A Study of Radicalism in Hare's *Fanshen* and Foucault's Dynamics of Power: Irrationalism and the Absence of Possibilities

Siamak Shahabi [1]

Ph.D. Candidate of English Literature, Department of Foreign
Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

Bahee Hadaegh (Corresponding Author) [2]

Associate Professor of Transnational Literature and Drama Studies, Department
of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

Abstract

This study pursues a study of radicalism in Hare's most radical play, *Fanshen,* and in Foucault's mode of radicalism within his theory of power relations. From a specific perspective, this study borrows from the new wave of reevaluating and reinterpreting Foucault, which is concerned with irrationalism in his mode of radicalism. This analysis helps us comprehend the changes in the social trends and the specific pattern of radicalism in both Hare and Foucault. What concerns this study gravely, is the absence of the other side of reality or possibility in Hare's *Fanshen* and in Foucault's claims on power relations. The aim of the study is to depict how adopting radicalism and revolution by Hare and Foucault results in the justification of malfunctioned experiments. Furthermore, the way political tendencies are manifested to the audience is proved to be a key factor in the analysis of British political theater and in the shaping of British society. Finally, it is found that a Foucauldian reading of *Fanshen* results in the recognition of Hare's specific pattern of radicalism which is in line with Foucault's.

Keywords

1. Introduction

Power has always been the governing and controlling factor throughout the history of mankind. The quest of people of different times with various races, ethnicities, and religions for power and for the authoritarian supremacy can be traced in the history of mankind and in the history of art. Power has always dominated the very essence of living in any possible way. From a social perspective, theatre in Britain has always played an important role in the formation of people's mentality in different times. As a fine instance, the theatrical conventions of the Thatcher and the post-Thatcher era are formed in accordance with the demands of the dissatisfied people, regarding the social upheavals

---

[1] siamak_shahabi@yahoo.com
[2] bhadaegh@shirazu.ac.ir

of the time. Sir David Hare as an advocate of the leftist theater in England writes his most radical play, *Fanshen*, in the light of the Chinese communist revolution at the time of troubles in Thatcherian Britain. Meanwhile, Michel Foucault, as a post-structuralist philosopher and social activist, supports the radical revolutions in various parts of the world. A study of Hare and Foucault's mode of radicalism is significantly examined in this study as both support radical social trends in their leftist approach toward political and social issues.

In this study, the scope is narrowed down to Hare's most radical and anarchist play, *Fanshen*, as it is an advocate for the legacy of its playwright. Radicalism and revolution as most dominant social acts are observed in both Foucault and Hare, and this observation is the significance of this study which seeks to find the mentioned concepts through the relations and dynamics of power in order to reveal the specific patterns they create and follow. Here, the focus is on the similarities between Foucault and Hare's mode of radicalism. Benefiting from recent analyses of radicalism in Foucault's theory of power relations, which is based on the depiction of radicalism by Janet Afary and Kevin B. Anderson, this study tends to contribute to a Foucauldian reading of Hare's *Fanshen* on the basis of his mode of radicalism and its commonalities with Foucault's approach. As Afary and Anderson (2010) suggest, "In the tradition of Friedrich Nietzsche and Georges Bataille, Foucault had embraced the artist who pushed the limits of rationality, and he wrote with great passion in defense of irrationalities that broke new boundaries" (2). They believe that some of Foucault's practical observations "were in fact closely related to his general theoretical writings on the discourses of power and the hazards of modernity" (3). Furthermore, the 1980s paradigm-shift in his discourses and writings leaves a great impact on his prior tendency towards supporting irrational radicalism, which is the focal point in the theoretical framework of this study, while we compare Foucault's primary pattern of radicalism with Hare's.

But how much influence has this social wave ever had on the British theatre to pave the way to leftist movements, and even the anarchism which results in a social disorder, or a radical play by David Hare? Significantly, in order to find radicalism, the dynamics of power, and power relations, Hare's theater is chosen as it is remarkably multi-dimensional and radical, and *Fanshen* is particularly observed as it is among the most political and radical plays by Hare. This study is conducted in the light of reinterpretations and reevaluations of Michel Foucault's mode of radicalism in relation to his theory of power relations. As a result, one can get more familiar with the flow of power, their pattern of radicalism, and the importance of the dynamics of power in Hare's theater.

2. Literature Review

Within the Foucauldian framework of power relations and his approach to systematic thinking, Marcelo Hofmann and Dianna Taylor in *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts* (2011) mention that, "Michel Foucault was not a systematic thinker. He referred to himself as an "experimenter" as opposed to a "theorist"; eschewed the labelling of his work in terms of existing categories" (27). Richard A. Lynch discusses that power comes in two forms in Foucault's analysis: empirical and theoretical. The empirical interpretations are about different historical (and modern) forms of power and how they ruptured from previous forms and shapes. Sara Mills believes that, "It is in the relationship between the individual and the institution that we find power operating most clearly" (Mills 33). She follows the same discussion in her analysis of Foucauldian notions. Foucault's notions might seem radical in comparison with the social conventions of the time (33).

Regarding Foucault's support of radicalism and revolution and the more recent contributions to the study of Michel Foucault, Janet Afary and Kevin B. Anderson (2010) believe that what led him into an error of judgment was his "Nietszchean-Heideggerian discourse"(13). Afary and Anderson believe that Foucault's "post-structuralist, leftist discourse, which spent all of its energy opposing the secular liberal or authoritarian modem state and its institution" made a proper way for many "socially retrogressive movements" (136).

Within this context, Amelia Howe Kritzer discusses how the modern British theatre is the stage of revolt. (58) Nicole Boireau also discusses how Hare is concerned with the matter of power in his plays and he uses the relationship between the stage and the audience to transfer his concepts and notions about the role of power (Boireau 34). In a radical way, Patterson even states that, "[i]n this ambiguous ending Hare offers a positive image of the Chinese revolution" (136). Hare (1978) in a lecture given at King's College, Cambridge, states that "a play is what happens between the stage and the audience … [T]he interaction of what you are saying and what the audience is thinking. The play is in the air" (26). This interaction manifests the impact of plays on the promotion of certain ideologies in a society.

Turning to an ultimate mode of radicalism is what both Hare and Foucault believe in even for those Western countries in which the result of revolution and radicalism remains to be unacceptable; therefore, radicalism provides a harder predicament. This is hopeless for those like Hare or Foucault who do not approve the circulation of power in various institutions in a country, but tend to deny any sort of reformation and see the ultimate prosperity in radicalism. Kenneth Minogue (2008), believes that, "Radicalism, or ideology, as I am considering it, shuttles between two preoccupations: domination and liberation. The link between them is the practice of revolution, or struggle" (151-152). Minogue asserts that the practicality of the idea of liberation and freedom is shattered in

the West for two reasons: "first, the consistent failure of revolutionaries in Western states to get themselves taken seriously; and second, the horror of what has happened in the rest of the world when the project did actually get to first base" (151-152). The unwanted results of revolutions have not led the radicals to modernity and instead the ideals and the utopia of their imaginations is replaced by the real world and this has provoked hatred in their minds. Minogue notes that, "I take Foucault's work to be an expression of that hatred, but one which takes the loss of the polarity of liberation with entire seriousness." (152).

The present study reflects that both Hare and Foucault are in favor of radical changes regardless of the consequences, and the commonalities in their modes of radicalism. Considering only the very nature of revolution, regardless of where it occurs, and what the consequences would be, Foucault and Hare support the radicalism found in revolution. However, the difference between them is believed to be their political taste and tendency. Bonnie Honig (2008) refers to Foucault's attitude toward an example of a radical change and expresses that : "Will this unitary movement, which, for a year now has stirred up a people faced with machine guns, have the strength to cross its own frontiers and go beyond the thing on which, for a time, it has based itself?" (302). Hare also makes fundamental errors of political judgment when he unrealistically backs radical acts of socialism. Finlay Donesky (1996) states that, "it was the remoteness of the revolutionary period in China from European consciousness that allowed Hare to believe it could be bracketed off from subsequent historical developments and presented as a plausible model of change" (47). Both tendencies seem to be unrealistic from the point of view of a theoretician who introduces the circulation of power and a playwright who is a strong player in circulating power on the stage.

Hare faces a drastic tough barrier in his application of a socialist, leftist, radical revolution, as well. The falling ambitions of the trapped societies in different regions who have already tasted the flow of socialism and the unknown prospects of such countries shattered the imagined restructured systematic evolution. What would seem to be very similar to Hobbes' Common-wealth by Institution was then a totalitarian regime that could compete the drawbacks of Foucault's sovereign power or prove to be not a part of any of Foucault's empirical subcategories of power. Within this context, this way of looking at how things worked for those of the Marxists and alike, gives one a horizon to comprehend the intentions of many political playwrights such as William Shakespeare, David Hare, Sara Kane, etc., and widens one's scope of observation. The main focus of the present study is then on the very essence of radical political acts backed and promoted by Hare and Foucault, one a dramatist and the other a sociologist, specifically in their climatic phases of support for the above-mentioned ideologies.

The question in this research is to find out about the other side of the story which is vastly neglected in many of Hare's plays, and that missing part would be the other core of power. What would happen if the radical side gains the central power? The consequences of radical social and political acts and the negligence of the danger of having one story are the points to be discussed in Hare as a playwright and Foucault as a theoretician, both confronting the same mode of radicalism and critique.

3. Power Relations and Radicalism

"Power is everywhere", embodied in discourse, knowledge and "regimes of truth" (Foucault 1991). Observing the more traditional interpretation of Foucault's theories, one might find out that in many of Foucault's works like The *History of Sexuality* (1978), *Power/Knowledge* (1980), *The Birth of the Clinic* (1973) and *Discipline and Punish* (1977), what he concentrates on is the analysis of the effects of different institutions on people, the individuals and the important impacts of people in confirming, upholding, or resisting and repelling those effects in the circle of power. According to Foucault, power is the entity that shapes our identity. In comparison with other theories, it operates on a very different level:

> His work marks a radical departure from previous modes of conceiving power and cannot be easily integrated with previous ideas, as power is diffused rather than concentrated, embodied and enacted rather than possessed, discursive rather than purely coercive, and constitutes agents rather than being deployed by them (Gaventa 1).

In *Power/Knowledge* (1980), Foucault emphasizes the scrutiny of revolution and times of great turmoil. Accordingly, the fundamental intention and purpose of any political action is necessarily found in conducting a revolution and the overthrow of the State, which according to them, results in the liberation of the working classes. Nevertheless, in his article 'Truth and Power', Foucault does not argue that revolution is necessarily a simple freedom from oppression, nor does he find revolution as a thorough challenge to bourgeois power, or a way through which power relations are overturned, since "the State consists in the codification of a whole number of power relations which render its functioning possible, and . . . revolution is a different type of codification of the same relations" (Foucault 122). A key factor in his approach is that his interpretation transcends politics. Power is depicted as an everyday, socialized and embodied phenomenon.

Foucault (1980) asserts that the rise of the bourgeoise and the evolution of disciplinary power are interwoven and interconnected; "this new type of power, which can no longer be formulated in terms of sovereignty, is, I believe, one of the great inventions of bourgeois society. It has been a fundamental instrument in the constitution of industrial capitalism and of the type of society that is its accomplishment" (105). This is to point out the integrity of the new forms of power, the state, capitalism, social

institutions, and the rising bourgeoisie. Foucault's method of interpretation in the matter of power and its dynamics is compatible with Marxist methodology; So is Hare's stratagem in the accumulation of his politics in *Fanshen*. Andreas Kalyvas (2002) states that a "'Marxist approach is entirely consistent with Foucault's interpretation of the advent of new techniques of power" (118). Therefore, as discussed later on, Foucault and Hare's methods are constructed from almost the same foreground and this is their commonality that lead them to radicalism.

The traces of Marxism in Foucault's post-structuralist paradigm weaken the existence of what postmodern Richard Ashley calls "dissident thinking space". Ashley's writings are key elements in post-structuralism and the evolution of 'thinking space'. Ashley finds the theoretical shortcoming of postmodernist and post-structuralist ideas of the 1980s. The absence of the other side of reality in Hare and Foucault results in the exclusion of dissident thinking space and ultimately it leads to radicalism. Structurally, the existence of a repugnant critique loses its chance as Marxism is prolonged with radicalism in both Foucault and Hare. In Hare's *Fanshen* there is no trace of a dissident thinking space as the structure of the play's politics would not reflect a basically different regime of thought. There exists a textual boundary in Foucault and Hare that frees space for radicalism as it narrows down the circulation of power to a close-ended set of ideology. Hare's *Fanshen* does not present a community which has an "open-ended, genuinely pluralistic, and contested approach to knowledge and society" (George and Campbell 270). Neither does Foucault's support of radicalism. Therefore, the presence of Marxism leads them to radicalism and neglects a pluralistic dialogue based on the existence of dissident thinking space.

From the perspective of the more recent examination of Foucauldian theories, this study focuses on a turning point in the theoretical framework of Foucault in which he reconsiders his prior support of radicalism and revolution due to his observation of the traumatic social and political consequences. There is the absence of a dissident thinking space in both Foucault and Hare. This absence results in a substantial change in Hare's mode of reaction after his most radical play, *Fanshen*.

4. British Leftist Theater, Radical Hare

There is an important evolving and expanding period of time for the British political theater between the late 1970s and 1990s. The modern British drama peels during these times and new social and political trends become implacable on British stage. Maria DiCenzo in *A companion to modern British and Irish drama, 1880-2005* (2006) states that, "While political playwrights such as Edgar and Hare invariably get more detailed coverage, unorthodox figures such as McGrath and Arden are treated less predictably" (420). The fact that ideologies find their ways in theaters, and they can be promoted and subverted is obviously seen in the way playwrights treat theater as a tribune for communication.

Power finds its way within plays and stages. John McGrath asserts that, "Reaching working-class audiences, about issues relevant to their lives, in their leisure and entertainment spaces-community centers and workers' clubs, not traditional theater venues – became his artistic and political goal" (421). Socialist theater was the cultural product of the time and, "It was there he believed that socialist theater could be part of generating a genuine and effective counterculture" (421). In this period of time theaters not only in England but also in many other countries had been bombarded by socialist, communist, and radical ideologies and those who were pre-supposed to be a part of the elite, were vastly involved in the contribution of radical ideologies such as what we find in *Fanshen*. McGrath believes that, certain basic promises must be made by any practitioner of theater:

> A writer (or director, actor, or technician) coming into the theater has to make a choice between working in bourgeois theatre with bourgeois values for largely middle-class audiences and I include the trendy, experimental bits of the National and RSC {Royal Shakespeare Company} as well as Bournemouth Rep. –and working in popular theatre with socialist values for largely working-class audiences. (95)

This demonstrates the fact that political theater of the time was not at work for anything even close to what Aristotle calls catharsis, nor even a mere triumph for a play through which, one can be helped to find the reality, but only a measure for untested and profoundly hazardous ideologies. In the 1980s, the aim of Hare was not to be trapped into just a one-dimensional mode of theater, to be the representative of the controversies between the left-wing and the right wing, but he went beyond the borders of his birthplace to get involved in a much broader perspective. One finds his tendencies in *A Map of the World* (1982) where the setting is Bombay rather than London. Hare's dissatisfaction with many British institutions and his tendencies toward radicalism result in broadening his geographical perspectives and thematic changes. John Deeney (2006) believes that:

> Thematically connected, *The Bay at Nice* (1986) employs the context of Soviet Russia; an ex-student of Matisse's from 1920s Paris is invited to authenticate a painting said to be the work of her teacher-a springboard for the examination of the nature of authenticity, both in art and in life. (430)

The dramaturgical shift of Hare is followed by *Pravda* (1985), which is a direct attack on Thatcherism. Hare's oeuvre is the proponent of the immense bipolarity in Britain and its reflection on the political theater. But before this shift, Hare is very much concerned with promoting radical ideologies, in his mode, regardless of the social and political status in Great Britain and the consequences of endorsing presupposed radical and revolutionary discourses.

Regarding the context and his personal beliefs and experiences, Hare's stage encounters change of mood and attitude during his career. There might be changes in form and style, as well. In a lecture given at Cambridge University (1991) Hare asserts that:

> Over and over again I have written about romantic love, because it never goes away. And the view of the world it provides, the dislocation it offers, is the most intense experience that many people know on earth. And I write comedy because {. . .} [*sic*] such ideas as the one I have just uttered make me laugh. And I write about politics because the challenge of communism, in however debased and ugly a form, is to ask whether the criteria by which we have been brought up are right. (35)

This signifies Hare's split from contemporary Marxist theater although it might seem "contradictory and paradoxical" as Richard Boon (2015) puts it. The absence of the other side of reality or possibility in Hare's notable political and radical play meaning *Fanshen* is noticeable. Furthermore, the same current runs in many other political plays by Hare such as *Stuff Happens*.

Hare promotes socialism and radicalism in *Fanshen* and neglects the other side of reality while urging on a series of ideologies that lack consistent framework and relative historical trials. Considering postmodern politics, in an extensive chapter on "the climate of collectivism," Stephen Hicks (qtd. in M. S. Sanders 2006) argues four of socialism's major principles, "that capitalism is exploitative; that socialism, by contrast, is humane and peaceful; that capitalism is less productive than socialism; and that socialist economies will usher in a new era of prosperity" (111). These notions have been, accordingly, disproved both theoretically and practically, and resulted in the formation of a crisis for the Left-socialist intellectuals. Hicks discusses Rousseau's "collectivism and statism [*sic*], Kant on collectivism and war, Herder on multicultural relativism, Fichte on education as socialization, Hegel on state-worship, and the rise of National Socialism" (115). The final outcome of the discussions is that "the National Socialists and the collectivist Right were wiped out physically and discredited morally and intellectually. The new battle lines were simplified and starkly clear: liberal capitalism versus Left socialism" (134). Therefore, we have a stage which is prepared for discussions of Marx and the New Left, which are sometimes unreasonable, and represent "non-rational commitment, impatience, demoralization, rage, and calls for revolutionary violence" (135-70).

Hare's *Fanshen* (1976) is a very political and social play that shows the dispossession of power. The process, through which power was taken from the feudalists, and was given to communists of the left. Chinese communist revolution in 1949 was the main source of inspiration for Hare's very influential play. China was not only the beginning of socialism in a vital region, but also, was about a consensus politics which would affect many societies in upcoming years, all around the globe. Foucault's notion of power and

its circulation is apparent in this social and political phenomenon. One even can say that the malfunction of Wilson's government in Britain resulted in a shift in the way people used to expect things from a socialist government. The post-war Britain witnessed the disappointment of many advocators of socialism after Wilson's failure, specifically in economy. Lin and Ho (2005) express the occurrence as follow:

> When the People's Republic came into existence in 1949, a new socialist state was established with at least two declared commitments: to combat and eventually eliminate private ownership of properties and the means of production and to set up a centrally planned economy monopolized by the state sector. Land, as both [an] important property asset and means of production, lay at the very heart of these commitments . . . The state abolished the previous land system under which rural land had been owned by landlords and distributed rural land to individual farm households. (417)

This new way of the distribution of lands resulted in a new circulation of power, obviously. Many dramatists in the UK were also looking for such systematic and fundamental changes inside the British government and the British society. *Fanshen* is the production of such an attitude. The phenomenon dissolved the established power structure within the ex-feudal society. What have been omitted by Hare in his documentary play, *Fanshen*, were the violence, oppression, chaos, and disorder caused by the restructuring of a society that was conducted by leftists. The revolution and the following land reform were not only about the circulation of power, but also about the many lost lives of innocent people. Peter Lamb and J. C. Docherty (2006) assert that, "[t]he Chinese communists attempted to adapt communism to the largely agrarian economy. Huge experiments cost millions of lives" (99). David Hare propagates radicalism as a social and political act in the circulation of power and he affects the society through provoking certain ideologies. Hare, in a big part of his career can be criticized for ignoring the malfunctioning of triggering revolutionary and radical tendencies among his audience without paying attention to the barbaric outcomes of blind social movements which can result in a revolution. In many of his plays like *Fanshen*, he ignores the realities and sticks to a certain notion which is ignorant to the oppression of the process.

5. Revolutionary *Fanshen*

The village of Long Bow is a Catholic- based region that is chosen by Hare to be set as a microcosm for all the Europeans and the English, in particular, so that they would identify with the peasants and find the portrayal of a macrocosm in which socialism saves people from corruption and malfunction. A theoretical misjudgment and miscalculation which would touch his audience and direct them via the power of theater is the result of manifesting such ideological discourses without considering the possible consequences. The way to remake the society is introduced to be turning over the

established order and replace it with an unknown alternative, as the very title of the play suggests so, the word, "fanshen" means "to turn the body" or "to turn over" (*Fanshen* 1.1.5). A shift toward socialism by peasants and turning over feudalism is what we find ideologically in *Fanshen*. Peasants are to play the key role in changing the long-established order through revolution. Hare believes that the lower class possesses the power to make change, to revolutionize, and to stabilize the society, empower economy, and restructure politics. In an interview (2015), Hare asserts that he was influenced by Raymond Williams for considering that "culture comes up from below" (Hare: *The Blue Touch Paper*). The play's message can be regarded as the enforcement of the lower class to act against the social order and the accepted values of the long-established order and redefine everything in their own terms.

Considering the above-mentioned points, Foucault himself mentions that, "I'd like to mention only two "pathological forms" those two "diseases of power"-fascism and Stalinism" (779). One might add Marxism, socialism, and Communism, as well. In general, any ideological propagandist form of theory, state, constitution, and institution can be added. A mixture of what might be to many, a political, ideological, or philosophical rationality, may carry dangerous radical potentials. According to what can be found in Foucault, the circulation of power permits *any* social class to intertwine and force certain points even to those people or institutions at the top of the pyramid. The argument here though, is the eligibility of those *any* layers and the chance of having them coexist with the long-established order. Power lies everywhere, but the question is the functionality of those hegemonies which try to reevaluate even the oldest, tested and accepted values of human societies which constitute prosperity, order, and stability. What Foucault himself thinks of the revolution against feudalism is noteworthy.

As mentioned above, Foucault believes that power has many faces in different societies; and there are certain faces of it which are more dominant. He gives us the example of feudal societies in which "the struggles against the forms of ethnic or social domination were prevalent, even though eco-nomic exploitation could have been very important among the revolt's causes" (782). Therefore, he introduces possible causes of revolts and revolutions which happened due to the malfunctioning of the ruling class's visions and ideas which could solve the problems and difficulties, modernize the face of feudalism to a win-win relationship and prevent the upcoming revolts and revolutions and the series of events that resulted in the irrevocable destruction of many societies, their structures, and countries. To Foucault, "In the nineteenth century, the struggle against exploitation came into the foreground" and "nowadays, the struggle against the forms of subjection-against the submission of subjectivity-is becoming more and more important, even though the struggles against forms of domination and exploitation have not disappeared. Quite the contrary" (782). It is important at this stage to remember that Foucault, revises himself after observing what happens to the radical movements such as the one already mentioned.

Standing against economic and social inequality, peasants in *Fanshen* decide to stand against their landlords and they are naturally provoked by the Communist Party. A member of the party tries to provoke peasants and their unconscious through propagandist lectures so that they would revolt against their landlords: "T'IEN-MING. Countrymen. Your eight years' suffering, your eight years at the hands of the Japanese are over. Their troops have gone. Now- revenge on traitors" (1.1.8).

The overthrowing of Kuo-te-yu is manifested by Hare to be a move towards liberation and justice, and is suggested by the playwright to be achievable through revolution. The act of revolt and the conduct of revolution are introduced by Hare to be the ultimate choice for the working class and he tries to touch their unconscious via his theater. It is a great achievement by Hare to put emphasis on the circulation of power and to present how the working class is able to change their fate and claim their right. He is also aware of the power which lies on the stage and how it can provoke the unconscious of the working class. T'ien Ming even proposes violence when he encourages the peasants to "beat down traitors" (1.1.9). "T'IEN MING. [y]ou have taken their lives into your hands, you, the peasants of Long Bow. It lies with you" (1.1.12). Ming plays a very crucial role in provoking the peasant and after killing people he asks them to take the clothes of the dead: "T'IEN MING. [t]ake them. You have earned them. You deserve them. You have played your part. You have condemned the traitors, you have executed collaborators" (1.1.13).

Hare's microcosm is supposed by him to set an example for the English working class, regardless of the fact that China is very much different from England in any sort of aspect one can imagine. He prescribes revolution and radical acts which lead to system change, and he believes in the propaganda of socialism which justifies any act of violence and killing in quest for a goal. The promise of liberty and equality is absorbing for the peasants, naturally. But the curious thing is Hare's tendency towards such an approach. Itzin (1975) believes that there cannot be a significant social, historical, or political similarity between Hare's England and other socialist countries like China or Cuba:

> I also wondered how relevant the Long Bow revolutionary process was to a modern industrial society. The process of the play applied to Russia in 1917, to China in 1946, and to Cuba in 1959, but how does it apply to England now? If a factory worker or even a suburban executive wanted to fanshen, how would he go about it? (qtd. in Ozmen 137)

Force and violence are suggested in *Fanshen* as the fuel for the power of revolution: "T'IEN-MING. [n]ever trust a landlord, never protect a landlord. There is only one road and that is to struggle against them" (1.3.22).

A positive act is explained as when the peasants turn to ferocity and atrocity against the landlords to make justice. In a documentary piece of information, one hears "[o]f the seven landlords in Long Bow, three died after being beaten to death by the Peasants' Association" (1.3.23).

Hare is aware of the power which lies in the political parties of the country, specifically the Socialist one, and emphasizes the regulatory influence of them and the crucial part they possess in this circulation of power. Hinton (2008) believes that:

> . . . the peasants, under the guidance of the Communist Party, had moved step by step from partial knowledge to general knowledge, from spontaneous action to directed action, from limited success to overall success. And through this process they had transformed themselves from passive victims of natural and social forces into active builders of a new world. This, as I understood it, was the essence of *Fanshen*. (609)

Hare implies his dissatisfaction with the political parties of his country and believes that the first thing a party should do is the unification and collaboration of his members. Something that he believes is found in Socialist parties. He completely surrenders to the propaganda of Socialism and other radical ideologies and tries to manipulate his audience by setting ideal examples of the members of such parties. T'ien-Ming cautions the members about that: T'IEN-MING. "[e]ven if you are arrested and beaten to death, you must never admit you belong" (1.4.28). Or elsewhere, when he wants to portray a very positive and idealistic picture of the members: "Its members must get up earlier, work harder, attend more meetings, stay up later than anyone else, worry before anyone else is worried" (1.4.28).

Being very much influenced by the revolution in China, Hare turns to be the spokesperson of Socialism. In a part of the play, the enforcement of Socialism through the act of violence and revolution is to be suggested as the way the British should also pave in order to gain equality and justice: "[t]o China's hundreds of millions of landless and land-poor peasants it [fanshen] meant to stand up, to throw off the landlord's yoke, to gain land, stock, implements and houses. But it meant much more than this. It meant to enter a new world" (1.1.5). A very dramatic and propagandist interpretation of what happens after the revolution is also found in what Ch'ung-Lai's wife asserts:

> CH'UNG-LAI'S WIFE. "We are moving from hell to heaven. To live in your own house, to eat out of your own bowl, is the happiest life" (1.3.26).

Comparing Hare's system with Foucault's radicalism, it is Foucault's approach and pattern which is cynical and apolitical, thus, moving towards an extreme nihilism. Walzer (1986) describes Foucault's approach as "'infantile leftism . . . that is less an endorsement than an outrunning of the most radical argument in any political struggle" (51). Nevertheless, in a journal article (1968), Foucault introduces his pattern of radicalism and his notions of progressive politics as different from the trend movements and acts (probably different from Marxism):

> A progressive politics is a politics which recognises the historical and specified conditions of a practice, whereas other politics recognise only ideal necessities, univocal determinations and the free interplay of individual initiatives. A progressive politics is a politics which defines, within a practice, possibilities for transformation and the play of dependencies between those transformations, whereas other politics rely upon the uniform abstraction of change or the thaumaturgic presence of genius. (Foucault, cited in Macey 195)

Marxist radicalism or not, what one finds in Foucault is pessimistic and nihilistic. Foucault's pattern of radicalism involves his attempt to have a pseudo-party approach to politics, while his mode of radicalism falls in the same category with those Marxists and Leftists. The Osborne generation, of which Hare is an unofficial member, headed to a radical approach toward any establishments or hierarchies. John Stanley Bull (1984) believes that, "Their political protest was contained within existing theatrical models. Their characters may have proclaimed a refreshingly abrasive form of radicalism at the audience … but they did so in plays which were remarkably unthreatening in format" (3). Their radicalism was a pragmatic dramatic necessity which, unlike Foucault's, slithered within the common approaches of radicalism such as Marxism and Leftism. In fact, their approach was deliberately and remarkably threatening in practice.

Hare is an open advocate of radicalism and revolution in his early career, but a deep analysis of Foucault makes it queer to categorize him as such. Craig Keating (1997) asserts that, "His public advocacy of the Revolution seems to run counter to the intellectual ethic he had articulated" (181). Hare's *Fanshen* is loaded with hopeful dreams which can only be achieved via revolution and radicalism. The same goes with Foucault who "not unlike many observers of revolutions before him and since, had seen something different and hopeful, for a moment, in the revolution he briefly witnessed, and he clung to it" (Honig 309). However, unlike Foucault, Hare, does not seek for a pseudo-political method of radicalism, but finds his desired political act in the framework of common radical approaches of the time. The result was never what Hare or Foucault had prophesized, and this is their commonality in their political act which involved a tendency toward radicalism.

Coming to terms with the seventies, Clive Barker (1978) believes that "Working inside the establishment is always a contradictory process" (62). In the form of radicalism presented in the seventies he continues, "The basic compromises necessary to present politically committed work inside an alien system will mute, if not silence, the radicalism of the dramatists. On the other hand, the system will have to change to accommodate them (62). However, Hare finds himself free of compromises and writes plays like *Fanshen* which are committed to a radical rejection of the necessary establishments. Unlike Hare's pre-supposed restrictions from which he frees himself, Foucault has the upper hand in manifesting his radical theories openly as he theorizes schemes outside any frameworks or establishments.

6. Foucault and Hare Recognitum

After observing the social, political, and economic consequences of radicalism, one can find a revised version of both Foucault and Hare in their later years. Boireau (2003), argues that in the matter of political passion, Hare gains a "special brand of revised radicalism" (26). This turn from radicalism of the sixties and the seventies results in Hare's more moderate works in the recent phases of his career. Comparatively, as Honig (2008) puts it, Foucault is found so much engaged with the spirituality and Orientalism in his mode of radicalism and revolution that finally makes him detached from "legal institutions, political procedures, and constitutionalism" (309). Actually, the fault lies in a misjudgment that ends with despair and disillusionment. As Honig asserts, "Foucault, too, not unlike many observers of revolutions before him and since, had seen something different and hopeful, for a moment, in the revolution he briefly witnessed, and he clung to it" (309). Then as the consequences of radicalism appear, there is a moment of epiphany and the theoretician realizes the deficiency of radicalism in general. Foucault re-evaluates his position as he asserts, "One needs to watch a bit underneath history for what breaks and agitates it and keep watch a bit behind politics over what must unconditionally limit it. After all this is my work. I am neither the first nor the only one to do it, but I chose it" (qtd. in Honig 311). Foucault does not openly restructure his theories on radicalism but consequently, like Hare, he revises himself after observing the outcomes of radicalistic political acts. The fabrics of political judgements in Hare and Foucault fail to prophesize the penalties of radical political act and that leads to the ruin of any possible progressive democratic politics.

Kallen (1968) defines radicalism as "a distinct philosophy and program of social change looking toward systematic destruction of what is hated, and its replacement by an art, a faith, a science or a society logically demonstrated as true and good and beautiful and just" (51-52). Comparatively, to what extent are the schema of Hare and Foucault logical when it comes to the moment of practical application? Besides, they both question the traditional structure of society which is not actually "hated" by the majority. Even in definition, what they theorize is at odds with societies they come from. Specifically, for Hare who prescribes a Chinese (eastern) version of radicalism for the United Kingdom which is intrinsically and significantly different in terms of historical, sociological, anthropological, and political background.

For a theory or a political act, it is crucial to carry common-sense and rationality. Egon Bittner (1963) asserts that, "One prominent feature of scientific knowledge and method is the high premium placed on systematic clarity and freedom from internal contradiction" (931). What Foucault theorizes in his mode of radicalism is very much like Hare's radicalism in *Fanshen* in its internal contradictions. They both seek systematic clarity, peace, prosperity, and stability within a fragile political and social act which is fundamentalism and radicalism.

It is to be concluded from what Hare portrays that when a socialist revolution happens then prosperity, independence, equality, and justice would follow. It is believed by Afary and Anderson that in the hands of dogma ideology anything, even passion plays of Christianity, can be used as tools of demonization, and European fascists, even anti-religious Nazis knew how they could take advantage of passion plays in order to implement their own ideologies and beliefs. Power lies in theaters and it has been hugely misused by radical leftists, dictators, and fascists during the past decades. Foucault is finally compared to Hitler, by Afary and Anderson (2010), for his passion for revolutionary acts and the propagandist plays that can distribute such actions. Hitler believed that the Oberammergau Passion Play must be well-maintained in order to teach future generations "knowledge of the menace of Jewry" (56).

Foucault and Hare both represent a context in which there is a fascination with self-sacrifice with bare hands in a revolution. It reminds us of the young Chinese protestor standing before a tank in Beijing's Tiananmen Square in 1989. Similar to the peasant's act in *Fanshen*. Is it seen irrational or a trend of eastern martyrdom? To Foucault, revolution is defined to be *irreducible*. Foucault says:

> Uprisings belong to history, but in a certain way they escape it. The movement through which a lone man, a group, a minority, or an entire people say, 'I will no longer obey,' and are willing to risk their lives in the face of a power that they believe to be unjust, seems to me to be irreducible. This is because no power is capable of making it absolutely impossible. Warsaw will always have its ghetto in revolt and its sewers populated with insurgents. (qtd. in Afary and Anderson 130)

Revolution here is perceived in a non-reductionist way. Each and every segment such as parties, institutions, public, and the establishment are involved in the formation of it and what is produced afterwards as the result. Later, in Franz Rosenzweig (2000) we find Foucault arguing against the science of revolution, "Then came the age of 'revolution.' For two centuries it hung over history, organized our perception of time, and polarized hopes", simultaneously, he observes revolution as a controllable act which can be managed, "The age of revolution has constituted a gigantic effort to acclimate uprisings within a rational and controllable history. 'Revolution' gave these uprisings a legitimacy, sorted out their good and their bad forms, and defined their laws of development. . ." (264). Through what was shown in *Fanshen* one can see the miscalculation of Foucault and Hare in their assessment of radical uprisings and revolutions acted by the working class. Finding a logical support of their notions seems to be unattainable, consequently, as shown here, they witnessed the result of any sort of radicalism in any part of the world, and it resulted in a kind of moderation and balance in Hare's future plays along with reconsiderations in Foucault's body of works. This is followed by a very closer stance to questioning the legitimacy of lavish political radicalism, a so-called plurality that ends in fascism, totalitarianism, and authoritarianism. A political culture which constitutes absolutism and fanaticism.

It is observed that in *Fanshen*, Hare himself, suggests the possibility of exploitation of the new socialist regime. He prescribes a reformation so that the change from feudalism to socialism can lead to a total success. While the negative influence of revolution is predicted, he insists on radicalism rather than reformation. As Chris Megson (2012) puts it, some "contradictions of the revolution" (133) are seen in his ideological play. As the society and the political system face drastic and fundamental changes, the peasant experience challenges and policies dictated by the Peasant's Association and the Communist Party. A redistribution of wealth is then decided as when T'ien-Ming suggests that by doing so, "any remaining trace of feudal exploitation" (1.5.32) can be erased. In the newly planted regime, a trial and error policy dominates as Carol Homden (1995) asserts, "whole pattern of progress, error and renewed optimism is to be repeated" (41). An extreme practice of leftism is done by the Party and Hare as an advocate.

Foucault, undermines the power of those at the bottom of the pyramid, and undermines the power of ideology which can act as the butchery of radicalism, fanaticism, and fascism, if they gain more institutionalized or ruling power. Honig (2008) believes that:

> Foucault had embraced a possibility. He did not want to betray the irreducibility he was so often criticized for neglecting (by critics who read him carelessly and say: "if power is everywhere, where is agency?") by saying that-because of how it had turned out-the revolution had never been what he had seen it to be, for a moment. (310)

Hare's only aim is to eradicate feudalism and replace it with socialism, the rest is propaganda, and does not really matter either to the Socialist Party or to other institutions at work:

> CH'EN. "Land reform can have only one standard and it is not equality. It is the abolition of the feudal system" (2.11.74).

This problematic aspect of such revolutions is discussed also by Patterson (2003), "[w]hile *fanshen* promises a better future for the formerly oppressed peasants, there is still much to be done to ensure that the revolution is successful" (129). To establish a unified society is the key to prevent extremism and the revolutions of Russia, France, etc. Ch'en believes that there is still so much to do in order to make the revolution a successful one, regardless of the fact that under a blurred paradigm there can never grow perfection: "Land reform can't be a final solution to men's problems. Land reform is just a step opening the way to socialism. And socialism itself is transitional. All we've done these past few years is give as many people as possible land to work. But our political choices have still to be made" (2.11.76).

Most notably, Hare, like Foucault becomes aware of the disadvantages of such radical social movements, but still sticks to them in his plays: TUI-CHIN. "[i]t was meant to lead us to fanshen. But, in fact, only members of the Party really fanshened" (2.8.51). Hare's portrayal of the negative aspects of the revolution is followed by another utopian resolution. He puts the corrupt leaders of the party on trial and realizes how to become good and nice communists and comrades! But, in the real world when the wrong side starts to possess the power then there would be no fair trail to take care of the corruption. Hare does not mention the violence which follows the revolution in his play to remain a supportive of the act of revolt. As Billington (2007) asserts, "no mention of the violence that accompanied the overthrow of the landlords, of the mass rallies in the major towns at which social enemies were denounced and sentenced, of the untold millions killed under the Maoist policy of purging the country of counter revolutionaries" (56). This fact proves the ideological mindset of Hare, as he backs revolution and socialism in his play, *Fanshen*.

Richard Ashley (1989) notes that, "Foucault's texts are routinely cited as an authoritative refutation of Marxist analysis, which is alleged to reproduce the 'reasoning man' of the sovereignty problematic and to rely on an economistic conception of power" (qtd. in Laffey 996). There is an ignored and marginalized part in Foucault's dialogue (which supports radicalism) that is very similar to marginalization and ignorance found in Hare. Hypothetically, they ignore the exclusion of dissident thinking space, which results in radicalism and anarchy.

7. Conclusion

At the end of Hare's account of revolution in *Fanshen* everything is resolved, corrupt leaders are punished, and peasants are free working on their own lands. Early Foucault's writing also supports the revolt in the same manner. Nevertheless, what one finds in history proves the opposite. He traces modern power and traditional liberal objectives in radicalism and unrest. This study has reflected how Hare tries to stage that socialism could be a proper system if not corrupted by the leaders. He has directed his audience to think critically about their own governing system and attempts to convince them to accept that socialism is *the* system to save politics, economy, and society. A Foucauldian reading of *Fanshen,* done in this research, with the significant study of radicalism in Hare and Foucault results in the recognition of the commonalities which reside within the structure of their ideological outline. Hare and Foucault's common social and political act is propagating radicalism and revolution. What is found in Hare, is manifested gravely and bravely in Foucault, regardless of the social impact they both have had on the formation of the radical acts and the consequent results. Moreover, the presence of radicalism results in the exclusion of dissident thinking space and creates a monolog.

Fanshen is a fine instance which demonstrates British manifestations and disguises of power in the modern political plays of Hare. Simultaneously, the play can investigate how power circulates in different forms of regimes. The analysis of Hare and Foucault's pursue of radicalism and the depiction of the circulation of power, lead into a better comprehension of the changes in the social trends and the political collective unconscious of the British people. Such influences and changes result in the formation of different governmental entities and social institutions. Consequently, Hare's theater carries the outcome of circulation of power in its various forms and can be very much influential. Furthermore, the way political tendencies are observed by dramatists and portrayed to the audience is proved to be a key factor in the analysis of the British political theater and in the formation of the British society. In conclusion, the significance of the British theatre lies within the formation of public opinion and public emotion. The ways dramatists, institutions, the establishment, and other sectors of power may use theater to advocate certain ideologies that might be unpredictable in practice, is crucial to be recognized and discussed as they might distress the foundation of a society.

References

Afary, Janet, and Kevin B. Anderson. *Foucault and the Iranian Revolution*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Barker, Clive. "From Fringe to Alternative Theatre." *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik Leipzig,* Vol. 26, No. 1, 1978, pp. 48-62.

Billington, M. "On the World Stage: Johann Hari State of the Nation: British Theatre Since 1945." *NEW STATESMAN-LONDON,* Vol. 4869, 2007, p. 56.

Bittner, Egon. "Radicalism and the Organization of Radical Movements." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28, No. 6, 1963, pp. 928-940.

Boireau, Nicole. "Re-routing Radicalism with David Hare." *European Journal of English Studies,* Vol. 7, No.1, 2003, pp. 25-37.

Boon, Richard. *About Hare: The Playwright and the Work*. Faber & Faber, 2015.

Bull, John Stanley. *New British Political Dramatists: Howard Brenton, David Hare, Trevor Griffiths and David Edgar*. London & Basingstoke, Macmillan International Higher Education, 1984.

Deeney, John. "David Hare and Political Playwriting: Between the Third Way and the Permanent Way." *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama 1880-2005*. Oxford, John Wailey and Sons, 2006, pp. 429-40.

Dicenzo, Maria. "John McGrath and Popular Political Theatre." *A Companion to Modern British and Irish Drama, 1880-2005*, edited by Mary Luckhurst, John Wiley & Sons, 2006, 419-428.

Donesky, Finlay. *David Hare: Moral and Historical Perspectives*. London, Greenwood Press, No. 75, 1996.Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translation by: Allen Lane. London, Penguin Books, 1996.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." *Critical inquiry*, Vol.8, No. 4, 1982, pp. 777-795.

---. *Power/Knowledge*. Translation by Colin Gordon. New York, Pantheon, 1980.

Gaventa, Jonathan. "Power after Lukes: An Overview of Theories of Power Since Lukes and their Application to Development." *Brighton: Participation Group, Institute of Development Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 11, 2003.

George, Jim, and David Campbell. "Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly,* Vol. 34, No. 3, 1990, pp. 269-293.

Hare, David. "Afterword [A Lecture Given at King's College, Cambridge, March 5, 1978]. Licking Hitler. By Hare.", 1978, pp. 57-71.

---. "The Play Is in the Air: On Political Theatre." *Writing Left-Handed.* London, Faber & Faber, 1991, pp. 24-36.

---. "Hare: *The Blue Touch Paper*." Interviewed by Tony Bicat. *National Theatre Platforms*. London. 12 Oct. 2015. Live.

---. *Fanshen*. London, Faber & Faber, 1976.

Hinton, William, and Fred Magdoff. *Fanshen: A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village*. New York, NYU Press, 2008.

Hofmann, Marcelo, and Dianna Taylor. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*. London and New York, Routledge, 2011.

Homden, Carol. *The Plays of David Hare*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Honig, Bonnie. "Review essay: What Foucault Saw at the Revolution: On the Use and Abuse of Theology for Politics." *Political Theory,* Vol. 36, No. 2, 2008, pp. 301-312.

Kallen, Horace M. "Radicalism." *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*: Vol. 13, New York, Macmillan Co. and Free Press, 1968, pp. 51-52.

Kalyvas, Andreas. "The Stateless Theory." *Paradigm lost: State Theory Reconsidered*, edited by Aronowitz, Stanley, and Peter Bratsis, U of Minnesota Press, 2002, pp. 105-143

Keating, Craig. "Reflections on the Revolution in Iran: Foucault on Resistance." *Journal of European Studies,* Vol.27, No. 2, 1997, pp. 181-197.

Khaleseh Dehghan, Mohsen, and Bakhtiar Sadjadi. "Symbolic Consumption and Media in Bret Easton Ellis's Less than Zero." *Critical Literary Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2021, pp. 93-108.

Kritzer, Amelia Howe. *Political Theatre in Post-Thatcher Britain: New Writing, 1995-2005*. New York, Macmillan, 2008.

Laffey, Mark. "Things Lost and Found: Richard Ashley and the Silences of Thinking Space." *Review of International Studies,* Vol. 36, No. 4, 2010, pp. 989-1004.

Lamb, Peter, and J. C. Docherty. *Historical Dictionary of Socialism*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2006. Print.

Lin, George CS, and Samuel PS Ho. "The State, Land System, and Land Development Processes in Contemporary China." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* Vol. 95, No. 2, 2005, pp. 411-436.

Lynch, Richard A. "Foucault's Theory of Power." *Michel Foucault*, edited by D. Taylor, Routledge, 2014, pp. 21-34.

Macey, David. *The Lives of Michel Foucault*, London, Vintage, 1994.

McGrath, John. "The Year of the Cheviot." *The Cheviot, the Stag, and the Black, Black Oil*, London, Methuen, 1981.

Megson, Chris. *Modern British Playwriting: The 1970s: Voices, Documents, New Interpretations*. London, A&C Black, 2012.

Mills, Sara. *Michel Foucault.* London and New York, Routledge, 2003.

Minogue, Kenneth. "Can Radicalism Survive Michel Foucault?" *Critical Review,* Vol. 3, No. 1 ,1989, pp. 138-154.

Ozmen, Ozlem. "Turning over Feudalism with Communism and the Process of Remaking Society in David Hare's Fanshen." *Interactions*, Vol. 25, No. 1-2, 2016, pp. 135-148.

Patterson, Michael. *Strategies of Political Theatre: Post-War British Playwrights*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Rosenzweig, Franz. *Philosophical and Theological Writings*. Indianapolis/Cambridge, Hackett Publishing, 2000.

Sanders, M. S. "Stephen RC Hicks's Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault: A Discussion." *Reason Papers,* Vol. 28, 2006, pp. 111-124.

Walzer, Michael. "The Politics of Michel Foucault." *Foucault, A Critical Reader,* Edited by David Couzens. Oxford, Blackwell, 1986.