Mike Harris

Are Writers Really There When They're Writing About Their Writing?...And Can We Theorise About What They Say and Do?

Abstract:

There have been repeated calls for Creative Writers in Universities to end their suspicion of theory. But most literary theories were invented by academic readers for academic readers and have little or nothing to say about composition. If we examined more closely the writing process and what writers say about it, might it give us an evidential basis for theories more appropriate to CW pedagogy?

The following paper gives an analysis of some writers' statements with these questions in mind.

Biographical Note:

Mike Harris is a script writer, theatre director and senior lecturer on the MA in Creative Writing at Sheffield Hallam University, UK. He has written many plays for BBC Radio Drama, Professional Touring Theatres, Theatre in Education, Community Theatre and for TV. He has given papers on writing practice and literary theory at NAWE conferences and elsewhere. He contributed chapters on Script Writing and Radio Drama to The Handbook of Creative Writing, E.U.P (2005), and was Assistant Editor of The Good Fiction Guide, O.U.P. (2002).

Keywords:

Theory – Composition – Pedagogy

Criticism of the lack of 'theory' in University creative writing courses used to come from literary academics and it used to be met with hostility from writers. This is changing. Two recently published books by teacher-writers confirm the trend: Paul Dawson's, *Creative Writing and the New Humanities* and Michelene Wandor's *The Author is not dead, merely somewhere else.* Both call for creative writing tutors to end their hostility to 'theory' and on the face of it, this is perfectly reasonable. Being against *all* theory is a bit like being against oxygen. You can try not to use it but you'll very quickly stop making sense.

So, the question for me, as a writer and teacher of writing, is not *whether* 'theory'? But '*what* theory'? And alarm bells only ring when I realise that the calls by Dawson, Wandor and others[1] for CW to embrace 'literary theory,' must refer to reader-and-text theories. This is inevitable because such theories overwhelmed all others in 20th century literature departments, and continue to do so.[2]

Reader-and-text theories began to be formulated in the early part of the last century, as soon as literary appreciation was professionalised in university literature departments. They reached their apotheosis in the 'New Criticism' of the 1940s and 50s, and with its successors, Poststructuralism and Post-modernism from the 1960s to the 1990s. As more and more creative writing teachers call for creative writing to engage with literary theory, it's important to note that nearly all this theory was, in political terms, a sustained attempt by academic readers to usurp the role of writer.

The 'New Critics' argued that a writer's intentions were irrelevant to the evaluation of his work and thus left literary value in the hands of critical readers. Poststructuralists went further, arguing that authors were not the cause of their own texts and that reading is in fact writing, leaving literary meaning in the control of the reader. Despite all this, and at the very height of the Poststructuralist boom, writers persistently claimed that they wrote their own works, and stubbornly asserted that these works were based, at least in part, on personal experience of an observable world. Whereas literary theorists had persuaded themselves that experience, the self that experiences it, and the world itself was just so much text.[3]

The differences between the two camps were not just about literature and writing. By obvious implication, they were differences about the nature of reality, morality, history, aesthetics, society, experience and identity. And these differences massively influenced the divergent ways in which all these things were taught and understood in universities. If writers can still be heard talking about truth, when politicians, businessmen and journalists increasingly talk of 'narratives' – they are dramatising a difference first defined in the academy.

And then, of course, things changed...

Sometime in the 1990s the 'theory boom' crashed, and literary academics began groping for the doors. At exactly the same time, increasing numbers of writers began to teach on university creative writing courses. Literary theorists started to look again at authorship and some writers began to think theoretically about their writing practice.

Despite this, the theories or ideologies that defined the original differences continue to shape the way people think and work. They operate rather like Richard Dawkins' 'memes': deeply

embedded, self-perpetuating notions fiercely resisting all attempts to remove them from their academic hosts, even when reason, evidence or serious internal inconsistencies suggest that they really ought to go.

For example, a teacher of creative writing in a UK university can still claim, in an international journal that, 'writing comes …from darkness … writers deal in darkness…some darkness must remain dark…'[4] for all the world as if modernism never happened; for all the world, come to that, as if the Renaissance had never happened; and literary theorists, busily demolishing their own Poststructuralist legacy, still argue about authorship with other theorists rather than consider anything novelists, poets or script-writers might have to say on the subject.[5]

And now, when writer-academics like Paul Dawson and Michelene Wandor urge writing teachers and students to engage with literary theory they exhibit a tendency, shared with literary academics, to mean Poststructuralism and its various avatars, as if theory as a whole had suddenly sprung fully formed from the breasts of Roland Barthes and co. in 1966;[6] and as if engagement with such theories might offer a solution to problematic areas in university creative writing now.   Which is an odd idea, because it was the increasingly problematic nature of these theories in literary studies that helped bring to an end the short-lived Age of Theory and its replacement by the so-called 'Post Theory' period. The name of which alone testifies to the irrational hold the original theories can still have. 'Post theory' implying that *all* theory suddenly stopped just because Poststructuralism had self-imploded into Post-modernism; and because Post-modernism had, in turn, began to look less like the revolution and more like a philosophical spin-doctor for the marketing strategies of globalised capitalism:[7] the key Post-modern idea that signs and representations determine 'reality' or, indeed, are reality, provides intellectual credibility for advertising campaigns that equate 'identity', 'values', 'morality' and even 'revolution' with the empty (but very purchasable) signifiers of 'life-style', image and brand [8].

Paul Dawson's aims are different of course. He wants creative writers in universities to engage with theory in order to join the rest of the 'New Humanities' in going 'beyond' it.[9] The problem here is that most writers never engaged with this kind of theory in the first place; so how can we be expected to 'go beyond' something that was never in the way? And what would be the point of engaging, at this late stage, with theoretical positions that literary academics are steadily eroding or abandoning? It would be like jumping into a sinking dingy then having to save yourself by jumping back out later on. Some literary academics, still convinced that Post-modernism is progressive rather than reactionary, collect and combine philosophically incompatible theories in their work, like children putting sweeties in a bag at the pick and mix section of Woolworths[10]. Others, perhaps in reaction to this, frantically pump air into the very theories that Poststructuralism punctured. Thus we now have the Neo-Leavisites, The New Aestheticism, The New Humanism and last, but not least, the New Formalism[11]. And so, remarkable though it may seem, the most reactionary creative writing teachers – long condemned by literary theorists for the cardinal sin of 'formalism' - have now caught up with the very latest development in literary theory, simply by standing still.

For her part, Michelene Wandor is seeking a root-and-branch revolution in creative writing pedagogy. As part of this she wants university writing students to 'study literature as a body of historical work along with literary criticism and theory' [12] I couldn't agree more with the first part of that sentence – writers clearly need to study the work of other writers, and in historical context - but I part company with her on the second. The primary task of a writing student is, obviously, *writing*. Critical reading is part of writing in both research and revision

but it's not the same kind of critical reading that a literature student or literary critic does. This is because it has a different purpose. The text writers read most of all is their own text. They read it over and over again as they revise: constantly changing it in order to make it better. And when we read other fictional works as *writers*, we read them as de facto instruction manuals for technique, style, structure and thematic possibility. When literary academics and their students read works of fiction, these works are neither their own, nor is it their task to physically change and improve them but rather to describe, analyse and re-interpret; and they certainly don't look to novels, poems or plays for tips on how to write better essays or papers.

So, writing students need to learn to read *very* differently. One example: in his edition of Chekhov's plays the academic critic Richard Gilman suggests that 'Three Sisters' abandoned 'the usual linear development of a play' and instead, 'worked toward the filling in of a dramatic field.'[13] But when I read 'Three Sisters', as a scriptwriter, it's obvious to me that Chekhov merely gives the *illusion* of this; and mainly by using two very old narrative techniques. That is, he tells a lot of his highly melodramatic and entirely linear stories either off-stage, or 'on the cut' between acts. This observation *might* be useful to a student script writer wanting to portray the dullness of ordinary life whilst not actually being dull, whereas Gilman's 'reading' has nothing useful to offer because, as a literary reader, he mistakes effects for causes.[14]

If it's difficult to see how the reading methods of literary criticism are going to help writing students, it's even harder to see what possible use reader-and-text *theory* might be, given that it has nothing to say about composition and (in the case of post-structuralism) militantly denies authorial control and casts doubt on the existence of the observable worlds writers need to write about. Even Marxist theorists (who see writing, correctly, as productive work) aren't interested in the actual production process of writers, no doubt because it can seem dangerously individualistic.

So, if creative writing is 'under-theorised' I think we have to do better than reach for ill-fitting off-the-peg formulations that don't describe the main thing that we do.

I now want to look at some statements by writers to see if they might be any help in this matter and, in passing, to see if they cast any light on serious problematics in some of the theories with which Paul Dawson, Michelene Wandor and others would like us to engage.

<div align="center">*****</div>

Don't ask me what I mean[15]*,* contains statements made by British, Irish and Commonwealth poets between 1953 and 2003. Writing about their work was a condition of being recommended by the UK Poetry Book Society. There were 500 selections and recommendations in 50 years and so the 200 or so in this book represent a significant sample of what successful poets had to say about their writing, when they were forced to say something.

I made a note every time these poets said they didn't know what they were doing when writing, or when they claimed to be writing under the influence of something beyond their conscious control.

Numerous poets were unequivocal on the subject of their ignorance. Harry Guest is representative: ' I don't know why or how I write poetry, and suspect that if I knew I wouldn't be able to anymore' (p 327). Others were just as firm about their lack of control.

For example, George Barker: ' I've never been able to believe that poets invented, or made up or created poems' (p11). Shelley would have been perfectly comfortable with such statements but, equally, so would a lot of twentieth century literary theorists because they're perfectly compatible with their theories. If a writer claims not to know what he is doing when he or she writes, it's perfectly reasonable for a theorist to look for other forces at work. A Marxist can find economics, class and history pulling the strings; a psychoanalyst might detect repression or sublimation; a Poststructuralist could explain that these poets are self-evidently the passive grammatical subjects of superannuated romantic discourse.

There are other correspondences. When, in 1953, Kingsley Amis writes, 'who am I to say what [my poems] are like or what they mean? That is the reader's job,' he echoes the Intentionalist Fallacy of Wimsatt and Beardsley, and anticipates Reader-reception theory (p 2).

When Geoffrey Hill says: 'by some process I can't fathom, common words… move themselves, into clusters of meaning' (p 117) – he no doubt brings posthumous assent from Foucault, Derrida and Barthes, who thought that 'to write is...to reach that point where only language acts, "performs" not "me"'. [16] Given these correspondences (and there are others) it begins to seem a little odd that writers and literary theorists have not always seen eye to eye.

But I haven't, of course, given the complete picture. A considerable number of poets did write about their conscious intention and craft. This group was less than half the size of the first one. In this smaller group, statements of intention crop up all the time: 'I tried,' 'I was working towards,' 'this line is intended to' – Some even admit to planning, extensive revision and even the use of dictionary and thesaurus.

Now, two groups of poets differing about the relative importance of craft and inspiration may be worth noting, but it's hardly surprising. What is interesting is that some poets turn up in one category making statements about the completely involuntary nature of their writing process, and then appear in another making equally strong statements about their conscious craft.

George Barker is one, and he writes: 'a man does not invent poems, they discover him.' And again (echoing John Clare): 'when I came [to Rome] I ... had simply to get up in the morning and collect the verses.' But later he writes: 'In the versification of these poems I have *tried* to avoid the... thumping mechanics of much formal metre... This kind of verse *I have tried* and *am trying* to construct' *(my emphases)* (p 11).

The last statement was made in a Poetry Book Society Bulletin some 14 years after the earlier ones, so it's possible that Barker just changed his mind. But R.S Thomas is only one of several other poets who exhibit similar contradictions in one and the same article.

'I have always sympathised with Keats's remark that if poetry does not come as easily as leaves to a tree, it were better that it did not come at all.... and yet... Can one achieve difficulty easily? Yeats's variorum sheets are a heartening reminder that good poems can emerge from much hard work and many alterations....' (p285).

Barker and Thomas display an unresolved tension between notions of an unconscious or unwilled creation and a willed and wholly conscious one and this is not, on the face of it, useful evidence for consistent theory.

However, the same tension is explored in a third major category of statements, by poets who are clear that their writing is the result of both conscious and unconscious processes. Their

statements not only suggest solutions to some seriously problematic areas in literary theory, but also help to explain why some of their colleagues get a bit confused.

These poets, of course, differ between themselves about the relative strength of conscious and unconscious elements in composition. Some give will-power, craft and intention a very weak role, as with James Reeves:
' It is as if [my poems]... had a life of their own ... Yet they are invariably affected, if only indirectly, by one's ideas of what a good poem should be'.

Whereas others, like Louis MacNeice, emphasise 'perspiration':

'once a poem has chosen its form, I naturally work... hard to hold it to it' (p166).

Here's Seamus Heaney describing the process:

'in the writing of any poem, there's usually a line being cast from ... your understanding towards intuition and images down there in the memory pool...if you're lucky, you feel life moving at the other end of the line; the remembered thing starts off a chain reaction of words and associations, and... what you need is the whole of your acquired knowledge... your cultural memory and literary awareness. You need them to come to your aid and throw a shape that will match and make sense of your excitement' (p102).

Here, Heaney identifies several related elements in composition: 'Intuition', 'chance' 'the memory pool' 'understanding' and suggests an interaction that sparks the engine, setting in motion: 'a chain reaction of words and associations.' This volatile linguistic / synaptic / semantic force is then contained and steered consciously by 'knowledge, cultural memory and literary awareness.'

Such descriptions avoid the contradictions and implausibilities of the hard-line involuntarists because they offer a version of composition that allows for voluntary and involuntary processes working together.

So, why do so many poets in this sample cling fast to inspiration as the only, or primary, element of composition? It could be, of course, that it just *is*, for them. But the contradictions suggest strongly that it *isn't,* entirely, actually. So could this be an example of some High Romantic discourse from the heyday of nineteenth century capitalism, speaking through these poets like a textual spirit through its medium?

Well, that no doubt plays its part, but the problem here is that poets and writers were saying this kind of thing long before Schiller, Kant, Shelley, Marx, or Adam Smith were born. We might consider what Socrates had to say, at least according to Plato, in the 4th century BC: 'poets utter all those fine poems of theirs not through skill, but when inspired and possessed[17].'

So, if this kind of thinking is determined by history, the time-line is very long and neither High Romantic discourse nor Capitalism would seem to be its necessary or complete condition. Which is a problematic for both Poststructuralist and Marxist theory.

Happily, there are supplementary explanations.

When poets in this selection write of being inspired, they are often referring to two particular stages of composition, 'Inception' and 'Flow.' [18]. That is to say, moments close to the very beginning when an interesting idea seems to appear from nowhere; and stages, usually

somewhere in the middle, when ideas come so thick and fast that the conscious mind has to run very fast to keep control. For example: Sylvia Plath, for whom, 'the birth of her first child seemed to start the process. All at once she could compose at top speed' (p 221).

When compared to the more conscious stages of composition (the cutting, the revision...the spell-checking), the flow of inspiration is obviously more exciting. Many of the poets say they simply can't remember what was going on when they wrote their poems (try to remember your own process in detail a year later). So it's not surprising that what they do remember is the exciting bits.

Now, as already noted, poets who prioritize inspiration, are expressing ideas entirely compatible with literary theories that describe writers as the passive subject of The Unconscious, Material Conditions, Culture, History, or Text. Conversely poets who stress intention, or testify to the interaction of conscious agency with inspiration, would seem to challenge such theories.

For example: theories that proclaim the absolute primacy of the reader in the creation of meaning. Here's the American critic, Stanley E. Fish:

'I write when reading…[*The Wasteland* is only] different because I have decided that..[it].. will be' [19].

But when Fish stresses the pre-eminence of the reader – usurping the role of writer entirely – he ignores the crucial role of reading in the writing process itself. The writer *is* a reader (although, as I have argued, not the same kind of reader as the literary academic). And Helen Dunmore shows precisely how. She was at a crucial moment in the composition of a collection of poems. After writing for several months she 'began to see' how 20 poems were beginning to fit together, because she:

 'found... echoes of rhythms and verbal correspondences and many other formal connections between one poem and another..and although I still had to write and rewrite many times, I knew I was working towards this structure and not at random...' (p67).

She describes herself re-reading, then discovering and interpreting a meaning in the middle of a draft and then changing it in draft after draft, 'working towards this structure and not at random.'

So*,* let's now assume the classic Poststructuralist position and deconstruct it from within: if the author is dead, and it is therefore the reader who writes, then it surely follows that if the writer is a reader he must still be 'alive,' or at least as alive as the-reader-as-writer, and just as much, if not more in charge of creating the meanings in his or her own writing.

Helen Dunmore's statement points to another flaw in 'text and reader' theories – be they New Critical or Poststructuralist: they're incomplete because they fetishise the finished text. That is, they *seem* to work if we allow that there is such a thing as a finished text from which writers can be easily detached. But they don't work at all for play scripts which are always only a stage in the endlessly unfinished production process of drama; and they don't work for poems or novels that are revised and republished by authors in their life-times. For example, Wordsworth's two, very different, versions of 'The Prelude'. How do we get from one to another without assuming the conscious actions of a writer? The same question can and must of course be asked of every draft a student or professional writer produces.

Derrida had an idea that, 'the person writing is inscribed in a determined textual system.' [20] In this, text itself is the controlling force in the creation of meaning - the writer becoming its subject and, in effect, its creation. This turns the writer into a kind of virtual bandstand, on which are played discordant, polyphonic discourses from many periods of textual history. The problem with this highly influential proposition is obvious: text doesn't have motive energies of its own. It can't move. It can't think. It can't do anything without massive assistance. So it's difficult to see how the polyphonic discourses get played on the bandstand for readers to 'hear' them.

 It's worth paying further attention to Maura Dooley here. After she submitted her collection, the editor detected a sexual innuendo in the suggested title, 'Kissing a Bone,' and wondered whether it was deliberate. At first Maura said it wasn't intended at all; and then, she bethinks herself and writes, 'Dimly. I knew it dimly...' and then gamely decides that she is quite happy for the title of the collection to contain that meaning as well as all the others.

There are a couple of things to note about this. One is obvious: words are symbolic. We could spend a happy minute or so right now listing all the possible associations of the word 'bone.' No writer can consciously imagine, even less prescribe, all the possible significations of all the words in a single poem, through all their semantic and syntactic interactions, let alone in a collection of poems, or a novel. Which is just one of the reasons why readers find meanings, associations and combinations that the writer did not intend, or know about.

Another is this. When in 'flow' the writer's 'memory pool' can throw up so many images and ideas so quickly that the writer can't consciously grasp or shape them all. Many of these unconsciously expressed ideas may be consciously apprehended later, as with Dooley, and then deliberately incorporated in later revisions but, equally, other ideas and other possible interpretations may remained hidden on the page, waiting for readers to discover them.

And so, to return to the question that has surely got to be at the heart of our understanding of what creative writing is, what useful research into it might be, and how it should be theorised and taught?

 'How do we get meaning and value from culture and history onto the page and into the reader's head?'

If we pay attention to reader-and-text theorists there can be no answer because they effectively remove composition from the process. And this is surely an insurmountable obstacle to co-opting their theories into creative writing courses? Listen to writers and the beginning of an answer is forthcoming: it gets there in composition, through the agency and efforts of the poet, novelist and script writer. As we have seen, she or he puts some of it there quite deliberately. He or she puts some more of it there in symbiotic inter-action between unconscious inception and conscious formulation. And she or he puts some of it there quite unconsciously. This still leaves an interesting proportion that seems to be extracted entirely by the reader from the associations of language itself, without any assistance from the writer, one way or another. So there's a consolation prize for Monsieur Derrida and Mr. Fish.

In conclusion: late twentieth century reader-and-text theories fail to account for the writing process, and so fail to account for how history, culture, and value actually gets into our texts. These failures make them unfit for the purpose of theorising Creative Writing.

So, if we want theories that do fit, I fear we may have to invent our own.

List of works cited

Aviram, Ammittai. 'Notes towards a new formalist criticism.' *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (Dept. English. Georgia State University), Spring 1998.

Barthes, Roland. 'The Death of the Author.' In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch, 2624. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2001.

Boulter, Amanda. 'Assessing the criteria: An argument for Creative Writing theory.' *New Writing: The international journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative writing* (Multilingual Matters) 1, no. 2 (2004): 134-141.

Brown, Clare, and Don Paterson, . *Don't Ask Me What I Mean*. Picador, 2004.

Burke, Sean, ed. *Authorship from Plato to the Postmodern, a reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995.

—. *The Death and Return of the Author*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. *Creativity, flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., 1996.

Dawson, Paul. *Creative writing and the new humanities*. Oxford: Routledge, 2005.

—. *Creative writing and the new humanities*. Oxford: Routledge, 2005.

Day, Gary. *Sheffield Hallam Working Papers on the Web*. http://www.shu.ac.uk/wpw/value/day.htm.

Earnshaw, Steven. 'When he woke up the dinosaur was still there.' *Post Theory Conference, De Montfort University*. 2001.

Fish, Stanley E. 'Interpreting the Varorum.' In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, edited by Vincent B. Leitch. New York: W.W. Norton & co., 2001.

Ghiselin, Brewster, ed. *The Creative Process, reflections on invention in the arts and sciences*. California aperback 1985.

Hawkes, David. *Ideology*. 2nd. Routledge, 2003.

Leitch, Vincent B., ed. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2001.

May, Adrian. 'The Writer's Dark Secret Desire.' *New Writing: the international journal for the theory and practice of creative writing* (Multilingual Matters) Vol 1, no. 0 (2004).

Murray, Penelope, ed. *Classical Literary Criticism*. Second (2000). Translated by Penelope Murray and T Dorsch. London: Penguin Classics, 2000 (1965).

Petts, Jeffrey. 'Directions for a new aestheticism.' *Postgraduate Journal of Aesthetcs* 2, no. 1 (April 2005): 20-31.

Pfenninger, Karl H, and Valerie R Shubik, . *The Origins of Creativity*. Oxford: Oxford Univerrsity Press, 2001.

Pope, Rob. *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*. Oxford: Routledge, 2005.

Smith, Hazel. 'Emerging from the experiment: A systematic Methodology for creative writing teaching.' *New Writing: the international journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing* (Multilingual Matters Ltd) 3, no. 1 (2006): 17-35.

Wandor. *The author is not dead, merely somewhere else.* Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

---

[1] Dawson: 'if, like the rest of the new humanities, CW is to go beyond theory, it must become more than a pre-professional training ground for artists dedicated to their craft... for which theory is an antagonistic discourse' (Dawson, 194); Wandor: 'any CW study is seriously incomplete unless it also consists of a study ...of literary criticism and literary theory' (Wandor 2008, 230); see also the pages of *New Writing: The International Journal for the practice and theory of Creative writing,* which provide numerous examples of this genre including: Hazel Smith's, 'because critical theory is an important part of literary studies, it is extremely appropriate for it to be integrated into the teaching of creative writing ' (P25); and Amanda Boulter's: 'by tackling the legacy of Literary theory we may both criticise the way it has marginalised aesthetic questions and learn from its interrogation of texts and contexts' (P 140)

[2] See Sean Burke: 'from the era of Elliot onwards, the dominant critical methodology in the Anglo American tradition has turned away from the problems posed by authorship, or has turned toward them only occasionally, and only by way of the most drastically impoverished descriptions. No attempts to consolidate, revise or redefine anti-authorial theory have been made, nor has any decisive and broadly based interest been shown in the project of authorial renewal' (Burke 1998, 187)

[3] For example, Jacques Derrida: 'in what one calls the real life of these existences '"of flesh and bone" ...there has never been anything but writing...what opens meaning and language is writing as the disappearance of natural presence,' quoted in Burke (1995, 119).

[4] May, 37

[5] Sean Burke's otherwise excellent *Death and Return of the Author* is an early example of this. Another is Isobel Armstrong's *The Radical Aesthetic*, Blackwell, Oxford, 2000, p.1. (see Earnshaw for a more detailed discussion).

[6] For example Wandor P 179 contrasting The Intentional Fallacy of Wimsatt and Beardsley with 'theory,' when, if the former isn't a theory I don't know what is.

[7] The Death of Post-structuralism (PS) had many causes. Here are some. Its 'hermeneutics of suspicion' was easily turned back on itself so that the deconstructers were in turn deconstructed. It's association with political radicalism was a left-over from the Marxism of 1968, never had any real justification within PS itself and this gradually became apparent. For example: when PS feminists like Julie Kristeva suggested that the 'feminine,' like the self, had no objective biological or psychic existence and could in fact be manifested by men, some of her political sisters were quick to point out the problem: 'I want to ask how... the very project of female emancipation would be thinkable without... enhancing the agency, autonomy and selfhood of women' (Seyla Benkidd, quoted in Burke, 1998, 202). The relentless 'anti-humanism' of PS seemed to undermine the very idea of human rights in an age boasting the genocides in Cambodia and Rwanda; and the 1987 Paul de Mann case didn't help. The Yale academic had famously suggested that all history was merely text, but was then discovered, after his death, to have written 170 articles for a collaborationist newspaper in Nazi-occupied Belgium, some of which were openly anti-Semitic. In the furore that followed no-one seriously suggested that De Mann was absolved of all responsibility because he was merely the grammatical subject of his own 'polyphonic discourses' (Lehman 131-140 and Burke 1998, 1-7). Despite all this the notion endures that Post-structuralism and Post-Modernism is inherently 'oppositional' and supports political radicalism.

[8] See Hawkes p 1-14

[9] Dawson, 194

[10] See Pope, 2005, almost in its entirety, as an example of this.

[11] See Day for the 'New Leavisism', Petts for the 'New Aestheticism', Aviram for the 'New Formalism',

[12] P 221 Wandor

[13] Gilman, ix.

[14] Another example is Martin Esslin's classic interpretation of Samuel Beckett's plays, claiming they, 'lack plot more completely than any other works' because they adopt 'a method that is essentially polyphonic ... [confronting] their audience with an organised structure of statements and images that interpenetrate each other and that must be apprehended in their totality.' (Esslin 1976: 44). In fact, any practising script writer could note

that something close to the opposite is the case. In Godot, for example, Becket merely creates the illusion of plotlessness, whilst deploying classic narrative devices throughout and with more gainsaying in his dialogue than the average soap. He gives us four very distinct and very argumentative characters (Vladimir, Estragon, Lucky and Pozzo) who vie for status throughout a play which is, in essence, a simple, one-room, invasion of space drama. There's even an 'inciting incident': when Vladimir informs Estragon and the audience that they are waiting for Godot, which then induces the wholly conventional audience anticipation that Beckett plays cat and mouse with for the next two acts. On several occasions in Act One he deliberately, Hitchcock-like, makes us think that Godot has arrived:

'Vladimir: Listen! *(they listen, grotesquely rigid)*. Estragon: I hear nothing. Vladimir: Hssst!'

But of course he hasn't and eventually, instead of him, Pozzo and Lucky turn up to inject danger into the play just when it's at risk of flagging. In between these conventional narrative tropes Becket occupies his waiting audience with stand-up patter, music hall slapstick routines and some great poetry. In the second half the power relations between Pozzo and Lucky have been transformed, Vladimir and Estragon are more despairing and it is also, sensibly, much shorter than the first because by then we know that Godot probably isn't coming and Beckett is too wily a story-teller to push us over the brink. Thus he gives us the illusion of a purposeless, story-less world by invoking narrative expectations that he never completely fulfils but which nonetheless allow him to portray ennui without making his audience feel it (too much). This can be taught; 'plotlessness' can't; but do try it in your workshops: 'everyone interpenetrate your meanings in their totality *now* please!'

[15] All unattributed references in the text are to *Don't ask me what I mean*
[16] Leitch 2001, 1467
[17] P 5 Murray, Penelope, ed. *Classical Literary Criticism,* transl. Penelope Murray and T Dorsch, London: Penguin Classics, 2000 (1965).

[18] "Inception" is self-evident. Detailed discussion of the term flow as used by Creativity theorists can be found in Csikszentmihalyi.
[19] Leitch 2001, 2085
[20] Burke 1995, 120