

Yunyeong Jung

**“Mistake makes people” • Dealing with one's mistake determines one's future in Apted's**

### **'56 Up'**

I would like to argue that in Apted's '56 Up' the central problem is the question of what determines their future. Life is a sequence of choices. When I say choice, this choice means people's action and behavior that affect their future. Dealing with one's own mistake determines one's own future. Firstly, I would like to argue that determining one's future can be best approached by thinking about the question of accepting one's mistakes, through the question of acceptance and perceiving can make their next move. Secondly, I would argue that determining one's future is also engaged with the issue of how people cope and fix their mistakes through the question of by facing mistakes, they can fix and even able to make better future.

I am not arguing that determining what to do with one's mistakes would only lead to success and happy life. Definition of success or happiness is relative. My argument is that by looking at their mistake as the next movement to reconcile, we will be able to see how the choice determines their future as well as the happiness they desired.

Firstly, let me address my argument regarding dealing with one's own mistake determines future and the question of how accepting one's mistake determines future. By Accepting mistakes , we are able to perceive what problems we encountered. This helps choosing our next movement and help us become better person, ends up determining one's future. In '56 UP', Suzy said "We all

make mistakes in everything from parenting to decisions in life. You make mistakes and that's how you become the person you are." I agree with her opinion. Mistakes make what person you are, but at the same time, how to deal with the mistake also makes what person you are, too. For example, Neil, living in a Liverpool suburb, had a middle class life. On his age 21, Neil said that he'd like to be somebody in important position, possibly in politics. However at the age 35, he was continuing his homeless life for over 7 years. When Apted asked him what are you likely be doing, he answered with uncertain and devastating discouraged voice, "I tend to think I will be wandering around London". He chose his life to be uncertain and planned vaguely at that time. It was his mistake not to determine his next move. However, when he accepted his mistake and perceived the problem, he could move on from homeless life to councilmen life as he desired in age 21. Also, Suzy said she had no career, but instead on age 28, she have 2 sons. At the age 42, she became mother of 3 kids, the job of huge responsibility and duties. If Suzy conceived her non-career as a problem, or a mistake of her life, then she might have dealt with it and made a difference. She might became a career woman with 3 kids, or became a career woman with no kid. However, she did not perceive non career as her problem. She instead chose her life to focus with kids. Even though that's opposite of what she imagined in her 7 to 20s. I am saying that there are lots of perspectives on perceiving what problem they have in their life. Neil perceived his homeless life as problem, so he dealt with it. Suzy perceived her non career situation, and instead dealt it as a problem to be fixed, she determines to have kids and focus on them. To perceive problems they have is that much important to determine their future. Also, just like Susan Pederson said, "the films do tell us much about the nature of class and social change in Britain across the past half century. ", Apted was trying to imply how social background and

circumstance of England affects the kids' future. Apter might be right. Suzy not having a career might be because of the England circumstance at that time. Maybe the social change has effected on Suzy's life. However, Neil kept complaint how children inherit from parents. Even though Neil was a middle class kid, he merely inherited and end up being homeless for a long time. He has no impact of having middle social status parents. I argue this shows how parent's social status merely impacted Neil's career and life. Susan Pederson also said, "Neil supposedly lost his way and became a squatter due to a "nervous complaint," but did he in truth receive the help he needed?". This concludes my argument of what determines their life is not a social status, but the choice they make through perceiving problems and accepting mistake. Though, England's devastated 80s social circumstance might have effected Neil to become a homeless, but him being a councilmen was because Neil chose to live so, after perceiving his problems, not because of the social circumstance. The fact that Neil has not married and no children might be derived from his relationship between parents. His anger of family has effected his thought on marriage and not having kids. His form of family ends up being alone with no wife and no kids, and this may effect England society back. However, when Neil became councilmen, at the age of 42, he was satisfied and even enjoyed to looking at his future, unlike when he interviewed devastatingly when he was 35 years old. Just like what Alon Confino said, he has turned his life around: "What's the most enjoyable thing in life for the moment? I guess looking at the future." Whether he made his own family or not, he was enjoying his life. The society effected kids' future and might have caused their mistake, but the future depends on how the kids are going to deal with their mistake. For example, the way Neil chose to reconcile his mistake as homeless, he was able to enjoy his future as councilmen. This concludes my argument as well as what Alon Confino

said, "Our ideas of limitations and possibilities are dialectically related, one a constitutive element of the other. Limitations in our society exist, and discrimination is real. But one also feels limited-regardless of wealth and influence-precisely because the ethos, and at times the reality, of our society emphasizes unlimited opportunities and happiness. Shining through 42 Up is the idea that limitations of income and status remain, but they coexist with a perception of increased possibilities in everyday life: in consumption, sexual orientation, and forms of family, among other things." Eventually, I am arguing that unlike what Apter expected as social circumstance might affect kid's life, it was the kid's movement that affected its own life. The movement of how the kid accepts mistakes and perceiving problem strongly affects their own life better than the social circumstance.

Secondly, let me now address my argument regarding what determines one's own future and the question of how fixing one's mistake affects one's life. As I said earlier, when people perceives problem and fix their mistakes, they can even make better future. For example, Neil fixed his problem by not quitting. He accepted his mistake and fixed his mistake. That's how he end up becoming a councilman instead of a homeless. This shows my argument that how to fix one's own mistake determines own's future, not the class inequality as Apter said. Just as Susan Pederson's essay, "From the outset, he imagined the project as an indictment of class inequality. He wanted to make, as he put it, "a nasty piece of work about these kids who have it all, and these other kids who have nothing." " ,Apter tried to see if class inequality effects kid's life. However, if this Apter's thought was correct, then Symon, the lower class kid, would have same lower class life as still. However, Symon didn't end up lower class life nor unhappy life as what Apter thought. Symon actually became wealthy enough to send his family a trip to oversea.

Unlike what Apter expected, class inequality had nothing to do with the kid's future. Instead, fixing their own problem determined their future to be happy or not. For example, Symon wanted to be a good dad since he was 7. On age 28, he succeeded his life to become a family with a wife and 5 children. However, he made a mistake of ditching on his family and remarrying with a new wife. This mistake had a heartbreaking consequence of some of their kids cutting off Symon, their dad. This is where I emphasize again my argument. How to deal with one's own mistakes determines one's own future. In his age 49, Symon showed how he fixed his mistake and made his future better. He did not run away from the mistake he made. He encountered the problem and tried to fix it. He focused on his kid's life, celebrating son's birthday together. He also sent the whole family a trip and spent times together. By his trial of fixing the mistake he made, he was able to be close with his kids again and continue his married life. As Claire Marie Healy said, "As the years go on, I watch as they begin one by one to forgive him (you don't see these moments of forgiveness, but they accumulate until everyone Symon wants in his life is there, again, off-screen and sometimes on). He is someone who accepted his lot in life, who found no actionable plan for his dreaming, but he is content. "Your life is as it is, not what it could be," he says, finally, at 63." his children accept him, and even though he could not fulfill a career as an actor as he wanted, he says his life has been fulfilled, as life is as it is. I would assert this content voice was able because Symon tried to fix his mistake. Fixing his mistake affected his life to be contented. As I said, definition of success and happiness is relative and different. However, Symon, even though he has not achieved a dream of being an actor, he is satisfied with his family. Family narrative is strongly related to one's happiness, and as Symon showed, his attempt of fixing a mistake is also for his family. Just like what Alon Confino said, "strong sense of

reckonings, but not of acute mid-life crises. Happiness is largely measured in terms of family life, children, and partnership". Therefore, I could say that the ultimate purpose of fixing mistake is family oriented, and family oriented decision effects own's future and happiness. As Symon and most of the participants pursued at last.

What we can now understand about Apted is Apted's intention to see how kid's life going depend on class inequality, I think it barely effected to their life. My argument has revealed what determines own's life is depends on Dealing with one's mistake. What we can now see that was not clear before is the way that decision on mistake has affected their life. What determines their future is up to how people perceive own's problem and fix the mistake. It is also improved by Neil, Suzy, Symon, and most of other participants. Along with the effect of their future, we were also able to see how the people's lives are based on universal issues we all deal with, not the system in which they live in. As Claire Marie Healy said, "Though the class narrative weakens while the familial narrative grows, there are things that go unmentioned, narratives that never emerge onscreen.", class narrative goes away, while the familial narrative grows. People cannot chose class narrative but we ca choose familial narrative, just like how Suzy and Symon showed. I argue, just like how we can choose familial narrative, we can make own decision to make own's life better, ends up content life like Symon. People can plan and imagine about their future but life is unpredictable. That is why mistake happens and we always have chance to fix the mistake. It's not based on social status or class status. Life is an unpredictable journey of mistakes, and reconcile with redemption and forgiveness.

