Allameh Tabatabayi University

Faculty of Foreign Languages
Department of English Language and Literature

Authorship and Readership from a Metahistorical Perspective within World War II: *Atonement* and *the Reader* in a dialogue

Advisor: Dr. Marayam Beyad

Reader: Dr. Behrooz Mahmudi Bakhtiari

Examiner: Dr. Reza Didari

By: Elham Hosseini

A Thesis submitted to the Graduate Studies Office in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in

English Literature

January,2013

Table of Contents

Abstract

World War II is one of the key events in the first half of 20th century, the impact of which on the nations involved was of so much great a consequence that it still becomes a site of strife in imaginative productions to reflect their anxieties. *Atonement* and *the Reader* are samples of such productions with the focalization of authorship in the former and readership in the latter, covering a span of almost 50 years. Therefore, three factors become of importance in connecting these novels together: 1. Authorship 2.Readership 3. History, more specifically World War II. The present study aims at inspecting the bifocal functioning of authorship and readership within a slice of history, World War II, through the eyes of the mentioned novels, i.e. *Atonement* and *the Reader,* in order to achieve a different perspective of the event and the consequences that befell its aftermath. The realization of such a perspective is subordinate to a plausible study of each novel first, then *The Reader*, which has been written ahead of *Atonement*, chronologically, the signals the former novel addresses to the latter, the answers the former receives and the final result of this communication. It is not within the plan of this study, of course, to change the whole history, since it is idealistic and unreal; however, it is satisfactory for it to raise questions regarding the role of other nations involved, especially Britain, which viewed Germany a rival. Again, it is not the purpose of this study to replace Britain with Germany as the faulty force in World War II, rather it attempts to figure out whether Britain was less guilty, compared to Germany. The natural result of this perspective is the mitigation of reproach Germany has burdened for so long, but that does not mean that it is fully exonerated, it simply means that Germany shares, or should have shared, shame and guilt along with other countries engaged in the war, Britain included.

Acknowledgement

Introduction

The first half of the 20th century witnessed the collapse of European civilization and identity in the First and the Second World Wars. They disillusioned Europeans of their cultural cultivation and uncovered by means of unveiling the ambitious drives, that a retarded movement may seem only apparently forward. World War II, of course, was of greater consequence to the nations involved, out of which Britain and Germany are the main focuses of the present study.

Bismarck's proclamation of a newly unified Germany under the sovereign rule of Wilhelm I, in 1871, made Germany the second military and economic power after Britain. Although German's defeat in the First World War and all the reparations imposed by Versailles Treaty made Britain sure of its own unique position in Europe, its watchful eye never overlooked German's progression. Colonel T.G, the British military attaché in Paris, reported German growth at the time. His report implicitly put Britain and France together against Germany: "…Germany [is about] to have more powerful army than France by 1938, with more modern equipment and aircraft and a more mobile war industry" (Colvin 32). Colvin, also, asserts Britain's suspicion of a secret union between Russia and Germany (22) which was later on affirmed by a peace pact signed between the two countries as well as Russia's reluctance to side with other allies at the beginning of the war. Germany's growing power, and the demand to retrieve the old colonies, according to Colvin, German's annexation of Sudetenland by Munich Betrayal[1] left Poland as the last fortress to hinder the advent of an immense conflict; however, Germany's invasion of Poland pushed Britain and France to the edge of declaring war on the country and hence World War II. This is, of course, a very rough picture of the events taking place in those years the elucidation of which is one of the tasks of the present study.

To view history as a flat fact would result in the belief that no alteration of orientation is likely to happen toward a certain historical event. The progress of events in the course of history proves a new entity different from what is known

---

[1] Despite the military alliance between France and Czechoslovakia, France along with Britain and Italy signed a agreement according to which Sudetenland was attached to Germany. The region was of great importance to Czechoslovakia's security as most of its border defense and banks were located there.

already. A.J.P. Taylor, an Oxford lecturer, comments on the origins of World War II: "... Hitler was no more wicked or unscrupulous than many other states men ... Hitler was simply following an 'historical necessity'" (Colvin 9). The sharp edge of charges against Germany was reduced to an inevitable 'historical necessity'. This sounds like a whole reversal of the events happening; moreover, it brings forth the possibility of different narrations of the same incident. The idea of the reversal is by no means an exaggeration since it would eliminate Hitler and Nazi party as dangerous and destructive from the portrayal of World War II; instead, it would give them an essential role. From this point onward the account of events are no longer irrevocable pieces of history; rather, hazy spots in the realm of "metahistory".

Metahistory's main preoccupation is with narratives, according to Dirlik, the result of which was "a reorientation in theory from a positivistic concern with history as a recuperation of the past to a concern with the ways in which the historian constructs the past"(2). This idea brings forth many controversies regarding history, one of which addresses White directly, i.e., George Iggers, asserting that historical texts may be "governed by literary criteria" but are not productions of imagination (ibid). Dirlik views Iggers with suspicion and instead suggests that different versions of the same event are not necessarily imaginative and therefore open to corruption of or perversion from the truth; instead, they would put us in a position to dig into history not only as means of understanding or writing about the past but also as "a project that extends into the future" (3). Dirlik's assertion about history, projection into the future, in turn affirms history as a dynamic entity and makes possible tracing the accounts of events long after they have already happened. Such view toward history, both confirm and confuse Hegelian notion of the same issue: that projection of history to the future is possible is an affirmation of the fact that history is an entity apt for progression in the future, and so has a potential for prophecy and accordingly it may, as well, be pre-determined. On the other hand, that history is a set of different narrations, which may alter in their course of progression, is regarded a negation to the predetermination of history. In the light of such a prospect, the two novels, *Atonement* and *The Reader*, become the subject of study concerning World War II as their historical context.

Atonement, by Ian McEwan, maps out the story from the summer of 1935: Briony, a young female writer of thirteen, accidently views her older sister, Cecilia, stripping her clothes off in front of the gardener's son, Robbie, by the fountain. Her naïve and wrong realization of Cecilia and Robbie's relationship, meanwhile, her own crush on Robbie leads her to testify to a false event, which separates the lovers, sending Robbie to the war; as an atonement she starts writing novels to unite them in fiction.

The novel, Atonement, is visibly cogitating on the concept of author & authorship and these two lean on the definition of the self, who takes the role of authoring, and has gone through many changes during the course of time. The subject has been very much a production of its surroundings. Once God was the prevailing force of the universe and therefore: "God exists; therefore I am", Saint Augustine said. With the progression of science and demystification of Nature and God, a new self was born out of the new perspectives; the Cartesian self who was unified and detached from God: "I think; therefore I am". This new self was consolidated with the advent of Rationalism and within the Enlightenment period. With Romanticism on the rise, the idea of the self differed from that of the past. Despite their celebration of individuality, the Romantics' tendency toward imperfection, uncertainty and self-contradiction shuddered the solid self created within the Enlightenment era. The legacy of the Romantics is seen in the picture of the today's self: fragmented, scattered and not unified. Authorship, accordingly, has been bearing diverse meaning ever since. As long as the self is unified, the author is looked up to and authorship is considered as an action resulting from genius. As the self was doubted upon, the author and authorship no longer kept in the same position. Post structuralism considering human subject just a space for the language to function robbed authorship of its formerly sacred standing. Roland Barthes, a prominent figure in post structuralism, went to the edge of celebrating "the Death of the Author" in the famous article with the same name, wherein he elaborates on the process of authoring, through which the identity of the author alters from the almighty knower of events to a mere experimenter with events leaning more on the reader of his text for the creation of meaning than himself.

Briony, the author figure in Atonement, is placed in a more or less same condition. She starts to write in order to redeem her conscience of a false evidence she gave once; however, her torn self plus ignorance, on the means by which she

could have peace, entails in her redeeming to result in numerous, almost twenty, versions of the same event, last of which becomes her atonement for her past wrong doing. But this achievement happens at the cost of her death from dementia; she dies at the point of perfection! The notion of authorship in *Atonement* is on the same line with the post structural sight of the idea regarding two factors: 1. Authoring as a penance and not a prestige. 2. Authoring leading in to annihilation of an identity: "…writing is the destruction of every voice, of every point of origin. Writing is that neutral, composite, oblique space where our subject slips away, the negative where all identity is lost, starting with the very identity of the body writing" (Barthes 142). *Atonement*'s association with World War II would be Britain's contribution in authoring the plot of the war within a metahistorical perspective, which would, perhaps, lead to a different version of the narrative.

"Readership" is the next concern of the present inquiry into the Second World War. Interrelated with authorship, readership, too, involves a subject. Phenomenology and emphasis on the perception of the subject gave way to developments of Reception theory and later on to Iser and his phenomenological reading process. These theories no longer view reading as a passive process; rather, they describe it as an activity close to co-authoring. Roland Barthes goes to the extreme of uttering: "…the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author" (148). In his view, the author melts in to writing and the reader receives an identity out of the act of reading.

The Reader is concerned with the post-war Germany and the readings of the new German generation of the events of World War II. A young boy of fifteen, Michael Berg, falls for a woman of thirty six, Hanna Schmitz, who used to be a Nazi guard during the war and now serves as tram conductor. Reading books to his beloved, Michael deepens relationship with Hanna only to find her gone suddenly. The next visit with Hanna is when Michael is a young student of law attending War Crimes trial courts, where he learns of Hanna's secret: 1. that she had worked at Auschwitz camp. 2. that she is illiterate. Hanna is sentenced to prison for life, where she learns to read and write eventually and Michael keeps reading, through cassette tapes, to her for the rest of his life.

The Reader, more consciously, sets forth the subject of history: "We didn't feel like mere spectators, or listeners, or recorders. Watching and listening and

recording were our contributions to the exploration of history" (94). Amazingly, the novel seems to be aware of the metahistorical role of the reader as well, because a former reference to Dirlik's inference of metahistory uncovered dynamism of metahistorical view, which would project the past to the future. So, in the analysis of *The Reader*, we are concerned with readership and the identity of the reader from Barthes point of view on the one hand, and on the other, with the role of the reader in a metahistorical context.

Thus far, the confrontation of authorship and readership in the same historical context, i.e. World War II, and intending to fade away the boundaries of literature and history to attain a metahistorical prospect are the main pursuits of this study. The main focus would be on Authorship and Readership through the eyes of the post structural Barthes. Within this scope, Authorship will become more of a self-annihilating act: "where all identity is lost" or may be hidden in favor of the birth of the reader. With this new selfhood born out of the process of reading, Readership's role becomes even more highlighted in bringing the text into being: "a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination". New views of history, in turn, will bring into terms notions of Authorship and Readership in forming a historical event as a text. More specifically it will set out the role of Britain and Germany in the Second World War, making note of the semiotics presented in the novels *Atonement* and *The Reader*.

Should authorship be studied from Roland Barthes' view, there will be new roles ascribed to the author, to the text ,and what is inevitable, to the readership. In a post structural perspective author is no longer an autonomous creature with whom we find the "meaning" of the text, rather, he "is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing" (Barthes 145).With this new definition of the author, the text also will have a different entity: "multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash"(ibid), or "text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable canters of culture"(ibid). The flexibility of such a text will give the reader a chance to add to it, reduce and change it, after all this will make an alteration in the role of the reader as well.

Wolf Gang Iser is very well known for his reader-oriented hermeneutics of the text. According to Iser, the text is in possession of the gaps, which are to be

filled by the reader while and after reading. This process, which according to Iser is phenomenological, is called concretization of the text:

> As we read, we oscillate to a greater or lesser degree between the building and breaking of illusions. In a process of trial and error, we recognize and reorganize the various data offered by the text. These are the given factors, the fixed point on which we base our 'interpretation', trying to fit them together in the way we think the author meant them to be fitted. For to perceive, a beholder must create his own experiences.

Provided that by Barthes' account the author is dead and the reader is born, Iser is his complement, since in Iser's theory the life of the reader is reflected upon. Iser describes the aftermath of the reader's birth, its growth and progression into a real identity, and this is a great contribution to the construction of *The Reader,* which will be focused upon in due time.

With classical ideas wiped off of Authorship, Readership and the Text, the creation of a historical event will differ as well. Regarding World War II as a historical phenomenon, Britain is not to be found faulty, instead of Germany, as the author of a scenario who had already predicted the end, rather, a nation witnessing their own annihilation as a result of authoring a text which was unpredictable and was "open to free play of meaning" (Barthes 2). Accordingly, Germany wouldn't be the passive reader of a text written by Britain; rather it would be the creator of such events not meant to happen .The history of the Second World War, in this regard, will have more of a narrative nature, which will also make possible different narrations of a single event exist.

Chapter One

The Bifocality of Authorship and Readership within

Metahistory

"We didn't feel like mere spectators, or listeners, or recorders. Watching, listening and recording were our contribution to the exploration of history" (*the Reader*, 94).

"Watching, listening and recording" are considered as "our contribution" only when they move to a level above "mere" observation. In other words observing should result in more than just witnessing, it should add to our awareness of the course of events and the means by which they took place and that's where history opens the door to "our contribution".

Consciousness was not first noticed by Hegel but the systematic progression of consciousness as a dynamic force of history was among his philosophical achievements. *Phenomenology of Spirit* contains Hegel's reasoning on the evolution of consciousness, "Dialectics of Consciousness", the ascending movement of understanding, ending in freedom as the final stage. (Taylor, 127-148). Elsewhere, in the introductory part of Hegel's lectures on philosophy of history, Hegel asserts that this freedom doesn't mean: "…the freedom to do what I like. It is the freedom that man has in following his own essence, reason" (Taylor, 390). This progressive system of Hegel to some is similar to: "a narrative structure and tells us that anything we wish to understand philosophically (*begreifen*) must be viewed as developing" (McCumber, 70).Therefore three issues are of significance regarding Hegel's philosophy: 1.That human consciousness is involved in formation of history. 2. Human consciousness is progressive. 3. Hegel's system has a narrative structure that allows a room for human contribution. Accordingly those newer approaches, viewing history as a narrative, have an eye on Hegelian system, even if they stand outside it: "the context in which the postmodern historical sense situates itself: outside associations of Enlightenment progress or development, idealist/Hegelian world-historical process"(Hutcheon 92), because to stand out of Hegel's system, one should first recognize Hegel's position, so he cannot be ignored; however, the missing piece compared to a Hegelian system is pre-determination and progressiveness; the new systems are indecisive and even retrospective some times. A well-fit example for such systems is Metahistory.

Metahistory, initially theorized by Hayden White, features history as "essentially poetic". Introducing this new paradigm, White claims the history to be "more comprehensive in scope than the monograph or archival report"(i). In line

with the poetic identity White ascribes to history, he introduces mode of "emplotment" to the act of historiography which is another step forward to describing history as narrative. However, narrative in White's term is not as systematic as Hegel's and the act of narration is influenced by a number of variables that is to be studied closely. On the other hand picturing history with a poetic nature, White tacitly involves two more factors: authorship and readership. In other words history is illustrated as a domain, metahistory, within which authorship and readership function.

The present study aims at inspecting narratives of World War II, as a crucial point in the portrayal of western culture. But the shift of emphasis, from what happened to how it was narrated, may become a preface to bring about other alterations towards this issue. Given the brief account above, this chapter serves to set forth the theoretical progression of this thesis. As such, metahistory as the soul debate of the whole argument is closely studied and the elements of which are inspected in the historical context, i.e. World War II, of the two novels *Atonement* and *The Reader* respectively. Authorship, being the focal point of *Atonement*, Readership, as the core of *The Reader*, will be assessed in the bounds of metahistory. More clearly stated, the bifocal functioning of authorship and readership is examined in the domain of metahistory.

Metahistory

The assumption that White's metahistory is merely the fictionalization of the serious, scientific and demure nature of history may not be a very just judgment of his undertaking. At least White's own claim is that his approach towards history is "systematic" and therefore orderly. In fact he creates a rather sophisticated web of concepts by which historiography may take place and through which history may be studied and analyzed, so his system should not, unjustly, suffer the disdainful label of romanticization of history; however, any system may have some shortcomings and his is not an exception.

White begins his assertion by distinguishing between a "chronicle" and "story". A chronicle, he believes, is the ordering of the events as they briefly take place; a story, however, is the arrangements of events in such a way that they "possess a discernible beginning, middle, and end"(5).White, here, focuses on formation of the story out of the scattered events and later on sheds light on the task

of the historian as an explorer of stories concealed in chronicles and finally he reaches the point of viewing historian as the inventor of events. Of course he does not radically assault history as mere story or historians as only story tellers, but his emphasis on creation and creative capacities of historians gives way to further results more in line with history as "essentially poetic": "The conception of the historian's task, however, obscures the extent to which 'invention' also plays apart in the historian's operation" (7).

Consistent with his task for the historian, White proceeds to explain the different phases of the process through which the creation or analysis of events takes place, namely Emplotment, Formal Argument and Ideological implication.

Mode of Emplotment

White's definition of Emplotment is as follows: "He [the historian] makes his story by including some events and excluding others, by stressing some and subordinating others. This process of exclusion, stress, and subordination is carried out in the interest of constituting a story of a particular kind. That is to say, he 'emplots' his story"(6). Easily put, emplotment is to frame the stories, found in the chronicle, in a certain type of plot so that the story takes a specific form. Treading behind Northrop Fry in *Anatomy of Criticism*, White detects four distinct modes of emplotment: Romance, Tragedy, Comedy and Satire[2]. White, thence, teams up these four modes two by two in order to define them comparatively.

Romance and Satire are cast in the same class since they are considered "drama of redemption" and "drama of diremption" respectively. Romance is basically the account of self- recognition embodied in the form of a hero's out-worldly superiority over this world, his triumph over it and his eventual salvation from it. The type of drama supporting the victory of the all the virtuous forces over the vicious ones is associated with the story of the Fall and celebrates man's release. In the face of this mode stands Satire testifying man's reason's inadequacy to outmaneuver the tyranny of the world and the impossibility of his victory over the

---

[2] . It should be noted here that White's definition of these genres are slightly different from their literary meaning since in literature there's a division between certain types of tragedy or comedy and the like but White takes these terms a bit more general. That is to say, given the word "tragedy", for example, he doesn't distinct between the Greek tragedy or tragedy in its 20th century sense.

force of death. The example of romantic emplotment in literature may be Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*, where Pamela's reasonable attitude nullifies Mr.B's lustful attempt to have a hand on her. Her virtue and sensibility not only ends in a successful marriage but also raises her to an upper social class. In contrast with this view of life and of human reason stand the works of Jonathan Swift the main attribution of which is human reason's inefficiency, *Gulliver's Travels* being its most prominent example pictures "Yahoos" as creatures similar to humans and deficient.

Comedy and Tragedy are paired for two reasons: 1. The rough prospect of separation from the condition of Fall they both hint at. 2. "Reconciliations" of the forces present in the society and nature in general. Comedy and Tragedy are free from the condition of the Fall since "transcendence" of man over the world is dismissed; men deal with men, the society and the world. Reconciliations taking place in Comedy and Tragedy is the differential point since denouement in the former is that of a happy ending and in the latter is that of a "somber" result; however, they are known as reconciliations since submission occurs whether with happy or sad tones. Comedy tends to present the society in a "purer, saner, and healthier" condition after the conflicts happening, Tragedy in the same sense, however with darker tones, pictures the submission of the protagonist for the betterment of the circumstances; moreover, there's a "gain in consciousness" for those who "survive the agonic test" and that's "the epiphany of the law governing human existence" which the protagonist's struggle opposed to the world has trespassed.

White's final assertions on the concept of emplotment is to distinguish between Satire and all the other genres based on the distinct type of "qualification" it represents as opposed to Romance, Tragedy and Comedy in turn. Romance, Tragedy and Comedy set to demonstrate a "Romantic" consciousness of the world considering the occurrence of redemption and reconciliation as a result of the conflicts present in the world of experience. Satire, on the other hand, sets forth the eventual deficiency of the views of the world represented in the genres of Romance, Comedy and Tragedy.

Putting White's theories into practice, the present study aims at spotting out the mode of emplotment in World War II in order to shed light on the identification of emplotment in the two novels under analysis. It is noteworthy that White does allow the composition of a new mode out of the four existing genres, provided that: "…the relation between the genre (Tragedy or Comedy) and the mode in which it is

cast (Romantic or Satirical) is different from that which obtains between the genre and the mode in which it may be cast" (10).As it is, the history of World War II has been reported as a Romantic Tragedy. In the introduction of *Atlas of World War II*, S.L.Mayer puts forward the ineluctability of the tragic advent of the Second World War: "World War II in Europe was very like a Greek tragedy, wherein the elements of disaster are present before the play begins, and the tragedy is writ all the larger because of the disaster's inevitability." Nevertheless, the craving of victory all along and the final triumph of the allies over the militant Germans give a romantic tone to the whole event. The two novels mentioned in the present inquiry, however, change their approach to the events of World War II by a shift in the emplotment of the incidents; *Atonement* and *The Reader* are Satirical Tragedies.

That the two novels mentioned, i.e. *Atonement* and *The Reader*, testify the inevitability of war and confirm the reconciliations made in a dark and gloomy tone aftermath, reveals them both as Tragedies. Nonetheless, each of the novels has certain attributes to unfold an ironical stand point. *The Reader*, sets forth a picture of a German generation, in the following years of war, reading the history and questioning the veritability of the affairs; the irony lies in the new picture sketched by these questions and inquiries. In other words *The Reader* tries to prove, by an ironical reading of the events in World War II, that the inevitability of war makes the consequences, also, unavoidable. *Atonement*, on the other hand, focalizes authorship at the same time destructs the role of the author as a fabricator rather than an indicator or, ironically enough, testifies to the role of the author as the one who annihilates. Synchronous movement of the events in *Atonement* with World War II in Britain makes enough space for suspicion of Britain's authorship in the occurrences befell the summer of 1935.

Mode of Argument

Metahistory is not supposed to demonstrate a totally artistic or literary portrait of history, rather is there to balance the portion of "narration", poetic side, with "investigation", scientific side. White puts it as: " I am for the moment taking at face value the historian's claim to be doing both art and science and the distinction usually drawn between the historian's *investigative operation* on the one hand and his *narrative operation* on the other"(12).To illuminate the idea, it is noteworthy to add that apart from the emplotment of the stories, logical back grounds are essential to the narration of the historical events, because after all there

has to be a logic behind the depiction of certain type of emplotment to provide the scientific grounds of history. This rationalization, by White, is considered as " Formal Argument" divided into four categories: Formist, Organicist, Mechanistic and Contextualist.

The Formist style is very descriptive in general, but very sensitive to the " uniqueness" or "peculiarity" of every incident narrated. In other words rareness of an event is described precisely, but not the context or the milieu within which that incident took place. Therefore, the picture given by Formism is unique, meticulously described, colorful and live, using Pepper's terms, it is "dispersive" though. Dispersion of ideas results in lack of interpretive functions to be performed on the data and hence the loss of appropriate generalizations or conclusions; however, it's not recommended to dismiss this form of argument totally; at least, this mode of explanation can be studied along with the others.

Organicist and Mechanistic modes of argument move side by side, but they differ from each other, slightly ,as much as the idealistic system of Hegel differs from materialistic system of Marx. Although Organicist does allow some space for the individual, it always views the individual as a part of a whole. White states this position as: "At the heart of Organicist strategy is a metaphysical commitment to the paradigm of microcasm-macrocasm…" (15). On the other hand, Organicist tends to view history towards an "end, goal" or "….certain provisional teloi". These two key concepts bring about the formation of "integrative" data as opposed to dispersive data given by Formism. Similarly, Mechanistic mode is systematic, and produces integrative data accordingly; however, metaphysical element, here, transforms in to a physical one: "…for the Mechanist, an explanation is considered complete only when he has discovered the laws that presumed to govern history in the same way that the laws of physics are presumed to govern nature"(17).To round out the analogy drawn between Hegel and Marx, it should be mentioned that Hegel perceives the prospect of change in consciousness, which is an abstract entity, whereas Marx remarks it in social class, which is a rather concrete one.

The final curtain is, by and large, the sum of all the other styles, but this is a very hasty and therefore a rough picture of what Contextualism has to offer. Indeed it makes note of variety and particularity presented by Formism, or the integration of data set before our eyes by Organicism, yet it seeks to figure out the "origin" and the "impact" of a phenomenon as well and that, of course, needs a greater effort to be carried out. Contextulism does not study an event in isolation; it traces

an event in the texture of incidents and tracks down the "threads" by which that specific event is related to the other occurrences. It, therefore, studies a set of events "in terms of 'trends'" and this operation White holds: "…suggest[s] the possibility of a narrative in which the images of development and evolution might predominate" (19).Dominance of growth and evolution may relate Contextualism as a postmodern mode to Lyotard's assertion: "Postmodernism thus understood is not modernism at its end but in the nascent state, and this state is constant"(79). That is how Contextualism, as an element of Metahistory, allows reconsiderations toward narrating World War II. As it is, *Atonement* and *The Reader* view the events of World War II, whether slightly or very, differently because they contextualize new issues in the narration of events and consequently identify new trends and threads, eventually attributing new roles to the agents contributing in the incident. In other words, authorship of a young British girl focalized in *Atonement* together with readership of a German Boy centralized in *The Reader* ,contextualized in the events of World War II and the aftermath, will become meaningful from a metahistorical perspective.

Ideological Implication

In the preface to his book, Metahistory, Hayden White expresses, amongst the conclusions he has made, the fact that: "..choosing one perspective on history rather than another are ultimately aesthetic or moral rather than epistemological"(xii).But he can't escape the indispensability of ideology, because after all, as he says, the "*decision*" made by the historian as to choose a certain type of argument is based on the "opinions" and " ..these opinions, in turn, would seem to be generally ethical and specifically ideological, in nature"(21). Thereafter, succeeding Karl Mennheim, White posits four ideological view points: Anarchism, Conservatism, Radicalism and Liberalism. He insists that these terms are sketches of "general ideological preferences rather emblems of specific political parties"(24).The basis, White considers for definition of these terms, is their attitude toward "social change"; Conservatives, most cynical considering modification or reordering of the "social status quo", set against all the other points of view. Liberals, despite their name, and Conservatives may be compared regarding their approach toward social change: Conservatives view it as "plantlike", organist movement, and Liberals, almost on a par with them, view it as a labor of a "mechanism". So they both consider foundations as unalterable but

"some change as inevitable". In the face of them stand Radicals and Anarchists both believing in "necessity of structural transformation"; however, they also differ from each other in a substantial issue: Whereas Radicals value the re-establishment of the society on "new bases", Anarchists desire the repudiation of society and alternating it for a "community".[3]

Regarding the rhythm of change, Conservatives favor a 'natural' pace, while Liberals call for a 'social' rhythm consists of "parliamentary debate, educational process and electoral contests". Radicals and Anarchists, by contrast, insist on revolutionary transformations, rapid and powerful.

The prospect of transformation in the eyes of each class differs on a wish-for-change basis. Conservatives, practically, applaud the current situation since the form of society is, to them, 'realistically' ideal. Liberals, on the other hand, hope for an improvement on the current conditions but they "project" this development to a "remote" future. Radicals view change as "*imminent*"; therefore they put forth all within their ability to bring about this change currently. Anarchist long for the pre-lapsarian innocence of humanity, the remedy of which is to undermine current social constitutions in to an ideal community of individuals, the possibility of its accomplishment is "at any time".

Thus far, White has established metahistory as a matrix of elements, giving numerous possibilities to narrate historical events. According to his delineations of these elements and factors certain types of emplotment should be combined along with certain sort o f argument along with a specific ideology. The matrix is as follows:

"Mode of Emplotment	Mode of Argument	Mode of Ideological Implication
Romantic	Formist	Anarchist
Tragic	Mechanistic	Radical
Comic	Organicist	Conservative
Satirical	Contextualist	Liberal" (29)

---

[3] .There are at least 7 differences betwixt these two terms, major ones are: Society is a web of social relationships but community is consists of groups of individuals. Common objectives and interests are necessary in communities whereas society is not so. Society is larger than a community and therefore can bear difference as well as similarity while community values similarities only(http://www.preservearticles.com/201104306147/7-most-important-differences-between-society-and-community.html). For further inquiries, **Ferdinand Tönnies's** comparison made between Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society) may be most helpful.