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Journalist, novelist, and short story writer, Will Self (London 1961) is considered to be a controversial character, praised and criticized for various reasons. Writers such as Martin Amis or J. G. Ballard have approved of his novels and his versatile writings, and he was included in *Granta* magazine’s list of the Best Young British Novelists (1993); other critics have emphasised his attitude of *enfant terrible*, his satirical comments about contemporary society and his provocative intention above his literary value (Hayes 1-2). A troubled childhood and adolescence led him to an early drug addiction that not only damaged his journalistic career, especially when he was dismissed by *The Observer* in 1997 for taking heroin on John Major’s plane during the general election campaign, but it also made him win the label of “Brit Bad Boy” in the contemporary literary scene (McGrath n.pag.). Self is definitely a transgressive writer who enjoys his provocative role questioning the cultural pillars upon which modern British society is based. He has been defined as a “moral satirist”; he is also a “social rebel who is more interested in shocking his middle-class readers” (Finney n.pag.) as he himself admits: “I write to astonish people” (Hayes 1). His intention is, therefore, to make his public consider moral questions, questions that are too often forgotten in our culture, as a means of improving the quality of the society which is, in his view, decadent and meaningless. He thinks contemporary culture has lost the real value of the pre-industrial age in which everyday rituals gave meaning to people’s lives; therefore he is trying to dismantle the modern pre-conceived social structure to show that we live in a meaningless world, and to demonstrate that there is an alternative and a more humanist view that popular culture is currently ignoring.

Self’s works are composed of novels, short stories and essays, revealing a nihilist concept of modern culture. Amongst his whole production, we can highlight some of his fictional work such as *Cock and Bull* (1992), *My Idea of Fun* (1993), *Great Apes* (1997), *The Book of the Dave* (2006) or his last novel *The Butt* (2008). He has also been highly acclaimed for his short fiction, in which we can include early masterpieces *The Quantity Theory of Insanity* (1991), and *Grey Area* (1994). In these two collections Self launched some of the most important themes that would become core issues in his later works.

Self is characterized by his pessimistic perception of contemporary reality, and there is a certain apocalyptic angst present in all his works. He presents this apocalyptic angst from a critical and reproachful perspective in order to promote an analysis of consciousness. There is, in fact, an affluence of themes related to mental illness, psychological imbalance, and emotional decadence in his short fiction work. Mankind in the contemporary world is presented as dehumanized and living immersed in an obsessive and absurd routine, living an emotional death within life, and making use of all sorts of drugs so as to achieve happiness and satisfaction. As Hayes comments, “Self depicts a society on the verge of psychic apocalypse as technology and deracination thwart essential human emotions” (82).

Self is not only focused on the depth of humanity’s psychological diseases, but also on society’s degeneration through various domains such as its deteriorating...
education and the lack of instruction of moral values. Most importantly, his existentialist vision of life has the precise background typical of literary movements of the end of century:

Self’s vision of contemporary society is one of decadence, forging a link between his work and that of writers from a century earlier, most prominently Oscar Wilde, Joris-Karl Huysmans, and Octave Mirbeau... As the term denotes, “decadence” suggests a sense of decay or degeneration of moral, physical, and sensory customs; it also expresses temporal concern at the end of an era, commonly expressed as the fin de siècle. (Hayes 25-26)

The loss of affection and emotions, the loss of perspective by society is depicted by Self in his fiction, in which he exaggerates reality and mingles realism with what he calls “dirty magical realism” (Hayes 5). It is also depicted in his essayistic prose, where he is explicitly sincere when expressing his personal opinions.

In his non-fiction collection Junk Mail (1995) we gain access to a selection of satirical pieces concerning a wide variety of topics published between 1991 and 1995 in different newspapers. The articles deal with his excursions to different under-world scenes such as drug subculture, the core topic in this collection, British prisons, unemployment, violence, etc. He also includes other pieces concerning issues such as television’s role in our society, British identity and various interviews with diverse British characters: either well established writers such as Martin Amis or J. G. Ballard, or alternative and provocative artists like Damien Hirst and Tracey Emin. He has defined the collection “a biopsy of our times, a tissue sample of diseased cultural and political organs” (Self b X). Consequently, it represents a set of argumentative essays that analyze different aspects of contemporary society in a satirical tone. This critical and subjective manner recalls the style of the American journalist Hunter S. Thompson, the so called Gonzo journalism in which the first person narrator tries to engage the reader through criticism and sarcasm (Hunter S. Thompson, Britannica n.pag.): “This proclivity to insinuate himself into his stories as a bona fide character has, of course, earned him the distinction of Gonzo Journalist of Britain, following in the footsteps of gonzomieister Hunter S. Thompson in the U. S.” (McGrath n.pag.).

Among all the articles, some will be selected and studied with the aim to reflect Self’s view of British society and his position with regard to the mainstream culture. We will see whether his view of contemporary British society stems from the margins as he claims it is, or, on the contrary, whether he actually belongs to a more established literary scene which he frequently criticizes.

Throughout his articles in Junk Mail (2006) we find a thoughtful picture of Britain representative in Self’s opinion about his country. He demonstrates a decadent society, in which he tends to defend the rights of the underprivileged, since they symbolise society’s failures. This can be clearly seen in his numerous articles concerning the underworld of drugs, himself having first hand experience, such as “New Crack City,” “Inside Her Majesty’s Powder Keg,” “Drug Dealer by Appointment to Her Majesty’s Government,” “Let Us Intoxicate,” etc. In all his accounts we observe how Self portrays the most decadent and damaged communities of society, where drug-takers have next to nothing, illustrating to the reader his knowledge of this world and proving his ease in these contexts. In this respect, it is apparent that Self’s interest in boasting about his previous position in drug culture emphasizes the fact that he belonged to the club: “Still, I suppose I can understand why my journalist friend needs me. The London street drug scene is as subject to the caste principle as any other part of English society; druggies identify one another by eye contact and little else” (Self a 11).
He exhibits his troubled past as a trophy proclaiming that he was, and still is, an outsider for having belonged to this marginal world. Apart from these superfluous comments, some of his articles express his most philosophical and intellectual views about drug addiction and drug policies. On the one hand, he explores the real meaning of intoxication in our society and claims people are unable to use drugs constructively: “‘alcoholics’ and ‘drug addicts’ are merely that statistically definable component of our collectivity who are paying with their lives for our inability to take a more constructive view of intoxication” (Self a 32). On the other hand, he also denounces contemporary hypocrisy towards drug usage, as there exists a meaningless line dividing socially acceptable and unacceptable drugs: “When he places drugs alongside laws and cultural taboos inveighing against their use, Self attempts to remove narcotics from moral censure, noting the hypocrisy of prohibiting street drugs when alcohol and a plethora of popular antidepressant medications have also demonstrated tragic effects” (Hayes 91). He also holds governments accountable for this hypocrisy, since they pretend to ignore illegal drug spheres where addicts are entirely forgotten. Self points out the high rate of drug conflict in British prisons, which are neglected by British authorities if they are not in risk of public scandals (Self a 43). Measures need to be taken, anti-addiction programmes need to be applied, but greater investment is needed. Self’s vindication is that: “For the moment the ADT [drug treatment unit] is struggling for its life. It desperately needs cash, cash and more cash, if it’s to continue its work of defusing the powder keg in British prisons” (Self a 51).

Although the author criticizes governments’ intervention with regard to this social reality, he does not contribute a factual solution. In his article “Street Legal,” Self narrates his trip to Amsterdam where he tries to analyse the scene of drug legalization policies and examine the real efficiency of this type of strategy. His conclusion is, therefore, that legalization is not the answer and that the problem is simply bigger: “all my research, and casual encounters, led me to believe that the iceberg was, quite simply, bigger overall . . . their policy is just as ineffective as everyone else’s, then perhaps everyone could sit down and plan a sensible, enforceable drug policy” (Self a 74-77).

Although the drug scene is highlighted throughout the book, Self does not miss the opportunity to criticize other aspects of contemporary culture that prove to be the source of the constant decadence that he greatly regrets. In his view, society is saturated with violence governing depressed areas of Britain where crime rates have increased because of the inner connection with unemployment, and economic deprivation (Self a 161). When young purposeless people are involved in void acts of violence, Self intends to defend these disoriented teenagers and underprivileged classes of society so that they may gain acknowledgment of society, whereas they are currently forgotten and ignored by citizens and politicians.

Popular culture is another of his favourite topics for criticism, whose manifestations represent, for Self, another proof of the decadence in contemporary society, demonstrated by its meaningless, uncreative, unadventurous, and mainly voyeuristic aspects. Such is the case of TV, which Self fervently attacks. We find two articles concerning this topic: “Off the Box” and “The Media Estate: Big Brother.” Whilst in the former Self simply expresses his reluctance to watch TV because in his opinion it is a waste of time and energy, in the latter he wonders about the significance of the TV society: “It is not my fault, this quintessentially modern, dare I say it, even post-modern, malaise. I didn’t set out to quit television, it just sort of left me. I admit I may not have exercised those vital television muscles enough, for the thing about television is that it actually requires a vast amount of energy” (Self a 110). He claims
that his abandonment of television is not a question of snobbism (Self a 109), but due to
the fact that programmes do not suit an intellectual audience, and they focus on
entertainment rather than information. As for the second article, which appears on the
American edition of this collection “The Media Estate: Big Brother,” we can obtain a
sharper criticism on television and his explicit opinion on how the “idiot box” is another
syndrome of contemporary cultural decadence. In this account, Self focuses his
attention on the worldwide renown TV show Big Brother, as an example of modern
television, and how we can define society by its contestants and its viewers. When Self
claims that society is made of a depersonalized bulk of people that are all equal, he is
criticising the cultural homogeneity which is spreading around the world, the so-called
globalization in which societal differences are not accepted. In addition, Self regrets
that we have achieved tolerance in our society at the cost of diversity (Self b 258). In
this respect, we no longer tolerate differences, but we standardize diversity and
exterminate variety because we cannot stand for it. In Big Brother we find this
conception of society, where “the contestants are equally unquestioning, equally sheep-
like, equally directionless, equally lacking in anything that passes for a social
conscience or a spiritual value” (Self b 258). The contestants are “a perfect biopsy of
the cancer that as I write is hypostatizing throughout our culture” (Self b 258) he has
said. However, apart from the criticism that Self makes on TV programmes, he also
attacks spectators stating that television in general and Big Brother in particular make
citizens voyeurs of real life, that is to say, millions of viewers are stuck in the armchair
watching how others live, or in Self’s opinion: “never before have so many watched so
many others, doing so very little . . . It offers us the spectacle of pure voyeurism” (Self
b 257-259).

One of the central articles in this collection is “The Valley of the Corn Dollies”
in which for the first time we observe a Will Self who is surprisingly optimistic with
regard to the nature of the British Culture. Hitherto, we have witnessed a nihilist
perspective of contemporary society, but when it comes to Self’s analysis of English
Identity we learn that he provides a proud vision of his own country and his own nature,
all with the aim of attacking the English bourgeoisie who dramatically believes the
purest English Culture is moribund: “the English . . . without wars or colonial
adventures they appeared merely passive and unassertive, with no very clear identity”
(Sampson 352). He claims that there is a late tendency of “self-loathing” (Self a 217)
due to the English cultural consumption whilst being culturally colonized by the
Americans (Self a 224); however, it is at this point when he reemerges from his
pessimism and claims that there exists an English culture that it is defined by its sense
of modernity, and youthful spirit: “Not only do I think that English culture is cool- I
also think we have been getting cooler . . . what the English are best at the moment —
and have been for some little while — is the synergy of dance, drugs and street fashion.
The youth of just about any English provincial city look infinitely cooler — to my mind
— than their contemporaries in either Seatle or Turin” (Self a 223-225). Cool Britain
has also been portrayed as “a buzzing phrase in Britain during the late 1990s. Coined by
the media to denote a renaissance in British art, fashion, design and music” (Osgerby
127). Perhaps the antique English culture of the Corn Dollies cannot represent England
any more, yet it is “a culture of profound and productive oppositions . . . Is English
culture bigoted or liberal? It is both. Is it hermetic and introverted or expansive and
cosmopolitan? It is all of these” (Self a 218-219). He likes his country, he is proud of
being English, but being English does not mean being tied to the purity of a tradition,
since this is no longer feasible due to the constant influences from all the communities
living in the UK. For Will Self, the traditional English culture does not represent his
country any more, he rejects the traditional elite’s claims of maintaining the pure Anglo-Saxon Britain, Britain is a cultural melting pot, as is many other contemporary western societies.

Throughout his articles in *Junk Mail* we gain access to Will Self’s view of Great Britain where he gives the impression of defending marginal spheres of society: drug addicts, unemployment, violence, etc. Apparently, he opts for positioning himself on the minorities’ side, denouncing the situation of the underprivileged and blaming the more affluent part of society for their current condition. When he emphasizes his criticism either of the privileged classes or of the Establishment, he remarks that his role is as an outsider detaching himself from the mainstream culture. Likewise, he defines himself as a writer of the margin claiming that he advocates the outcasts’ right of acknowledgement in society. Being a rebel implies having a strong social commitment, that is, a determination to promote social change, defending the rights of those who do not have a comfortable position, and espousing a radical critique of the elitist habits of British society, as Bataille said: “it is only by transgressing taboos that we simultaneously contrive to endorse or modify them” (Finney n.pag.). Not only does he attack political elitists concerning social injustices, but also the literary Establishment representative of the old power at Academy: “I am fiercely anti-establishment . . . as you no doubt know” (Mitchell n.pag.); on other occasions he has been more insolent: “I do think that the construct that people call the English literary establishment is so full of shit that it’s good fun to spoof it” (Idler n.pag.). His satiric intention of despising the acknowledged literary scene is rooted in the public image he loves to put forward, thus gaining importance and attention. Nevertheless, attacking the Establishment is not extraordinary: “Oxbridge was a natural target for anti-elitists, given its traditional links with the old Establishment” (Sampson 199). Being anti-elitist does not always signify existence on the margins, it can also be the natural flow of a postmodern anti-establishment tendency that opposes the system simply because being an intellectual today is no longer synonymous with being powerful or prestigious. As Sinfield suggested, intellectuals are no longer influential in politics or with ordinary citizens (Fernández Sánchez 272). Sampson, considering the world of the Academy and the intellectuals, also believes that “no profession has been more conscious of its diminishing status and political influence” (Sampson 197). For Self, the Establishment suffers from being too inscrutable in its own community and has little awareness of the state of ordinary citizens, and even less awareness of the lower classes. He accuses the Establishment of not being rooted, and ignoring the dehumanized situation of minorities, whilst enjoying privileges and prosperity. He targets well-to-do writers that live in comfort enjoying their position and fantasising about unrealistic topics: “[Fiction] ultimately it makes people very arrogant even if they are successful at it because it is so divorced from the real world” (Mitchell n.pag.).

On the contrary, he boasts about being a conscious writer, realistic and intimately linked with the real world; which is how he defends his value and his role as a writer. On many occasions he has strongly defended journalism, which he loves, due to its connection with reality. Although he expresses his interest for it, he confesses a fake modesty: “I feel genuinely guilty about not being a more conscientious journalist . . . I am just not very good at it” (Idler n.pag.). Is he suggesting that he considers himself to be a better novelist? He certainly prefers fiction, and is acclaimed in the established literary scene: “Self regards his non-fiction as secondary to his novels and short stories” (Hayes 191).

Will Self untruly shows a disdain for the literary Establishment, which secretly fascinates him, such as the admiration he has for writers like Martin Amis or J. G.
Ballard (Mitchell *n.pag.*), who inspire him as a writer. Self is not a marginal author; he belongs to an upper-middle class, he was educated at Oxford, and has a posh northern London accent as he himself has admitted (Vincent *n.pag.*). Therefore, he is closer to the Establishment than he presumes to be. Surprisingly, Self has also evaded being called a rebel, magnifying the fact that he is ambiguous and contradicts himself:

I am an arch-conformist. . . . I am exactly what my parents would have wished me to be. Obviously, the hard drug addiction was very upsetting for them. But I went to Oxford, I am a writer — where’s the rebellion? They were left-wing, middle-class intellectuals. Like me. (Tayler *n.pag.*)

Anthony Sampson, in his book *Who Runs This Place?*, states that new forms of the Establishment are rising up in the media world. TV and the press are currently gaining more power becoming an impenetrable community, a hermetic circle whose members are educated in the same schools and colleges, and share family relationships (354). Sampson recalls the journalistic trade mentioning explicitly Will Self as one of samples of this present and new tendency: “They are part of an emerging ‘media class’ which has become very aware of its importance . . . Its members come from a more limited background than politicians: most were educated at Oxbridge, live in Islington or Kensington . . . They have increasingly married within their own profession, producing husband-and-wife teams like Andrew Marr and Jackie Ashley, . . . and Will Self and Deborah Orr” (239-240).

On the other hand, it is essential to mention Self’s writing style to consider him a prominent writer, rather than a marginal one. It is well-known that he has an overwhelming vocabulary, an outstanding intelligence, and vast knowledge on all fields of study, which has provoked controversial comments suggesting suspicious intentions in his verbal incontinence. Some critics have indicated a possible inferiority complex as a writer which makes him exaggerate his language: “some reviewers of his work have suggested that he possesses an inferiority complex as a novelist which manifests itself in his exuberant writing style” (Hayes 13).

It can safely be declared that Will Self, despite claiming his anti-elitism, takes great pains to maintain the position he has already obtained as a literary and media establishment member: “Yet he is not some class warrior storming the citadels of the literary establishment from the outside but an Oxford-educated, middle-class metropolitan who, despite his protestations to the contrary in interviews, is about as much at the heart of that establishment as you can get, a place he has occupied almost from the start of his career” (Hayes 11-12).

Nonetheless, the Establishment is not the only sphere that is rejected by Self, while simultaneously existing as one of his favourite elements. Popular culture is the second as such. When performing his role of outsider, he criticizes mass culture, television and fascination with celebrities, and chooses a refined and intellectual position with regard to the crowd: “Erm… popular culture. No, I am not very keen on popular culture” (Idler *n.pag.*). Self attacks modern fame, he is irritated by celebrities and he despises the importance that modern culture gives to public recognition by arguing that people have lost their human nature. Yet, Self is one of the most recognizable media characters; in fact, some only know him for his TV contributions in chat shows such as *Room 101, Have I got News for You, Grumpy Old Men*, and *Shooting Stars* (Hayes 2). Television is another example of one of his incongruities, and is also certainly one of his contemporary weaknesses that he oddly criticises. Although he advocates that he is an outsider, he is the perfect example of the product of
contemporary society, fully immersed in popular culture, television and drugs; being also both practical and realistic, he is a sample of his own time.

All in all, what best characterizes Self as a contemporary personality are the contradictions he embodies when alleging his defense of deprived minorities. Although he considers himself to be an outsider, he is constantly prowling around the established literary sphere, and socialising with honoured writers. It seems that under his committed masquerade he is unexpectedly contradictory in terms of what he claims and how he behaves. Thus, his anti-elitist position is merely an example of “window-dressing,” a bold statement to *epater le bourgeois* without real foundations. On the other hand, not only does he belong to the intellectual class, he is also submerged in the popular masses through his presence in appealing TV shows. He is a media character that demonstrates interest in engaging a popular audience with his controversial comments and criticism. Television makes him accessible to a greater range of the public, more than is accessible through newspapers or even novels, giving him the label of a celebrity that he has so often despised: “this mixture of so-called high- and low-cultural references, expressed in a style that synthesizes these two poles in its blend of Mandarin and popular vernacular formulations, is at the core of Self’s style” (Hayes 49).

Therefore, it is evident that Will Self, as a satirical writer, spares no one. He has earned a name that benefits him economically; yet he still condemns all frustrations of society and he does not provide a real alternative or an effective answer for all the problems he deplores. On some occasions he has revealed that his purpose is to make people think and to demonstrate to his public that present-day society is senseless and degenerated. His purpose is to raise people’s awareness of the problems; which is the first step to solve them. On other occasions, he exhibits extravagant methods that, instead of offering authentic solutions, provoke more excitement and discussion, one such example is the so-called “psychogeography” in which a kind of urban hiking becomes a way of giving the world some meaning. In his walks, he is able to better understand the world and experience it in a new light (Bures n.pag.). He believes that he is contributing a solution to the lack of values in contemporary society by utilizing these techniques; however, they more closely resemble spiritual or philosophical elucidations rather than practical forms of action. His criticism is advantageous for consciousness-raising, which is obviously crucial in a paralyzed society, but he does not provide a forceful proposal to change the state of things in a crucial way.

I argue that Will Self, despite trying to present himself as a pure outsider through his satires and criticism, displays certain contradictions that lead us to think that he belongs to the Establishment, regardless of his attempts to make us believe otherwise. However, Will Self is not an isolated instance, but one of many examples that belong to a natural evolution among anti-elitists. Let us remember some of the authors that fascinate Self: Martin Amis and J. G. Ballard. They are considered two of the most regarded writers within the contemporary established literary scene; however, these two writers were marked as marginal authors at one point in their careers, and still they always defined themselves as such. In a way, Self is following the steps of his predecessors, and is reproducing the patterns that similar authors took before him: “With Amis having already passed through the unasked for role of enfant terrible that Self is now encountering, there is something to the idea that Amis has mapped out some of the territory that Self is now exploring” (Mitchell n.pag.). In this respect, young novelists normally show a lot of promise in the literary sphere with a critical and transgressive attitude in regard to their surrounding; they seem nonconformist and question the values of the society in which they belong. These young writers rebel against the literary environment of their time, an environment that, despite its rejection
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and disdain, will end up being accepted and will integrate them as new members. This is the model that J. G. Ballard and Martin Amis symbolise, precursors of what Self will probably become.

Ballard was regarded as a writer of the margins; he was a science fiction author, a representative of modernity and an opponent of tradition in diverse fields, including literature. He vindicated his role as an outsider not only for his alternative conception of reality, but also due to his position towards more traditionalist authors: “I felt that—without naming any names—the mainstream writers I met in the sixties . . . were still mentally living in an England that hadn’t changed since the 1930’s . . . If I have not taken part in the English literary scene it is because I don’t feel that I have much to talk about with A.S. Byatt or Karl Miller, with no disrespect to them” (Self a 357). Despite his efforts, Ballard has been considered one of the key figures in the British literary scene, having won a place within the literary Establishment: “I feel that you like to reject, as I do, the English image of the writer as a superior craftsman who wears a tweed jacket with leather arm patches . . . but on the other hand, you seem to embody the Magrittian idea of a very bourgeois lifestyle and a wild imagination. So there is a sort of contradiction there, isn’t there?” (Self a 355-56).

We can also refer to Martin Amis as another intellectual reference for Self. Both have often been compared to one another for their similar trajectory, style, and attitude. Amis is an *enfant terrible* in Literature, an instigator and a confrontational figure, characteristics with which he has earned the image of a rebel, an image reflected by Self as well. Like Self, Amis is also one of the most prominent writers in contemporary literature, an indisputable part of the literary Establishment: “At forty-five, Amis has for some years been at the peak of his profession. Whether it is a shibboleth or not, he is almost ceaselessly referred to as the leading writer of his generation; ‘the most talented contemporary English writer’” (Self a 324).

We can therefore observe parallelism between Amis and Self, both short fiction writers who have experience with journalism and whose novels have a pronounced urban tone where contemporary decadence is the central theme of their narratives: “‘I was thinking about Martin last night,’ admits Self, ‘about the way that our careers run quite parallel in some ways’” (Mitchell n.pag.). Some commentators have stood out the analogy amongst Will Self and writers like Ballard or Amis, as well as the evident similarity of their literary paths, to the point of suggesting that Self will end up being an essential writer of the Literary Establishment, despite his attempts to look otherwise. In this context, Anthony Sampson mentioned that being anti-establishment was a necessary requirement to settle oneself as a part of the Establishment: “In journalism, art and literature no newcomers could make their mark without showing themselves to be anti-establishment” (357). In other words, those who wish to integrate themselves in the mainstream need to puzzle the public opinion by claiming to be anti-establishment. By defending the deprived spheres of society, they may attain prestige, which allows them to gain access to the core of the Establishment.

It can be said that the Establishment is very powerful in an attractive way, which makes it tremendously difficult for an outsider to remain on the margins, and at some point they feel tempted by the main current. In this respect, Sampson declared: “A new generation of ambitious politicians and businessmen could build their careers on their reputations as outsiders who claimed to represent the interests of ordinary people against an entrenched and privilege elite. The anti-establishment soon became more potent than the establishment” (357). It is true that many anti-elitists like Self benefit from a popular support that the official system lacks, and the influence they enjoy is what most attracts them to pretend to be on the margins. In the end, it is not easy to
endure a position on the margins forever: there is a time in which the main culture absorbs the outsider to assimilate it: “In practice it is not easy to kick free from the mainstream cultural apparatus” (Sinfield XXV) and Will Self is the best sample to prove it.
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