

## 1<sup>st</sup> Sem Major

### Unit 6: Literature of the modernist and postmodernist period: from 1920 to the present(Credit:1/2)

#### **1. Old and new writing: Practitioners, Promoters, and The Little Magazines-**

The term "old and new writing" may refer to a specific publication or body of work that discusses the role of practitioners and promoters in the context of little magazines. However, the exact title and author cannot be confirmed from the search results alone, and a PDF of the specific text is not available.

**History of little magazines:** Margaret Anderson, 1951 American editor Margaret Anderson founded The Little Review in 1914. There were four principal periods in the general history of little magazines. In the first, from 1890 to about 1915, French magazines served mainly to establish and explain a literary movement, while British and American magazines served to disseminate information about and encourage acceptance of continental European literature and culture. In the second stage, 1915–30, when other magazines, especially in the United States, were in the vanguard of almost every variation of modern literature, a conspicuous feature was the expatriate magazine, published usually in France but occasionally elsewhere in Europe by young American and British critics and writers. The major emphasis in this period was upon literary and aesthetic form and theory and the publication of fresh and original work, such as that of Ernest Hemingway (in *The Little Review*, *Poetry*, *This Quarter*, and other publications), T.S. Eliot (in *Poetry*, *Egoist*, and *Blast*) James Joyce (in *Egoist*, *The Little Review*, transition), and many others. The third stage, the 1930s, saw the beginnings of many leftist magazines, started with specific doctrinal commitments that were often subjected to considerable editorial change in the career of the magazine. *Partisan Review* was perhaps the best-known example of these in the United States, as was the *Left Review* in England.

#### **2. Society and Society: The new novelists of the 1920s and 1930s:**

While many of the novelists of the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century showed continuity with the Victorian literary conditions, more radically modern writing began to emerge specially in the works of James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and D.H. Lawrence. The novel remained the major source of important English Literature in the new century.

The rise of the novel in the 1920s and 1930s saw an attempt by Chinese authors to produce fiction largely inspired by the Western novel of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There was a social and political impetus toward this effort to create a new novel: the need for literature to reflect and critique social realities during a prolonged period of crisis and turmoil and a burgeoning nationalist movement. Literature was conscripted into the cause of national rejuvenation; authors received imaginary marching orders and endeavoured to contribute to the collective cause through fiction. The rise of the novel in the 1920s and 1930s saw an attempt by Chinese authors to produce fiction largely inspired by the Western novel of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There was a social and political impetus toward this effort to create a new novel: the need for literature to reflect and critique social realities during a prolonged period of crisis and turmoil and a burgeoning nationalist

movement. Literature was conscripted into the cause of national rejuvenation; authors received imaginary marching orders and endeavoured to contribute to the collective cause through fiction. On a formal level, realism sought to dislodge traditional Chinese literature's reliance on classical genres and outdated linguistic registers. Modern realism endeavoured to adopt a standardised written national vernacular, known as baihua, that would become a literary lingua franca congruent with a national spoken standard. Authors sought inspiration from the plot structure and organisation of modern Western novels and did away with traditional novelistic conventions of the linked-chapter structure that were often episodic. Literary prose focused on interiorisation and the narration of conscious thought, which was by comparison lacking in traditional narrative forms.

However, the Chinese realist novel was not without its detractors. Some decried realism's fidelity to political imperatives at the cost of individual freedom of expression. Writers and critics argued among themselves about what modern literature should be. Moreover, popular literature that combined both traditional narrative and modern techniques continued to be widely read; they dealt with mass market themes like romance and martial arts adventure and boasted a far larger readership than the more high-minded literature of intellectuals. As China entered a war of resistance against the Japanese invasion in the late 1930s and 1940s, culture would be mobilised in the war effort. The critical realism of the 1920s and 1930s was seen as increasingly out of touch with the lives and struggles of the inland rural peasantry. Especially within the Communist controlled areas, writers adopted more politically oriented literature that incorporated folk styles and themes popular among the peasantry.

### **3.Dividing and Ruling: Britain in the 1950s:**

The Divide and Rule policy, also known as the "divide and conquer" strategy, was a British colonialist policy used in India to keep the different Indian religions and ethnicities divided. This allowed the British to maintain their power and control over India for centuries. In this blog post, we will discuss the history of the Divide and Rule policy and how it impacted Indian society. We will also explore the effects of imperialism on India.

#### *The Divide and Rule Policy*

The Divide and Rule policy is a strategy that was used by the British during colonial rule in India. This policy was used to keep the Indians divided so that they would be easier to control. The British used this policy to create divisions among the different religious groups, castes, and ethnicities. They also used it to put different regions against each other.

The British used the Divide and Rule policy to their advantage in many ways. One way was by controlling the media. They would only allow certain information to be published in the newspapers. This would help them control what the people were thinking and believing. Another way they used this policy was by giving preferential treatment to certain groups over others. This would create jealousy and resentment among the groups. The British also used this policy to exploit the natural resources of India. They would give certain areas more development than others. This would cause unrest and conflict between the regions. The British also used this policy to control the education system in India. They would only allow

certain people to get an education. This would create a class system in India that still exists today.

The Divide and Rule policy was used by the British for many years. It was not until after Indian independence in 1947 that this policy finally came to an end. The Divide and Rule policy had a lasting impact on Indian society. It created divisions among the people that are still evident today.

#### Imperialism

The British used the Divide and Rule policy to control India for many years. This had a lasting impact on Indian society. Imperialism is when one country controls another country politically, economically, and/or culturally. The British controlled India politically by making it a colony. They controlled the economy by exploiting natural resources and labour. They also controlled the culture by imposing their values and beliefs on the people, and, they used Divide and Rule Strategy. The British imperialists were not the only ones to have an impact on India. The Dutch, French, and Portuguese also had colonies in India. These other colonial powers also used the Divide and Rule policy to control their colonies. Imperialism had a very negative impact on India. It led to the exploitation of the people and the resources. It also caused divisions among the different religious and ethnic groups. Imperialism is one of the main reasons why India is such a diverse and divided country today. Unravelling the Policy. The Imperial policy of Divide and Rule was one of the major causes of the outbreak of the Indian Rebellion of 1857. The British had succeeded in playing off one group against another and in fomenting communal disharmony. However, the Indians united to throw out the British during the Rebellion. After the Rebellion, the British changed their policy and adopted the policy of Divide and Maintain to prevent any such united front against them. They succeeded in this by playing off different groups against each other and by creating communal disharmony. The British also used divide and rule to prevent the rise of any leader who could unite the people against them. This policy was successful in preventing any further united front against British rule. The policy of divide and rule began to unravel in the early 20th century, with the rise of leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, who were able to unite the people against British rule. The policy of divide and rule also contributed to the growth of separatist movements, such as the Muslim League and the Sikh separatist movement. The British were also unable to prevent the growth of communist and socialist parties, which united the people against British rule. The policy of divide and rule finally collapsed with the independence of India and Pakistan in 1947.

The Divide and Rule policy was a British imperialistic strategy employed in India to keep the Indian people divided. This allowed the British to rule over India with little resistance for nearly two centuries. However, the movements like the Quit India Movement and many more brought Indians together to demand an end to such an oppressive colonial legacy. While many challenges were faced, it was heartening to see Indians coming together and fighting for their rights and for reclaiming their identity.

#### **4.The New Theatre:**

From *The Short Oxford History of English Literature*, by Andrew Sanders. It was assumed at the time, and it continues to be assumed, that John Osborne's play *Look Back in Anger*, which opened at the Royal Court Theatre in London on 8 May 1956, marked either a 'revolution' or

a 'watershed' in the history of the modern British theatre. The play certainly shocked its first audiences, as well as some of its more perceptive critics, into responsive attention. It is also sometimes claimed that the play single-handedly provoked theatre managers and theatre companies out of their complacent faith in the middle-class virtues of 'the well-made play' and into a response to a new kind of drama which grappled with 'the issues of the day'. Osborne's play was revolutionary neither in its form nor in its politics; it was, however, by the standards of its time, alarming in its rancour, its language, and its setting. After *Look Back in Anger*, out went the country drawing-room with its platitudes and its sherry; in came the provincial bed-sitter with its noisy abuse and its ironing-board. The accepted theatrical illusion of a neat, stratified, and deferential society was superseded by dramatic representations of untidy, antagonistic, and disenchanting groups of characters grating on one another's, and on society's, nerves. The social class of these characters may not have changed, but their social assumptions and their conversation had. The transformation of the English theatre in the late 1950s and early 1960s was both more gradual and more truly radical than can be explained by focusing on a single production or on the work of a single playwright. Before 1956 British drama, and the London stage in particular, had been far more open to new influences, both from home and abroad, than is often supposed. The theatre could, and did, fall back on its inherited tradition of plays and acting styles, notably in its rethinking of Shakespeare and in its revivals of more recent English, Irish, and European dramas. Although the record-breaking run of Agatha Christie's *The Mousetrap* at the Ambassadors Theatre may tell us something about the resilience of certain theatrical conventions and styles (the play opened in November 1952 and is still going strong in the 1990s), it does little to illustrate the real challenges that a discriminating theatre-goer might have discovered in the London theatres of the late 1940s and early 1950s. The repertoires of West End theatres and their provincial counterparts may, for the most part, have been selected so as not to offend the sensibilities of audiences happy with a pattern of light-hearted banter divided into three acts by two generous bar-intervals, but that does not tell the whole story. The work of two native playwrights, Christopher Fry and Terence Rattigan (1911-77), belies the accusation of theatrical blandness with which some literary historians have damned the immediate post-war period. Since the 1960s, however, the dramatic achievement of both writers has been commonly belittled as irredeemably genteel. Fry's attempts to revive the fortunes of poetic drama both derived from, and was contemporary with, T. S. Eliot's later experiments in the same genre. Like Eliot, Fry saw poetry as the vehicle for a re-exploration of religious mystery in the theatre; unlike him, he never quite found a voice or a subject which satisfactorily echoed the essentially agnostic prosiness of modern life and thought. He put his considerably international success in the early 1950s down to what he saw as a reaction against 'surface realism' in the theatre, with its 'sparse, spare, cut-and-dried language', and to a post-war world which longed again for a poetry of 'richness and reaffirmation'. With hindsight, it now seems that his hopes of re-creating an Elizabethan ambience, in which 'the accent of the living' was placed firmly on 'the adventuring soul', proved as ephemeral as his once inflated reputation. Nevertheless, the original commercial success of the comedies *A Phoenix too Frequent* (1946), *The Lady's Not for Burning* (1948), and *Venus Observed* (1950) and of the church pageant *A Sleep of Prisoners* (1951) (performed throughout England as part of the Festival of Britain), cannot be put down solely to the excellence of their original casts. At its worst, Fry's verse can seem

mannered, arch, and effete; at its best, it enables him to distance his dramatic discourse from 'surface realism' to play with the effects of alienation, of the unexpected, and of metaphysical oddity.

Rattigan is a far more impressive dramatist. He was neither an innovator nor a particularly cerebral writer, but he was a profound sympathizer with the cause of the victims of what he saw as the tyrannous hypocrisies, the double standards, and the emotional coldness of 'respectable' British society. Although his first theatrical success, *French Without Tears* (which ran for 1,039 performances in 1936), made few real demands on either the emotions or the intellect, his equally 'well-made' post-war plays took up the themes of vulnerability and victimization. The upper-class Rattigan's sympathy with the wounded outsider, and with the insider compromised by his or her emotional choices, can certainly be related to his own discreet homosexuality (discreet in the sense that he made no parade of it, though he later acted as an appreciative and generous champion of Joe Orton). In *The Winslow Boy* (1946), a middle-class father determines to play by constitutional rules in battling against the oppressive weight of the British Establishment. In *The Deep Blue Sea* (1952), however, an equally middle-class character, the wife of a judge, determinedly breaks social rules by having a passionate affair with a bluff, down-at-heel RAF officer and by desperately attempting suicide. If this is not quite the world of *Look Back in Anger*, the play is set in a furnished flat which has 'an air of dinginess, even of squalor, heightened by the fact that it has, like its immediately blitzed neighbourhood, so obviously "come down into the world"'. People and places which have come down in the world also figure in the pair of one-act plays, *Separate Tables* (1954), set in the ironically named *Beauregard Private Hotel* near Bournemouth. The second pair of the two, 'Table Number Seven', highlights the complementary emotions of two of the *Beauregard's* 'guests', a repressed girl and a bogus major who has been found guilty of molesting women in a local cinema. It exposes a communal pretence to 'virtue' which is far more damaging to society than the major's assumption of respectability, but it also affirms the possibility of a new strength emerging from the dismantling of protective illusions.

in 1946 whether 'a vigorous theatre can exist on the cerebral subtleties of Huis Clos and Caligula alone', the much-vaunted intellectuality of Paris did not prove completely alien to London. Nor did the sometimes-shocking vitality of the new American drama. Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie* (1945) was produced in 1948 and *A Streetcar Named Desire* (1947) in 1949 (with Vivien Leigh as Blanche du Bois). *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof* (1955), having been refused a licence by the Lord Chamberlain in 1958, had, however, to be privately performed under the auspices of a 'theatre club'. Less controversially, Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman* (1949) appeared at the Phoenix Theatre in 1949. His *The Crucible* (1952) at the Bristol Old Vic in 1954, and his *A View from the Bridge* (1955) at the Comedy Theatre in London in October 1956. Perhaps the most striking theatrical event of all was the visit to London of the Berliner Ensemble in August 1956, some two weeks after the death of its founder, Bertolt Brecht. The company brought with them their celebrated productions (in German) of Brecht's *Mother Courage, The Caucasian Chalk Circle*, and his less-known adaptation of Farquhar's *The Recruiting Officer—Pauken und Trompeter*. Brecht's work, which proved so influential over a new generation of British playwrights, was, up to that time, little

known to British theatre audiences (though there had been an amateur production of Galileo in Birmingham in 1947 and a professional staging of Mother Courage in Barnstaple in 1955). With benefit of hindsight, it is arguable that by far the most significant 'foreign' novelty to be performed in London in the years immediately preceding the appearance of *Look Back in Anger* was Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. The play opened to largely dismayed reviews at the small Arts Theatre in August 1955, but reports of the sensation it had caused in Paris to years earlier, coupled with a real enough and discriminating curiosity, allowed it to transfer for a longer run at the Criterion Theatre a month later. The success of *Waiting for Godot* in London cannot be simply put down to a yearning for innovation on the part of a theatre-going intelligentsia; the play also contained distinct echoes of a truly 'alternative', but often despised, British theatrical tradition, that of music-hall comedy. In Beckett's hands, however, that tradition had been transformed by a sparse, but none the less definitive, musicality and by a dialogue rich in literary resonance. Beckett (1906-89), born near Dublin, educated (like Wilde before him) at Portora Royal School and at Trinity College, and since 1937 permanently resident in Paris, cannot be slickly or imperially fitted into a narrowly 'English' tradition of English writing and English theatre. He was an English-speaking, Protestant Irishman, and, as the full range of his work demonstrates, his highly literate, cricket-playing, Bible-reading, Irish background had a profound bearing on what and how he wrote. Having worked closely with James Joyce and his international circle in Paris in the late 1920s, Beckett also remained part of a polyglot and polyphonic world of literary innovation. His earliest publications (which, apart from his work as a translator and a novelist, include an essay on Joyce and a study of Proust) also testify to his espousal of a Modernism which transcended frontiers and what were often presumed to be the impassible barriers between languages. Beckett continued to work in both English and French, with French often taking precedence over his native tongue. His work, however, ceased to be tied to a monoglot environment once it had undergone the scrupulous linguistic metamorphosis which marks his own acts of translation (his puns, for example, are often exclusively and inspired English). Although his trilogy of novels, *Molloy*, and *Malone meurt* (1951) and *L'Innommable* (1953) had established Beckett as amongst the most discussed and respected of the avant-garde Parisian writers in the early 1950s, it was *Godot* (also originally written in French) that gave him a wide international reputation. That reputation was cemented by his later work for the theatre, notably the plays known by their English titles as *Endgame* (1957), *Krapp's Last Tape* (1960), and *Happy Days* (1962). He also wrote innovatively for the radio (*All that Fall* of 1957, *Embers* of 1959, *Words and Music* of 1962, and *Cascando* of 1963) and for BBC television (*Eh, Joe* of 1965 and *Ghost Trio* of 1977). His one foray into the cinema, *Film* (a complex 'script' designed as a tribute to Buster Keaton in 1964), was remarkable not simply for its nods to a cinematic comedy rooted in music-hall and for its visual puns on the philosophical ideas of being and seeing but also for its silence broken only by the sound of a voice saying 'sssh'.

Beckett was consistent in his use of drama as an extension of his wider interest in the gaps, the jumps, and the lurches which characterize the functioning and the malfunctioning of the human mind. In his plays—as much as in his novels—ideas, phrases, images, and minds overlap; voices both interrupt and inherit trains of thought begun elsewhere or nowhere and separate consciousnesses both impede and impress themselves on one another. Beckett's

dialogue, for which *Waiting for Godot* is particularly remarkable, is the most energetic, densely layered, and supple written by any twentieth-century playwright; his comedy, whether visual, verbal, ritual, or even, at times, slapstick is amongst the most subtle and surprising. The set of *Waiting for Godot* may, for example, require simply the suggestion of 'a country road' and 'a tree'; *Endgame* may take place in a 'bare interior' and the designer of *Happy Days* may be instructed to aim for a 'maximum of simplicity and symmetry' in the representation of an 'expanse of scorched grass rising centre to low mound' but the static baldness of Beckett's visual statements serves both to counterpoise and complement the animation of his verbal ones. When Beckett uses blindness, as he does with Hamm in *Endgame*, he suggests that one kind of deprivation may alert audiences to the force of alternative ways of perceiving. When, by contrast, he uses silence, as in *Film* and the mime play *Act without Words II* (1967), he seems to be directing his audiences to explore the value of new sensory and physical formulations. Beckett never plays with minimalism and reductionism simply for the sake of the aesthetic effects he could achieve. In parallel to the work of certain Modernist architects and composers, if without their Puritan frugality, he was exploring the radical potential of the idea that 'less is more'. Time-present, as when Beckett represents it in his plays, is broken, inconsistent, and inconsequential. Nevertheless, in each play he allows for the intrusion of a past which is oppressively rich in the larger inconsistencies of private and public history. Krapp's *Last Tape* and the two far sparser later plays, *Footfalls* and *That Time* (both 1976), make much out of the involuntary, untidy, quirky, and even ghost-haunted memories of the old. These memories negate linear concepts of time and of ageing as much as they disturb old assumptions about 'plot'. The structural principles on which he built both his plays and his novels can be related back to the pattern of ideas explored in 1931 in the dense critical essay on Proust. When, for example, he insists on Proust's 'contempt for a literature that "describes"', or when he affirms that 'there is no escape from yesterday because yesterday has deformed us, or been deformed by us', or when he describes 'the attempt to communicate where no communication is possible' as 'merely a simian vulgarity, or horribly comic', it is possible to recognize the extent to which his theatrical innovation was rooted both in a literary precedent and in a coherent Modernist philosophical statement. Beckett continued to be fascinated by what he saw as Proust's concern with the protective significance of habit: 'Habit is a compromise effected between the individual and his environment, or between the individual and his own organic eccentricities, the guarantee of a dull inviolability, the lightning-conductor of his existence.' His own dramatic repetitions and iterations, his persistent echoes and footfalls, emerge not from a negative view of human existence, but from an acceptance of 'dull inviolability' as a positive, if minimally progressive, force. As his inviolable and unsentimental Krapp also seems to have discovered, a path forward lay in exploring the resonances of the circumambient darkness.

Although Beckett gradually came to be recognized as the most important dramatist writing in English in the latter half of the twentieth century, his work initially struck many early critics as emerging from a largely foreign tradition of symbolic and philosophically based drama. If the purely British shock waves radiating from John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* in 1956 need to be accounted for, it was because Osborne's work was more obviously a response to, as much as a reaction against, an established native theatrical tradition. His was the rebellion of an insider. Osborne (b. 1929) had served his apprenticeship as an actor in

provincial touring companies and his plays show an appreciation both of the craftsmanship that went into the making of the respectable 'well-made play' and of the art that allows a Wilde, a Shaw, a Coward, and a Rattigan to transcend conventions while exploiting them. Osborne's sometimes painful witticisms can be as carefully and devastatingly placed as are those of Wilde and Coward, his confrontations and surprises can be as telling as those of Rattigan, his invectives and monologues can be as provocative as Shaw's. However, the origins of Osborne's style do not lie exclusively in what was once known as 'the legitimate theatre' but are also found in the noisier, often impromptu and far more various world of vaudeville. Where Beckett's debts to an inherited tradition of music-hall lie in his appreciation of deadpan humour and careful timing, Osborne's are revealed in his love of the outrageous, of the suggestive and, above all, of loud-mouthed repartee. It was a debt acknowledged in his forceful juxtaposition of a shabby and increasingly outdated type of theatre with a faded and redundant British imperialism in *The Entertainer* (1957). *Look Back in Anger* introduced the noisiest of what contemporary journalists dubbed the 'angry young men' to theatre audiences. Osborne's hero, Jimmy Porter, is 25 and 'a disconcerting mixture of sincerity and cheerful malice, of tenderness and freebooting; restless, importunate, full of pride, a combination which alienates the sensitive and insensitive alike'. He was for the 1950s what the restless, idealistic, public-school misfits had been to the 1930s (Porter's father, we learn, had fought in Spain, but Porter himself is neither an idealist nor an ex-public schoolboy). He is, and his wife's friend Alison recognizes, 'born out of his time.' He is a revolutionary without a revolution, or, to put it in terms readily grasped in the 1950s, he is a rebel without a cause. He fulminates against the crumbling authority of what he identifies as Establishment values; his wife's middle-class and ex-Indian army parents; his Sandhurst-educated, Member of Parliament brother-in-law (characterized as 'the platitude from outer space'); bishops and church bells; the intellectually pretentious Sunday newspapers; English music (Vaughan Williams) and English literature (Shakespeare, Eliot, 'Auntie Wordsworth'). Nevertheless, Jimmy Porter is the protagonist in an otherwise affirmative play, one in which love and loyalty are tested and are found, despite the strains, not to be wanting. He may be a new type of character, classless, restless, and aimless, but his dramatic context was largely conventional. When a middle-aged Jimmy Porter returned to the stage in Osborne's play *Déjà Vu* in 1992, the force of those dramatic and philosophical conventions became self-evident.

### **5.The New Novelists of the 1950s:**

**Overview:** A group of writers dubbed *Nouveaux Romanciers*, "new novelists", emerged in the mid-1950s. Vivian Mercier considered Michel Butor, Alain Robbe-Grillet, and Nathalie Sarraute to be the core of the group, becoming known through their theoretical writings about their writing practices in addition to their novels. This group has commonly been expanded by critics to include other innovative writers who had published with Les Éditions de Minuit under Jérôme Lindon, such as Samuel Beckett, Marguerite Duras, Claude Ollier, Robert Pinget and Claude Simon. The style had different approaches but generally rejected the traditional use of chronology, plot, and character in fiction, as well as the omniscient narrator. The Nouveau Roman authors were open to influences from writers such as Dostoevsky, Joyce, Faulkner, and Kafka, as well as the cinema.

**Theory:** The earliest theoretical writings about the Nouveau Roman were the four essays by Nathalie Sarraute compiled in 1956, *L'Ère du soupçon (The Age of Suspicion)*. Alain Robbe-Grillet and Michel Butor also published essays on the nature and future of the novel which were collected in *Pour un Nouveau Roman* (1963) and *Essais sur le roman* (1969), respectively. Rejecting many of the established features of the novel to date, Robbe-Grillet regarded many earlier novelists as old-fashioned in their focus on plot, action, narrative, ideas, and character. Instead, he put forward a theory of the novel as focused on objects: the ideal *nouveau roman* would be an individual version and vision of things, subordinating plot, and character to the details of the world rather than enlisting the world in their service. The Nouveau Roman literary movement and the novels themselves were further theorized by Jean Ricardou, who in addition to his theoretical works (e.g., *Problèmes du Nouveau Roman*) also published *nouveaux romans* himself, such as *L'Observatoire de Cannes* (1961), *La Prise de Constantinople* (1965), and *Les Lieux-dits* (1969). He also organized, directed, and published the proceedings of several conferences on the *nouveau roman*, including the 1971 conference and debate at Cerisy, published in two volumes: *Nouveau roman: hier, aujourd'hui*, which added to an understanding of the history of that period. Just before his death in 2016, he was working on a book of interviews with Amir Biglari, in which he provided an account of the Nouveau Roman movement.