative work, “The Flight of the Hawk”, he recounts how the father wishes his son to follow him down the pit, while the mother wishes their academic son to matriculate to university. Hines would go on to repeat this trope in his first novel, *The Blinder*. In this incident, Harry blames Maisie for nurturing Cal’s opposition and his symbolic defection from communist ideology. The term “denounced” is pivotal to recognising Harry’s antipathy. Cal’s father voices his sense of betrayal fervently: Cal is a “turncoat”, a “revisionist” and a “bourgeois opportunist”. Each of the slurs provides a representation of Cal’s “betrayal” of his father in its own right. Rather than a turn of phrase appropriate to a father voicing his disapproval, Harry’s dialogue is based on a politicised discourse which conveys an ideologist speaking to a defector. Much like the depiction of a scab, seen in Hines’s other miners’ strike texts, here the “turncoat” signifies one who turns against his own class and betrays them, while the term “revisionist” points towards a more specific turning away from Marxist doctrine. Most significantly, Harry realises that Cal will never turn out to be a communist sympathiser like himself. He believes that his son has joined a class which is culturally elite but has the opportunity to ignore the working-class struggle.

**Cal the Lover**

Hines’s text draws attention to the importance of returning home. Once home, Cal is driven to re-immerse himself into the history of strike and its effect on the community. This re-immersion has two main effects on Cal’s psyche; Cal is forced to reflect on his status as a son and writer because he has to confront the relationship with his parents, especially his father. But also, because of his returning home, Cal’s remembering of past events causes him to regress unconsciously. Cal is moulded in the same vein as several of Hines’s other leading men. Hines introduced his model of writing sexual relationships in *The Blinder*, and it is echoed throughout his oeuvre. Cal’s narrative arc and the way Hines describes his relationships with women is reminiscent of the sexual relationships in his third novel, *First Signs*. In *First Signs*, Hines envisioned a love triangle between his protagonist, Tom, with Helen, a “mature” wealthy heiress, and Zelda, a young woman he met while at university. A similar dynamic can be found in *The Heart of It*. Cal’s love interests are Christine, his ex sister-in-law, and Hélène, a French film star. This dynamic relies on a difference in status between the women. Although the ages of the objects of Cal’s desire are never mentioned, the most significant aspect of the female figures’ characterisation is that they are from two very different ways of life. Indeed, by repeating this dynamic in other texts, Hines reiterates the importance of this difference in status as a leitmotif. This repetition reflects, at an unconscious level, Hines’s own feelings of dislocation, and in being caught between two divisions of class. Thus, in terms of masculinity’s metaphorical importance within the text, the textual intersection between masculinity and sexuality crystallizes a reading of his own oscillation between classes.

Cal’s returning home has triggered a memory which, in turn, has caused a psychic shift, between the conscious and the unconscious. This shift can be perceived in the first sexual scenario in *The Heart of It*. The shift exposes how Karl’s first experience of sex was as a spectator and not as a lover. Cal, when “driving past the rec” (p. 20) the day after visiting his parents, recollects playing football when he was a child, with “Bob Markham”, “Jack Lacey”, and “Ronnie Harrison” (p. 20). As the narrator puts it: “Suddenly, he thought about something else and got an erection…” (p.20). The reader soon discovers that the mysterious “something else” is that the younger Karl is witness to a sex act when he goes to retrieve the ball when it ran down a “steep bank” and into “the bushes” (p. 20). The narrator states that when he “pushed aside the branches” he “revealed Jack Collins and Mary Hanson lying in the grass. Jack was leaning back on his elbows with his trousers open, watching Mary suck his cock.” (p. 20). The slippage between temporalities does not at first acknowledge why Cal’s reaction to the “rec” is able to arouse him. Indeed, this resurgence of memory triggers his erection; he is stimulated in the present, yet this sexual urge has been deferred from a past experience. By chancing upon Jack and Mary, Karl is initiated into the world of erotic pleasure at an early age; however, the narrator does not state how old he is. It was Karl who saw Mary and Jack, but it is Cal who remembers the occurrence. For Cal, being witness to such an act, where an older girl gives pleasure to an older boy, signifies that Cal in the present is orally fixated. Yet, Cal’s memory articulates more about his being a sexual self in the present than it does in the past.

Hines’s early focus on fellatio also exposes the sexual politics at play within the text. Caught in the act by a “little boy”, the couple “laugh[ed]” and “relax[ed]” (p. 20). Then, “Mary slowly raised her skirt and opened her legs.” (p. 20). A sense of *insouciance* is derived from the action, yet, the focus is on both the availability and the fragmentation of the female body. It should be noted here that Mary appears to Cal as older than her years. Yet, as the narrator reminds the reader, she has a “young mocking face” (p. 32). Thus, her representation in the novel is conflicted. She is sexually precocious, as Cal remembers her opening “her legs” and showing him “her knickers” (p. 32). This image conjures the idea that Mary in this memory is acting provocatively and is willing to be sexually available to Karl, as well as Jack. Mary, as a minor female character, is presented only as a sexual object and one whose only purpose in the text is to satisfy the male libido. She also appears later in the text when she and Christine meet Cal in the hotel where he is staying. Cal recognises Mary as the girl from the incident at the rec. As the narrator explains: “Suddenly, Cal realized something. Her stared at her. Was it her? Was it *really* her? He wasn’t sure. […] She was so slim that her tits were too big for her body. But it was her. Yes! definitely!” (p. 32). Mary does not recognise Cal as the boy who discovered her in the bushes, as she says, “No, I can’t remember you.” (p. 32). Hines replaces the negative contraction “don’t” with “can’t”. The turn of phrase here signifies how Mary is resistant to remembering Cal and more significantly, to identifying where she first saw him. This provides the awareness that older Mary does not want to remember. Free indirect discourse reveals Cal’s thoughts to the reader:

What if she had remembered him and said, I remember you? You are that little lad with the football who surprised me and Jack Collins that day.

And what if said, Yes, you were sucking his prick, then you opened your legs and showed me your knickers.

And what if she said, Have I to open my legs and show you my knickers now?

Instead she said, What are you staring at? (p. 32)

While, Mary unconsciously resists remembering, conversely, Cal actively enjoys replaying what he witnessed when he first met Mary. Internally, Cal’s libido is stimulated by role play and imagining a sexual scenario featuring Mary. Hines makes the reader aware that Mary is in the text as an object of desire but she is not necessarily presented as a sexual partner, like Christine orHélène. Cal gradually distorts his inner dialogue in order to stimulate himself sexually. The conjunction “[A]nd” denotes the heightened conflict inside Cal’s role play. Cal transforms the dialogue and manufactures Mary in his own sexual fantasy. This act of autoeroticism is reiterated in the following passage: “When Cal went to bed, he had a wank. But he wasn’t fucking Hélène. Or Christine. Or Mary. Or both of them together. He pictured a little boy in glasses, watching Mary Hanson sucking Jack Collins’ cock.” (p. 33). Desire has been put aside in favour of an internalised voyeurism. Cal is not a participant but a spectator. Just as this passage underscores Cal’s oral fixation, it additionally suggests that he has narcissistic tendencies. Cal is happy to pleasure himself, and his own memory is the vessel in which pleasure is derived.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I have analysed the typical masculine narratives found in Hines’s novels. Owing to the breadth of Hines’s corpus this chapter was limited as to which masculine narratives to include. However, the masculine narratives discussed in this chapter are not limited to one kind of text. Types such as ‘anxious adolescent’ and ‘the family man’ can be found in other published works by the author. For instance, Mick Walsh, played by Graham Green in the film *Looks and Smiles* (1981), could be described contextually as an anxious adolescent because of the nature of the text’s plot. Written more than twenty years after *The Blinder* was published in 1966, the author foregrounds his ongoing concern with the plight of working-class youth and labour market under a Thatcher-led administration focused on competition and selection. Hines delineates the effects of the economic slump in the north of England in the 1980s via a narrative filtered through the young school leaver. He paints a picture of how working-class expectations of a job for life are pitted against mass deindustrialisation. Mick represents a working-class adult “in waiting”, a young man who wants to work, but who cannot find a suitable apprenticeship in the present economic climate.

During the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, the representation of the family man takes a pivotal role in Hines’s texts, both on screen and in print. In *Threads* (1984), directed by Mick Jackson, Bill Kemp (David Brierley,) a working-class family man, is shown wearing an apron and serving dinner to his wife, Rita Kemp, played by Rita May, who is the main breadwinner of the family. This visual metaphor symbolically connotes the perception of the decline of the masculine provider and his apparent emasculation. Through this symbolic image Hines implies that the destruction of industry in the north had influenced the power dynamics in the home. Home and family and their destruction are central themes in *Threads*. Yet, patriarchal primacy is not pivotal to survival after the nuclear blast. *Threads*’ narrative makes explicit reference to the obliteration of the family man as Ruth Beckett, played by Karen Meagher, takes the role of both father and mother to her daughter Jane (Victoria O’Keefe) after the explosion. Hines’s meditation on the obliteration of the family man and his role as provider continues in his penultimate novel, *The Heart of It*, and his construction of the ailing father, Harry Rickards – a miner who has suffered from a stroke. The novel holds its own political potency in its reiteration of the incendiary events of Orgreave in 1984. However, Hines’s decision to fashion Harry as a martyr to the cause symbolically expresses the destruction of the coal industry in South Yorkshire. According to David Forrest and Sue Vice, Harry’s failing body and lack of speech due to his stroke, “seems to consolidate the apparent erosion” of a “traditional” working-class masculinity after the collapse of the mining industry.[[114]](#footnote-115) Notably, from these two examples of the depiction of the family man in Hines’s later works, an awareness of the shifting nature of working-class masculinity becomes evident. Indeed, Phil Downs’s masculine narrative foregrounds how the figure of working-class family man in Hines’s later texts was changing.

On another note, undeniably there is one glaring omission from this chapter, Hines’s most memorable central masculine character, Billy Casper. On reflection, however, Billy is not a typical form of Hinesian masculinity when compared to the rest of the principal male characters in the author’s work. *A Kestrel for a Knave*’s narrative tells the story of the soon-to-be school-leaver, Billy, who is transported from his desolate adolescence by finding and training a kestrel. Billy is represented as a schoolboy who is a socially isolated underachiever and the product of a one-parent family. His characterisation does not compare with other masculine figures found in the author’s published works. Yet his characterisation does have some parallels with the author’s lost masculine narrative types. For instance, in Hines’s radio play, *Billy’s Last Stand*, which aired in 1965, the eponymous Billy is another of the author’s socially isolated masculine figures. For some, the author’s first venture into commercial writing may seem surprisingly melodramatic for a writer associated with social realism. But, like many of Hines’s works, the play has an allegorical potential which implicitly warns against the evils of capitalism. The play endeavours to critique the mass consumerist tendencies of the 1960s. *A Kestrel for a Knave* also does this implicitly. Like A *Kestrel for a Knave*, the play is set in an anonymous South Yorkshire location and a peripheral narrative focuses on the mining industry. In terms of chronology, the texts were written in the same period, the 1960s. Also, similarly to *A Kestrel for a Knave, Billy’s Last Stand* shows the experimental side of Hines’s creative inclinations. The play is surreal in nature and one of the most experimental in Hines’s corpus. *A Kestrel for a Knave*’s ending can also be described as leaning towards the experimental -- veering away from his realist style, Hines changes the tone and treatment of Billy’s narrative which at this point of the novel is delivered in a stream of consciousness.

Another way in which Billy has a similarity with masculine figures in the lost works is in relation to his of lack sexual presence. In the lost works, Hines uses sexuality to engender a sense of otherness. Otherness or, indeed, a perception of sexual difference, is an essential factor in understanding why Hines’s lost text went unpublished or unperformed. *A Kestrel for a Knave* and *Kes*, garnered great commercial success and, on the whole, the vast amount of the success of the texts was due to Billy’s characterisation and its ability to engender a conscious empathic response from the reader or spectator. Because of the mode of Billy’s characterisation, he lacks the potential to progress into manhood. He is constructed as being in opposition to his sexually active half-brother, Jud; and his mother. Billy remains in a state of regression; a Peter Pan-like figure, fixed as a symbol of non-sexualised adolescence within the narrative. Billy Casper’s characterisation stimulates the reader to feel the need to nurture him or, moreover, to protect him –Billy thus remains unthreateningly asexual. Thus, Billy’s otherness, his sexual difference, renders his masculine narrative palatable and more significantly, commercially viable.

However, the lost masculine narratives discussed in this thesis did not have this advantage. Billy Casper’s masculine narrative is an isolated episode within Hines’s body of work and the author would never again capture the essence of Billy’s appeal in narrative form. Moreover, all of the masculine narratives attached to the lost texts discussed here unequivocally differ from Hines’s typical masculine types. With that in mind, this thesis seeks to unearth their difference.

**Chapter Two**

**Discovering the Mutability of the Outcast in *Billy’s Last Stand***

*Billy’s Last Stand* was one of Hines’s first ventures into commercial writing. Hines’s play focuses on a seemingly unsophisticated dynamic, based upon domination and subordination. *Billy’s Last Stand* was originally written for radio and it was aired on the ‘Third Programme’ in 1965. Hines’s play witnessed a resurgence of interest after he published his best-known work *A Kestrel for a Knave* in 1968, with a staging of it at the theatre “upstairs” at the Royal Court in 1970. This version of the play was published in *The Best Short Plays of 1971*, edited by Stanley Richards. In Richards’ introduction to the play, he states that the dialect has been modified for publication because of it being “very complicated and really convoluted”[[115]](#footnote-116) for an American audience to understand. Hines’s play was then filmed for BBC television in 1971 as part of the *Play for* *Today* series. Although no copy of the television play survives, the reviews relating to this broadcast illustrate that the production was well received. However, it would seem from the reviews that the cast was extended to at least five members, unlike the radio version, in which Billy and Darkly are the only characters; there is no evidence of this augmentation in typescripts contained within Hines’s archive. By being performed across three mediums, Hines’s script was able to reach a wider audience, yet the play has only appeared since in the public realm as part of an Arthur Lowe retrospective on Radio Four in 2015, since he had played the role of Billy in the radio play.

*Billy’s Last Stand* centres on the relationship between Billy, who makes a piecemeal living shovelling coal, and Darkly, a mysterious stranger who desires to “organise” Billy’s working practices and enter into partnership with him. Darkly creates a system of work for Billy which increases income but this comes at the cost of Billy’s wellbeing. However, their partnership is threatened by the arrival of a younger rival, Stark, who threatens to undercut Billy and Darkly and take away their business. The crisis initiated by this rivalry prompts Darkly to persuade Billy to help him rid them of this competitor; Billy capitulates and they attack Stark, leaving him for dead. After committing this heinous act Billy declares that he is ruined and in turn, murders Darkly.

The play, like Hines’s later works, illustrates the author’s long-standing interest in working-class subjects and working-class selfhood. Although there are no handwritten manuscripts within the papers concerning *Billy’s Last Stand,* contained within the Hines Papers are four typed scripts. The typed scripts are catalogued as follows: BLS 1 is a proof copy of the published play; BLS2 is a shooting script; BLS3 is a carbon copy of the typescript BLS 4 with annotations and some crucial sections to be omitted marked on it; BLS4 is a typescript; and, last, BLS5 is a folder which contains reviews from the time of the performances and correspondence relating to the play. This material and the changes over time it represents in relation to Hines’s conception of the play will be my focus here. The omissions in BLS3 depict Billy’s failed career as a professional footballer, which came to a close when he broke his leg; his failed relationship with a woman called Gert; and his working life as a miner – yet none of this background material relating to Billy appears in any of the three performed versions of the play. Neither does the background material relating to Darkly’s characterization appear. These omissions expose his relationship with his mother, his mother’s possible career as a prostitute, his fatherless status, and his representation as a virgin. The omissions in the typescript BLS3 relating to Billy and to Darkly therefore connote an alternative way of reading Hines’s dramatic construction of masculinity. If the omissions were incorporated back into the script it would change the spectator’s perception of it entirely.

Throughout his long career, Hines wrote from the perspective not so much of a failing masculine culture but rather from a faltering one. Most readers of Hines’s work would associate him with a persistent focus on working-class life and a specific interest in the mining community. His oeuvre shows a continued emphasis on male-dominated domains such as the manual workplace and sporting culture, and his later texts offer an awareness of a post-industrial manhood, the rise of the feminist movement and how this influenced the masculine domains and the disposition of the young man in the post-war era. But Hines, more significantly, wrote from a viewpoint which elaborated the plight of individual men facing a specific crisis or crises.

 In *Billy’s Last Stand* the crisis centres on the possible loss of Billy’s livelihood. In this chapter I will explore how the performance of this crisis intersects with masculinity; and how masculinity is constructed by way of this meeting. I will explore what forms of masculinity are available to Hines’s male characters in *Billy’s Last Stand* in the midst of crisis. I will argue that Hines’s dramaturgical approach allows for a dimension beyond that of the realism that became his trademark. In this way, a sense of otherness manifests itself. The arrival of Stark induces Billy to manifest his other, Darkly, as a defence mechanism against the threat of losing his livelihood. In a psychoanalytic sense, we witness the protagonist Billy undergoing an internal division in a dramatized form. When considering how Hines’s masculine other is represented within the play, this chapter will take a two-fold approach based upon the critical material relating to *Billy’s Last Stand* found amongst the Hines Papers; and will also focus on both the published play and Hines’s own omissions to this play found in the typescript BLS3.

The Hines Papers holds a brief analysis by Raymond Williams. This review of Hines’s play was published later in an anthology along with other reviews of television programmes. After viewing the television version in 1971, Williams gave this adroit synopsis of the play:

 *Billy’s Last Stand* was familiar structurally; a duologue

 centred on the arrival of a sinister stranger. Billy has

 been scraping a living by shovelling coal from its delivery

 point on the pavement to people’s coal-houses. Darkly

 arrives, watches him and persuades him of the need for

 organisation: Darkly will get orders and set up a regular

 rota; Billy will hump more coal and earn more money. This

 goes along until Billy’s back gives out under the increased

 workload. And there is competition from a younger man,

 Briggs.[[116]](#footnote-117) Darkly persuades Billy to join in an attack on

 Briggs after threatening to leave and organise him instead.

 Back in Billy’s hut Darkly insults his shame and pride. He

 throws Billy’s souvenirs around smashing the place, and

 for a long time, Billy does nothing. Then at last he picks up

 one of his lumps of coal and kills Darkly. [[117]](#footnote-118)

Williams highlights the drama’s allegorical nature. Although he mentions the arrival of Stark, Williams focuses on the relationship between a symbolic bourgeois and proletariat model of representation. This model of representation illustrates a way of reading the play through a Marxist lens. Williams’s review provides a useful account of how the play was possibly perceived by a wider television audience, as an allegory of how a working man was installed into a system of organised work at the behest of the exploitative bourgeoisie, which ultimately leads to his downfall.

On the one hand, *Billy’s Last Stand* is written in dialect, which conveys a sense of realism which in turn, tempers the aforementioned allegorical tone. Yet, on the other hand, Hines’s approach to form turns towards the experimental, as the play’s aesthetic can only be described as verging on the minimalist. This combination of form and style allows a reading which goes beyond the realist working-class focus that later became associated with Hines’s work. Although the play is still centred on the world of work and labour, *Billy’s Last Stand* is unusual when compared to the rest of Hines’s oeuvre because it ends with murder. In order to reach this *dénouement* Hines has to place his protagonist, the eponymous Billy, in the position of negotiating a crisis which culminates in the murder of Stark. Stark’s arrival thus prompts Billy’s fragile psyche to be threatened. Moreover, this crisis forces Billy’s psyche to fracture, thus allowing his other Darkly to manifest in his time of great need. I argue that this crisis disturbs and destabilises Billy’s identity, rendering him as the dehumanised, “docile’ other. Hines’s thematic and tonal approach to writing Billy’s and Darkly’s negotiation of crisis illustrates that in casting Darkly as the sinister stranger, a different mode of otherness is available to him – that of the uncanny. However, this investigation into Hines’s representation of the masculine other is further complicated as BLS3 reveals that Hines’s original script differs from the one that was performed on radio, on stage or on television. This script clearly shows Hines’s own annotations, alterations and his significant omissions. Thus, in the final section of this chapter I will analyse Hines’s omissions, which include removing a section of exposition, alongside Julia Kristeva’s theory of the abject, in a reading of Darkly as abject and an unspeakable other.

**Billy’s “Docile Body**”

In his review, Raymond Williams, for the most part, ignores the crisis created by the arrival of Billy’s rival Stark. Instead, he concentrates on the play’s overarching allegory. He observes that the play and its playwright “did not have to force any super structural meanings”.[[118]](#footnote-119) Williams’ observation, at first sight, outlines the subtlety of Hines’s writing and of his fashioning of Darkly’s and Billy’s relationship. Williams’ commentary focuses on how Hines paints the parasitic dynamic between the employer and employee. It indicates the ideological viewpoint of the commentator and how Williams perceived the play as an allegory of how the capitalist system subordinates its working-class subjects. However, from the outset of the play, the spectator is immersed in the world of the marginal and the alienated and those outside of “superstructural” norms. By constructing a dramatic schema outside of societal and cultural spheres, Hines denotes that his dramaturgical approach goes beyond an allegory depicting the dynamic between the base and the superstructure. The play is minimalist in its aesthetic, which accentuates the experimental form; but, more significantly, it foregrounds the parasitic dynamic forged between Billy and Darkly. Outwardly, Hines’s play outlines the relationship between the two characters and how they become “partners” in enterprise. This enterprise, however, begins to falter after the appearance of a rival worker. Hines’s drama, for Williams, also focuses on how capitalism can corrupt the individual. Yet, as Hines’s dramaturgical approach highlights, it is not only Billy who is corrupted but Darkly also. Billy becomes a slave to Darkly’s method of work and loses his identity. For Williams, the crisis contained within the drama is the crisis of selfhood and of independence. As Williams notes, the play is about “precarious survival”[[119]](#footnote-120) on the periphery of society. The play does focus on Darkly’s function, which is ostensibly to clearly define the division of labour between the pair: Billy works while Darkly provides the system of “organisation”. Billy’s and Darkly’s construction thus, in light of Williams analysis, may be thought of symbolically as that of the proletariat and Darkly’s bourgeoisie. But Hines’s construction of these characters goes beyond this ostensible symbolic representation of contemporary capitalist work-relations to something more akin to Michel Foucault’s analysis of systems of power.

As Foucault argues in *Discipline* *and Punish,* the body becomes a “target of power”,[[120]](#footnote-121) and Hines’s play illustrates how Billy’s body is targeted by Darkly. Hines shapes an allegorical message within the play. According to Williams, Hines’s allegory denotes that capitalism is predominantly a corrupting force. However, Williams fails to note that Darkly’s representation from the outset of *Billy’s Last Stand* is that of the other or Billy’s dark double. Darkly isdemarcated from Billy by way of Hines’s depiction of the two characters as to oppositional entities: one individual that works, and one individual that organises the work. However, as the play moves towards its conclusion, the spectator realises that Darkly is an element of Billy’s own being and that his manifestation is provoked by the arrival of a rival. Hines’s dramaturgical approach sheds light on his interest in how power can shape and re-shape the body. Hence, Billy’s body is put under pressure, first by Darkly’s system of control, and second by the crisis which is initiated owing to the arrival of a rival worker. Thus it seems that the play’s political and psychic allegory concerns not only the domination of a proletarian by a bourgeois figure, but the deathly effect of unstable and competitive labour.

From Williams’s point of view, Darkly’s characterisation is based upon not only his own self-improvement and his quest for upward mobility (arising from his exploitation of Billy) but also on perfecting Billy’s body as a mode of production. Darkly moots that he wishes to “conserve” Billy’s physical “energy” and that he also wants to save Billy from “strains”.[[121]](#footnote-122) At first sight, Darkly’s wishes seem neutral, but his comments at this stage of his interaction with Billy still imply the possibility of adapting Billy’s body for a certain purpose. As Foucault suggests, the perfection of the body comes at the cost of docility of the subject; or, in other words, the body (in Foucault’s example, that of the soldier) is rendered docile by systematic organisation. The body, for Foucault, is a mode of production and its materiality defined by its efficiency, making it more “useful” by way of its “aptitude” and “capacity”.[[122]](#footnote-123) Darkly wishes to transform Billy’s inefficiency and elevate the chaos of his working life by making Billy’s bodily movements the epitome of efficiency. In the initial interaction between the pair, Darkly tries to undermine Billy as he suggests for instance that Billy is making “a tow o’t’ job”, meaning hard work. However, it also signifies that Billy’s physical appearance would be under a great deal of strain. Darkly here not only reinforces his superiority over Billy, but also shows a desire to perfect and increase his productivity. Williams observes that Hines dramatises the structure of the “world of work” and this engenders the dynamic between the two men, as he argues:

Everybody else had been organised, Darkly explained; Billy was one of the few casuals left. But for Billy this was work, as opposed to employment. An old miner, he had chosen this way of running his own life, taking his own time, relying on the fact that people knew and trusted him. What Darkly was taking away was the freedom and self respect of that kind of work, and he was doing it in the name of the modern idols: increased productivity and a rising standard of living. [[123]](#footnote-124)

Williams notes what Foucault would describe as the imposition of docility on Billy by Darkly. The play thus relies upon what Michael Billington describes as the rise of “consumerist conformation”[[124]](#footnote-125) in the 1960s. Before meeting Darkly, Billy lived from day to day, never knowing where the “next meal’s coming from, living wi’out a system or organisation”. At first, Billy begrudgingly accepts Darkly’s offer of organisation. Now that Billy is organised he earns “twice as much” but loses his identity as the ragman and the outsider. Billy’s desire for “luxuries” transforms him into what he dreads most. He loses his “independence” and becomes a “regular bloke”. Hines, therefore, uses Billy’s newly enforced materialism to critique societal aspiration - by being slowly broken down by over-work, Billy’s body becomes a symbol for a burgeoning consumer culture, and Darkly’s methods of transforming Billy into a perfected mode of production depend on “calculated manipulation”[[125]](#footnote-126) of Billy’s bodily movements. For example, later in the play, Billy’s back, which is the essential instrument of his method of production, becomes the fulcrum on which Hines’s plot hinges, thus adding to the drama’s allegorical significance.

As Darkly procures more work he causes Billy’s production to increase, and Billy’s body inevitably begins to suffer:

 Darkly: Tha making a tow o’t’ job, aren’t tha?

 Billy: Well, it’s a tow of a job, in’t it?

 Darkly: Ar, but tha making it harder still for thi sen.

 Billy: In what way?

 Darkly: Tha not using thi head at all.

 Billy: How can I use mi head to get a ton o’coal in?

 It’s not a number five shovel I’ve got on mi

 shoulders, tha knows.

 Darkly: Well for a start tha putting too much in thi

 barrow. Better to put less in, even if it means a

 few more trips. Conserves energy, less chance

 o’ strains.

 Billy: Owt else?

 Darkly: Ar, tha not using your legs at all when tha

 shovelling.

 Billy: Tha don’t shovel wi thi legs.

 Darkly: That’s where tha are wrong, that’s where thi

 power comes from.

 Billy: How’s that then?

 Darkly: Well by bending thi legs that mobilises thi

 large muscle groups and takes all t’strain off

 thi back.

 Billy: O’ ar.

 Darkly: Tha sees, t’way that shovelling thi back’s

 is taking all t’weight. Use thi legs,

 conserves energy, less chance o’ strains.

 Billy: Who’s told thi that, then?

 Darkly: I’ve read it in books.

Hines use of dialectal discourse highlights, outwardly, the diverse nature of Billy’s and Darkly’s opinion. Yet, the almost anaphoric repetitions illustrate that Billy is being slowly persuaded by Darkly as to his limitation as a coal shoveller. This mirroring technique allows Hines to present Billy’s doubt as to his own abilities. Darkly’s rhetoric highlights the illocutionary force of his dialogue. From the outset of their meeting, Darkly presents his orders as if they are in Billy’s own interest, while also wishing to ingratiate himself with Billy. This may seem ironic, yet Hines highlights how the nascent relationship between the pair is nurtured: Darkly must interact with Billy in order to persuade him to change to his system of organisation. Although Darkly is not working or moving like Billy, his dialogue mirrors Billy’s movements but with the distinction that he desires to make Billy more efficient. Hines’s purpose in shaping Darkly’s locution in the negative is to, again, reinforce his desire to alter Billy’s practice of work and persuade Billy as to his own inefficiency. Darkly may not be physically shifting the coal, yet Billy believes, because of Darkly’s apparent superior knowledge about the body and indeed regarding coal shifting, despite the fact that it comes from “books”, that Darkly could do the job more efficiently than himself. However, Darkly’s negative tone indicates that he has no intention of doing any manual labour: he will only organise Billy’s productivity. Indeed, Darkly’s rhetoric renders Billy’s body as docile from the outset of their first meeting, when he tells Billy that he is making his work “harder still”. This negative comment at the start of their interaction allows Darkly to undermine Billy’s ability. By defining Billy’s movements, Darkly strips away Billy’s independent thought. Hines’s concentration on the adverb “not” therefore allots Darkly the potential to recreate Billy’s body as docile.

Darkly’s focus on Billy’s “head” or intelligence is again in the negative, as he says to Billy, “Tha not using thi head at all”. By way of this first interaction between the two men, Hines fragments Billy’s body into distinct parts. Moreover, this fragmentation only concentrates on the body-part which will be of most use. Darkly’s focus on the body is exclusive because he “watches” Billy intently, calculating how Billy’s mode of production can be improved. He reads Billy’s body and in doing so, Darkly “explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it”.[[126]](#footnote-127) Darkly therefore denatures Billy’s body in furtherance of a system of organisation. What Hines displays in this first interaction between his male characters is that for Billy, the cost of efficiency is the loss of identity and the loss of self. Not only does Billy lose his sense of self, he also loses the governance of his own body. His body is now under the control of its organiser – Darkly.

On the arrival of the rival coal shifter, Stark, Billy is forced to realise his limitations. Darkly’s function is to refine and perfect Billy’s body in pursuance of matching Stark’s agility and ability to perform his function as a coal shifter. Billy’s and Darkly’s representation is based upon the mechanics of the split-self dynamic and by representing it as such, Hines outlines the duality of the body and the psychic cost of exploitation. Darkly is depicted as having superior knowledge to that of Billy. This allows him to dominate Billy and his body. Thus, Darkly is the mind or the entity that thinks. Billy is relegated to being the functioning but not thinking body, one that does “all the work”. In depicting Billy’s and Darkly’s duality, Hines displays Billy as subject to and exploited by a system of organisation that will lead to his self-improvement or at least a nominal improvement in standard of living. Darkly is instrumental in crafting the system of work which Billy will eventually adhere to. Darkly forces Billy to recognise his own mortality as he exclaims: “I think your working days are numbered. (*Pause*) Five years at most, I should say.”[[127]](#footnote-128)

The pause in the middle of Darkly’s veiled threat forces Billy to recognise his own limitations. Darkly’s pause creates an ellipsis – a gap between speech and thought. By pausing or breaking down his conclusion as to Billy’s ephemerality and his limitations as a working object, Billy reflects on the implications of Darkly’s suggestion. Darkly’s persuasion is based on speech and on expression and his ability to identify Billy’s “diminishing” strength. Moreover, Darkly’s power over Billy is established by his opportunism and the chance to “utilise” his “powers and make some money” while Billy can still work.

Billy has elected to live on the periphery of society, yet Darkly’s manifestation forces him to conform to a socio-economic ideal: the more he works, the more he earns, the more he spends. Billy realises himself that when he had “nothing” he was “never bothered” like he is now while working with Darkly. “Modern living” for Billy is synonymous with the breakdown of his body; the more Billy works to keep up with Darkly’s quotas, the more his body fails him. Hines’s use of rhetoric towards the end of the Act 2 is proleptic, which confirms Darkly’s subjection of Billy and foreshadows Billy’s demise. It foretells how Darkly will ultimately exploit him like a beast of burden. Billy ascertains that he will be “saddled for t’ first time” by his relationship with Darkly. Billy here signifies himself as subjected – he predicts that he will indeed be turned into a “saddled” beast. This part of the play takes place in Billy’s local pub. This dramatic representation of a social space connotes the possibility of equality between the men and in conversations they appear to be on equal terms. “Saddled?”

questions Darkly, mirroring Billy’s terminology. Hines employs this mirroring technique to generate an apparent equality of speech. Yet, Billy’s reply: “That’s what it amounts to, in’t it? Being broken in and saddled”, reveals his resignation. Hines uses zoomorphic imagery to symbolise Billy’s new position as docile, since he is now owned by Darkly. Billy is conscious of what will happen to his existence and his questioning of himself has a rhetorical tone. Thus, Hines’s stylistic technique of Darkly mirroring Billy’s dialogue only masks Billy’s hidden fears and, more significantly, Darkly’s intentions. Billy’s phrase “broken in” signifies his later status: he will be paradoxically both loner and conformist. As Billy’s reliance on Darkly grows, so too does Billy’s realization of Darkly’s hold over him. The breaking down of Billy’s body for the purpose of someone else’s profit causes a psychic rupture and generates the appearance of a third character, that of Stark. It seems that in terms of the allegory, exploitation must be followed by competition.

**Darkly as the Uncanny**

Darkly appears when Billy’s livelihood is threatened. Yet, Darkly’s aspiration, knowledge and control of Billy’s body leads only to Billy’s downfall. As discussed above, Williams’ analysis of Darkly’s construction is one-dimensional, as the critic concludes that Darkly’s purpose within the drama is to exploit and to “organise” Billy’s “world of work”.[[128]](#footnote-129) Williams suggests that Darkly – “the stranger” - comes “not from an undefined area of threat, but from a real social condition”.[[129]](#footnote-130) Williams here does recognise that Hines’s Darkly is himself dispossessed due to his undisclosed mental illness, suggesting that the act of exploitation itself has a cost. Also, Williams recognises Darkly as the sinister stranger, and that he appears when Billy is most in need. Yet, this

representation of Darkly for Williams does not have any “metaphysical”[[130]](#footnote-131) connotation. Thus, Williams ignores the significance attached to this method of dramatic narrative and the certain expectations of the audience. Darkly’s role within the drama is complex and for the most part ambiguous. Darkly may be a cipher for the extremes of capitalist exploitation yet the “meanings” behind his construction are not so straightforward.

Darkly’s manifestation has a long literary heritage, since his is a similar textual presence to that of Christopher Marlowe’s Mephistopheles in *Doctor Faustu*s. The devil’s subordinate appears at a time of crisis and tempts Faustus. Thus, Marlowe’s dramatic composition, like Hines’s, depends upon an allegorical approach. Darkly’s “wheedling” does drive Billy to murder Stark. Yet, Hines’s dramatic schema is not so linear as to confirm or deny the reason for Darkly’s manifestation at the outset of the play. As the play moves towards its dénouement it is not quite clear what Darkly’s role is set to be, because Hines fashions Darkly from the beginning of the play as, ambiguously, either the “tempter” or the “saviour”. By contrast, the “complete stranger” appears in the form of the “drifter”, Stark, as someone who Billy does not know. The crisis prompted by Stark comes to its apex, “*Three months*” after Billy and Darkly start working together, as Hines’s stage direction reads. If the latter part of the play does portray Billy’s existential crisis, that is to say, Billy facing the prospect of attacking Stark, then it can be inferred that this crisis was present from the very beginning of the play. Hines’s use of the long-established theme of the visitor/visitant scenario, like the one seen in Marlowe’s drama, promotes the perception that the visitor (whether tempter or saviour) manifests at the time of an existential crisis. In other words, the visitor appears at the time he is needed most.

Billy is rooted to the village he comes from and works in, yet he does not have a “regular” client base for his coal shovelling. Darkly’s appearance reminds the spectator of his precarious status as he comes to “save” Billy “from starvation”.

Darkly’s ominous appearance at the beginning of the play has a metaphysical signification as it alters the spectator’s perception of the dramatic schema. Hines’s characterisation of Darkly as visitant therefore stimulates an expectation as to his role within the play, owing to his representation as a shadowy figure that has the capacity to “threaten” or to “save” Billy. Nicholas Royle provides a context for what Darkly’s manifestation represents: “The uncanny entails another thinking of beginning: the beginning is already haunted.”[[131]](#footnote-132) Royle’s characterisation of the uncanny shows how Darkly’s manifestation works within the framework of the play: he is both known but unknown. On one hand, Darkly haunts the text as his representation is one that is recognised and familiar. On the other hand, he also haunts Billy, yet his motive is unknown. As Billy observes, in Act 2, Darkly is like a “bloody vulture hovering around”. Again Hines uses zoomorphic imagery, this time to depict Darkly’s nature. Hines illustrates Billy’s docility by likening him to a donkey, yet the depiction of Darkly reduces him to that of a carrion bird waiting to pick the flesh from Billy’s bones. This representation again illustrates Hines’s use of allegory within the drama but it also portrays Darkly’s uncanniness: his “watching and waiting” puts Billy “on edge” just like the spectator watching the play. The uncertainty of Darkly’s purpose combined with the stark aesthetic of the production engenders a tone of uneasiness. Indeed, as Hines’s opening stage direction dictates, Billy is working while: “*Another appears who stops and watches*”. On the whole, this positioning of the action between the two actors would seem benign. However, it is the stillness of Darkly’s movement posed against Billy’s action that stimulates the notion of uncertainty from the outset of the play. Darkly’s name carries its own ominous resonance as it explicitly defines him as the ‘dark’ other: the dark half of Billy’s consciousness whose purpose is to lead him to his downfall. Billy brands Darkly a “bloodsucker” who bleeds him dry, and a “vampire”. Darkly’s appearance conversely can be seen as a reaction to an impending threat of mechanised work and the loss of Billy’s livelihood; thus, Darkly embodies the figure of the “double” or doppelgänger.

Darkly first encounters Stark, when Stark is shifting coal outside one the villager’s houses. He describes his first impressions of Stark to Billy as thus:

 Darkly: Tha knows when I

 left thi after that last load?

 Billy: Ar.

 Darkly: Well I wa walking up Pitt Street pleased as punch ‘cos

 we’d finished when I saw this bloke.

 Billy: What bloke?

 Darkly: This bloke getting coals in outside t’beer off. It

 Stopped me dead in my tracks.

 Billy: Who was it?

 Darkly: Got anymore o’that left?

 Billy: Here. (passes the bottle) Go on.

 Darkly (Drinks) I couldn’t believe my eyes, a complete

 stranger shovelling like a maniac.

Darkly creates Stark as a rival to Billy in the act of describing him, using sibilants and alliteration. Moreover, Darkly’s use of the simile “shovelling like a maniac” emphasises Stark’s working method and more suggestively symbolises his virility. The simile, outwardly, highlights Stark’s physical intensity and his potential for work. It is also a hint at the material cut by Hines from one of the draft versions of the play, in which a sexualized version of masculine activity is threatened.

Hines’s play follows a trajectory which culminates in the murder of the interloper Stark. In turn, Billy at the end of the play murders Darkly. By occurring at the dénouement of the play, it is clear that there is a symbolic resonance to these acts of destruction by the disadvantaged or the marginalised. Henry Raynor notes that the play is based upon the perils of “the machinations of the capitalist system” and exploitation.[[132]](#footnote-133) The characters have no chance of escaping their definitive circumstances. This crisis of loss of livelihood incites Darkly to goad Billy into joining him in this nefarious scheme to get “rid o’ Starky”. In the end, Billy does aid Darkly to “send t’boot in”. The threat that Stark’s arrival to the village engenders can be recognised in the representation of Stark’s physicality in Hines’s staging of the fight. Hines choreographs Stark’s demise via stage directions thus:

 (*Footsteps, determined, purposeful; Stark*

 *appears, passes the spot where Billy and*

 *Darkly are hidden; then Darkly leaps onto*

 *his back and knocks him to the ground. Billy*

 *hovers around, uncertain, while the combatants*

 *struggle furiously on the ground, rolling over and*

 *over*)

Hines uses adjectives to act as synecdoches to mirror Stark’s embodiment and his role in the play, since his steps are both “determined” and “purposeful”. This description evokes Stark’s intention to destabilise Billy’s monopoly in the village. Stark’s presence within Hines’s narrative disrupts its structure, and Stark’s appearance substantiates the metaphysical dimension to Hines’s play overlooked by critical perspectives which emphasise solely its allegorical qualities.

Hines’s depiction of the murder of Stark is choreographed to display Darkly as leader. Notably, in this confrontation, Billy stands back or “hovers”. Indeed, Billy’s physical reaction to the act is that of feeling “dizzy” and he states that his head is “goin’ round like cocks an’ hens”. Again, Billy’s physical condition is described in zoomorphic terms. He thus reduces the self to that of the animal and in so doing dissociates himself from the situation. This positioning illustrates Billy’s status throughout the play; he is always at the mercy of those who wield power. Darkly is therefore dominant, physically matching Stark’s physical intensity. Conversely, Billy’s subordinate docility does not allow him to enter into the fight. But as the stage directions highlight, as the attack progresses Billy’s awareness of the situation alters, as Hines’s script defines thus:

 Darkly: Billy, damn thi, come on!

 (Stark appears to be getting the upper hand

 and is gradually getting astride Darkly).

Darkly: Billy! Billy get him you bloody fool.

 (Billy pauses for an agonising second, the

 leaps in desperation on Stark, rolling him off

 Darkly and pinning him to the ground.

 Darkly quickly joins Billy astride Stark and

 starts punching him at random).

Hines’s choreography and use of diction here insinuates that Stark’s attack on Darkly has a sexual motive. In Nancy Banks-Smith’s review of the television play, she notes a toning down of Hines’s staging of the fight in contrast to the stage play:

 The two fight scenes were toned down, possibly on

 advice from above (from the feller who always stands

 over every hole recommending adjustments) and I think

in this case it was a pity, for this play, much of

 its brute strength demanded a degree of brutality. [[133]](#footnote-134)

It would seem from Banks-Smith’s observation that the television production differs from how Hines outlines the attack in BLS3. It is not hard to judge that the male/male body contact or at least the violence was too graphic for television broadcasters. Stark, as the stage-direction outlines, “gradually” gets “astride Darkly”. In depicting this sexualised scenario, Hines is able to engender a greater sense of threat and crisis. To save his other, Billy must come to Darkly’s aid by “rolling” Stark off Darkly in order to save himself from what we can almost imagine to be a scene of rape. In her analysis of Shane Meadows’ *Dead Man Shoes* (2004), Clair Schwarz observes that male-on-male rape “while relatively rare, is often found in texts which concern exclusively male spaces/places, as prison dramas such as *Scum* (1977; 1979) and *The Shawshank Redemption* (1994) or male-bonding adventures in the vein of *Deliverance* (1972).” [[134]](#footnote-135) Like these examples, *Billy’s* *Last Stand* has no female presence. The female characters in the play are represented retrospectively and only as part of the dialogue. The play’s settings express a gradual transformation from the real and the imaginary. On the one hand, depictions of the village and the pub seen in Act One are male/male spaces owing to Billy and Darkly inhabiting them, yet they also signify spaces that are domesticated and familiar. On the other hand, Billy’s “*higgledy-piggledy*” allotment hut engenders a sense of disorientation by being an unfamiliar domestic space owing to its being set apart from the village. Moreover, it is an unconventional place for someone to live. The lack of female presence reconstructs Billy as a “culturally feminised ‘other’”[[135]](#footnote-136) owing to his marginal status in society. This marginal status, his disconnection from society, permits Stark’s physical attack on Darkly – because Billy, like the feminised other, is therefore symbolised as being passive. During the fight, Billy “paused for an agonising second”. The pause, like so many of the pauses in the text of the play, acts as an ellipsis and suggests an aporia in Billy’s thought and his actions. More significantly, Hines’s semantic field signifies the satisfaction of a version of the *petit mort*: a brief loss of consciousness. This break between thought and action once more illustrates Billy’s dissociation and his reliance on his other – Darkly.

Furthermore, this depiction of Stark being “astride” Darkly sees a return to a previous suggestion that Billy will be “saddled” with Darkly. However, this time it is Stark who is dominant and Darkly is subordinate. Hines allows Stark to appear to be getting the “upper-hand” and this positioning forces Billy to act and cease his dissociation. Billy has to come back from the imaginary to the reality of his situation. Darkly’s “cunning” and his “plotting and playing him against” Stark, leaves Stark “inert” and most likely dead. As Virginia Ironside observes, “The crunch of this allegorical drama came when Billy, physically and morally ruined by the awful Darkly, beat him to death.”[[136]](#footnote-137) Ironside’s observation, in regard to Darkly’s death, emphasises the allegorical nature of the drama and its moral significance, yet once more omits its existential dimension. Darkly and Billy have been for the most part of the play suspended in a two-fold relationship built upon interdependence. In the midst of the crisis, the assault on Stark, Billy makes a critical decision, as he elects to combine with and join the attack. Billy thus becomes a composite whole self again and his ruination is complete. This may seem contradictory; however, Billy ultimately conforms to his tempter’s desires and realises that the attack and consequent murder of Stark were inevitable. He therefore murders Darkly, after the attack on Stark, in pursuance of breaking Darkly’s “hold” over him. This act suggests that Billy has surrendered his victimhood and taken control of his own destiny once more.

Stark has a dual role within the drama: he is both a psychic and an allegorical figure. In order to achieve this dual function within the narrative and to force Billy and Darkly to take action against their rival, Hines affords Stark the masculine identity of a predator. Darkly identifies Stark as a “drifter” who “moves about working anywhere”. Like Darkly, Stark appears from nowhere yet is also cast as the embodiment of an insurmountable crisis, one that cannot be reasoned with or ignored. By means of Darkly’s narrative, Hines constructs the dramatic visualisation of Stark. Darkly describes Stark thus in answer to Billy’s question, “If, I don’t stand a chance against you two, how comes he’ll stand a chance against us?”: “I don’t know. (Pause) He’s young and strong an’ there’s summat about him that’s frightening”. Whereas Darkly’s manifestation is uncanny, Stark’s own manifestation is one that engenders genuine fear on Darkly’s part. Stark’s opacity, the fact that he is not known or knowable, leads to his destruction: he has to be “snuffed out”. Darkly’s purpose as Billy’s dual self, however, is to recognise the threat Stark poses; there can only be one coal shifter in the village – and it must be Billy.

**Reading the Abject inHines’s Omitted Material**

In the typescript BLS3 Hines made significant omissions to his script. The omissions highlight that, if left within the body of the play, the construction of both Billy’s and Darkly’s masculinity would be perceived by the spectator in a different light. As discussed, the script that was performed on radio, stage and on television has an allegorical tone and the masculinities rendered have a symbolic function. But, *Billy’s Last Stand* also offers a psychological perspective on how crisis impacts on the self. Yet, if the script was left in its original form the masculinities contained within it would evade a psychodynamic interpretation. Hence, the uncanny is not a sufficient way to analyse the omissions alongside the script that was performed in light of Hines’s disturbing ending. Julia Kristeva posits that abjection is more “violent” than that of “uncanniness”[[137]](#footnote-138) because nothing is familiar. Unlike the uncanny which forces the self to recognise the sensation of the familiar, abjection engenders disgust and revulsion.

Although Hines does not shy away from pathologising both Darkly and Billy in the published text, he clearly reveals Billy’s dissociation and his reliance on his saving “lumps of coal”, while Darkly’s “mental strain”, his neurosis and paranoia, are also explicit. The omissions, however, provide an account of Billy’s family life and lost love affair. They also provide an awareness of Darkly’s sexuality and his relationship with his mother. Hines’s omissions in BLS3, moreover, expose in deeper detail what type of masculinity is available to the abject: Hines’s self-censorship displays what Kristeva calls the “disturbance”[[138]](#footnote-139) of identity. In his exploration of a darker side of masculinities, Hines shows a clear interest in societies’ marginalised individuals. But more significantly, the original materials clearly define and demarcate Billy and Darkly as individuals. Conversely, the published text, which is the one that was performed, relies on a doubling metaphorical approach in which the spectator is led to believe that Darkly and Billy are aspects of the same psyche. However, the omitted material found in BLS3, exposes the abject. The abject, according to Kristeva, refers to physical reactions from the self which consist of such responses as horror or revulsion, in reaction to the other or otherness. For example, the repulsion provoked by the sight of a corpse can be considered as a moment of abjection. Abjection threatens “the apparently settled unity of the subject”, in this instance the spectator as well as the protagonists, “with disruption and possible dissolution”.[[139]](#footnote-140) The threat in this instance centres on Darkly. In the omitted material Billy is clearly defined as being a heteronormative masculine subject. Billy tells Darkly about his lost love: “I turned to allsorts but I could never make a go of owt. (Pause) So Gert tha wa’ who I was courting broke it off. I never seemed to care about owt after that”. Even though Billy has seemingly lost interest in romance or indeed sex, his orientation is still clearly heterosexual. He is a pure and clean body in that sense. However, it is implied in the omitted material that Darkly is homosexual. Therefore, Hines unites his characters by way of their marginalised status but clearly defines Billy and Darkly as separate representations of masculinity by placing them in opposition in this way. Kristeva does not mention homosexuality explicitly, yet, she implies that abjection is a form of protection or safeguard against “perversion”. As Kristeva observes: “The abject is perverse because it neither gives up nor assumes, a rule, or a law; but turns them aside, misleads, corrupts; uses them, takes advantage of them, the better to deny them”.[[140]](#footnote-141) For Kristeva, it would appear, “them” means the abject entities themselves. If performed, the omitted material would induce the spectator to experience narrative unease, since the introduction of sexuality as a theme disrupts the allegory and the realist plot – but only towards Darkly. In the omitted material, Darkly is fashioned as sexually opposite to Billy. This construction by Hines signifies that if the omissions had remained within the script, Darkly’s purpose as an abject self would have led the spectator to believe that he may threaten Billy’s purity and lead him to his self-destruction.

In the omitted material Billy claims that Darkly’s sexuality “seems unnatural”. Billy also speculates that Darkly has “never shagged a woman” in his life before. Moreover, as this interaction between the two characters in the omitted material confirms, Billy goes on to support his allegation that Darkly is homosexual thus:

 Billy: Tha’ d throw thi’ cap at it run an’ run away.

 Darkly: Thar wants to talk! It most be donkey’s years

 since that wa’ anywhere near.

 Billy: It is.

 Darkly: Well then!

 Billy: Ar but I’ve been there, that’s more than thar

 can say.

 Darkly: How does thar know?

 Billy: Cos I do! Admit it you lying bastard.

In this interaction the female body is addressed in its absence. By being absent, the female body confirms Billy’s celibacy while maintaining his heteronormative status, while on the other hand, affirming Darkly’s depiction as homosexual or virginal because he has never been “anywhere near” a woman. At the time the play was written, sex between men was still illegal. The published play does not reference Darkly’s suggested sexual orientation, even though by the time the play was performed on stage and on television in the 1970s homosexual sexual activity had been legalised for men over twenty-one years of age. In the published play, Darkly is both a symbol of the bourgeoisie and the manifestation of Billy’s existential crisis. The omitted material highlights how society might have perceived a homosexual character at the time of the performance. Foucault sheds light on how the homosexual was and has been perceived by a dominant heteronormative society. As Foucault observes, in the “nineteenth century homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology, with indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology”.[[141]](#footnote-142) According to Sullivan, Foucault “insisted that the category of the homosexual grew out of a particular context in the 1870’s and that, like sexuality generally, it must be viewed as a constructed category of knowledge rather than as a *discovered* identity”.[[142]](#footnote-143) The hidden and disavowed nature of Darkly’s sexuality both as plot device and in relation to Hines’s omissions suggests the abject. As Sullivan notes, “an analysis of discourses surrounding and informing sexuality can provide clues as to why particular knowledges, practices, and subjectivities emerge when and where they do, and what purposes they might serve.”[[143]](#footnote-144) Sullivan’s argument points to a reading of sexuality which might have been occluded by the writer. This “queering” of Darkly, or to put it another way, this retrieval of such detail, reveals that he goes against a heteronormative construction of what is “socially acceptable”.[[144]](#footnote-145) For Darkly’s sexuality to be, as Sullivan observes, socially acceptable within this text, he would have to be constructed by Hines as heterosexual. It can be perceived then, in accordance with Kristeva’s theory that the abject is a corrupting force, that Darkly’s sexual orientation and his representation as an abject masculinity which could corrupt or indeed, pollute Billy’s heteronormative status, rendering him abject as well.

Hines’s omissions also illustrate that Darkly is abject not only by way of his sexuality but also by his fatherless status. Darkly is clearly represented as a “bastard” or illegitimate. Marie Maclean notes that the image of the bastard in literature “goes hand in hand with myth making”.[[145]](#footnote-146) In light of Maclean’s observation, it can be argued that in *Billy’s Last Stand*, Hines generates a “myth” in relation to Darkly’s provenance. Even in the 1960s, illegitimacy was an unmentionable issue. Billy’s reference, “What a bloke, a bastard, an’ a virgin bastard into t’bargain”, highlights both Hines’s “queering” of Darkly, his non-normative sexual desire, and his abject status. By using the term “virgin” as an insult, Billy emasculates Darkly. For a man of Darkly’s age (forty or so) to be a virgin is unthinkable and unspeakable. Darkly’s bourgeois status and masculinity is tainted by his illegitimacy. Billy in turn, is from a large family and this legitimate status engenders the perception of him as normative. Billy’s comments allow him gain to power over Darkly for the first time in the drama. This reversal of the power dynamic (if only fleeting) is not seen in the performed play.

Again, the spectator is made aware of the difference between Hines’s two male characters. In the omitted material Billy asks Darkly: “Didn’t tha know him them?”. The “knowing” of the father is essential in understanding and being given status in society. Darkly does not “know” what happened to his father. This void in Darkly’s memory not only reflects on his own but also on his mother’s past, as Darkly confesses, “[No] I don’t think my mother knew him very well either. (Pause)”. Darkly has his mother’s name – her maiden name; he does not have his father’s name; thus as Maclean posits, his past and future are fixed. The mother is always known first. She has “maternal authority”,[[146]](#footnote-147) yet this is only possible if the father is present so that the patriarchy is maintained. The non-presence of the father means the unmarried mother is impure and “unspoken”.[[147]](#footnote-148) Thus, the status of the “unspoken” mother in society is a marginalised figure, who is excluded because of her actions (having a child outside of marriage) and she exists, then, on the periphery of society.

Hines goes on to explore Darkly’s mother as unspeakable. Billy claims that when Darkly was growing up, “There wasn’t much work for women in the[m] days”. Billy’s statement may seem innocuous on first sight as it explicitly refers to the state of women’s employment after World War II. Yet implicitly it has a darker connotation as it refers to Darkly’s mother’s reliance on prostitution in order to make ends meet. Darkly openly notes that his mother stops working when she was “past it”. This not only references her longevity in a certain workplace, mirroring the theme seen earlier in the performed play which concentrated on Billy’s long working life, but it also signifies her waning sexual attractiveness. Her age, therefore, undermines her ability to earn a living and Darkly must now become the breadwinner of the family. Furthermore, Billy’s implication is also confirmed by Darkly acknowledging that he doesn’t “know” what she did or does for a living and that she came home “at all hours” of the night. This “rum carry on” highlights Darkly’s dissociation and his reluctance to accept what his mother did for a living. The shame of his mother’s “work” means that Darkly and his mother were “allus off” travelling about. Darkly’s shame is apparent because he does not or cannot acknowledge what his mother does for a living. The mother is always pure, virginal. Elizabeth Grosz notes that the mother’s body “as much as the psyche or the subject, can be a cultural and historical product”.[[148]](#footnote-149) In light of Grosz’s observation, the body of the prostitute/mother is a polluted one. The mother’s body, for Darkly, is a site of conflict as it provides nurture but it is also the focus of desire as a sexual object. This background material shows how Darkly’s mother is experienced as a corrupting force and that Darkly has been corrupted by his mother’s lifestyle. But this position likewise implies that Darkly by being tainted can in turn be a corrupting influence.

Darkly and his mother are connected by way not only of the devotion of a mother and son but by an unnatural interdependence: one cannot exist without the other. This suggests that, like the dynamic between Billy and Darkly in the performed play, Darkly’s relationship with his mother may have been an exploitative one in which Darkly procures ‘work’ for his mother. There is on Darkly’s part a reluctance to untie his “mother’s apron strings”; Darkly cannot “leave” her and Billy insinuates that the only woman Darkly’s been “near” is his mother. Billy only hints at the “unnatural” nature of Darkly and his mother’s relationship, yet the taboo of incest still resonates through his discourse. Again, Hines’s omissions illustrate a trope that demonstrates Darkly’s willingness to exploit those who are near to him, as this interaction with between Darkly and Billy demonstrates:

 Darkly: There, I wa’ just me an’ my mother (filling Billy’s glass).

 Billy: What?

 Darkly: I wa’ just saying, me an’ mother.

 Billy: What happened to her?

 Darkly: Nowt.

 Billy: She must be knocking on a bit then.

 Darkly: She’s about eighty I think.

 Billy: Where is she in a home?

 Darkly: No she lives with me

 Billy: Fancy living wi’ thi mother at thy age.

In this excerpt from the omitted material, Hines not only describes Darkly’s mother’s age, but also demonstrates the longevity of their relationship; a relationship which has been dominated by Darkly’s mental instability. Incest in Hines’s omitted material is based upon what Kristeva notes: “For the subject will always be marked by the uncertainty of his borders and of affective valency as well; these are all the more determining as the paternal function was weak or even non existent, opening the door to perversion and psychosis”.[[149]](#footnote-150) Darkly’s “mental strain” or psychosis is formed owing to his desire for the mother object. The “uncertainty” of Darkly’s desire leads to his mental breakdown and to his being subject to electric-shock treatment, which he refers to only in the omitted material. This almost confessional account of his treatment is a way of distracting the audience from the pared-down focus on the work dynamic in the performed play. Thus, the omitted section of exposition allows a reading of the play which alters the dynamic between Darkly and Billy. However, by being portrayed as abject Darkly is still constructed as a corrupting force.

In the performed text, Darkly is represented as the sinister stranger. Hines crafts him as both familiar and unfamiliar to the audience. In the omitted material Billy is assertive, if not dominant, owing to the thematic composition of Darkly. In crafting his masculinities in a certain mode, Hines not only shapes the nature of the performance (the published play, as noted, has an experimental and austere aesthetic), but also shapes his masculinities to fit the play’s aesthetic. In the omitted material Hines therefore augments the spectator’s reading of the relationship between the men. However, Darkly’s depiction as abject is still one that leads the spectator to view him as a tempter and a corrupter of Billy’s virtue.

**Conclusion**

As Raymond Williams observes, *Billy’s Last Stand* is centred upon “the facts of labour and on human identity”.[[150]](#footnote-151) But the original version of the play before the omissions were made would have had a quite different emphasis. The performed text therefore adheres to a narrative structure which only allows a glimpse of both Billy’s and Darkly’s backgrounds. The omitted material follows the only intimate interaction between Hines’s two male characters. In Act three, Darkly is seen to be massaging Billy’s back like a “masseur”. This intimacy leads Billy to confess that he had not been touched for a long time and Hines’s omissions begin with this confession. In BLS3’s omitted material, intimacy leads to an exposure of the private lives of Billy and Darkly. The intimate exchanges between the two men in Hines’s omissions thus elevate Billy and Darkly from masculine symbolic constructs to nuanced depictions of men from very diverse backgrounds. Notably, the realist approach to the construction of the abject seen in Hines’s omissions offers a way of reading sexuality and paternity which is not present in Hines’s published works. It is not known why Hines removed the material. It can be suggested that in removing the sections of exposition, Hines constructs his own barrier against the abject. Hines settled for a version of his drama that promoted an allegorical message; however, the script with omissions would acknowledge that the masculinities contained within text come from the reality of a social exclusion.

*Billy’s Last Stand*, with or without the omissions, is about the instability of the world of the work; a subject matter Hines wouldconsistently return to throughout his writing career. The play, with the omissions included, still focuses on the crisis of losing one’s livelihood to a competitor and the subsequent murders of Stark and Darkly owing to this crisis. Yet, the omissions found in BLS3 force the spectator to view Darkly differently, owing to his abject status. Darkly still remains exploitative and the instigator of Billy’s ruination but in light of the exposition found within the omissions, he becomes a real corrupting force, and not just a psychological one.

**Chapter Three**

*…suddenly, writers like Barry Hines start to feel like a history lesson.[[151]](#footnote-152)*

*My second subject was History.[[152]](#footnote-153)*

**Liberating the Prisoner of War in *Elvis over England***

In this chapter I trace the origins of one of Hines’s ancillary masculine characters, Jack Brooks, in his last novel, *Elvis over England*. After studying the archival material connected to the novel, it reveals that Hines originally cast Jack, the step-father of the novel’s protagonist, as a prisoner of war during the Second World War, who was held in internment camps in Italy and then in Germany. Yet it would seem that, having read certain secondary sources during the course of his research, Hines altered his characterisation of Jack to that of a soldier serving in the “Forgotten Army” in Burma. By tracing the course of Hines’s research process, I argue that Hines elected to convert Jack’s characterisation for two specific purposes. First, Hines transforms Jack’s masculine narrative so that it is symbolically heroic. That is to say, Hines revises his depiction of Jack in furtherance of making him possess a militarised masculinity: one who fights and conquers the enemy, rather than being imprisoned in a POW camp. Thus, in returning home to his wife and to her illegitimate son, Jack appears more sympathetic to the reader; and his sacrifice, his service in Burma, appears greater. Second, by detailing Jack’s heroic sacrifice during the war, Hines exaggerates his malaise in the post-war era. The depiction of Jack’s disaffection allows Hines to pursue a political discourse. This discourse illustrates how working-class soldiers, who were suffering from the effects of prolonged warfare, injury, or indeed, internment by enemy, desired a better way of life from that before the war, and were instrumental in vanquishing the Conservative government in 1945.

*Elvis over England*, Hines’s last novel, was published in 1998. On the surface, the text could be defined as a “road novel”, or, indeed, a pilgrimage novel. Its main character, Eddie Brooks, is a steel worker who has been made redundant. After his mother’s death Eddie decides to takes a road journey to Prestwick Airport, Scotland, to visit the site where Elvis Presley landed in 1960, while on the way to Germany to complete his national service. During this journey, Eddie has a brief fling with a barmaid named Sue. When he finally arrives in Prestwick, Eddie finally comes to terms with the ghosts from the past that have haunted his present: his ill treatment at the hands of his step-father, Jack; and the untimely death of his best friend, Jet, when he was a teenager. As the blurb on the back of the paperback edition reads:

When Eddie blows his redundancy money on a car just like Elvis’s, it is the last straw for his wife Pearl. But Eddie has been thinking about the past, his lost dreams and the car might help him recapture them.[[153]](#footnote-154)

What the blurb from the book jacket captures is the mood of the novel, its pessimistic beginning, the death of Eddie’s mother; changing gradually through Eddie’s engagement with past events, to an uplifting, if ambiguous ending where Hines’s narrator implies that Eddie buys a plane ticket to the USA, so that he can visit Graceland. Yet, the novel’s blurb also belies the multiplicity of Hines’s last novel. Hines entwines two narrative streams, one which focuses on Eddie’s journey in the present, while the parallel narrative concentrates on past events. So that Hines can construct the retrospective part of his novel, he uses artefacts to bring to life memories of the past. For example, at the beginning of the novel, Eddie returns to his dead mother’s home for the wake after her funeral, and finds his old clothes in her wardrobe. As the narrator observes: “It was a suit. A crimson Teddy-boy suit”. This triggers the memory of Jet joining “Eddie in the mirror” after trying on the suit for the first time, and Eddie putting his “arm around his pal’s shoulders”, while they laugh “uproariously at their outrageous reflections.”[[154]](#footnote-155) This method of creating narrative by using artefacts from the past allows the author to prompt Eddie into delving into his past. Thus, Eddie’s exposition is sporadically revealed during the course of the novel.

Because of the extent of the material held within the archive that relates to *Elvis over England*, it would seem that the author kept all the documents associated with this publication. The extensive papers relating to *Elvis over England* are contained within ten separate folders held within Special Collections at the University of Sheffield. They consist of: one copy of proofs with covering letter; a corrected typescript; editorial queries and correspondence; a typescript; photocopy of a second draft manuscript; second draft manuscript; first draft manuscript; correspondence and documents relating to copyright clearance for music titles and lyrics; proofs of covers and related correspondence; and last, press cuttings and related correspondence. What is most pertinent to this chapter is the part of the *Elvis over England* material which provides invaluable knowledge of Hines’s working practice and his research methodology. This chapter concerns itself with the contents found in folder EOE/7 – the author’s research notes and notebook. From reading the research material, it would appear that at the outset of his research that Hines did not have a definitive idea of how his character Jack should be depicted. It seems that at the time of drafting, Hines was not sure which campaign Jack was supposed to have taken part in or what type of militarized masculine figure Jack was supposed to be. It seems provident, however, that the fiftieth anniversary of victory in Europe and in Asia coincided with the development of the novel. This anniversary seems to have aided Hines in creating Jack as he appears in the published version.

In the pursuit of gathering information, the writer started with reading secondary material. A notebook found in EOE/7 reveals that Hines may have spoken to several war veterans and prisoners of war, as a list of names and telephone numbers are listed in his notebook. However, there are no documents contained within the research material connected to the novel to prove that this occurred or that Hines transcribed their discussion. Thus, we could conclude that as a matter of discretion, and because of the sensitivity of the discussions, the author did not include the interviews in his archive.[[155]](#footnote-156) However, Hines did list the titles he consulted while researching the novel in one of the handwritten notes contained in EOE/7. The titles relevant to this chapter are: *Welcome Home* (1991), by Ben Wicks; *England in the Twentieth Century* (1965), by David Thomson, which is discussed briefly; and *Chindit* by Richard Rhodes James, published in 1981. *Welcome Home* is a collection of first hand accounts given by soldiers returning from World War II and their families. Thomson’s book plots the course of England’s development both politically and culturally during the twentieth century. *Chindit* is Richard Rhodes James’s memoir of his taking part in the Wingate expedition into Burma behind Japanese lines in 1944. In scrutinizing Hines’s research notes and how he comprised and compiled them, it is likely that he read Ben Wicks’ book first because the European prisoner of war narrative appears in the first draft of Hines’s research notes. It can also be concluded that Jack’s narrative must have changed after Hines read Rhodes James’s memoir and after he watched BBC’s *Arena* series, *Burma: The Forgotten War* (1995). Again, when looking at the notes that Hines made during reading the secondary sources, it is possible to trace how he alters Jack’s wartime experience from fighting in Italy and being captured and interned in a prisoner of war camp in Europe, to fighting in the jungles of Burma.

***Welcome Home*’s role in the Fashioning of Jack’s Masculine Narrative**

In the early stage of the novel’s development, Hines details his provisional thoughts in notes written by hand on paper. His research material shows that he read and made notes from Ben Wicks’ *Welcome Home*. Wicks’ book is based on interviews with servicemen, wives, or girlfriends and the service men’s parents, detailing their thoughts, emotions and the hardships and adjustments they had to face after they had returned home to the United Kingdom. His early notes disclose Hines’s interest in placing Jack’s narrative in a concentrationary setting – that of a prisoner of war camp in Europe. The research material shows how Hines’s own notes are interspersed with those taken from Wicks’ book. Thus, by reading the research material related to Jack’s narrative and Wicks’ book we can comprehend clearly how Jack’s narrative evolved. Hines’s original plot reveals his intentions of setting Jack in Tobruk in 1941, where he is captured by the Germans and held prisoner in Italy and then Germany. One such research note taken from EOE 7/3 xvii reads:

[Jack called up in 1940. Married in 1939. Captured in Tobruk in N. Africa. Spent 3 ½ years in various POW camps in Italy then in Germany] Jack yellow when he come home, marched over 300 miles across Germany in the winter sleeping rough in the open with no proper meals. Hadn’t taken his boots off for 6 weeks, thin couldn’t sleep on mattress used to sleeping on floor.

More aggressive when arrives home – turned into a socialist.[[156]](#footnote-157)

In the note, and as reproduced above, Hines uses blue ink for Jack’s first name, possibly because the writer wanted to remember what he had called his prisoner of war in the early stages of the novel’s development. The brackets in the quotation are a sign of Hines’s intertextuality and signify which part of Ben Wicks’ commentary in the text he has used in this research note. Here, it is clear that, even with Jack’s characterisation in its infancy, Hines had a clear awareness of how Jack was to be depicted in *Elvis over England*. From the outset Hines makes a concerted decision to keep Jack away from home in some form of military setting and away from his wife, who at this initial stage of the novel is called Betty. Hines stipulates that Jack’s time in captivity is “3 ½ years”; this precise indication of the time spent as a captive of the Nazis highlights that even in the preliminary stages of writing Hines had decided to engender the significance of Jack’s representation as a militarised masculinity. He is to be interned for the rest of the war and according to Hines’s preliminary note, Jack is captured just after being “called up”. This then suggests that Hines had made a preliminary decision to represent Jack’s time in active service as a short one. In curtailing Jack’s active service, Hines connotes a sense of lack. Taking Jack away from active service symbolises Hines’s preliminary notion of emasculating him and negating the masculine prestige attached to being one of His Majesty’s soldiers. Hines from the outset had the view that by limiting Jack’s time as an active soldier he would make Jack less sympathetic as a symbolic heroic character, who returns after his war service to find little in way of job opportunities. Hines then at this early stage of the novel’s development casts Jack’s masculinity as being conflicted. On the one hand, Jack is a soldier and this representation gives him the potential to be perceived as heroic. On the other hand, this transformation from soldier to prisoner could be perceived as Jack’s representations weakness in not serving in battle.

In the first of Hines’s research notes denoted as EOE 7/3, the hardship suffered by Jack in trying to get back home can be perceived. This early conception of Jack’s journey can be found in Ben Wicks’ *Welcome Home*: “*Elsie Moyer’s husband was called up in 1940. They had been married in December 1939 and had had a few months together before he left for North Africa.”* [[157]](#footnote-158) Elsie then goes on to describe that: “[H]e was in the desert until he was captured at Tobruk with a few thousand others and spent three and a half years in various POW camps in Italy and then Germany.”[[158]](#footnote-159) She then goes on to outline her husband’s journey from Germany to the United Kingdom:

When we met he looked so poorly. He was yellow and it turned out that he marched 300 miles across Germany in the winter, sleeping rough in the open all the time and with no proper meals. He had not had his boots off for six weeks.[[159]](#footnote-160)

In his research notes, Hines replicates this description of Elsie Moyer’s husband’s journey home from captivity, almost word for word. Hines’s intertextuality, his quoting and then inserting this oral history into his own notes, would notably create a sense of authenticity if it were used in the finished novel, as it places Jack in a factual setting by replacing Elsie’s husband with his own character. The extract also indicates the hardship and privation Elsie’s husband suffered while trying to get back to England. In relation to why Hines was attracted to Elsie’s story, it could be construed that he was interested in the juxtaposition between what Elsie’s husband’s suffered during his war-service and the author’s proposed narrative, which focused on Jack’s dissatisfaction with civilian life and lack of opportunity after the war. Mentioned in this extract first is the distance of “300 miles” covered by Elsie’s husband, and the fact that he slept “rough” with “no proper” food. This observation of the hardships suffered by Elsie Moyer’s husband is significant because the subject matter, the itinerant nature of soldiers’ lives while fighting, the food that they ate and the diseases that they suffered from, would be returned to throughout Hines’s research for *Elvis over England*.

Hines elected to draw on a factual description of a soldier’s return from internment from the viewpoint of a wife and not from the soldier himself in his embryonic construction of Jack. Elsie Moyer ventriloquizes her husband’s experience, hence this experience is witnessed from her point of view not her husband’s. This act of telling and recounting is therefore afforded by means of another voice and not from the one who originally underwent the experience. This way of telling, of speaking about another’s experience - notably a concentrationary one - signifies that for Elsie’s husband, this experience is unspeakable as her husband’s silence is exposed. At this early stage of his research, Hines takes into account the reservations of a wife, who tries to negotiate her husband’s return. In the finished novel, Hines instead allows the reader to see Jack’s return home from his viewpoint and the reader witnesses the soldier’s own emotional response to returning home. Yet, in the published novel, Hines still distances Jack’s narrative from his audience. In *Elvis over England,* Hines’s approach to writing the traumatic wartime experience is to represent it from the point of view of his protagonist, Eddie. Thus, as a narrative device, Hines represents Jack’s wartime experience through the voice of another, just as Elsie vocalises her husband’s war trauma.

In Wicks’ book, Elsie’s testimony evinces her concern for her husband’s body, as her awareness of health centres on her husband’s feet. This may appear, at first glance, to be a mundane concern when considering her husband’s traumatic experience. However, Elsie’s concern for her husband’s feet (as she notes, he has not taken his boots off for six weeks whilst trying to return to England) acts as a synecdoche for her husband as a whole self. Her husband’s boots become a metaphor for part of his concentrationary experience and the hardship he faced when trying to return home. In his note, taken from Wicks’ book, Hines embellishes Elsie’s testimony by elaborating her husband’s post-internment experience through the post-concentrationary experience. Hines writes in his research notes that Jack cannot “sleep on” a mattress and goes on to explain how he is used to “sleeping on the floor”.[[160]](#footnote-161) Hines’s embellishment may appear to be a subtle alteration, yet it expresses the difficulties of adjusting to domestic life after enduring internment.

This note also makes reference to how Hines’s character of the repatriated soldier is transformed by his war-time service. First, Hines documents how he will be more “aggressive” after he returns home. Here, Hines’s reference is ambiguous and does not at this stage of Jack’s early characterisation outline how his aggression manifests. Notably, this difference is engendered by experiencing internment. In an article written in 1996, Ben Shephard details the homecoming experience of Japanese prisoners of war, and points out that British army doctors held in prisoner of war camps in Europe during their internment made extensive notes on fellow prisoner’s “psychological states” while being held captive. Using the case of one such doctor, Philip Newman, who went on to publish his research in the *British Medical Journa*l, January 1944, Shephard’s article briefly summarises how “camp life” affected the prisoners of war:

Newman eloquently conveyed the “longing for freedom, security, female society, and above all sympathy” that the PoWs felt. He acknowledged the destructive effect of years of idleness, of sexual deprivation, over crowding and military impotence, and warned that many returning would show anti-social and self destructive behaviour after the war, as they had after the First World War. [[161]](#footnote-162)

Shephard highlights the injustices endured by Japanese POWs both while being held captive and after they had returned to the United Kingdom. However, Shephard’s article also outlines a homogenised reaction to captivity by those being interned by the enemy, whether in Europe or in Asia. Notably, Dr Newman specifies in his report how the concentrationary experience may change the soldier/prisoner irrevocably. The prisoner of war’s separation from a normative society modifies their behaviour and when repatriated makes readjustment to “normal”, civilian life hard.

In her description of her husband’s repatriation in Wicks’ book, Elsie Moyer notes how her husband was, “much more aggressive than he used to be”.[[162]](#footnote-163) Hines, in the finished text, does not use an incident that Elsie recounts about her husband’s outburst on train after a woman questioned his civilian status while the war was still waging. In *Welcome Home*, Elsie outlines how he “blew his top and showed them his repatriation papers.”[[163]](#footnote-164) This account of her husband’s behaviour corresponds with what Dr Newman in his report describes as the returned prisoner of war’s desire for sympathy from a society that at this stage of war did not comprehend their suffering at the hands of the Nazis. Even though Jack in the finished novel is not cast as a prisoner of war, the author, however, still goes on to foreground Jack’s frustration and aggression on returning home after being demobbed. An example of this emotional response to being released from service of the army can found later in the novel. It is written by Hines in form of a memory from Eddie’s childhood and it details Jack’s behaviour when he returned from Burma. As the narrator states: “He remembered Jack, bitter and disillusioned after life as a soldier.”[[164]](#footnote-165) Notably, it would seem at this early stage of writing, Hines was toying with notion of how to represent in his text how the repatriated soldiers adjusted to civilian life and the difficulties which were juxtaposed with this adjustment.

Another note found among Hines’s research material highlights how Jack’s narrative was being formed while Hines was reading Wicks’ book. As note 17, states: “[Betty] Stella doesn’t put banner up saying “Welcome home Jack” ashamed of what the neighbours will think.”[[165]](#footnote-166). This note evinces the possible mood of those left on the home-front at the time, and who may have felt that being captured by the enemy was thought to have dishonoured militarised status amongst the community. Hines again acknowledges the obstacles faced by returning POWs. He shows how the emotions surrounding the return of the prisoner of war were possibly conflicted. This note connotes the oppositional representation of Jack, at this stage in the novel’s development, as a militarised masculinity. He is returning home after his war-time service and yet there will be no celebration of this event. Hines therefore conveys the dilemma of how family felt about the those that were returning home after surrendering to the enemy. On the one hand, Jack as a soldier has returned safely from war-time service, while, on the other, he spent his time not fighting the enemy because he was held captive. Jack’s capture is thus depicted as inviting a sense of shame.

In the published novel, Stella’s narrative centres on a moral dilemma. At the heart of this dilemma lies the guilt of having a relationship with another man, who Hines characterises as an American air force officer, while Jack is away fighting for his country. Many of Hines’s other texts, such as *The Blinder* (1966), *Unfinished Business* (1983), and his penultimate novel, *The Heart of It* (1994), also concentrate on a narrative which features a wife’s infidelity. Hines may not be known as a writer who had interests in sexual politics and the female body, since he is thought to be concerned only with the industrial and post-industrial world and the plight of the working-class. However, his body of work shows that he had a deep-seated interest in the dynamics of domestic life and of marital relations. The research material connected to *Elvis over* *England* highlights that by focusing on particular texts such as Ben Wicks’ books that Hines had a profound awareness of the interplay of sexual politics and separation from the outset. Newman, during the course of his study, noted that the prisoner of war lost his libido owing to the continued absence of “female company”. This loss of libidinous energy, therefore, caused the de-militarised masculine figure to be emasculated. It is not known if Elsie had an affair while her husband was away, as Stella does in *Elvis over England*. But Hines in transcribing Elsie’s oral history focuses on her husband’s return to domestic life after a long separation. In the published novel it is the thought of Stella that keeps Jack’s courage up during the campaign because he had Stella to return to.

Indeed, the finished novel articulates that Stella, for Jack, would be a sustained object of desire, as this note from Hines’s early research highlights: “Only thing that kept him going was thinking about Stella”.[[166]](#footnote-167) Unlike the prisoner of war, Jack’s sexual desire is fuelled by thoughts of his wife. Hines’s crafting of both Jack’s and Stella’s characterisation in turn, shapes the moral dilemma attached to their narrative. There is, of course, an expectation in 1940s society that Stella will remain loyal to Jack while he is away fighting. By instilling the theme of adultery in his novel Hines overturns this expectation. Thus, Stella is caught in a multi-stranded plot which centres on both her infidelity, her illegitimate child and her husband’s unrepressed sexual desire.

**Discovering *Elvis over England’s* Burgeoning Political Discourse**

In the latter part of the published novel, Hines captures how Jack, a repatriated soldier, longed for social change and how his active service informs and indeed, transforms him into a socially aware demobilised soldier. Hines’s note, which integrates Elsie Moyer’s testimony, details how not only will Jack show more aggression on his return; he will also alter his political allegiance, as he will return home after the war a socialist. It is clear that Hines’s interest in this transformation was piqued by reading Wicks’ book. In a section before Elsie’s description of her husband’s return, Wicks briefly details the desire for social change in Britain after World War Two. Wicks observes after describing the Labour victory of 1945 that:

*It was not difficult to understand what happened. In the aftermath of war, many of the British electorate felt they had deserved a new life, and chose a government that would favour the poor and middle classes*.[[167]](#footnote-168)

Wicks in this observation not only traces the desire of working-class soldiers for social change, but the desire of their families and more significantly, after the hardships suffered during and after the war, of society as a whole. As his notes show, Hines consulted another text which focuses on the political after-effects of the Second World War, the historian David Thomson’s *England in the* *Twentieth Century.* There are no specific notes from this text contained in EOE/7. However, it can be clearly understood why Hines’s imagination would have been captured by Thomson’s description of how working class attitudes had been cemented after World War Two. As this section of the book highlights:

Socially the war was a mighty crucible, melting many pre-war contrasts and softening (though not always removing) old rigidities. Experience of evacuation, of manual aid in air-raids, of great collective sacrifice and service, of stringent rationing and controls in the cause of “equal shares”, all helped to strengthen a tide of sentiment that had been generated before war began. Common humanity began to seem more important than distinctions of wealth and birth. Participation in so great a common effort made the pre-war years of insecurity and social hardships seem in retrospective grossly unjust. A new resolve was born to build, from the sacrifices of war, a better society wherein none should be deprived of the necessities of life, and where the opportunity of work and live in decent surroundings should be opened to all citizens. This dream of a more just society was not new. It had appeared from time to time to visionaries of the nineteenth century. Much of the appeal of the pre-war Left had been to those who shared it. The sense of national purpose, rediscovered in war, began to be transferred to this goal. Victory could serve the ends of social justice. [[168]](#footnote-169)

Hines maintained that throughout his writing career his political outlook was the “mainspring”[[169]](#footnote-170) of his creativity. Consequently, David Thomson’s powerful and eloquent description of a conspicuous modification in perception of how society should be reorganised after total war from a large section of society, the working class, would have been an appealing subject for a politically-fuelled writer like Hines. Thomson’s observation on the sacrifices made throughout the war show how this had germinated a conscious desire for social change and the necessity to re-calibrate Britain’s stratified social order. This “levelling of class” crucially mirrors Hines’s own political ideology. Thus, Thomson’s positing the desire for an egalitarian society would have inspired Hines to represent Jack as a working-class serviceman who had given so much during his war service. Hines’s note which describes Jack’s nascent political affiliation thus reflects the changing attitudes of those living in a post war Britain. As J. B. Priestley pointed out, mass war may have turned out to have been a “people’s war” but this egalitarian approach to war must lead to a “people’s peace.”[[170]](#footnote-171)

Hines carries on his interest and awareness of the hardships faced by soldiers after imprisonment in a prisoner of war camp throughout his preliminary research. In his preliminary notes pertaining to Wicks’ book he outlines the early details of Jack’s return home in note 10 thus, continuing his use of blue ink for characters’ names:

 Jack does not like [Terry] Eddie in his wife’s bed.

Jack grinds cig ends on floor as if still in prison camp.[[171]](#footnote-172)

Hines’s note, found in EOE 7/3 xvi, shows an interest in how repatriated soldiers adjust when restored back into their domestic environment. As the note discloses, Jack’s behaviour will display a difficulty readjusting to domestic life. The first note explicitly discloses Jack’s jealousy towards Eddie, his stepson. Hines’s published version of *Elvis over England* would go on to display Jack’s overwhelming antagonism towards Eddie, the product of his wife’s brief affair with an American Air Force officer. Eddie’s presence is a constant reminder of Stella’s adultery. In the novel, the joy and relief of Jack’s safe return from Burma and the resurrection of his and Stella’s marriage is counterpointed by the cataclysmic event of Eddie’s birth. However, this first note also allows a preliminary glimpse of one of the emerging themes in *Elvis over* *England*: the theme of sacrifice.

The two notes found in EOE 7/3 xvi, which concentrate on Jack’s early characterisation, provide a sense of his alienation in the domestic space. As discussed previously, repatriated soldiers found returning home and settling back into domestic life problematic. Hines, in this early depiction of Jack’s reintegration into the domestic space, foregrounds not only his detachment or disregard for domestic mores by his putting out his “cig ends” on the floor, but also an appreciation of Jack’s apparent institutionalisation. This conflicted position of being liberated but still behaving as a prisoner mirrors what Ben Shephard in *A War of Nerves* observes was a manifestation of the “prisoner of war mentality”, and an “evident difficulty” in “readjusting to life back home.”[[172]](#footnote-173) In the published novel, the representation of Jack’s adjustment to civilian life would play a pivotal role in underscoring Hines’s depiction of the domestic dynamic between Jack and Stella and the novel’s exploration of the injustices felt by working-class soldiers returning from war.

**Jack – Prisoner or Hero?**

One of the most important discourses in the published version of *Elvis over England* centres on Jack’s heroism and his prowess as a militarised masculinity who returns home from active service. This discourse, which outlines his service as an active soldier and not as a representation of a submissive prisoner of war, is essential to understanding the novel as a whole. In the published novel, Jack’s war service is recounted via Eddie’s narrative. By forming Eddie’s narrative in this manner, it thus relies substantially on his self-reflexive connection to past events. This narrative pathway connects Eddie’s plight as an illegitimate child born as a consequence of his mother’s infidelity and Jack’s heroic status, which in the published version is overtly constructed as sacrificial embodiment of masculinity by Hines. This idea that a man would have given up so much for his country, then returned to discover that his wife had been unfaithful and given birth to an illegitimate child, leads to an understanding on behalf of the reader. In writing Jack’s characterisation with this specificity, Hines offers the reader the opportunity to sympathise with his character, in the later stages of the novel, just as Eddie comes to terms with his step-father’s treatment of him as a child.

So that the author can achieve this empathetic influence over his reader, he centres the nucleus of the couple’s narrative around the emotional response of resentment. Jack resents Eddie for being the product of his wife’s “folly”.[[173]](#footnote-174) Later in the novel the narrator confessors that Eddie, “Even though he was old enough to understand Jack’s behaviour towards him after returning from the war, he still couldn’t forgive him for his blighted childhood.”[[174]](#footnote-175) Although, the adult Eddie cannot forgive his step-father’s treatment of him, he can understand why Jack treated him in such a cruel manner. As the narrator observes of Eddie’s insight into his step-father’s behaviour, “Poor bugger, Eddie thought, putting himself in Jack’s position.”[[175]](#footnote-176) Jack’s all encompassing desire for Stella during his war service, and the fact she pervaded his thoughts throughout “four harrowing years”[[176]](#footnote-177) spent in the jungles of Burma makes his discovering of Stella’s act of betrayal when he returns all the more painful. The novel does not condone Jack’s cruelty towards both Stella and Eddie, however, it does offer an opportunity to understand way Jack behaves as he does after he returns from war. Moreover, Stella’s resentment of her husband returning from war is also exposed in the text. Stella confides her innermost thoughts during a discussion with Eddie about his birth father’s absence that, “She daren’t tell Eddie her secret wish: that Jack would die a war hero in Burma, then, after a decent period of mourning, she would marry Ray and set sail for American.”[[177]](#footnote-178) Notably, Hines again makes known that the fashioning of Jack as a war hero is essential to how perception of betrayal is recognised within the narrative of the novel. But, what is most illuminating about this statement is that it reveals Stella’s desire to be the widow of a war hero. This desire for her husband to have the standing of dying as a hero and would in turn, give her distinction of being the widow of a hero. This state of being would to some degree neutralise any disgrace of marrying another man shortly after the death of her war-hero husband.

In the section of Wicks’ book which features Elsie Moyer’s reflection on her husband’s return, there is a recollection from another wife of a service man, Rosina Smith. Mrs Smith’s feelings regarding her husband’s return appear as follows:

Then all the doubts came crowding in. Will he still love and want me? Have I changed? What will he think of Martin? How will he talk to a little boy, almost four years old, he’s never seen? [[178]](#footnote-179)

In comparing Mrs Smith’s narrative, which foregrounds her concerns for her son, Martin, with the published text there are traces of the narrative evident in the finished version of *Elvis over England*. The latter part of Hines’s novel focuses on the relationship between a returning soldier and a son or stepson who he has never met and the repercussions of these circumstances. However, in the published version, Hines adapts Rosina’s history since the finished novel offers a glimpse of returning from active service from a masculine point of view. By way of Eddie’s imagining of how Jack would feel on his return, Jack’s doubts and mixed feelings about returning to Stella are conveyed in the published text thus:

What would Stella look like? Would she still be beautiful? Would she still love him? Would she even *recognize* him? [[179]](#footnote-180)

There are in this adoption of Rosina’s history some subtle differences. The author places “Stella”, Jack’s wife’s name, at the beginning of the passage, thus allowing the focus of this comment to concentrate on her as the object of his desire. Moreover, Hines feminises the personal pronoun and repeats it throughout. This repetition of the personal pronoun emphasises Jack’s emphatic longing to see his wife again. It also, as in Rosina’s oral history, stresses a sense of nervous anticipation. Rosina questions herself in an enquiring and almost intimate tone. This is shown by Rosina’s modulation between the auxiliary verbs, “[W]ill”, and “[H]ave”; the pronoun, “[What] and; the adverb, “[How]. Rosina’s verbal modulation reveals a complexity of thought which demonstrates intricate consideration of her state. Hines’s adaptation places emphasis on the repetition of a single auxiliary verb - “would”. In using “would”, Hines also engenders a sense of Jack’s anticipation through Eddie’s imagining how Jack would feel about seeing Stella after being so long away from home. Yet, this is tempered as the repetition of the verb engenders the perception of self-doubt. Hines, in rewriting Rosina’s thoughts, manifests the importance of the consequences of this imaginary scenario. This scenario is realised because in the published novel Jack’s narrative is formed from Eddie’s point of view. Therefore, Jack’s reservations in returning home are vocalised by Eddie. The stress on the verb “would”, with this stylistic approach in mind, then expresses his imagining his stepfather’s experience.

Rosina’s thoughts can also be traced in Hines’s research notes. Note 7 reads: “Mixed feelings before meeting – will I know him? Will I like him? Will he like me?”.[[180]](#footnote-181) Hines’s note clearly draws on Rosina’s “mixed feelings” regarding her husband’s return. At this stage of Hines’s research, his fashioning of Jack’s characterisation still focused on his internment in a prisoner of war camp in Europe. However, Rosina Smith’s husband was not a prisoner of the Nazis, but was captured by the Japanese in Singapore 1942 and held in Burma until the end of the war. As Rosina observes about her husband’s deployment as a soldier:

I went to his home in London and he was called up in May 1941. Our son Martin was born a month after he sailed for the Far East. He landed in Singapore and was taken prisoner on 15 February 1942.[[181]](#footnote-182)

It seems that Hines, at this nascent stage of his research, also read Rosina’s evocative account of her husband’s return from internment in Burma, as it appears directly after Elsie Moyer’s account of her husband’s return. I argue that at this preliminary stage of the novel’s development that Rosina’s Smith’s account caused Hines to temper Jack’s characterisation.

Not only does Rosina’s depiction of her husband’s return attest to the reservations connected to her husband’s impending arrival from Burma, but also, later in her history she offers a brief description of her husband’s first bout of malaria: “On 16 October Steve had his first attack of malaria”.[[182]](#footnote-183) As Ben Wicks writes in his introduction to Rosina’s narrative: “*Troops who had served in areas prone to tropical diseases suffered yet another strain on their marriage*”.[[183]](#footnote-184) Here, both Rosina and Wicks demonstrate how a consequence of the concentrationary experience, in this instance the contraction of a tropical disease, haunts domestic relations. Similarly, Rosina, like Elsie, recognises that although her husband has returned home seemingly unharmed, that is to say, he has no disabilities, his body has been affected by his concentrationary experience. Rosina observes that her husband has changed by reason of his internment: “The bouts of malaria came every three weeks and I had to learn to cope with them and the bad temper that came just before each bout.”[[184]](#footnote-185) Rosina in this observation registers what Dr Newman describes as a modification in behaviour in the person that is caused by being subjected to a concentrationary experience. This alteration in behaviour after service would be referenced by Hines systemically in the finished novel.

***Chindit*: Researching the “Forgotten Army” in Burma**

It is at this preliminary stage of the novel’s development that Hines focuses his attention on writing Jack’s exposition in a slightly different mode, and in his research the contraction of malaria by British soldiers serving in the East during World War Two features heavily. The research material connected to *Elvis over England* highlights Hines’s preoccupation with certain hardships faced by the soldiers fighting in Burma. One of these preoccupations was the tropical disease of malaria that the soldiers endured. The detailed notes numbered 1 to 3 relate to another text Hines consulted while developing the novel: *Chindit* byRichard Rhodes James, who served as a cipher officer during the Burma campaign. Hines’s notes read thus:

1. humidity, jungle, heavy packs, heat stroke, malaria
2. malaria, fever.

 mepacrine tablets [[185]](#footnote-186)

Whereas Rosina Smith’s account offers a mere glimpse of her husband’s service in Burma and subsequent internment, and Wicks’ book centres on a panoramic and multifaceted history of repatriation, Rhodes James’ autobiography tenders a subjective narrative based on a specificity of time and place: Burma – 1942-1945. Hines must have chosen this text with this detail in mind. Hines’s notes follow the course of Rhodes James’ account of his experience while serving in Burma, although the specific account relating to this note cannot be traced in the text. However, *Chindit* demonstrates how contracting malaria placed a constant strain upon the soldier’s health while serving in Burma as this description illustrates:

Then the malaria started. I became an early casualty and swore in the midst of my fever that I would never carry a pack again. Men were being carried off dozens at a time to Jhansi hospital twenty-five miles away. Battalions were left with barely enough men to look after their mules and training came to an abrupt halt. An air of depression hung over the camp combined with a listlessness of movement which transformed every act into a great effort of will-power. [[186]](#footnote-187)

Hines’s note detailed above, astutely reiterates not only the hardships faced by those serving in the Burma but also places emphasis on how the bodies of those serving in this campaign suffered. Hines’s notes 1-3 found in EOE7 XLIX parallel both Elsie’s and Rosina’s spoken concern for their husband’s bodies. Yet, Hines’s note shows not only his interest in the effects of this particular campaign on the soldier’s body, but, most significantly, this note evidences how a soldier did not have to be interned by the enemy in order to suffer a similar fate.

Like the accounts from Elsie and Rosina, this extract from Rhodes James’s book acknowledges an alteration in the soldiers’ demeanour, as an “air of depression” hangs over the camp owing to exhaustion, meagre rations, the heat and the constant battle with malaria. Malaria, then, becomes the focal point and narrative framework for Hines. The great “effort of will” described by Rhodes James signifies how the soldiers who were part of the Burma campaign had to endure not only the physical effects of the disease but also the psychological strain placed upon them by recurring bouts of malaria. Rhodes James’ description highlights how the soldiers of the Burma campaign were battling an enemy on two fronts.

Another note made by Hines, which again acknowledges how his perception of Jack’s characterisation was developing during the course reading of Rhodes James’s book, demonstrates how malaria demilitarises the soldier, just like those who capitulate and are interned by the enemy. It also emphasises how the malaria-stricken soldier’s courage and endurance fared in difficult circumstances, as part of Hines’s note, numbered 34 shows: “Illness. malaria, dysentery or jaundice, bad feet – reduced to raw flesh by mud and wetness”.[[187]](#footnote-188) Hines made this note from the latter section of Rhodes James’s book which centres on, as the latter puts it, going “[I]nto the [D]epths”. This chapter of *Chindit* describes an attack on Mogaung and how the members of the battalion at this stage of the campaign were ever dwindling and those who remained were in the depths of a “physical decline”.[[188]](#footnote-189) Not only does Hines in this note reference the prime significance of the exposure to tropical disease for those who fought in Burma, but he also focuses on a “succession of discomforts growing daily less tolerable”.[[189]](#footnote-190) As Rhodes James explains in *Chindit*, he watched how the soldiers’ bodies were “barely kept upright by their festering feet”.[[190]](#footnote-191) By drawing attention to the condition of the battalion’s feet, Rhodes James shows that they signify the psychological condition of the men at this stage of the campaign. Thus, the foot or the soldier’ become a somatic metaphor for the psychological disintegration not only of the single soldier but of his battalion as a whole. At this stage of the Burma campaign, the soldiers were facing what Ben Shephard notes was a “collapse”[[191]](#footnote-192) of morale owing to the brutal conditions in the jungle. Shephard states that the conditions the Allied POWs were kept in by their Japanese captors were not known by the outside world and were only discovered when the camps were liberated. More significantly, the prisoner’s psychological condition was neglected by their liberators owing to their concern for their physical state. As he points out:

Any mental problems were overshadowed anyway, by numerous physical disorders the men presented after three years of starvation and ill-treatment. The disorders of tropical disease and the relationship between vitamin deficiency and the nervous system, rather than the psychological consequences of maltreatment, dominated the medical press in 1946.[[192]](#footnote-193)

 Shephard discusses the shock of being captured by the enemy and the shame of capitulating. Similarities, however, can be found between the conditions faced by the those fighting in Burma and those that were being held, like Rosina Smith’s husband, by the Japanese. The exposure to tropical disease thus became a problem for those fighting the Japanese as well as those being interned by them.

By reading Hines’s research notes from the initial stage of the novel’s development, we can establish an understanding that the author was collating material which would feature in the rising action of the plot in Jack’s and Stella’s narrative; and this plot would feature in the finished text. In place of Jack being held captive in a prisoner of war camp in Europe, Hines modified the setting and decided to situate Eddie’s step-father in Burma instead. As a result of this, Hines not only distances the character geographically; he also dislocates him psychologically. Burma plunges Jack into being caught between the known, that is, his being with the other British soldiers in his battalion; and the unknowable, the nightmarish and almost subterranean jungle landscape of Burma. The impression created by Rhodes James suggests that Burma was a place of otherness. Burma in the officer’s account was a place of tropical disease, monsoons, humidity, fever and hunger. In positioning Jack in this setting and in this distinct situation which connotes a sense of otherness, and promotes difference, Hines centres his character in a location that was “far away” and alien.

Newman writing in 1944 pointed out that the prisoner becomes an isolated self within the confines of the strange and alien “camp” environment from almost the instant that he is captured. This strain, provoked by the conditions found in the camp, manifested a change in the soldier which led him to isolate himself from other prisoners. Those who suffered from being captured and then being interned by the enemy, according to Dr Newman’s post-war research, were isolated and put under perpetual strain. As Dr Newman noted during his own internment in a POW camp, which formed the basis of his research: “Broadly speaking, a prisoner’s reactions to the camp are of minor importance in comparison with those which he shows on his return to normal life when he then may be again beset by large responsibilities”.[[193]](#footnote-194)

Evidently, in setting part of Jack’s narrative in Burma, Hines opted for a setting with elements unexpectedly similar to those found in the prisoner of war camps. Thus, Hines was able to duplicate the effect of being displaced within Jack’s narrative while simultaneously representing him as a heroic figure. In Hines’s research notes, the prisoner of war camps he chose to focus on were ostensibly far away from Britain, located in Italy and Germany. The prisoners, like the soldiers fighting in Burma, had to trek miles in order to traverse the terrain. Similarly, as Newman reveals, POWs were forced to march long distances in order to reach the camp in which they would be interned. Hines’s notes taken from *Chindit* point out that food for The Forgotten Army was limited. Rhodes James’s book also reveals how this scarcity became a cause of great distress for the soldiers fighting the Japanese in Burma. Hines, in his research note 26, illustrates concern for this scarcity thus: “When escaped from one battle send for food none comes for days.”[[194]](#footnote-195) This concern about the lack of food for those serving in Burma features only briefly in Jack’s narrative in the finished novel. Nevertheless, Hines’s early research notes mark the importance of the consistency of the food supply for the men fighting the Japanese in Burma. Hines thus engages with the perception that those serving in the armed forces in Burma suffered as much as those who were captured and then imprisoned by the Nazis in Europe during the war.

In the introduction to a collection of essays that describes the experience of fighting in Asia, during, and after the Second World War, Rear Admiral Richard Cobbold remarks:

[t]he passions of the British military who took part in the campaigns against the Japanese, particularly those who were prisoners of war, burn more fiercely in retrospect and the memories are harsher, than those of the servicemen who fought in Europe. [...] More directly the reasons lie in the prevalent cruelty, which is evidenced not by far too many eye witnesses accounts, but specifically in the much higher survival rates of British and American PoWs in German camps than in those of the Japanese.[[195]](#footnote-196)

After the Second World War was over, and on later reflection, Rear Admiral Richard Cobbold notes, possibly unexpectedly to the present-day reader, the manifest disparity between serving and being imprisoned in Europe during the Second World with those being imprisoned in Asia. This may seem difficult to comprehend as the Allied troops were fighting the same enemy, the Axis Alliance. But, the enemy that formed the alliance were from diverse cultural systems. As Cobbold points out, and as is reiterated in Hines’s research notes based in other sources, the Japanese soldiers were “fanatics” and they thought it was better to die than to become a “prisoner”.[[196]](#footnote-197) This note was taken from another source that Hines used in order to collate material for the novel. Hines is writing from a privileged retrospective position, as was Rear Admiral Cobbold; and it is at this stage of writing that Hines viewed a BBC documentary made by Mark Fielder shown on 14th August 1995 to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over the Japanese army. The documentary, *Burma: The Forgotten War*, follows the return of three veterans to Burma in April 1995, one of whom was Richard Rhodes James, the cipher officer who wrote *Chindit*. The documentary follows the men as they tour the sites of the Burma campaign. Again, like Ben Wicks’ book *Welcome Home*, the BBC documentary is based on consolidating the oral histories of three soldiers who served in Burma during World War II. Hines’s notes to this documentary, however, plot a decisive course. Whereas the notes taken from *Chindit* appear to be concise yet comprehensive, the notes taken from Mark Fielder’s film outline a precise methodological progression, since they delineate the soldier’s point of view of their enemy while in combat with the Japanese Army while fighting in Burma.

One such group of notes, made from the documentary, reads as follows:

Japs savage, fierce

37,000 allied troops, lost in Burma

kill or be killed

hot sweet tea kept them going

Japanese shot mules – spots of blood on mules

HAD TO KILL THE JAPS - NO SURRENDER

Japs fight to the end – wounded had to kill them

 This note shows how Hines negotiates between the philosophy of a militarised masculinity and the Forgotten Army’s approach to and responsiveness of their enemy, the Imperial Japanese Army. At first glance, the note underlines, explicitly, the ferocity of enemy. One comment, “kill or be killed”, delineates the mind-set of the once serving soldiers who are shown in the documentary. The Japanese army and its combatants appeared to BEF soldiers fighting in Burma in the Second World War to be superhuman, if not preternatural, as another comment details, that they “HAD TO KILL JAPS – NO SURRENDER”.[[197]](#footnote-198) With this philosophy in mind, those fighting for the Allied forces also had to assimilate the same mentality. By fashioning Jack as a soldier and as a combatant, and not as a prisoner in a concentrationary setting, Hines situates him as a character in a symbolic conflict with that of the Other [[198]](#footnote-199) - the combatants in the Japanese army.

Jack as a representation of a typical militarised masculine figure is valorised, in one sense, because of his military prowess and bravery in facing such a ferocious enemy. In another sense, engineering this scenario not only signifies the importance of Jack’s heroism, but Hines also draws attention to the notion of endurance and enduring in order to gain victory over the enemy. This focus on endurance, and with it the potential to suffer in enduring, brings forth an understanding and a sympathy on the part of the reader which is twofold. First, Jack is perceived to have suffered as much as a POW because of the extreme conditions of the Burmese jungle and from the potential threat of a ferocious enemy. Second, Stella’s betrayal is magnified and becomes all the more destructive and poignant owing to Jack’s representation as this heroic militarised figure, but only in retrospect, because Jack’s military service is portrayed only via Eddie’s narrative. By plotting this scenario, the blame for marital discord is laid firmly at Stella’s door. However, this shift in representation allows Jack, as a character, to have a symbolic heroic value when returning home from combat. In altering Jack’s characterisation, Hines in turn alters Stella’s narrative. If Jack had been captured and imprisoned, Stella might have thought that he would not return from internment. This position would have provided her plot with a flexibility which would have possibly allowed the reader to sympathise with her for committing adultery. However, in fashioning Jack as a heroic figure, Hines does not allow this sympathy in the reader to manifest.

It is not known for certain why Hines elected not to set Jack’s narrative in a prisoner of war camp in Europe or indeed, in a camp in Burma. But in writing Jack as a heroic militarised masculinity, Hines substantiates Jack’s courage under fire from the Japanese and in doing so creates his own “warrior myth” in order to relay a politicised point of view. Yet, Hines does not romanticise the figure of the soldier in the course of writing *Elvis over England*, but pursues a line of story-telling which endorses the pure day-to-day horror of warfare. It could be assumed that Hines avoided the setting of an internment camp in Burma; possibly the acts committed by Japanese in these internment camps in Asia were too challenging for him as a writer. However, Hines did not shy away from writing about problematic subject matter. His BBC drama, *Threads* (1984) shows how he navigates and communicates unimaginable and unspeakable material. *Threads* was written at the apex of the Cold War period and during the AIDS crisis. The film also offers a reading of post-industrial masculinity in the age of a Thatcherite administration. As his research notes from *Elvis over England* show, the author’s creative instinct led him on a different course - a course which focused on the impact of a soldier *returning home*. This focus on the return to the domestic led Hines to choose a different narrative pathway for Jack; one that pinpoints the sacrifices made and the hardships faced by those serving in the Forgotten Army. But it is also a narrative pathway which foregrounds unspoken historiographies that centre on heroic values.

However, as Hines’s research notes disclose, he was not reluctant to engage with the horrors of the Japanese prison camps and the soldiers that were held within that oppressive system, as a note taken from *Chindit* reads:

33. Sometimes thin, long suffering men came into camp with villagers (Kochins?). Escaped prisoners from Japs hiding with hill tribes. Suffered a great deal from Japs. Some captured in Singapore. Seemed like people from another world. Made Jack uneasy – like people returned from the dead.[[199]](#footnote-200)

This scenario does not appear in the novel. Rhodes James describes what he witnesses thus:

With the villagers came strange, thin men who had suffered much. They were some of our troops who had escaped from the Japs and were living in the villages of the hill tribes in north Burma. Some of them had been taken in Singapore, others on the first Wingate expedition – these were Gurkhas. Though they were spare and hollowed-cheeked their delight was wonderful to see. We sent them down the path to strip at Lakhren and they were still chattering wildly as they left us. Contact with such people was strange. They were from another world, having suffered so much more than we, and we had a sort of fear that their sufferings had removed them far from us despite their smiles and cheers and shouts of greetings. [[200]](#footnote-201)

In comparing the two extracts, Hines’s research note, at first glance, condenses the facts found in Rhodes James’s description. Hines uses the emotional cadence of the description and keeps this particular note almost to bare facts. In doing this, Hines negates the responsive nuances of Rhodes James’s description. Rhodes James was writing from the point of view of a subjective observer, whereas Hines’s point of view is that of an objective researcher. Consequently, in his research note Hines transposes the emotional impact of Rhodes James’s depiction of the encounter with escaped prisoners of war. Rhodes James’s description fosters in the reader an awareness of fear of the other and of otherness as the escapees are familiar yet from “another world” – a concentrationary one. Thus, they are not like Rhodes James and his fellow servicemen. This is not, however, a fear of the escaped prisoners but a fear of becoming like them. Rhodes James’s description strips the escapees of their militarised construction owing to their once being captives; they become “strange” and almost unrecognisable as the servicemen they once were. As a witness to this scene, Rhodes James tries to empathise with the prisoners, but it is as if he is trying to understand those that are separate from there own human race. As Rhodes James observes, the once interned are “removed” from the ones who witness their return from confinement. Rhodes James’s reasoning, his trying to understand, leads him to register the escapees as different because their concentrationary experience has altered them. Hines, as a consequence of reading Rhodes James’s account and in approaching the subject matter of his book, must have also deliberated whether placing Jack in a concentrationary setting or as an escapee from such a setting would have distanced the reader from his book as a whole.

This potential to alter the militarised masculine figure into an un-masculinised being that is different and uncanny, I argue, caused Hines to alter Jack’s narrative trajectory. Rhodes James’s oral history of the contact with the escaped prisoners not only strips the escaped prisoners of their masculinity, but shows them to be stripped of their language. The “hollow-cheeked” escapees are seen by Rhodes James to be “chattering wildly”. Again, this depiction fosters an image of the non-human and of the un-masculine. The idea of the voiceless, un-masculine figure is an important factor when considering that part of Jack’s narrative centres on disaffection when returning home, since Jack is able to vocalise his apparent marginalisation.

Hines in his version of this incident from *Chindit* not only lessens the emotional effect of the meeting with the escapees. He also places Jack in the scenario. This makes Jack into a witness/bystander. And like Rhodes James’s memory of the occurrence, in this note via his character Jack’s point of view, Hines willingly acknowledges the suffering that the POWs endured, as he writes that they “[S]uffered a great deal from Japs”.[[201]](#footnote-202) Notably, Hines’s use of clipped diction, like the account of the meeting depicted by Rhodes James, gives a sense of the desire to separate the self, the combatant, from the other, the escapee. By paring back his diction, it appears that Hines is reluctant to commit this scenario to paper because of its unsettling nature. In transcribing the information from *Chindit* in this mode, Hines does not embellish or quantify Rhodes James’s experience. Hines, therefore, does not vocalise the escapee’s suffering in detail, as Rhodes James does.

Similar to Rhodes James’s account, Hines, through the eyes of his character Jack, places himself in the position of a witness who is trying to cognise what he is seeing and who instinctively separates himself from the figure of escaped prisoner. Hines writes that the escaped prisoners make Jack “feel uneasy”. Jack’s ontological response to the POWs is a response to their otherness. Clearly, in transcribing Rhodes James’s account of the meeting, Hines is aware of how it affected the author of *Chindit*. This perception of an emotional impact is foregrounded by Hines in order to point out the difference between Jack as combatant and the escapees.

This realisation of how the POWs are transformed by their concentrationary experiences also discloses their new embodiment and their lack of potential as a militarised masculinity. The experience of internment in the camps in Asia, which included their enduring arbitrary violence, starvation, forced labour and sadistic punishments, had emasculated the POWs. By not being able to control their own environment, and what happens in that environment, the POWs were stripped of their military prowess and prestige in terms of a militarised masculinity and they were rendered powerless by their experience in the internment camps. A militarised masculinity is trained systematically to conquer the enemy and is instilled with an intrinsic sense of honour which transformed their identity. “POWs” writes Clare Makepeace, “had been uprooted from their home society and more absolutely cut off from it than other servicemen.”[[202]](#footnote-203) By being taken away from home for so long the POW lost their sense of self. Thus, to lose this perfected perception of the self places the POW into a psychological chasm of powerlessness. Powerlessness, or the lack of potential, becomes an early focus for Hines’s early fashioning of Jack’s characterisation. However, as the notes from his research show, the writer re-evaluated this masculine representation of Jack. As Hines writes in the note denoted EOE 7/3 LV:

1. Dad resents [Terry] Eddie his freedom particularly when was in [prisoner of war camp] Burma during the war. Thinks the best years of his life have been wasted. [[203]](#footnote-204)

This note shows Hines’s change in direction in this representation of masculinity, from an emasculated masculine form to another figure, one which possesses a militarised masculinity. It would seem from this note that Jack envies Eddie’s youth and the possibility of a bright future. Hines used a spectral trope in order to try to and understand the transformed embodiment of the escaped POWs. Yet, as this note suggests, the author had realised even at this stage of the novel’s development how being part of war “wasted” men’s lives while they were fighting. But more importantly, Hines realised that by being captured by the Japanese equally wasted lives and such a masculine narrative would have caused the author’s political message to become diluted. In order for Hines to use his character Jack to deliver his political message, his figure of the soldier should have potential to carry on in his life as before.

Hines’s association between his representation of the epitome of wasted masculinity, the prisoner of war, and death can be seen in the finished version of *Elvis over* *England*. The extract below shows that Jack and Stella go on to have two daughters after his return from Burma, while part of the novel reflects on the relationship between Jack and Eddie as a child. During one such recollection, Eddie wishes that his stepfather had been killed while being held prisoner by the Japanese and working on the Burma railway. When visiting his mother’s house, Eddie is drawn to a collection of photographs taken when he was a child. As Eddie recollects in the finished novel:

Jack used to sit on the sofa by the fire with Brenda and Carol on either side of him and Eddie hovering around the back, trying to glimpse the photographs between their heads. He wanted to be on the sofa too, pointing and asking questions about the war in Burma where Jack had spent for years fighting the Japanese. He hated Jack so much for excluding him that he wished he had been captured and died like the soldiers building the Burma railway.[[204]](#footnote-205)

This recollection of Eddie’s childhood provides a glimpse of the dynamics of family life after Jack’s return. But it also highlights how Eddie is marginalised within the dynamic of the family owing to his illegitimate status. The theme of return is fundamental to understanding the finished novel. Jack has to return to Stella in order for another one of Hines’s themes to flourish, the theme of betrayal. This extract from the novel highlights Hines’s connection between the prisoner of war and death. Hines places the representation of the prisoner of war within Eddie’s childhood as part of his process of wish fulfilment. However, Jack has to live in order for Hines’s political polemic to be realised.

**Conclusion**

The contents of this chapter show that Hines as writer strove to provide a sense of verisimilitude in his works. Although, this chapter has only concentrated on exploring his working practice for one text, the contents of the writer’s archive prove that he used secondary sources to authenticate his narratives throughout his career. As this thesis has shown, many of Hines’s texts were written from an autobiographical perspective; Hines’s first novel, *The Blinder,* for example reflects the conflicted nature of Hines’s experience as a young man. Yet, as Hines’s career progressed, he became intent on reiterating the precarious nature of northern working-class life in his texts. Thus, as well as using a plethora secondary source material to authenticate his writings, Hines also became a recorder of oral history apropos to the stories his wished to tell. As noted above, Hines possibly interviewed soldiers that were imprisoned by the Japanese in the course of gathering information for *Elvis over England*, yet there are many examples of this method of research found among the papers from his archive. This form of methodology can be witnessed during his research for the novel, *Unfinished Business*. The papers connected to this text, reveal that he met with mature, female students, reading English Literature at the University of Sheffield. The archival material for *Unfinished Business*, like *Elvis over England*, contains contact details of interviewees, but it also contains a list of questions Hines had prepared for the students. The answers to the questions are not contained within archival material. But, it must be concluded that the answers were absorbed into Lucy’s narrative. Thus, an authentic reflection of life as a mature, female student was portrayed within the text. With this in mind, I argue, that this part of Hines’s writing methodology endorses his credentials as a writer of realism.

Jack is not the first depiction of a soldier in Hines’s corpus of work, however. Tony Pitts played the squaddie, Alan Wright, in *Looks and Smiles* (1981), which was directed by Ken Loach. Off camera, Alan takes a tour of duty in Northern Ireland, when he returns home on leave, he regales his childhood friend Mick, played by Graham Green, with the “benefits” of joining up. Alan feels more like a “man”[[205]](#footnote-206) after completing his military training. This sense of the hyper-masculine is in stark contrast to Mick’s representation in the film: he remains an anxious adolescent because he cannot find a job. Alan’s narrative is presented in negative terms and his representation shows the hyper-masculine traits of a fictional soldier. There is also a version of a militarised masculine narrative in one of Hines’s “lost” texts, *Springwood/Springfield Stars*.[[206]](#footnote-207) The draft of the novel is held in the Hines Papers archive, and Hines started writing this novel in 2002. Detailed in the draft is a character named Mad Bob. In the text, Mad Bob has returned home to a South Yorkshire pit town with severe shell shock after serving at the front in the Great War. The inclusion of such a character in the late stage of the writer’s career suggests that Hines had a continuing interest in those who had served in the army. Jack’s narrative in *Elvis over England* corresponds with Mad Bob’s narrative in the unpublished text owing to the fact that it foregrounds how working-class men suffered irrevocably by serving their country. Another soldier is depicted in Hines’s penultimate novel, *The Heart of It*. Yet in this text the soldier’s masculine narrative has more in common with the abandoned prisoner of war storyline than with Jack’s finalised narrative in *Elvis over England*. Told through the narrative of Maisie Rickards, Cal’s mother in the novel, Bernardo, an Italian, is captured by the British and held in a prisoner of war camp, near to where Maisie lives in South Yorkshire. Maisie describes the camp to her son, during an excursion they take to the camp. This camp is described through Maisie’s eyes:

There used to be a prisoner-of-war camp here.

 Cal glanced at her in surprise. What, in this field?

 This field and the next one. It was all one big field then. There were two rows of Nissen huts surrounded by a wire fence. She dotted out their positions in the air, then drew a square around them. The gate was up there – she pointed along the hedgerow –next to that tree. [[207]](#footnote-208)

Maisie goes on to recount her love affair with Bernardo which culminates with her getting pregnant. Held along with papers connected to *The Heart of It* is a small collection of research material, catalogued as HEA/20, which relates to Potter Hill Prisoner of War Camp. The research material comprises of: a three-page photocopied description of the camp, written by Colin Sansam; and an article about an escape from the camp which was foiled by a local policeman in 1944. Sansam’s article emphasizes the camp’s proximity to where Hines grew up as a child. As the article states: “Big Nissen huts were built in Wortley Park and by the roadside from Wortley to Grenoside[[208]](#footnote-209).” The camp was built in 1941 and interned Italian prisoners of war for a short time until it was emptied and filled with German prisoners of war. The archive reveals how Hines imbued his narratives with his awareness of South Yorkshire’s local history. Although Sansam does not give such a detailed account as Maisie in his brief article, it can be concluded that Hines was inspired to write this small section of exposition because of the article’s subject matter.

What the last example shows is that Hines used the same research method in the development of at least two texts. Central to *Elvis over England* is that certain tropes found within the sources are re-imagined within Jack’s narrative. The most notable motif in the notes found the research notes, but not incorporated into the final version of the text, is Hines’s focus on “mepacrine tablets”.[[209]](#footnote-210) This medication was taken by the troops fighting in Burma in order to prevent malaria. Hines also mentions malaria in a small, red, notebook. On page two Hines writes, “Malaria, shivers, fever, tablets, Mepacrine, tin of tablets”[[210]](#footnote-211). A note a little further on in the notebook states: “malaria/dysentery”[[211]](#footnote-212), taken from the BBC’s *Burma – the Forgotten Army*. There are many accounts in Rhodes James’s book of soldiers suffering from malaria and jaundice; Hines’s research notes observe that the British POWs in Germany also suffered from jaundice. Hines’s explicit interest in this disease and this particular medical condition which the service men endured during their war service is focused on at the beginning of this chapter. Hines’s interest in the body of the soldier and its sufferings can be linked to the author’s longstanding concern with the working class and their vulnerability as being integral to the labour market. However, there is another significant factor which correlates with Jack’s overarching narrative, the symbolic connection between the jaundiced outlook on life, which permeates Jack’s narrative and the grievances Hines identifies in the published novel of those who had served during the war.

But, we could assume that Hines changed Jack’s initial narrative because of the emotional weight that is attached to the representation of those who were held captive by the Japanese during the Second World War. Hines may have thought that Jack would have suffered enough by being captured and held by the Japanese forces. This would have “altered the balance of sympathies”[[212]](#footnote-213) for the reader and would have changed the focus of the political significance attached to Jack’s narrative. Hines chose instead to connect Jack with another masculine militarised narrative, one in which he could articulate the discontent felt by the brave working-class soldiers who were demobbed after the war. Jack’s sense of dissatisfaction could not have been communicated by one who had suffered at the hands of the Japanese while being interned in the East, or indeed, in Europe.

**Chapter Four**

**Articulating the “Limping Man” in the Lost Television Drama *Promise***

This chapter aims to answer one central question in relation to Hines’s lost script *Promise*: “Does the representation of Mr Price in *Promise* align with British new wave texts which contain representations of the war veteran?”. First, however, this chapter begins by trying to date Hines’s lost television drama and exploring whether the script is older than the date provided by the archive. The archive states that the drama was written in the 1970s in their inventory of the Hines Papers. With this in mind, the chapter moves on to ask if *Promise’*s style and content aligns with other texts written by the author in the early 1970s. The third section of the chapter looks at how disability is represented in the text. So that the chapter can seek to answer this hypothesis, the last section of the chapter discusses the contextual markers found in the text, such as clothes and music. I will also demonstrate in this chapter, how disability was perceived culturally in the post-war era, especially in the late 1950s and early 1960s, by examining the disabled figure of Mr Price in *Promise* alongside the British New Wave films, *Room at the Top* (1959) and *A Taste of Honey* (1961), which contain a representation of the war veteran. Joe Lampton in *Room at the Top*, although not physically damaged, can, owing to his time as a prisoner of war, be described as a maladjusted veteran. Peter Smith in *A Taste of Honey* is noticeably physically disabled after losing an eye in the war. His treatment in the film is similar to that of Mr Price in Hines’s drama. In scrutinising the depiction of the war veteran in these films, I argue that in writing *Promise*, one of the author’s lost scripts, Hines voices how society perceived and tried to articulate the intersection of disability and masculinity in post-war Britain. Thus, the Second World War’s presence in cultural memory allowed the bodies of disabled men to become visible, and this permitted the unspeakable to become part of commonplace discourse in society. I argue that the disabled figure in these films and in *Promis*e reflects post-war society’s “ableist” attitude. As Clare Barker and Stuart Murray point out: “If disability was judged to be a state of negative difference, then normal is the point from which it deviated.”[[213]](#footnote-214) This point of view allowed the disabled figure to be constructed as a stereotype, such as a sexual predator, a homosexual or as a more generalised other.

Contained within a file marked “Other Scripts” held in the Hines Papers are three manuscripts. *Getting Better* very much “resembles” the television drama *The Price of Coal*, which was part of The Play for Today series and was directed by Ken Loach in 1977. Another manuscriptis the beginning of Hines’s autobiography which would eventually be entitled *This Artistic Life* and would be published by Pomona in 20o9. The third draft manuscript is titled *Last Shift* and its narrative is based upon the “retirement” of pit ponies owing to the mechanisation of the pit works. Also contained within the file is a transmission script for the radio show “Northern Drift” which was aired in 1964 and alongside it is a programme for “Northern Drift on Stage” which played at the Victoria Theatre in Stoke-on-Trent on 7th February 1965: both documents contain Hines’s poem “Locked Out”. The file also contains a treatment for a pit pony story which is very similar to *Last Shift*. There also two of Hines’s short stories held within the file, “I Went to a Concert”and “Different People”, dated March 1960 and May 1963 respectively. These were written whilst the author was training to be a teacher and are contained in two separate issues of *Thesaurus*, a magazine from Loughborough Training College. Lastly, the file also holds a copy of a typescript of Hines’s “lost” television drama *Promise*, which is catalogued as being written in the 1970s. As this eclectic collection of writing suggests, the folder includes work that cannot be categorised on its own account or alongside any other of Hines’s major works.

When reading *Promise,* the reader would be forgiven for assuming that the screenplay was not written by Hines at all, as its uncomfortable subject matter deals with such issues as a sexual rivalry between mother and daughter; it also concentrates, if implicitly, on a man with a disability: a “stiff leg”.[[214]](#footnote-215) This thematic foundation, and the play’s genre of farce, completely differs from anything else written at any stage of Hines’s career. The other “lost” manuscripts in this collection of miscellaneous texts exhibit what can be only described as “Hinesian” concerns. *Getting Better* could possibly be a first draft of the novel adaptation of the television drama *The Price of Coal* (1979). This manuscript is a typical example of a Hinesian concept. Hines’s television drama was set in a fictional colliery in South Yorkshire and is told in two very distinct parts. The first part, *Meet the People*, is based on a fictionalised visit by Prince Charles to the pit and the colliers’ humorous reaction to it, whilst the second part, *Back to Reality*, focuses on the grave consequences of a mining disaster. Hines came from a mining community and his father and grandfather were both miners. As the son of a miner Hines was inescapably aware of the dangerous nature of a miner’s everyday working life. *Last Shift* is also a script about mining, and portrays the ethical dilemma that encompasses the working life of pit ponies. Essentially, this drama exhibits Hines’s continual interest in “animal metaphor(s).”[[215]](#footnote-216) Hines used this particular type of imagery with the special function of rendering the symbolic and poetic difference between the working-class subject and the capitalist system. With these factors of Hines’s work in mind, I argue that *Promise* can be viewed as an anomaly in the author’s oeuvre because it conflicts with what might be called a Hinesian ethos. Hines’s political stance and his interest are explicitly referenced throughout his body of work; this discourse cannot be witnessed in this drama. This unconventional approach taken by the author is an intriguing and yet unexplored component of Hines’s corpus.

The major points of the plot of the drama are as follows: Freda has been at home all day watching the horseracing on the television when Karen, her daughter, having just been paid, returns home from work with various items of shopping. The two female characters take part in a spontaneous dance competition. Karen then gives her mother a make-over and allows her to wear one of her dresses. The drama is set on a Friday evening and the landlord, Mr Price, is due to collect the rent. Mr Price eventually arrives and compliments Freda’s new look. During their conversation, Price tells Freda and Karen that he contracted polio as a child and goes on to explain how the disease has left him with a leg that he cannot bend and which he holds in a fixed position. Karen teases him in a sexual manner and tries to extract various compliments from him. Freda, on the other hand, tries to rebuff Mr Price’s advances because her husband has not returned home with the rent money; and this prompts Mr Price to believe that payment “in kind” may be offered instead of money, either from Freda or from Karen. This leads Karen to pay the rent from her wages. Then, in an attempt to get some much-needed repairs to their house, Karen takes Mr Price upstairs to look at a window which needs fixing. In the meantime, Karen’s boyfriend Mick arrives. Freda flirts with Mick while Karen is upstairs with Mr Price. While upstairs, a flirtatious exchange takes place between the two and Karen promises to try on one her dresses for Mr Price. This leads to very unfortunate consequences for Mr Price as Karen hears her mother and Mick laughing downstairs, and she then accuses Mr Price of trying to rape her. The script ends with Freda comforting Mr. Price.

Although Hines does portray a disabled male character in his text, he does not place disability at the forefront of his narrative. This is because *Promise* is unequivocally female centric. The drama is set over the course of an evening, and the limited timescale of the script is essential in fostering the claustrophobic tone of the piece, as the female characters are forced to confront the issues which shadow their relationship, such as Karen not being able to go to grammar school, and Freda’s maternal neglect. At first sight, the plot may appear to be straightforward; however, by looking at how the gender relations and the sexual tensions function within the text, the plot is determined by what can only be described as an oblique and ineffectual love triangle.

*Promise*’s subtext delineates the intersection of masculinity and disability by portraying a disabled male subject. Hines describes Mr Price, the disabled character in the piece, as an “insignificant man”,[[216]](#footnote-217) who contracted polio when he was four years old. Yet, the text does not essentially concern itself with the serious consequences of contracting the disease. Indeed, the fact that Price suffered from polio is an “insignificant” textual aspect. The only importance attached to Mr Price contracting polio is the fact that it is implied he escaped active service and became wealthy by buying property during the Second World War because of this. As a text that may have been written in the 1970s, Mr Price should represent a contemporary masculine figure; however, in writing about his war years Hines presents Price as not being from this period, thus imbuing Price’s representation with a sense of pastness. If the text was supposedly written twenty-five years after the Second World War, then why is the memory of the war so indelibly imprinted on the script? I argue that the manifestation of the disabled male figure in Hines’s lost text is both a deliberate and a typical construction of a post-war male identity. This then makes the specific time frame of writing the piece uncertain. However, there is a possibility that the script may have been written earlier in Hines’s career than the date it has been assigned; possibly, during his burgeoning writing career in the early 1960s.

**Dating the Text**

This chapter is written apropos a hypothesis that *Promise* was written by the author in 1960s and not in the 1970s as the archive stipulates. Even though the drama has been catalogued as being written in the 1970s, by evoking similar tropes to those that are found in cinematic texts from the British New Wave of the 1960s, it appears older. The confines of a “[D]ingy, threadbare living room”,[[217]](#footnote-218) set gives the appearance of verisimilitude. It can therefore be construed that the setting bears a resemblance to the working-class households seen in many of the texts of the British New Wave. The script also contains many contextual symbols which would place it as being written earlier than the 1970s. Three of the most significant examples are as follows: Karen buys “six pairs of nylons” in size 9 for herself and for Freda;[[218]](#footnote-219) Karen also states that she pays “four guineas”[[219]](#footnote-220) for a skirt; and when both women take part in a spontaneous dance competition, they dance to “The Twist”.[[220]](#footnote-221) All of these contextual details highlight an interest in mass consumerism in the 1960s. Furthermore, the script shows an awareness of working-class familial disquiet as Hines focuses on Karen’s social aspirations, and the desire for a better way of life. This is a core theme of the British New Wave, but is mostly attributed to the male protagonist’s aspirational desire. However, this theme can also be seen in relation to a similar young female protagonist of Tony Richardson’s *A Taste of* *Honey* (1961). In the film, Jo, played by Rita Tushingham, moves into a flat and lives independently rather than staying with her mother, Helen, and her new husband Peter. Karen also wants to live independently and beyond the restrictions of patriarchy. As she says, she does not want to be like her mother, who is ‘saddled with a useless man”.[[221]](#footnote-222) Hines also makes explicit the unease that surrounds the sexual rivalry between mother and daughter and fading female sexual attractiveness, as an example of the sexualised mother figures who were depicted with great frequency in British New Wave films of the early 1960s.

The first evidence that *Promise* may be older than the archive suggests, other than the historical markers described above, can be found among the papers relating to *Billy’s Last Stand* which are also held in the Hines Papers. In a letter to Hines concerning the television production of *Billy’s Last Stand* dated shortly after the Play for Today was broadcast on the 10th February 1971, the script editor Ann Scott writes: “If you do re-write your radio play and you think it might work on television, I would love to see it. And I am looking forward to the novel.”[[222]](#footnote-223) According to the time period in which Hines received this letter, the novel mentioned in the letter must be Hines’s third novel *First Signs,* which was published 1972. Hines, however, did write another television script in the early 1970s. *Speech Day* was written between 1971 and 1972 yet this script was definitely written specifically for television. The drama aired on television on 26th March 1973 and the script editor for the drama was Ann Scott. Thus, it is not incongruous to speculate that the script may have been drafted earlier and that Hines adapted it for television based on the acclaim *Billy’s Last Stand* had received by the television reviewers at the time.

**Style and Subject in the Post *Kes* Phase**

The subject matter of *Speech Day* aligns with the Hinesian ethos of writing, and is in contrast to his lost drama *Promise*. David Forrest and Sue Vice point out that the mode of *Speech Day* is “ambivalence”. Thus, *Speech Day* bears a signature of Hines’s writing style while *Promise* does not. *Promise*’s script from the outset promotes an ableist viewpoint on disability, as the later sections of this chapter will show. The script ends with Karen accusing Price of rape. The nature of Hines’s ending sustains the script’s opinion of how the representation of the disabled figure is depicted in the narrative. In relation to *Speech Day*, its narrative structures transpose the capitalist structure which is based upon the division of class and labour into the microcosm of everyday school life. The author’s symbolic representation of how even comprehensive education is organised calls to mind the grammar school system of which Hines himself was a part. The male and female students of class 4GI are taken away from their school work in order to tidy the grounds of the school (male) and to cook (female) for the guests coming to hear the speeches. In this early television drama Hines reveals the gendered and divided nature of labour. The school system in *Speech Day* conjures the image of a culture of inequality based upon a class bound system. Those that are privileged, the academically gifted, equate to belonging to the upwardly mobile “white collar” middle classes, whilst the play suggests the division is strategic - any gift the pupils in the lower classes have is ignored and devalued. Thus, the less gifted students’ potential is limited to providing physical a mode of production. *Speech Day*’s focus on education and the world of work differs significantly from *Promise* due to Karen being portrayed by Hines as a successful product of the grammar school system. This could be because of a generic difference: *Promise* could be viewed as a farce, whereas *Speech Day* is satirical in mode. *Promise* does gloss over Karen’s school days, in contrast *to Speech Day*, and the drama deals with an overtly gendered narrative. It focuses on female sexuality and the notion of the sociosexual in the same vein as Alice Aisgill’s narrative in *Room at the Top* (1959) and Rachel Roberts’s character, Brenda, in *Saturday and Sunday Morning* (1960). We could ask why, if the text was written in the 1970s, it follows narrative conventions which focus on the regulation of female sexuality rather than following a political schema seen in Hines’s other work in the post *Kes* phase? There are no other artefacts or correspondence associated with *Promise* held within the Hines Papers. However, one answer could be that the author was responding to a specific invitation, although there is no evidence of this. As the letter from Ann Scott reveals, Hines was adapting a radio play (from an earlier period) for television.

The “post-*Kes*” phase can be defined as being just after the film *Kes* was screened in 1969 and before Hines’s fourth novel *The Gamekeeper* in 1975*.* The texts written in this phase were: *Promise,* Hines’s third novel *First Signs* (1972) and *Speech* *Day* (1973). Hines is known for the poetic prose in which he describes the prosaic happenings of everyday working class life, yet, if we compare the two texts written in the post-*Kes* phase*, Speech Day*, and *First Signs*, again we see that both these texts have a political message about the nature of work. *First Signs* is a novel of two parts, as the dust jacket of the first edition illustrates. Divided into two parts, the dust jacket features a window portraying an image of a mine shaft and the figure of a naked women’s torso. Thus, the dust jacket attests to the fact that one part of the novel, told in flashback, focuses on Tom Renshaw’s sexual relationship with his girlfriend Zelda, and his affair with a separated married woman while travelling in Italy. The other half of the novel deals with his return to his home in a mining town in South Yorkshire; his reuniting with his family; the fuelling of political ideology; and, lastly his reconciliation with Zelda.

In contrast to *Speech Day*, *First Signs*’ narrative is not allegorical but leans towards the didactic, as Renshaw’s story becomes a way for Hines to voice his own political philosophy. One such illustration of Hines’s political viewpoint within the narrative can be seen halfway through the novel when Renshaw returns to his family home in the North. Hines details how Renshaw, when going to his bedroom for the first time on his return, comes across his father’s books. From Hines’s description, it would appear that Tom read this collection of books while he was still at school:

Even his father’s books were still there, the Union histories, the political biographies, the works of Marx and Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and H. G. Wells; all of which had formerly lived behind leaded glass in the china cabinet downstairs, but had gradually, through the years, been brought upstairs by Tom, to be read in bed, and then been given a home amongst his own collection.[[223]](#footnote-224)

Hines’s imagery has a dual purpose. On the one hand, the adolescent Tom can be understood as a left-wing intellectual going against his destiny as a miner. Thus Tom goes beyond his class constraints by reading texts which inform and shape his nascent political ideology. On the other hand, Hines shows Tom’s father’s to be a wide-ranging reader. Hines presents miners here as well-read and politically sophisticated. The novel’s appearance in the 1970s accords with Sam Goodman pointing out that this decade witnessed the continuation of the Irish Troubles; industrial action on a large scale; and “The Winter of Discontent”.[[224]](#footnote-225) In turn, David Forrest and Sue Vice note that Hines “had remarkable foresight”, since *First Signs* was “published in the midst of the first miners’ strike since the general strike of 1926” and that Hines seemed “to anticipate the outcome of the struggle”.[[225]](#footnote-226) Renshaw is Hines’s own avatar, a class warrior who rails against the unjust nature of the capitalist system.

In this text, Hines oscillates between his poetic realist style that paints the pastoral and the political themes of the novel, and a lyrical but repeatedly sexually explicit expression. One example of this mode of writing can be seen the first part for novel. Shortly after arriving in Italy, Tom starts a sexual relationship with Helen, an older woman of means. In conversation with Helen, Tom discusses Zelda, with whom he had a relationship before travelling Italy, and who has stayed with Tom while Helen was away. Tom and Helen share a tumultuous relationship. As the conversation turns to Zelda, and Helen, in a state of jealousy, asks Tom about his previous girlfriend thus:

 (Tom) “They call her Zelda Grey?”

(Helen) “Zelda Grey? What a curious name. Never heard of her!”

(Tom) “She’s heard of you.”

(Helen) “In what circumstances?”

(Tom) “She says she’s seen you around. Met you once at a party.”

(Helen) “A journalist? I don’t know anyone of that name. What’s she like, this Zelda?”

(Tom) “Big tits, tight cunt, and she moaned a lot.”

(Helen) “Don’t be disgusting!”[[226]](#footnote-227)

Helen’s admonishment of Tom, in this exchange, does not annul the sexual objectification of Zelda’s body, nor Tom’s aggression towards Helen. Her evident shock makes Zelda’s objectified state more visible. Delivered in a list-like style, Tom’s pornographic articulation of Zelda’s body all but reduces it to a torso. In detailing a sexual partner’s body in this fragmentary mode, his own imaginings of his sexual prowess are also revealed. Zelda’s body thus becomes a mirror for how he sees himself during the sexual act, as a consummate sexual partner. Therefore, in signifying Zelda’s body in this fragmented manner, Hines reveals the insecurity of a displaced young male character.

 Clive Jordan notes that the narrative landscape in the novel is a “man’s world”,[[227]](#footnote-228) while another critic observes that *First Signs* is a “modern” novel.[[228]](#footnote-229) Another remarks on Hines’s “savage dialogue”.[[229]](#footnote-230) The possible reason for the reviewers’ verdicts is a difference in form and diction from Hines’s most influential novel, *A Kestrel for a Knave*. Notably, Hines’s style in this third novel communicates Renshaw’s state of flux, in synergy with the author’s own politicised point of view. But what is unearthed from reading the critics’ observations of the novel is its overt sexual content; it shared the vogue of the era for sexually explicit writing. I Q Hunter explains that the “sex” films of the early 1970s, were “[U]nabashedly populist”.[[230]](#footnote-231) Hunter does not discuss how the permissive society of the 1970s influenced the novel in this era; yet, his observation does provide an understanding of how British culture saw a “rapid social and moral change”[[231]](#footnote-232) in the late 1960s which went on to influence the cultural milieu of the 1970s. Zelda and Helen in *First Signs* provide Hines with a means of expression which allows him as a writer trying, or being expected, to emulate the new permissiveness. In writing this text Hines takes a more “mature” direction than that that witnessed in his previous novels, *The Blinder* and *A Kestrel for a Knave*. Both of these texts focus on male adolescents who struggle with the concept of entering an adult world, whereas his third novel centres on Renshaw’s post university “twenty-something” years and the transition into a masculine adulthood. The success of *A Kestrel for a Knave* provided Hines with a creative agency. However, in writing *First Signs*’ permissive sexual content, Hines may have been compelled to capitalise on the newly “liberated pleasures available” to “working class and suburban audiences”.[[232]](#footnote-233)

**Reading Disability in *Promise***

From the beginning of the script of *Promise*, the plot makes its anachronistic view on disability explicit. On page two, the two female characters are introduced, and the opening scenario shows Freda trying to tidy up the front room while Karen comes in from work carrying some shopping. A pithy interaction takes place between the women which highlights from the outset the enmity between them, on the one hand, while providing a glimpse of how disability will be portrayed in the text, on the other. This interaction between the pair is written thus:

Karen. Are we having any tea then?

Freda. It’s a waste of time bothering!

(Throws the shoes on to floor and kicks them under an

 armchair.)

Karen. Or am I eating out again?

Freda. What’s up with you, are you crippled?

Karen. I’ve been working, haven’t I?

Freda. And what do you think I’ve been doing?

 (Pause) [[233]](#footnote-234)

The term “crippled” is used in this piece of dialogue as an insult. It is used ironically by Freda to point out Karen’s apparent laziness, when in contrast from the very beginning of the drama and from the writer’s directions, it is Freda who appears to be the lazy one. Karen has been in fact working all day while Hines discloses a few pages into the script that Freda has been watching the racing. In addition, Hines redoubles the emphasis on the insult by the action of Freda, who “[T]hrows the shoes on to the floor and kicks them under an armchair.” It has to be remembered that *Promise* was written for television, and this action signifies that shoes are not required because the person cannot walk. I argue that this coupling of action and dialogue at the early stage of the script exemplifies the script’s rhetorical stance towards disability.

By being used at this stage of the text the insult conforms to what Leonard Kriegel notes illustrates how the “cripple”, to use his terminology, is thought of as “other” and outside the realms of able-bodied existence. He writes that in what he views as an able-bodied world, the disabled person is still, “the other, if for no other reason than that only by being the other will be allowed to presume upon the society of “normals.”’[[234]](#footnote-235) In light of Kriegel’s observation, “crippled” is used as an insult in the conversation between Freda and Carol because the disabled person is viewed differently to those that are able-bodied. A few pages on in the script, another metaphor is used by Karen to insult her mother. When discussing how many people have mistaken Freda for her daughter, Karen retorts: “They must carry white sticks?”[[235]](#footnote-236) This again reiterates the representation of Karen’s perception of a disabled person as being other and uses disability, this time being blind, as an insult.

It should be noted that Price would not have appeared on screen until late on in the script. However, the two women discuss his disability while he is off camera, and Hines makes the viewer aware from the outset of Mr Price’s physical difference as Karen and her mother discuss how they love to dance:

Karen: Or have a dance with Mr Price when he comes.

Freda: Don’t be funny.

Karen: Can you imagine him, waltzing around with his rent

 book under his arm?

(She starts to waltz, keeping one arm pressed to her side and holding one leg stiff dragging it behind her.)

Freda: Karen! Stop it.

(Karen continues around the table then stops, laughing.)

Karen: Why, what’s the matter?

 Freda: You shouldn’t mock people like that. [[236]](#footnote-237)

In writing these directions, Hines dramatizes the limping man’s physicality via Karen’s mimicry. Joanna Bourke notes that the First World War “magnified the experience of deformity, and the broader reality of disablement in twentieth-century Britain changed dramatically as a result.”[[237]](#footnote-238) In writing these directions, Hines draws a parallel with Bourke’s suggestion, as both Karen and Freda see Price as a man who was disabled during World War Two. Karen then projects the image of the limping man as she asks the spectator to “imagine” how Price would look “waltzing”. The physicality of the limping man is not only an epistemological reality: it is also magnified when Price finally appears. Additionally, the moral image of Price is tainted before we see him. As we shall see, in *Promise* Hines’s disabled figure is depicted by way of a succession of sexual stereotypes which concur with Longmore’s paradigm. What Hines outlines then is how an abled bodied society perceived those who were disabled.

Disability is used in the script as a metaphor to distinguish physical injury occasioned in war. In the drama Price discusses his “war” years, yet Hines does not depict him as a soldier. Price goes on to describe how the war years were “happy years” for him while all the other men from the town “went off” and he “missed out”. He also outlines how this “was a blessing in a lot of ways” because, while the men “were fighting”, he “was earning”.[[238]](#footnote-239) Further, Price observes in relation to the demobilised soldiers who had returned home after the war that:

And then it ended, and they all came back and they’d missed it. The lads were old men, crippled old men as well, a lot of them, and it was their turn to be bitter then. Some of them never got over it, you know, you can still talk to them, men who’ve still got it inside of them.

(Pause)

But it’s no good coming to me for sympathy, because one cripple can’t sympathize with another. How can I say that I am sorry about the war? It was just their bad luck that’s all. [[239]](#footnote-240)

Historically speaking, Price’s words show an awareness, if not a critique, of the consequences of warfare for the male body and, indeed, the male psyche. Hines poetically puts forward the notion of the human cost of war as Price describes how the men who went away to war were transformed by their wartime experience. Price’s oxymoron: “The lads were old men”, symbolises how the soldiers were aged prematurely. It can be gleaned from this dialogue that Price himself was untouched by the war, and his injury, ironically, made him a fortunate man. In relation to this, Hines also transposes the militarised rhetoric of “missed it”[[240]](#footnote-241) rather using the term to mean missing while fighting in the war. Price instead uses this term to highlight that those that volunteered or were conscripted to fight had missed out on the comforts and opportunities of the home-front. This militarised rhetorical term is connected to the concepts of a masculine duty in a patriotic activity. From a patriotic point of view, those who “missed” the war had lost their chance to prove their heroism to the nation. Thus, they were deemed cowardly and unmanly by wartime society. In writing about the consequences of returning home in relation to the repatriated war-veteran, I suggest that the author draws on ideas about the fragile nature of the masculine self in the post-war period. Hines uses his own construction of a disabled figure to give a voice to the traumatic consequences of warfare for the male body in a vicarious sense. Mr Price’s body therefore symbolises war trauma. What is more, Price’s observation has a cultural importance as it expresses the bitterness felt by those war veterans who returned from the Second World War.

Price cannot sympathise with those who returned from war disabled because he is disabled himself. However, the able-bodied female subjects in the text - Freda, described by Hines as “[A] middle aged woman”, and her daughter, Karen, a woman aged “about twenty” - manifest different unconscious responses to the disabled figure. In her study of the relationship between literature and disability, Alice Hall notes that able-bodied subjects *do have* the ability to identify and “to imagine disability”, yet they also have a “deep-rooted desire not to do so because of the fear, pity and even revulsion” that is associated with disability.[[241]](#footnote-242) Indeed, in comparing Hill’s observation with Hines’s narrative, we see how the able-bodied characters act in response to a disabled figure. Whereas Mr Price cannot sympathise with other disabled figures, Freda and Karen respond differently to him as able-bodied subjects, because they can imagine what it would be like to find themselves disabled. Freda, on the one hand, fears but also pities Mr Price’s embodiment, while on the other hand, Karen appears to be sexually attracted to Price but repulsed by this impulse simultaneously. The responses of the two female characters allow a reading of how the intersections between masculinity and disability are articulated in the narrative.

**The War Damaged Veteran in British New Wave Aesthetics**

In writing *Promise* the author reveals how society perceived and tried to interpret the disabled masculine figure in the post-war era of the 1960s. Paul Longmore notes that those authors who included disabled figures in a romantic scenario, like the plot in *Promise*, had a specific aim in doing so. As he goes on to say:

Stigma and discrimination are still especially powerful regarding sexuality and romance. In a sexually supercharged culture that places almost an obsessive emphasis on attractiveness, people with various disabilities are often perceived as sexually deviant and even dangerous, asexual, or sexually incapacitated either physically or emotionally. Film and television stereotypes reflect and reinforce this deviant sexual viewpoint.[[242]](#footnote-243)

For Longmore, those who are somatically different are almost always represented as having some sort of sexual pathology. This system of representation can be seen in two films from the British New Wave: *Room at the Top* (1959), directed by Jack Clayton and Tony Richardson’s, A *Taste of Honey* (1961). In British society during the Second World War, the “requisites”[[243]](#footnote-244) of wartime manliness, bravery, endurance, and physical strength, were channelled into the heroic and militarised masculine forms such as the soldier, the sailor, or the airman. Yet, another representation of militarised masculinity was appeared on screen after the war, as Andrew Spicer observes:

These damaged men can be analysed as two inter-related types. The first, which dominated the immediate post-war period, was the maladjusted veteran whose war service had caused psychological damage and/or social dysfunction. The second, the schizophrenic, was more obviously generic.[[244]](#footnote-245)

In the of post-war films which Spicer discusses in his chapter, released in the period between 1946 and 1951, only two depict physical disability: *Frieda* (1947), which includes a war veteran with a facial disfigurement, and *The Small Back Room* (1948), which features a war veteran who lost a foot in World War Two. It would seem then that greater emphasis was placed by film directors on psychological trauma than the bodily damage incurred by warfare. It can be concluded that the cinema at that time had little interest in portraying those who had been injured during the war and had been left disabled. Martin F. Norden writes that Hollywood in the 1940s and 1950s frequently dealt “explicitly with contemporaneous social concerns”.[[245]](#footnote-246) Although Norden does not discuss representations of disability in British film, he does observe that American films made after the war which depicted war veterans highlighted American society’s “submerged ideological perspectives”[[246]](#footnote-247) on disability. These films cannot fully articulate this embodiment because it is a ‘submerged’ and unspeakable representation.

One film from the British New Wave portrays what Spicer would term as a war-damaged veteran whose war service had “had profound psychological effects upon”[[247]](#footnote-248) him. In Jack Clayton’s 1959 adaptation of John Braine’s novel *Room at the Top,* Joe Lampton can be classed as a war-damaged veteran. Although not apparently physically damaged, due to his violent outbursts and his venal attitude, which becomes apparent during the course of the film, Joe appears to have been transformed by his war service. At the very beginning of the film, he openly states that he was a prisoner of war, yet his wartime experience is glossed over. When Lampton does discuss his status as a former prisoner, it only goes to reinforce his characterisation as cynical and self-serving. Lampton could be categorised as a maladjusted veteran who lacks the ability to assimilate back into civilian life. In a late scene in the film, with Alice Aisgill, played by Simone Signoret, a married woman and Lampton’s lover, an argument reveals that she once posed in the nude for a painter. Joe takes exception to this revelation and the couple argue. Joe’s reaction exposes his unsophisticated, parochial nature because he judges Alice’s act to be immoral. As the argument continues and in an act of quid pro quo, to juxtapose Joe’s own ostensible immorality, Alice also details how Joe got by in the prisoner of war camp, while he was held in Europe:

Joe: Oh, shut up!

Alice: You make a great to-do about your humble

 beginnings, but you’ve never really been

 hard up. You’ve never gone hungry.

 Joe: What do you think a POW gets to eat?

 Alice: Ummmm…Even then you didn’t starve.

 There has always been somebody to take care

 of our Joe. You got extra, you told me yourself

 because you got on so well with the guards. Ummm

 Why didn’t you have the guts to escape like Jack

 Wales? [[248]](#footnote-249)

On the one hand, Alice exposes that during his time as a prisoner of war, Joe may have fraternised with his captors in order to get extra food. As Clare Makepeace observes, the existence of a prisoner of war was a “famished” [[249]](#footnote-250) one, where hunger was always a concern for the prisoners held by the Germans. The size of the rations fluctuated throughout the war and the prisoners supplemented them with the occasional Red Cross parcel. Ben Shephard writes that for a POW, “the main topic of conversation and thought”[[250]](#footnote-251) was food. On the other hand, this interaction in the film exposes the unspeakable nature of the notion of being held captive by the enemy in the post-war context. The deprivations suffered by the prisoner of war led the serviceman to carry out actions that they would not do in civilian life. Alice’s insight undermines Joe’s standing as a once-militarised masculinity. By contrast, Jack Wales’ characterisation in the film is the epitome of the heroic masculine figure by virtue of his escape from his captors. It was part of a British serviceman’s duty, and part of a militarised code of conduct to try and escape from their captors. Alice’s insinuation only goes to reinforce the representation of Joe’s inherent cravenness and his desire to do anything to get by.

Indeed, Neil Paterson’s screenplay acknowledges the uncomfortable nature of being interned by the enemy. This interaction between Joe and Alice is taken straight from Braine’s novel. Braine makes references to the Stalag or prison camp in which Jack was held. But this motif is interspersed into Lampton’s stream of consciousness and is never heard externally in the film, except in the interaction with Alice. For example, in the novel, when Joe goes to a party, he thinks in relation to the food presented there that people of the upper classes in the post-war period will never be “hungry in the way I’d been in Stalag 1000…”.[[251]](#footnote-252) But this is never heard in the film – it remains internalised, private and unspoken. By showing Alice articulating Joe’s status as POW to shame him, Braine foregrounds the almost unspeakable nature of Joe’s internment. By denouncing Joe, Alice exposes the moral implications of fraternising with the enemy.

The screenplay does make reference to Joe’s POW status from the outset of the film in his first encounter with Charlie Soames, Joe’s work colleague in the Town Hall. In another scene at the beginning of the film, which takes place during a dress rehearsal for a play. Some of the cast gather around Joe, while Jack who was in the air force during the war questions him about his war service. Paterson explicitly highlights that the implicitly shameful POW experience was not acknowledged in post-war society:

Jack: I don’t know about that? What outfit?

Joe: Wellingtons.

Jack: Argh. Sergeant Observer-hey?

Joe: Yes. How did you know?

Jack: Oh I can tell. Did you ever get beyond Wellingtons?

Joe: No, as a matter of fact I was shot down early, spent

 most of the war in a prison camp.

Jack: Ummm. Is that so. Must have been rough?

Joe: Well, as a matter of fact…

Jack: Oh, come on Sue. 22.40 precisely – operation

 supper to begin. What a stinker I don’t know how

 you all stand it. Come on Sue.

Eva: Do come and have a drink with us first.

Jack: Well we’d love to. But you know poppa

 Brown, he likes you there on the dot. Some other

 time. Good night all. Good night Sergeant.

 You must tell me about your POW experiences.

 But, some other time.[[252]](#footnote-253)

This conversation between Jack and Joe is shot in medium close up. However, the shot does not only contain these two characters; standing alongside Joe and Jack, played by John Westbrook, are Cyril (Ian Hendry), Charlie (Donald Houston), and Eva (Delena Kidd), while Susan (Heather Sears), sits in the foreground of the frame. The depth of this shot and Clayton’s long take allows for a sense of intimacy to be engendered between the ensemble. It allows the spectator to become aware of Jack’s snub and his desire to silence Joe, because we are aware of this reaction as much as the others in the group are. As Joe tries to answer Jack, three of the other members of the group, Cyril, Charlie, and Eva, avert their gaze from Joe’s face as he mumbles, “Well, as a matter of fact…”. Cyril looks at the floor, and at Joe, while he is speaking, whereas Charlie and Eva look directly at Jack, avoiding Joe’s gaze altogether. Susan is the only member of the group, other than Jack, to look Joe fully in the face. However, her expression is indistinguishable, as the spectator can only see the side of her face. Thus, in this shot Jack is portrayed as the dominant figure because he holds Joe’s gaze. Moreover, Jack’s silencing of Joe becomes a signifier for his emasculation of him. By not voicing his experiences and more significantly, by no one in the group intending to listen to him, Joe becomes a symbolic feminine figure. Silencing Joe can thus be seen as an act of dominance.

As noted at the beginning of this section, the British film industry at this time seemed to pay more attention to those war veterans that were psychologically maladjusted rather than those who were physically wounded. One exception is biographical film, *Reach for the Sky* (1956), directed by Lewis Gilbert. Starring Kenneth More as Douglas Bader, a RAF squadron leader during the Second World War. The film charts Bader’s heroic war service after losing both his legs while taking part in a RAF aerial exhibition before the war. Another masculine figure who was physically damaged in the Second World War can be seen in a different British New Wave film made shortly after *Room at the Top*. *Promise* rehearses many of the themes witnessed in *A Taste of Honey*. For example, *Promise* is female centric and its narrative is built upon the dynamics of a working-class mother and daughter relationship. In *A Taste of Honey* Robert Stephens plays thirty-two-year-old Peter Smith, a soldier who lost his left eye in the Second World War. Like Price’s representation in Hines’s lost television drama, Smith’s characterisation is imbued with a sense of otherness. Like Clayton’s war veteran, Lampton, Smith openly acknowledges his war service, yet, the film presents his disability in a heightened manner. This attests to both the notion of isolating the disabled figure and the unspeakable nature of the damaged war veteran. In the first scene containing Smith (shot in Smith’s office) his artificial eye is hardly noticeable. Shot in a medium close up from his left side, the disparity between Smith’s right eye and the artificial left eye cannot be distinguished, as Richardson’s choice of shot in this first encounter with Smith obscures his artificial glass eye. But in the next scene containing Peter, alongside Helen, his fiancée, his artificial eye becomes more apparent. Caught in a medium close-up two-shot, Richardson focuses on both Smith’s and Helen’s faces straight on. Smith’s left eye appears to be set in a fixed position, while his right eye acts in an apparently natural fashion. Yet, this perception is due to Richardson’s use of chiaroscuro which only reveals the right side of Smith’s face, whilst at the same time showing Dora Bryan’s character Helen’s fully lit face, as the couple stand together. Far from consolidating Peter’s visual image and bringing it to the fore, the lighting technique in effect divides his face and foregrounds his supposed difference. Nonetheless, Smith’s disability is only hinted at in this second scene.

This scene cuts to show the couple back at Helen’s digs. Richardson cuts between Jo, Helen’s daughter, standing above the couple on the landing, and the couple who are below her having just entered the house. Richardson then gradually moves from a medium shot of Peter and Helen to a close up of them in the frame, shot from a slightly raised angle, as if captured from Jo’s point of view. The spindles of the staircase cast alternating shadows across both Peter’s and Helen’s faces. In this close-up the spectator becomes aware of the disparity between Peter’s eyes as he looks up at Jo, owing to the shadow of a spindle falling on the right side of his face. Thus, Richardson again uses chiaroscuro to divide Peter’s face. Yet, in this scene the director illuminates the left side of Peter’s face and deliberately shows his disability. This technique allows the spectator to witness that the artificial eye appears more bulbous than his biological eye. Moreover, even though the film is shot in black and white, the spectator realises that the iris of his left eye is slightly different in tone; it is also slightly smaller than his right. Thus, the chiaroscuro technique is used to isolate Peter and to make his disfigurement more apparent, whereas Helen’s face is seen as being without irregularity. This style of lighting converts Peter’s damaged face into a form of spectacle.

In a later scene Richardson’s film presents an unhealthy connection between Jo and Peter. In the scene where Peter, Helen and Jo are about to go to Blackpool, Jo and Peter are seen together alone as Helen is getting ready in another room. Jo asks Peter this question:

Jo: Why do you have a glass eye?

Peter: Well…I lost one during the war.

Jo: Can you take that eye out?

Peter: Don’t ask daft questions.

Jo: Do you wear it when you go to bed?

Peter: Well there’s one highly recommended way for

 a young lady to find out.

Jo: Oh…do you fancy me?

Peter: …No thanks. [[253]](#footnote-254)

In shooting this conversation between Jo and Peter, Richardson again isolates Peter’s face, and focuses explicitly on his disfigurement. When Peter says to Jo, “Well there’s one highly recommended way for a young lady to find out.”, Richardson shoots Peter while he is speaking, and he moves closer to the camera as if looking at Jo. This shot then progresses from a medium close-up to an acute close-up of his face looming over Jo, as she sits. Peter is shot with the left side of his face being closer to the lens while the right side is in shadow. As he looms over Jo his left eyebrow rises slightly. This involuntary response of the eyebrow being raised suggests that Peter, who may be seen as mocking Jo, is, on first sight, fully aware that she is in fact mocking him because of his disability. In saying, “Do you wear it when you go bed?”, Jo emasculates Smith, by clearly implying that he must take it out. In filming Peter in this fashion, Richardson articulates two unspeakable issues that encompass representations of disability. The first focuses on the relationship between the disabled figure and sex and the individual’s prowess as a lover. The second foregrounds an apparent predatory proclivity. What the depiction of Smith in this British New Wave film unearths is the anxiety that surrounds disability even in the latter part of the post-war period.

In this conversation, moreover, Jo speaks from the position of being unaware of *how* Peter “lost his eye”. This is because Jo was born in the post-war era; she is around 15 years old in the film, in contrast to her mother, Helen, who lived through the war. A similar scenario can be seen in Hines’s *Promise* as Karen asks Mr Price if he likes to dance, knowing full well that he has a limp. However, she presumes that he lost his leg in the war:

Karen: Did you ever go dancing, Mr Price?

Freda: Karen!

Karen: There’s nothing wrong with that.

 He could have done before.

Price: Before what?

Karen: Before the war.

Price: Which war?

Karen: I don’t know. The war you had it shot off in.

Price: I was never in the war.

Karen: (*To Freda*.) You said he had it shot off in the war.

Freda: I said nothing of the kind.

Karen: You told me that he had.

Freda: I said somebody had said that he’d had it shot off.

 Price: I had polio when I was four. [[254]](#footnote-255)

Karen, like Jo in the scene with Peter in *A Taste of* *Honey*, speaks from a position of not remembering the war. In representing Mr Price as a polio victim, Hines conflates two disastrous historical events: the polio epidemics, which took place in the middle of the twentieth century, and the Second World War, which had a disastrous impact on the masculine self. Yet each is perceived entirely differently in the memory-culture. A war trauma or injury suffered in war is seen as the ultimate sacrifice and is glorified in nationalist society. In contrast, according to Marc Shell, after the war the threat of polio “crystallized human uncertainties” and the survivors of the disease were a reminder of diseases’ ever increasing “power to slay”.[[255]](#footnote-256) The polio epidemics were a disastrous occurrence for men, women and children alike. Polio was a disease that could cripple those who contracted it for life. It had the power to maim and deform but it also had the power to cause widespread fear. Neither Karen or Freda realise that Mr Price developed his limp by contracting polio until he tells them that this was the case. Thus, Hines uses polio as a means of exploring the fragile nature of disabled masculinity in the post-war era, and the shame of a disability not sustained during the war.

In embedding his figure of the limping man into Karen’s and Freda’s discourse, not only does Hines make the spectator aware of his overt physical difference, but he also emasculates him. In an altercation with her mother, Karen says that she saw her in bed with Mr Price. As Karen recalls: “You looked so funny, his game [gammy] leg was all stiff and stuck out over the edge of the bed. (laughs). I’ll never forget it. You looked stupid.”[[256]](#footnote-257) Here Karen makes explicit the connection between a physical dysfunction, the limp, with sexual dysfunction, impotence. Returning to Longmore’s observation that film and television “stereotypes reflect and reinforce this deviant sexual viewpoint”, this stigmatisation can be witnessed in this script. In saying that Price and her mother looked “stupid”, Karen reveals the revulsion at seeing her mother and the disabled Price making love. By Price’s leg being “stuck out over the edge of the bed” it is not in the right position; lovemaking is disrupted and the sexual act is not consummated.

A limp on film cannot be hidden: it is always perceptible to the spectator. Thus, Hines chose to “other” his limping man just as Delaney does with the partially blind Smith in *A Taste of Honey*. In a conversation in which the trio discuss why Mr Price has never married, Karen implies that Price is gay:

Karen: They always talk about men who are…

(claps her hand over mouth and giggles. Price shoots up in the chair gripping the arms.)

Price: Who are what?

Karen: Nothing.

Price: Who are what?

Freda: She just meant about your limp that’s all.

Price: What about it?

Freda: Well, the way people make fun of someone with

 an…impediment. [[257]](#footnote-258)

By using an ellipsis - a break in speech in Karen’s dialogue – she creates her own metaphor in the phrase the “[M]en who are”, yet she does not go on to describe what they are. This metaphor therefore implies how homosexuality, at the time of writing this piece, still cannot be spoken about openly in society. It also provides an indication that the script was written before sex between men was decriminalised. Even as Price challenges her to answer his question: “Who are what?”, she replies, “[N]othing”. Karen here insinuates that men who are gay, from her perspective, are unspeakable as she cannot articulate what they are. Price’s manliness, from Karen’s point of view, reads as being inconsistent. If he were an able-bodied man he would follow a prescribed gender script and would be assumed to be heterosexual. In contrast, by being a man who has a disability, he must be inadequate.

Freda, conversely however, speaks from the position of fearing disability. In this dialogue from Hines’s script, Freda interprets and speaks Price’s body differently:

Freda: Well, the way people make fun of someone

 with an…impediment.

 (Pause)

 You know, like they did with the hunchback.

 What’s his name?

Price: (Standing up)

 Well:

 Freda: The one in the cathedral, the hunchback of Notre Dame.

 What was his name, Karen?

 Karen: I don’t know.

 Freda: Mr Price. You’re an educated man.

 Price: Quasimodo.

 Freda: That’s it! Quasimodo. Well, people were scared of

 him as well. [[258]](#footnote-259)

For Freda, Price’s body is also a site of inscription. She identifies Mr Price as a disabled figure who provokes mockery from others. Throughout the drama, Freda tries to censor Karen’s vocalisations of the limping man. She equates Price’s “impediment” with an extreme and exaggerated form of masculine disability, a form that can be seen in the 1939 film version of *The Hunchback of Notre* *Dame*. Freda’s simile expresses how she tries to understand Price’s embodiment. This simile is a reaction to fear of the able-bodied finding themselves with a disability. As Freda points out herself: “Well, people were scared of him as well”. This fear also highlights the generational difference between Freda and Karen. Freda as a middle-aged woman would have lived through the war and the polio epidemics. Whereas Karen is repulsed by Price’s bodily difference, Freda fears it.

Towards the end of the script Karen takes Price upstairs, so he can make a note of the house-maintenance issues. This scene is set in Karen’s bedroom. During the course of this scene, Mr Price makes an observation about Karen’s body: “You’ve got the figure to look good in anything…or nothing.”[[259]](#footnote-260) Hines follows this observation by writing the direction: “(Price laughs. Karen giggles)”. This salacious comment reinforces Price’s representation as being sexually predatory, even though Karen is shown to be flirting as much as Price is. The viewer, however, will always perceive Price’s physical difference. The bodies of both Karen and Price are brought to the attention of the viewer throughout this interaction with many references to Karen wearing and removing dresses. Karen’s small, claustrophobic bedroom provides the perfect setting for the screenwriter to exhibit the difference between bodies. When Mr Price first appears in the script, the stage direction describes him as “seedy” and as “insignificant”. For a writer who does not usually comment on his character’s physicality, this succinct description signifies bodily difference and Price’s intention. The adjective, “seedy’” which is used to describe Price allows the immediate awareness that the landlord has morally dubious aims in the realms of the script. According to Longmore, on screen, disabled characters are often represented as being “sexually deviant”.[[260]](#footnote-261) He goes on to say:

We are never quite sure what he will do to her. Sexual menace, deviancy, and danger stem from loss of control often represented as inherent in the experience of disability.

Although Karen appears to be aware of the sexual tension between her and Price, indeed she actively encourages it, his difference and the close proximity to her creates a sense of danger. Karen’s body is young, and perfect. Because of its perfection it is almost virginal (although her actions show that she may be experienced). Owing to this awareness of bodily difference, a sense of threat or “sexual danger”[[261]](#footnote-262) shadows this interaction.

One comment made by Price reveals a deeper, almost unconscious emphasis on the intersection of disability and sexuality. The conversation starts by Karen saying to Price that he has not seen her wearing some of her “good” dresses:

Price. No, but I should like to, because they’re only pretty skins while they’re flat and empty like this. They need a body inside them to be beautiful.

Karen. Do you mean like a snake?

Price. Yes, something like that.

Karen. Do you think I’m like a snake then?

 (Holds her arms above her head and wriggles.)

Price. No, I didn’t mean that.

Karen. Snakes wrap themselves around things, don’t they?

 (Wraps herself round an imaginary body.)

Karen. And swallow their prey whole.

What this interaction between Price and Karen reveals is the emphasis on phallic imagery. It is Karen who makes the connection between clothes hanging in a wardrobe and a snake shedding its skin. But she goes on to extend and build upon her simile by asking the question, “[D]o you think I’m like a snake then?” This question is compounded by her physicality and her raising her arms above her head and writhing. Although Hines’s direction “wriggles” is almost childish in tone, her writhing with her body exposed is salacious rather than childlike. By taking on the mantle of the snake illustrates that Karen now has power in this scene. She goes on to extend the snake comparison even further by relating the act of a snake eating its prey with the act of fellatio, registering the change in dynamics between the pair.

In the dénouement of the drama, Hines fosters a correlation between a physical abnormality and a psychological one. Price is the scapegoat for Karen’s own sexual anxiety, as highlighted by this scene, in which Karen’s boyfriend Mick suddenly appears:

There is a scream from upstairs. Both [Freda and Mick] jump up and Mick runs out of the room followed by Freda. Karen is struggling with Price on the stairs. Price pushes Karen behind him and faces Mick.

Karen: Get him, Mick! Get him!

Price: It was her idea. I didn’t do anything.

Mick: You dirty bastard!

Price: I didn’t do anything. Honest!

Karen: He tried to rape me, Mick. He got hold of me… [[262]](#footnote-263)

Throughout the drama, Karen not only mocks Price, she sexually teases him. For example, she asks him to “feel at the material” of her dress. He does so, as Hines describes: “tentatively” touching her thigh and “then he takes his hand away.”[[263]](#footnote-264) She also asks him if he would like to see her in one of her dresses – “a topless”[[264]](#footnote-265) one. It can easily be deduced that it is these mixed messages that prompt Price to try to make sexual advances towards her, and Karen stops this advance when she realises that her boyfriend Mick is downstairs. But as the action of what Karen calls the attempted rape is not shown in the drama, the spectator is left to draw their own conclusion about what actually happened, as Hines’s directions are ambiguous. Price, at this point in the drama, is isolated and at his most vulnerable, yet he “pushes Karen behind him” when coming face to face with Mick. This gesture symbolises an instinct to protect. Nevertheless, the disabled man becomes a focus of blame, although Price repeats that he “didn’t do anything”. And then later, he states: “She lied. Why did she lie like this?”[[265]](#footnote-266) Karen’s behaviour is ambiguous. Her reaction is due to post-war society’s regulation of those which it deems to be imperfect, just like Mr Price.

**Conclusion**

Price is written as having contracted polio as child, yet *Promise* cannot be designated as a “polio text”.[[266]](#footnote-267) The script seems to ignore the significance of writing about a character who had contracted the disease. The only significance given to this state of being is that by being a polio sufferer Price was exempted from his war duty. Instead of being a wounded war veteran, Price turns out to have the effects of a childhood disease. The disabled characters analysed in conjunction with Price in this chapter from British New Wave films were represented as war veterans. But what shapes this analysis is the overriding attitude towards disability in the post-war period. Hines provides a fleeting insight into the plight of the maladjusted war damaged veteran. He uses this rhetoric to voice the regret of those who had and who had not served in the war. The significance of this discourse is that Hines ironically uses a disabled figure who had not served in combat to articulate the bitterness of those that did serve.

 As this study of the lost masculine narratives in Hines’s unpublished text shows, the author was not averse to voicing the plight of marginalised masculine characters in his texts. Leonard Kriegel observes that: “The cripple is the creature who is deprived of his ability to create a self”.[[267]](#footnote-268) The limping man, Mr Price, in *Promise* has no agency as a self; and as a man his identity is created by others. In allowing his characters to speak about the limping man, Hines shows how a post-war society vocalised the intersections of masculinity and disability. In constructing his disabled figure’s sexual identity, Hines casts Price as heterosexual on the one hand and also as symbolically homosexual, on the other. In the post-war period sex between adult men was heavily criminalised. In trying to establish when the text was written, it should be noted that Hines also used a methodology of manifesting sexual identity in relation to another male figure: Darkly, in *Billy’s Last Stand*. Darkly is not physically disabled, yet he does exhibit signs of a non-disclosed psychological disorder. In bringing Darkly’s characterisation to life, Hines feminises him by outlining his attachment to his mother in the text. Hines implies that there might be a possibility that Darkly has been sectioned because of homosexual tendencies. If *Promise* was indeed written in the early 1960s rather than the early 1970s, it is likely that this manifestation of sexual identity was written in the wake of the findings of the Wolfenden Report in 1957. In relation to homosexuality in literature in the post Wolfenden era, Joseph Bristow notes that in the 1970s, thanks to the decriminalisation of homosexuality and increased interest in lesbian and gay studies, there was a “change in climate”[[268]](#footnote-269) in relation to how homosexuality was both written and regarded in contemporary texts.

As Leonard Kriegel concludes, representing a disabled figure in the way typifies the conceptualisation of the cripple by a predominantly able-bodied society because he is always conceived as a “manifestation of his condition” which is “also the symbolic correlative of that existence”.[[269]](#footnote-270) In Hines’s text the queering of the disabled figure functions in order to neutralise Price’s manliness on the one hand, and articulates the notion of a supposed deviant nature on the other hand. As the text shows, this construction of Mr Price relates to the concept of the disabled body being a threatening masculinity which should be feared by an able-bodied person but is paradoxically asexual simultaneously.

Hines would go on to write about other disabled characters. Firstly, Morgan Lewis is a young man who suffers from burn injuries, in the unpublished television drama *Slate*, possibly written in 1987. This unpublished drama focuses on an historical event – The Great Strike of Penrhyn Quarry in Bethesda, Wales. Hines’s novel *The Heart of It*, published in 1994, features Harry Rickards who is suffering from the effects of a debilitating stroke, and is set after the 1984-85 miners’ strike. Both texts were written in Hines’s Miners’ Strike phase; and both Morgan and Harry are symbols of decline of the masculine figure in the post-industrial age. Yet, their disabilities typify the writer’s, if not society’s, sympathy towards such figures at the time of writing. By contrast, Price embodies the societal reaction to disability and unease that surrounds those who were damaged in the war. Although Hines writes that his disabled character is “insignificant”, by reading the text through the lens of unspeakable masculinity his impact within Hines’s corpus of work gives a significant and a vital insight into the author’s work in the initial stages of his writing career.

**Thesis Conclusion**

As I stated in my introduction, my thesis proposal suggested that Hines’s men were “northern, working-class and straight”. After reading through the archive at the beginning of my research, I realised that the facts I had established in my thesis proposal were not correct. Indeed, in reading both the published and “lost” works as a whole, I unearthed traces of queer masculine types, neurotic men, blacklegs and scabs, uprooted northern men, a man who suffered from polio, social outcasts, and prisoners of war. This led me to re-evaluate my approach to the thesis. I asked myself why the masculine narratives unearthed in the lost works were unpublishable or were found to be inappropriate to broadcast, and why others were forced to suppress their masculine representations. What made the texts that were published or performed desirable, consumable or popular? Starting with the earliest lost masculine narrative found in The Hines Papers and one discussed in this thesis, Darkly’s queer manifestation in *Billy’s Last Stand* is obscured because of his neurosis. Yet, his queer manifestation is further submerged because it was omitted from the script entirely. Like with so many of Hines’s works there is no evidence which provides a clear picture as to why these editing decisions were made. However, prior to the 1967 Sexual Offences Act, it is easy to understand why such a representation of masculinity should be removed. Also, the delicate nature of Darkly’s relationship with his mother was also censored. Another queer figure can be found in the narrative for *Promise*. Mr Price’s masculine characterisation is similar to Darkly’s, yet the queer manifestation is fully realized in the drama and used to make Price’s disability monstrous in nature. The motivation for writing such a narrative again is obscured. The drama is a curious one and stands as an anomaly not only among the unpublished works. It is also interesting that the author did not keep any correspondence relating to the text. This is possibly because the text was rejected by producers at the time. A less eclipsed representation is that of the prisoner of war. Hines was particularly interested in prisoners of war who were held in South Yorkshire during World War Two. Ken Loach and Hines tried to make an adaptation of *The Heart of It*, yet, Loach did not intend to include Maisie’s and Bernado’s storyline. Thus, the prisoner of war would be yet again left out of the finished production, just as Jack’s prisoner of war narrative was eventually left out *Elvis over England*. It would seem that such an emotive representation of masculinity within the narrative would cloud the overarching political message of the text.

Another intriguing factor about the lost masculine narratives is that they can be ordered into categories which identify with the author’s writing phases. For example, strike-breakers or scabs can found in narratives concerning the miners’ strike and the period beyond this dispute in Hines’s miners’ strike phase which extended over ten years. Another example, for instance, is that of the outcast or the marginalised masculine figure which appears in the very early stages of Hines’s career. As I argued in the “Typical Men” chapter, Billy Casper’s narrative bears more similarity with lost masculine narratives than with Hines’s more typical masculine figures. *A Kestrel for Knave* was written at the beginning of his career. In the same period as he was developing his narrative about his neglected school boy, Hines had already written two radio dramas: *Billy’s Last Stand* and the almost “forgotten”, *Continental Size Six,* this latter text has not been studied in this thesis but its storyline opens many interesting lines of enquiry in relation to the early stages of the author’s career*.* The masculine narratives contained within Hines’s early radio plays highlight how his expression at the time of writing leaned towards an articulation which goes beyond the expectations the normative working-class representations and turned instead to an interest in those who were marginalized. Darkly’s narrative in *Billy’s Last Stand*’s shares many of the same qualities found in the masculine narrative in *Continental Size Six* because it also portrays an intersection between masculinity and mental instability. There is no recorded date for when the *Continental Size Six* aired on radio, yet the script states that rehearsals for the drama took place on 30th April 1966, and 1st May 1966. *Continental Size Six* tells the story of avid “City” football club fan, Stan, and his long suffering wife, Jill, who is about to have a baby. It would seem that Stan is suffering from some sort of mental health disability, possibly, post traumatic stress disorder, although Hines never explicitly states this in the drama. Watching his favourite team has becomes “an obsession”[[270]](#footnote-271) for Stan. He refuses to take on extra shifts at work and he leaves his pregnant wife to travel all over the country to watch City play. It is also implied in the plot that because of his obsession, Stan does not eat properly as he will not eat “any green veg” because it is the same colour as United football shirts, who are City’s rivals. For a drama written in the mid 1960s this brief mention of a possible eating disorder in connection with a masculine subject is unexpected. Even in contemporary times, eating disorders are thought be a predominantly female disorder. Another two elements of the plot that are vital to understanding Stan’s mental instability is that he will not permit the council to paint his house green or allow any grass to grown in his garden, such is his obsession with City. Jill, Stan’s wife, observes that their neighbours “think” she is “married to a lunatic”.[[271]](#footnote-272) “Men” like Stan should never marry, Jill states during the drama. Again, Hines acknowledges that the mentally ill are placed on fringes on society, they are outsiders who are mistrusted. In this comment, Jill points out that married men have responsibilities to their wives and their children. Thus, the role of working-class men, according to Jill, is that of the bread-winner. Here, Hines foregrounds that a working-class man’s only function in the institution of marriage is that of a provider. The radio play’s plot reveals a much more nuanced approach to mental health than Hines had shown in *Billy’s Last Stand*. This deft focus on neurosis would never be seen again in Hines’s later works.

Furthermore, there are two more specific factors which underscores *Continental Size Six*’s difference and conformity with the rest of Hines’s oeuvre. The text reflects one of the author’s passions, football. Of the four texts written by Hines in this period, two focused on a footballing plot. *A Kestrel for a Knave* and *Kes* contain what as now become an iconic depiction of a school football match. However, *Continental Size Six* also exposes one of Hines sustained literary interests which recurred throughout the author’s writing career. Yet the theme only appears in one text that has been published so far, the second part of *The Price of Coal*: *Back to* *Reality*. *Back to Reality*’s storyline centres on a mining disaster, a mine-shaft caves in and some of the miners working in that shift are suffocated and do not survive the disaster. The theme of suffocation, is both prevalent in Hines’s body of work but it is usually obscured by the author’s political motivations. In *Continental Size Six*, Stan is a victim of mining disaster. He is buried alive with six other men. The details of the disaster at the pit are revealed by another character in the play, a barman, who works in Stan’s local pub. He gives an account of the disaster to a rival football fan who is in the pub while Stan is having a drink:

“It took ‘em nearly two days to dig ‘em out, and when they reached ‘em three were already dead. Another died on the way to hospital and Stan here was unconscious for three days. Imagine that, three full days.”[[272]](#footnote-273)

Stan does not recount the story of the mining disaster himself in the drama, another character vocalises the traumatic events of the cave in. Thus Hines exposes the unspeakable nature of the incident for the injured party. In an interview given in 1970, Hines described the play as being a “poor melodrama”[[273]](#footnote-274). The play does have a strong dramatic arc especially as its ending deals with a miscarriage. Yet, Stan’s accident also engenders a sense of understanding in the audience. Moreover, whereas *Billy’s Last Stand* was stark in tone and experimental in form, *Continental Size Six* places a fantastical obsession in an ordinary domestic setting. What also arises from reading the play and other texts written in this period, is that masculine narratives that manifested traits that were thought to be not masculine in nature had to be suppressed.

Suffocation is possibly the most personal motif found in the author’s works. Hines’s grandfather had died in a mining disaster. After including the motif in *Continental Size Six* and in *Back to Reality*, it appears again later in texts which concentrate on the 1984-85 mining strike, operating as a symbolic motif to signify the death of mining industry. The Hines Papers hold four strike plays which contain the suffocation motif. For example, the second version of *After the Strike* slightly differs from the first version, as it ends with the death of a young miner, Scott, while coal picking. Coal picking becomes synonymous with death; and in the strike plays it always results in the death of a young, striking miner.

*Springwood/Springfield Stars* is Hines’s last novel, but it has remained unpublished. The text’s narrative concentrates on an industrial dispute in a privately owned pit in the 1920s just before the general strike. Hines divides his text’s story between the owner’s Lord Stancliffe’s plot, and his workers, the Kemps’ plot. In the novel the miners go on strike for more pay, and like his other strike texts, Hines incorporates scabs and scabbing and the breaking up of an industrial dispute into the narrative. Because of the multifaceted yet familiar narrative structure which features the Kemps’ younger son, Jack, winning a scholarship and going to grammar school and his older brother, Harry, playing for Arsenal football club, there was confusion about as to how main themes of the novel would crystalize in the finished product. Moreover, there was also some uncertainty as to whether the draft manuscript should remain in novel form or whether Hines should adapt it for television. As a letter from Hines’s editor, Jenny Dereham reads: “The style is very different from your previous books and I could not help but see it has the outline for a television script.”[[274]](#footnote-275) Moreover, the draft manuscript draws together many of Hines’s literary interests, such as: class relations; mining and the role of unions; the general strike; football; the grammar school system; and rural life. It seems that in this text Hines rehearsed many narratives that he had used before. As a synopsis contained within the archive reads:

Set in the 1920’s Springfield Stars is an epic story concerning two families, the aristocratic Stancliffes who own a large estate in Yorkshire and property in London, and the Kemps, whose father and seventeen-year old son work in the mine owned by Lord Stancliffe.[[275]](#footnote-276)

This novel would be the second text in which Hines had placed his narrative in the past. The first was a television drama called, *Slate* which he started developing for Channel Four after the strike. The origin of the screenplay *Slate* is contested one, the archive defines it as being written in 1990s; however, on further investigation, Hines seems to have written the screen play in 1987. This screen play is based on a factual industrial dispute which took place in Bethesda in Wales in the early 1900s. In this text Hines transforms his miners’ strike themes and places them in a historic and factual narrative. What is most significant about the both *Springwood/Springfield Stars* and *Slate*, in terms of future study is that they were both set in the past and focused on an industrial dispute. But more significantly, they never went into production. However, the evidence as to why the texts were never produced or published takes very different forms. The only evidence as to why *Slate* was never made comes in the form of a “post it” note written by Mrs Hines, which reads, “Trouble with Welsh TV mafia.”[[276]](#footnote-277) In contrast, *Springwood/Springfield Stars* material contains all of Hines research notes, reviews and re-writes, drafts of manuscripts and correspondence with his editor, which provide vital insight as to why the text was never published.

To finish on another note, as I have stated before, in cultural memory Hines is known as the author of one text, *A Kestrel for a Knave.* Indeed, a blue plaque was erected in July 2019, where he once lived in Hoyland Common. The plaque reads: “Barry Hines 1939-2016 Author of ‘A Kestrel for a Knave’ and other novels which gave voice to working-class people, lived here 1970-1976”. *A Kestrel for a Knave* can be called iconic or even monolithic in terms of Hines’s writing career. As the plaque states, his “other” novels also gave a “voice” to working-class characters, however, they are not mentioned, nor is there any mention of works that were not published or remain unperformed – and for that matter why should there be? It has to be remembered that Hines himself was a commodity and as a commodity his cultural capital is very much linked to one text. The phrasing on the plaque is also noteworthy in relation to this thesis insomuch that *A Kestrel for Knave* is allowed dominate the plaque and to give “voice” for the rest of Hines’s body of work. This again acknowledges that Hines is only known for writing one text to which his “other” texts are always subordinated. Moreover, and most significantly, every novel that Hines wrote during his career has always been compared to his second book. For an example of this, one does not have to go further than looking at the book jackets of Hines’s other novels; all of which state: “By the writer of *A Kestrel for a* *Knave*” or “*From the writer of Kes*”. Thus, from Hines’s audience’s perspective, any new publication from the author is always judged through the prism of his most popular novel. On an anecdotal basis, I read a section from Hines’s fourth novel *The Gamekeeper* to group of Hines’s readers, from Barnsley and the surrounding area, at a Barry Hines workshop hosted by Hoyland Library in May, 2016. The attendees were all fans of *A Kestrel for Knave*, but did not seem to like the section from *The Gamekeeper* because it was not like their favourite Hines novel. Even though the novel does share similar themes to *A Kestrel for a Knave*, for them, it was not the same experience as reading their favourite Hines text. It did not have the same emotional depth; its themes were too dark; they did not like how man’s connection with the natural world was relayed; it was too brutal for their tastes. They preferred *A Kestrel for a Knave* and the optimism it offers.[[277]](#footnote-278) Barry Hines’s legacy, however, is not bound to one text. His archive attests to Hines’s ongoing quest for a multiplicity of purposes. The archive, like its donor, cannot be judged as a dormant entity. As a resurgence of interest in Hines’s work mounts, following his death, the collection of material in his archive grows. Thus, the archive remains integral to a more balanced approach to understanding the importance of Hines’s articulation of the voices of working-class South Yorkshire.
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