SOCIAL INTERACTIONS AND MORALITY ISSUES IN IAN MCEWAN'S *THE INNOCENT*

Alina Buzarna-Tihenea (Galbeaza), PhD and Mihaela Rus, Assoc. Prof., PhD, "Ovidius" University of Constanța

Abstract: In his fiction, the British contemporary writer Ian McEwan boldly exposes and explores the weaknesses and faults of a society he grows to know under more and more aspects. In his novels, the author permanently focuses on the interrelation between the private and the public spheres, by casting his characters on a stage spinning out of control and by exploring individuals, relationships, families, communities and even nations which are deeply shaken by the havoc of struggles for power, anxieties, private and public tensions, political and social conflicts. This article aims at analysing, through the lens of symbolic interactionism and social identity theories, the patterns of social interactions and several morality issues, as reflected in Ian McEwan's novel "The Innocent".

Keywords: identity, symbolic interactionism, role identity, morality, interactions

Introduction

The British contemporary writer Ian McEwan boldly exposes and explores the weaknesses and faults of a society he grows to know under more and more aspects. In his novels, the author permanently focuses on the interrelation between the private and the public spheres, by casting his characters on a stage spinning out of control and by exploring individuals, relationships, families, communities and even nations which are deeply shaken by the havoc of struggles for power, anxieties, private and public tensions, political and social conflicts. In McEwan's novels, interactions play an important role in fictionally illustrating the inherent interconnection between identity and social structures, professed by social identity theorists. The level of interaction refers to the concrete pattern of behaviour that characterizes day-to-day contacts among people in families, schools, social groups, typically studied by symbolic interactionists. For symbolic interactionists such as Baldwin, Cooley and Mead, the personal self develops as a consequence of interpersonal relationships with certain significant others (Harter 677).

Structural symbolic interactionism is also explained by Sheldon Stryker (who coined this concept in order to make reference to several ideas related to the nature of the individual and the relationship between the individual and society) and by Peter Burke as it follows: people act toward things based on the meaning those things have for them; and these meanings are derived from social interaction and modified through interpretation (Stryker and Burke, The Past, Present and Future of an Identity Theory 285). In his turn, Goffman assumes that people must mutually negotiate their respective identities before interaction is possible and that they continue to reinforce and renegotiate the original transaction throughout the encounter.

In structural symbolic interactionism, theorists start their scientific approaches from the premise that a symbol is socially defined, as it derives its meaning from social consensus and it is arbitrary, differing from one culture to another. Therefore, symbols evoke the same meaning responses in distinct individuals belonging to the same or similar cultures. Individuals use symbols (such as words, language and the naming of things including the self)

with the purpose of engaging in symbolic interaction. In order to interact with others, individuals must first establish both who they are and who their interlocutors are. Furthermore, the interaction is not between whole persons but between different aspects of persons having to do with their roles in the social groups or organizations they belong to (i.e. their role, personal and social identities) (Burke and Stets, Identity Theory 12-13).

McEwan's novels fictionally illustrate the ways in which social relationships and interactions play a significant role in the development and balance of the characters' identities. In general, it is presumed that identity development is strongly connected to the micro-level of relationships and interactions, as it involves the tension between how the individual sees himself or herself and how he or she is seen by significant others. Therefore, individuals need and internalize this assessment and recognition of significant others which takes place permanently, taking into consideration that their patterns of behaviour in the interactions with others are continuously judged and assessed both by themselves and by others (Machielse 15) and constantly readjusted, in accordance both with the respective context and with the feed-back they receive.

In order to engage with society and its values, to show the tensions between the public and the private words, and to emphasize the tensions at the level of personal relationships and interactions McEwan's novels deal with issues such as innocence, experience, guilt, morality and taboos, against the broader historical and political background. Faced with life changing (contingent) circumstances, orphaned siblings (*The Cement Garden*), disoriented individuals (*The Innocent, Amsterdam, Atonement*), couples which either separate as a consequence of miscommunication (*On Chesil Beach*, *Black Dogs*) or which, on the contrary, reconcile their differences and misunderstandings (*The Child in Time*) struggle for survival and/or happiness and desperately try to cope with situations haunted bys loss, trauma, anxiety or change. Thus, McEwan's novels fictionally illustrate a wide range of human interactions and conflicts, offering interesting perspectives on the protagonists' minds and reactions and on the process of identity transformation, while being threatened by psychologically disrupting events (Pitt 9).

2. *The Innocent*'s Risky Initiation and Interactions

McEwan's fiction offers memorable representations of the contrasts between innocence and the terms of experience, maturation and guilt. In *The Innocent*, McEwan casts Leonard Marnham (a post-office telephone technician in his mid twenties who has come to Berlin to help tap Russian phone lines, and who becomes involved in a romantic relationship with Maria Eckdorf, a 30 year old German divorcee) against the tensed background of the Cold War. His role in Operation Gold project, his relationship with his American superior, Bob Glass, his love affair with the experienced Maria and the confrontation with Otto (Maria's brutal ex-husband) contribute to Leonard's transgression from innocence to experience and question whether experience involves guilt and the loss of innocence.

The novel closely depicts Leonard's movement from inexperience and naiveté to a different stage which cannot be labelled as experience in the proper sense and tries to reveal the extent to which experience triggers the character's culpability and loss of innocence. Leonard's "multiple" inexperience at the level of his role, social and person identities is emphasised from the very beginning of the novel. At the age of 25, the young man has never

managed his life by himself; he has never made love to a woman and he has never had a serious romantic relationship. This lack of life experience makes Leonard awkward and confused in his relationships and interactions with other people. Clumsy in his interactions, he does not know how to cope with his new boss' abrasiveness, especially since he has never received an insult since becoming an adult. Once he meets Bob Glass, Leonard is struck and intimidated by his energy and force. When he talks to him for the first time on the phone, "Leonard's manner collapsed into the English dither he had wanted to avoid in conversation with an American. "Oh yes, look, I'm terribly sorry I..." (McEwan, The Innocent 4).

In McEwan's *The Innocent* there are certain instances which fictionally reflect Stryker's structural symbolic interactionist views according to which behaviour is dependent on a named or classified world. The names or class terms point to aspects of the environment, both physical and social, carry meaning in the form of shared behavioural expectations that rise from social interaction. By means of the interaction with others, the individual learns how to classify objects he or she comes into contact with, and in that process also learns how he or she is expected to behave with reference to those objects (Stryker 53-54). Leonard's inexperience regarding social interaction and relationships is emphasised in several episodes within the novel and he constantly has to adapt patterns of his behaviour in accordance with the new aspects of the environment. His lack of experience is emphasised in different situations: while being at the night-club with Glass, he receives a note from Maria and he impulsively reacts as a child, imagining for a moment that the note is from his mother. Later, a trip back home to his parents' house in a London suburb returns him rapidly to the role identity of a child. While comforting Maria, who has been beaten up by her ex-husband Otto, Leonard reflects on how little he knows about the true nature of people and what they are really capable of. He also asks Maria: "Why am I so ignorant?" to this question, she answers: "Not ignorant. Innocent" (McEwan, 1990: 131) It is this innocence, this naiveté that is dismantled within the novel, though whether this dismantling is an improvement or a drawback is open to question (Malcolm 126).

The responsibilities ensuing from his involvement in the military secret operation offer Leonard new perspectives accompanied by a feeling of male competence and pride, enforcing thus his male gender role identity but also the social (group) identity of military men. He begins to like the darkened environment of the military tunnel and the secrecy lurking beneath Berlin; he ends up by falling in love with "its earth, water and steel smell, and the deep, smothering silence, unlike any silence on the surface" (McEwan, The Innocent 116). His relationship with his American boss and with the other colleagues from the tunnel may be considered not only an initiation in multicultural social interactions, but also an introduction into the worlds of politics, war and espionage. Moreover, for the first time in his life, Leonard becomes acquainted with the struggles involved by loyalty, responsibility and self-preservation. For instance, he develops a tense friendship with Glass while entering into a secret partnership with an English superior named John MacNamee, who is plotting against the Americans.

As already stated, innocence can refer to a state of unknowing, where one's experience or knowledge is lesser, either from the point of view of the relationships with significant others, or by an absolute comparison to a more common normative scale. In *The Innocent*, the secret operation of the Allies also implies that power relationships are influenced by the level

of knowledge. From this perspective, this system of military clearance is a good illustration of Foucault's statement in *The History of Sexuality: the Will to Knowledge*, according to which power is based on knowledge and makes use of knowledge; on the other hand, power reproduces knowledge by shaping it in accordance with its intentions. Power creates and re-creates its own fields of exercise through knowledge. Both power and knowledge are to be seen as de-centralised, relativistic and dynamic systemic phenomena. Thus, it might be argued that knowledge determines force relations.

"A haunting investigation into the varying and troubling possibilities of knowledge" (130), as critic David Malcolm labels it, *The Innocent* is concerned with levels of understanding and awareness. For example, Leonard quickly finds out that information, on all levels, is scarce and it is often reluctantly shared or given in secrecy. It is Bob Glass the one who initiates Leonard into the underground secrets of the Cold War and in the levels of knowledge, in the sense of "military clearance".

Leonard's initiation into the closed world of espionage involves acquiring clearance levels as he is exposed to the deeper mysteries of Operation Gold. Glass gives Leonard first, second and then third level clearance and explains that everyone thinks they know what the military operation they are involved in is about, but the information they are given access to depends on their level of army clearance. For instance, the soldiers guarding the warehouse above the tunnel know nothing from what Glass tells Leonard, and the whole business of different "levels" of knowledge is based on degrees of innocence (in the sense of lack of initiation) and power; the more the characters know about Operation Gold, the less innocent but the more powerful they are. Operation Gold is thus presented as an intricate, confusing and complex labyrinth of secrets and of levels of clearance and permission. Glass himself tells Leonard that:

> The point is this (…) everybody thinks his clearance is the highest there is, and everyone thinks he has the final story. You only hear of a higher level at the moment you're being told about it (McEwan, The Innocent 13).

From this perspective, the relationship between Glass and Leonard is based on knowledge. Glass has a higher level of clearance; he has more information and initiates Leonard in the secret operation. Therefore, he is more powerful, he is situated on a higher hierarchical level; in other words, he is the boss and it is his orders that should be obeyed without any further discussion.

This relationship between Leonard and Glass reflects thus the typical symbolic interaction between the identity roles of the subordinate and his superior, within the army system. However, due to the context of military secrecy, Leonard and Glass's (fictional) interaction is also inscribed within Foucault's above mentioned interrelation between knowledge and power. The discourse (by means of which truth, morality and meaning are created) combines power and knowledge, and its power follows from the individual's casual acceptance of the reality with which he or she is presented. Individuals are created through discourse (through knowledge), they are made up from their experiences (the knowledge they encounter), and, therefore, those in control of their early life experiences have enormous power. When Bob Glass initiates Leonard within the intricate world of military secrecy, he

tells him that secrets are at the origins of consciousness, of society; secrets are the beginnings of individuality, the instigators of language (Slay 135). "Secrecy made us possible" (McEwan, The Innocent 35), Glass tells Leonard, who takes pride in this confidentiality. He thus becomes "a sharer in a secret", and this situation pleases the young man enormously.

Within the novel, the author also illustrates Leonard's initiation into the role identity of lover, as he acquires knowledge of a woman, of the mysteries of sex and romance and of different kinds of physical and emotional experiences he has never enjoyed. His relationship with Maria makes him experience serious emotions which he expresses in a way that he could never have done previously. The day-to-day routines of their life together also influence Leonard's person identity, making him feel "grown-up at last" and even "civilized".

Their relationship is building up slowly, with Leonard learning to be a gentle, respectful and passionate lover, preserving at the same time his general behaviour as a stereotypical English gentleman of the period. When he makes love with Maria, Leonard feels at first vulnerable and uncertain before a more experienced woman, as the traditional identity standards of the male-female gender roles internalized by Leonard do not match the situation he is exposed to. He is both aware and embarrassed of his inexperience and, at a certain point, he even has "his first intimation of a new and troubling feature" (McEwan, The Innocent 77), when he aggressively rejects Maria's offer to help him; "Later on, he wondered what had troubled him" (McEwan, The Innocent 77). The movement from innocence also triggers darker experiences, such as rape fantasies induced by the interiorization of history and politics (he places himself in the role identity of the British conqueror and thinks of Maria as the subdued Germany), jealousy of Glass, and, finally, the grotesque and violent fight with, and the nightmarish murder and dismemberment of, Otto.

Moral codes and meanings affecting interactions and the perspectives upon what is right or what is wrong can differ not only between nations and cultures but also, to a certain extent, between personal characteristics, experiences, situations and circumstances. McEwan's *The Innocent* seems to fictionally illustrate the social identity theory alleging that the person identity implies seeing oneself as a unique and distinct individual, different from significant others. It is the "idiosyncratic personality attributes that are not shared with other people" (Hogg 115). In Maria and Leonard's case, the distinction lies in the characters' different person identities and past (hi)stories, in their distinct personal experiences. Leonard does not know that, in fact, it is his vulnerability and lack of aggression which attracted Maria. This also frees her of social constraints and expectations and she is willing and anxious to guide Leonard into the world of sexual experience, the world of love:

> She would not have to adopt a conventional role and be judged in it, and she would not be measured against other woman. Her fear of being physically abused had receded. She would not be obliged to do anything she did not want (McEwan, The Innocent 54).

On the one hand, Leonard discovers that he likes the idea of dominating and aggressing Maria and considers it as nothing more than a sexual role play, as a game which should bring both of them pleasure; according to him, "she was wrong to overdramatize" (McEwan, The Innocent 82) the so-called rape scene. Leonard's sexual game reactivated in Maria's mind the rape scene which she witnessed during the Russian occupation. Leonard's

domineering soldier fantasy raises in Maria's mind the real memory of the subdued and raped victim and makes her think that Leonard is not the gentle and innocent young man she mistakenly took him for, but a violent and possessive man, just like her former husband, Otto.

Leonard will quickly realise his mistake and he will recognise that his attempt to sexually attack Maria was a childish, a brutish and a stupid one: "As more time passed, the more unbelievable his attack on Maria seemed, and the less forgivable" (McEwan, The Innocent 88). Leonard also learns that relationships imply reciprocity and communication and that each participant in a relationship should take into consideration not only his or her own desires but also those of the other individuals involved, and that he or she should also take into account the other's perspectives and life experience and the implications of these desires upon the relationship. This may be considered the moment of Leonard's true initiation into adulthood, the moment when he finally reaches manhood. When the two lovers eventually reunite and when Leonard begins to consider Maria as an equal partner, he is "truly grown-up at last" (McEwan, The Innocent 110).

At the level of the theme experience vs. innocence, in *The Innocent*, an extremely important part is played by the unheroic, violent and grotesque fight between Leonard and Otto, and by the novel's most horrific scene: the stomach-turning detailed description of the dismemberment of Otto's corpse on the table in Maria's apartment; these scenes represent the climax of both Leonard's sexual, (a)moral and political initiations (Slay 138). Concerning this scene, McEwan states that he was interested in rendering the way in which a violent impulse appears and grows inside the character, pushing him/her towards irrational and brutal behaviour:

> In The innocent, a rather ordinary man is caught up in a difficult situation and becomes extremely violent. The protagonist's mind is full of images of the Second World War. I wanted to show the brutality man can inspire to by comparing the dismemberment of a corpse to the dismemberment of a city: the bomb-devastated Berlin of the post-war (Gonzalez Casademont 41-42).

The horrifying and grotesque elements of the scene and the questions related to the characters' morality do not lie so much in the description of the fight between Otto and Leonard but in the lovers' efforts to hide their unintentional crime (Seaboyer 27). Before these horrific and violent scenes, the thought of Otto's arriving to threaten Maria and Leonard's relationship unleashes the latter's imagination and provokes in his mind "fantasies of confrontation" drew up from film clichés: "He saw himself in movie style, the peaceable tough guy, hard to provoke, but once unleashed, demonically violent" (McEwan, The Innocent 119).

Leonard's fight with Otto is described as grotesque, macabre and absurd. Before the actual confrontation, Maria, faced with Otto's violence and Leonard's jealousy, provokes the latter to meet the intruder with fury and force: she encourages the fight by accusing Leonard of not properly acting in accordance with the standards associated to the male gender role identity and by encouraging him to appeal to his male force and authority: "You're a man, throw him out!" (McEwan, The Innocent 141). Then, things get worse, going far beyond the borders of the darkest nightmare, as not only do Leonard and Otto engage into a brutal

confrontation, but it also leads to even more savage acts. It seems that both characters have lost their humanly features beyond which they are nothing more than animals engaged in a savage and deadly fight. During the confrontation, Otto clinches Leonard's testicles, Leonard bites deep into former's face:

> It was not a fighting manoeuvre. It was the agony that clenched his jaw (…). There was a roar that could not have been his own (McEwan, The Innocent 147).

Reasoning gets out of the question, violence grows beyond any humanly behaviour. Any trace of moral consciousness, of mere rationality, is effaced. Finally, Leonard and Maria smash Otto's skull with a cobbler's last, piercing the bone toe-first, and going deeper still and dropping the German veteran soldier dead to the floor (McEwan, The Innocent 147-148). Otto's violent murder assigns to Leonard and Maria the counternormative social role (Burke and Stets, Identity Theory 114) of murderers which they both interiorize and try to conceal. In order to avoid prison and legal punishment, the couple dismembers Otto's body, and tries to get rid of it and hide their crime. Several pages of the novel are dedicated to the detailed description of the ways in which Leonard and Maria dismember Otto, starting by amputating his lower legs below the knee, the arms, and then the head:

> He was through the bone in seconds, through the cord, neatly guiding the flat of the saw against the base of the skull, snagging only briefly on the sinews of the neck, the gristle of the windpipe, and through… with no need for the linoleum knife (…). Otto's banged-up head clunked to the floor (McEwan, The Innocent 169).

The scene becomes even more nightmarish and stomach-turning, when Leonard has to cut Otto in half because the trunk is too big for the case. After the grotesque and detailed account of the dismemberment of Otto's corpse, Leonard gets out of Maria's apartment carrying Otto's mutilated body in two heavy suitcases; during his short "trip" to the city, made in order to discard the dismembered corpse, he is afraid of every passer-by. The cases are so heavy that Leonard cannot carry them more than 10 or 20 yards at a time; a dog, smelling fresh meat, attempts to scratch and snarl its way into the case. To make things worse, the railway lockers where he had planned to conceal the remains prove to be too small. Forced to hide the suitcases in his flat over night, Leonard falls into an exhausted sleep and in a troubling and haunting dream in which he pieces out the dismembered body.

Leonard's behaviour fictionally illustrates the explanations given by Stets and Burke, in their analysis of the interconnection between goals and identity standards; these two Professors explain that the agents whose legitimate means to a goal is blocked may resort to illegitimate (criminal) means (Burke and Stets, Identity Theory 6). Failing to discard Otto's body at the railway lockers, Leonard decides to hide it in Golden Operation Tunnel and, in order to prevent their discovery and his accusation, he resorts to another crime: he discloses information about the secret military operation to the Russians who eventually burst into the secret tunnel. In the end, private and public relationships, politics, secrecy and betrayal (elements of the chaotic and corrupted modern world dominated by the eternal fight for

dominance and power) all unite and cover up Otto's murder, but also discarding Leonard of his innocence.

Conclusion

Although his actions are overtly amoral, at the end of it all, Leonard still considers himself innocent, strongly believing that his grotesque behaviour was imposed by the situation he found himself into. Nonetheless, it is not innocence in the sense of lack of experience, but innocence defined as lack of guilt, which he advocates for several times, claiming that he has only done what seemed logical and necessary at the respective moment. For instance, as the U.S. soldiers try to open the suitcases containing Otto's dismembered corpse, Leonard thinks: "He had done his best, and he knew he was not a particularly bad person" (McEwan, The Innocent 191). Later on, he imagines a long exculpating speech, trying to explain his actions and their causes: "He was innocent", he thinks to himself, "that he knew" (McEwan, The Innocent 204). The novel leaves the debate open to the reader. Is Leonard gaining experience? And is his newly gained experience more important than his lost innocence? Does experience always involve the potential for this kind of horrific nightmares? Is there some innocence left within Leonard after his terrible and grotesque crime?

Taking into account Timothy Gauthier's statement professing that "a consciousness of lost innocence – of imperfection and corruption and, hence, of guilt – frequently underlines the accomplishment of maturity" (104), it may be argued that Leonard is far away from reaching real maturation. Although he committed murder, he grotesquely butchered Otto's body and he betrayed the secret Golden Operation, Leonard still denies his guilt, he still insists that he is innocent. From this point of view, Leonard, although has acquired new role, person and group identities, being initiated into the world of politics, foreign relationships, personal interactions and sex, he did not achieve complete maturity.

In connection to the issue of the protagonist's maturation process, in an interview given in 1990, Ian McEwan said about Leonard that:

> He's a man who goes on protesting his innocence without ever really examining his guilt having been involved in at least a manslaughter, and having betrayed his country, and by an act of extraordinary paranoia rejected the woman he loves, because he suspects her of having an affair, he still manages to leave Berlin with an idea of his innocence intact. He's a worrying instance of a man who makes no use of history (McGrath).

Thus, from the author's perspective, Leonard did not truly acquired maturity; he did not learn much from his experiences. He committed amoral and grotesque deeds for which he does not consider himself responsible. Although his actions clearly show that he lost both his legal and moral innocence, he is not fully aware of this.

A final coda of the novel shows that, after thirty years of silence, the recently widowed Maria has written to Leonard from her home in Iowa; the memories waken up by her letter lead to his return to Berlin. Older and wiser, Leonard plans his trip to Iowa, but the novel's end remains ambiguous. It seems that, eventually, Leonard at least becomes aware that he had been wrong in what concerns his attitude towards Maria. However, as McEwan himself said, Leonard's possible reunion with her comes a little bit too late, as his life had already gone by,

while bearing in mind, all this time, an idea of his innocence intact. In Leonard's case, it is certain that the experiences in Berlin led to the loss of moral innocence (although he is not aware of it); however, the question of whether he achieved maturity by means of these experiences remains a debatable issue.

Works Cited

Primary source:
McEwan, Ian. *The Innocent*. London: Jonathan Cape. 1990

Secondary sources:
Burke, P. J., ed. *Contemporary Social Psychological theories*, Stanford: Stanford University Press. 2006.
Burke, Peter J. and Stets, Jan E. *Identity Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2009
Burke, Peter J. and Stets, Jan E. "Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory"**.** *Social Psychology Quarterly* Washington, DC.: Washington State University. 2000. Vol. 63. No 3. pp. 224-237
Burke P. J., Owens T. J., Thoits P. A. and Serpe R. T., eds. *Advances in Identity Theory and Research.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum. 2003
Casademont, Rosa Gonzalez. "The Pleasure of Prose Writing vs. Pornographic Violence: An Interview with Ian McEwan". *The European English Messenger*. Vol. 1. No. 3 (Autumn 1992).
Harter, Susan. "Symbolic Interactionism Revisited: Potential Liabilities for the Self Constructed in the Crucible of Interpersonal Relationships". *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 45 (4). 1999. p. 677.
Malcolm, David. *Understanding Ian McEwan.* South Carolina, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. 2002
McGrath, Patrick. "Ian McEwan", BOMB Magazine: The Artist's Voice since 1981, 33/Fall 1990, *Literature*, http://bombsite.com/issues/33/articles/1368, accessed on 4th April 2010
Pitt, Daniela. *The Representation of Trauma in Ian McEwan's Novels*. A Research Report for the Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts (English). Dr Michelle Adler, supervisor. University of the Witwatersrand: School of Humanities. 2009
Roelof, Hortulamus, Anja Machielse and Ludwien Meeuwesen, eds. *Social Isolation in Modern Society*. London and New York: Routlegde. 2006
Seaboyer, Judith. "Sadism demands a story: Ian McEwan's *The comfort of strangers"*. *Modern Fiction Studies*. 45.4. 1999. pp. 957- 986.
Slay, Jack Jr. *Ian McEwan* (Twayne's English Authors Series). Twayne Publishers. 1996.
Stets, Jan E. and Burke, Peter J. "Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory". *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 63. 3. American Sociological Association. Sept 2000. pp. 224-237.
Stryker, Sheldon. *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version*. Caldwell, NJ: Blackburn Press. 1980.

Stryker, Sheldon and Burke, Peter. "The Past, Present and Future of an Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 63. 4. Dec. 2000. pp. 284-297. Special Millennium Issue on the State of Sociological Social Psychology. American Sociological Association

Wood, James. "James Wood writes about the manipulations of Ian McEwan", *London Review of Books*, 30th April 2009, http://www.lrb.co.uk/v31/n08/ james-wood/james-wood-writes-about-the-manipulations-of-ian-mcewan, accessed on 5th April 2010

Wood James, "On a Darkling Plain". *The New Republic*. 18th April 2005. http://www.tnr.com/article/darkling-plain, accessed on 15th March 2011