



Figuerola, Ricardo Armando (1984) The model of society in Lewis Grassic Gibbon's writings. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/6633/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

THE MODEL OF SOCIETY  
IN LEWIS GRASSIC GIBBON'S WRITINGS

A THESIS

Submitted by

RICARDO ARMANDO FIGUEROA

Candidate for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(Ph.D.)

Supervisor: MRS. BRIDGET FOWLER

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY  
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE  
UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

August, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
<u>List of Abbreviations</u>	i
<u>GENERAL SUMMARY</u>	iv
<u>PART ONE: THE MODEL</u>	
INTRODUCTION	vi
Chapter 1 The Natural State. Original Harmony in Equality	1
I. The Term Model	1
II JLM/LGG's Basic Premise	8
III Phase I: The Natural State. Equality	9
Chapter 2 A Qualitative Change Phase II: The 'accident'	14
Chapter 3 A Reversed Situation. The Disease: Inequality and its Aftermath Phase III: the Quest for a new Harmony	18
Chapter 4 The Reversal of the Reversed Situation: Another Qualitative Change. Phase IV, or the Second 'accident'.	35
Chapter 5 Equality in Freedom Phase V, or a Higher Level of Social Harmony	64
Chapter 6 F T S as Paradigm of the Model	70
I F T S: a resumé	70
II Partial Analysis of FTS	73
Chapter 7 Imagery as the Key to the Second Meaning. Romantic Imagery?	84

## PART TWO: THE CULTURAL APPROACH

	<u>page</u>
<u>A. The Creator</u>	
Chapter 8 "HE WHO SEEKS", A tale in the light of its essential meaning.	117
I Preamble	117
II A Resume of HWS	118
III The Proem to HWS	120
IV Analysis of HWS Through its Proem	122

## B. The Intellectual

Chapter 9 The Cultural Question	146
I The Background and the Humanist Tradition	146
II The Writer and the Writers	158

## PART THREE: THE IDEOLOGICAL QUESTION: HUMANISM

### A. The Protagonists

Chapter 10 Humanism: Rousseau and others	176
Chapter 11 Diffusionism: G.E. Smith, Perry and Rivers	190
Chapter 12 Monism: Haeckel	209
Chapter 13 Anarchism: Kropotkin and others	223
Chapter 14 Feminism: Bebel	244

### B. The Antagonists

Chapter 15 Spengler	255
Chapter 16 Nietzsche	270
I n C o n c l u s i o n	295

NOTES	303
-------	-----

Bibliographies	321
----------------	-----

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Had it not been for the active wave of solidarity with Chile, especially after the coup of 1973, this thesis might never have been attempted. It was thanks to this solidarity that the British Government, through its Overseas Development Ministry, funded from 1974, the WUS Scholarship Programme for Chilean Students and Academics. Our gratitude to all those involved both from WUS and Academics from Chile, and from the governmental departments concerned. Our special gratitude to the then Minister for Overseas Development, Mrs. Judith Hart, whose general committment to Chile and her people found another channel of expression in this programme. To her, my personal gratitude for her kindness in helping me.

In the wake of this wave of solidarity, the University of Edinburgh endorsed an initiative of its Academics for Chile local group, and eventually, the Department of Hispanic Studies offered me a post in my capacity as a Chilean academic in exile. It was thanks to these developments that I ended up in Scotland where I was later offered the opportunity to undertake this research. My gratitude to all those concerned, and my special recognition to the University of Edinburgh. My personal gratitude to Professor E.C. Riley, Head of the Department of Hispanic Studies for his sympathy and friendly attitude and support.

This thesis would not have been undertaken if the Department of Sociology of Glasgow University had not accepted me as a postgraduate student. My gratitude to the University of Glasgow, in particular to its Department of Sociology. My appreciation to all its academics concerned. I also acknowledge the help received from academics of Strathclyde University. My deep gratitude to John Ross of the Department of English Literature of Glasgow University for his kind help and friendly sympathy.

This work might never have been carried through to the end without the wise guidance, steady encouragement, and firm determination of my supervisor. To Mrs. Bridget Fowler not only my deepest gratitude but

also my most sincere admiration.

Without the support of my wife's relatives, the Clarks of Chesterfield, I would never have been able to complete the final stages of this work. My deepest gratitude to Win and Wilf; to Joe and Shirley; and last but not least, to Kate, my companera.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- A M Anton Maierkhold, a character in TD.
- A S H "A Scots Hairst", edited by I.S. Munro.
- A S Q "A SCOTS QUAIR", a trilogy of novels by LGG.
- A S Anton Saloney, narrator of CC and LT.
- B S "Beyond the Sunset", by D.F. Young.
- C "Cockrow", a story in CC.
- C C "The Calends of Cairo", a collection of stories by JLM
- C C C "Camelia Comes to Cairo", a story in CC.
- Ch C "The Children of Ceres", id.
- C G Cuthbert Graham.
- C H "Cloud Howe", the second novel of ASQ.
- C M "The Conquest of the Maya", a book by JLM
- Co Ma "The Cornhill Magazine".
- D "Daybreak", a story in CC.
- D A "Dawn in Alarlu", a story in PDEN.
- D D "Dieneke's Dream", a story in PDEN.
- D H "The Diffusionist Heresy", an article by JLM.
- D W "The Decline of the West", by O. Spengler.
- E "The Epic", a story in CC.
- E I W "East is West", a story in CC.
- E i C "Essays in Criticism", a journal.
- F S "The Floods of Spring", a story in PDEN.
- F R R "From Ritual to Romance", by J. Weston
- F T S "For Ten's Sake", a story in CC.
- F W N Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche.
- G G "Grey Granite", the last novel of ASQ
- G H "Gay Hunter", a novel by JLM.
- G R "Gift of the River", a story by CC.
- G s G "The Greatest since Galt", an article by G. Wagner.
- H "Hanno: or the Future of Exploration", a book by JLM.
- H A T H "Human All Too Human", by FWN.
- H W S "He Who Seeks", a story in CC.
- I I W "It Is Written", a story in CC.
- I S "Image and Superscription", a novel by JLM.
- J L M James Leslie Mitchell.

- JLM/LGG James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassic Gibbon.
- J M John Metaxa, a character in TD.
- K E "Kametis and Evelpis", a story by JLM/Armstrong.
- K R P "Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets".
- L C "The Lost Constituent", a story in PDEN
- L D E C "The Life and Death of Elia Constantinides",  
a story in CC
- L G Lucien Goldmann.
- LM:LGG "Leslie Mitchell: Lewis Grassic Gibbon", by Munro.
- L G G Lewis Grassic Gibbon.
- L O "The Last Ogre", a story in PDEN.
- L P "The Lost Prophetess", a story in CC.
- L Tr "The Lost Trumpet", a novel by JLM
- M M Malcolm Maudslay, a character in TDF.
- M & T "Man and Technique", a book by FWN.
- M Th "Masterpiece of Thrills", a book of stories.
- N A U "Nine Against the Unknown", a book by JLM and LGG.
- N L M P "Niger: the Life of Mungo Park", a book by LGG.
- O M D "One Man with Dream", a story by JLM.
- P D "The Passage of the Dawn", a story in CC.
- P D E N "Persian Dawns Egyptian Nights" a collection of  
stories by JLM.
- P W W M "The Political Writings of William Morris", a  
book by A.L. Morton.
- R "Revolt", another name for OMD.
- R U "The Riddle of the Universe, a book by E. Haeckel.
- S L Sergei Lubov, a narrator in PDEN.
- Sp "Spartacus", a novel by JLM.
- S R "Stained Radiance", a novel by JLM.
- S S "Sunset Song", first novel of ASQ.
- ScONS "The Scientific Origins of National Socialism",  
a book by D. Gasman.
- SC S "The Scottish Scene", a book by LGG and H. MacDiarmid.
- T D "The Thirteenth Disciple", a novel by JLM.
- T G B "Three Go Back", a novel by JLM.
- T I "The Twilight of the Idols", by FWN.
- T O G G "The Other Grassic Gibbon", an article by G. Wagner.
- T S Z "Thus Spoke Zarathustra", by FWN.

- V M "A Volcano in the Moon", a story in CC.
- W L S "The Woman of Leadenhall Street", a story by LGG in M.Th.
- W L "The Wonders of Life", by E. Haeckel.
- WMAWS "William Morris Artist Writer Socialist", by May Morris.
- W M R R "William Morris Romantic to Revolutionary", a book  
by E.P. Thompson.
- W P P F "Woman in the Past Present and Future", by A. Bebel.
- Ws' I "Writers' International", a letter by LGG.
- Z Zarathustra

### GENERAL SUMMARY

The present research concerns itself with the underlying social content detected in the romance literature of James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassie Gibbon (JLM/LGG), which applied to all his writings gives as a result a second meaning in his texts, that turns out to be his essential meaning.

Two short stories, He Who Seeks, HWS and For Ten's Sake FTS were selected as objects of analysis. However, at least two romance novels are also analyzed even if partially only. The nature of the method employed determined that any other work by JLM/LGG, even if realistic in style, could be brought into focus at any time since all his works are mutually related both in content and imagery - romance and realistic alike - so that eventually, practically all his literary production came to play a more or less active role in the research. But the trilogy A Scots Quair, ASQ was excepted as a rule.

Apart from the General Introduction in which are to be found the explanations concerning the nature of the problem that motivated this research, the objective pursued, the method used, etc. and the theoretical premises that contribute to its orientation, the present work is divided into three parts.

Part One deals with the Model. It consists of seven chapters: whereof the first five explain the five respective phases of The Model of Society in the Writings of JLM/LGG. Chapter 6 has been conceived as a suitable illustration of the model, since it contains a partial analysis of FTS as its paradigm; as in a nutshell it suggests the whole outlook of contemporary culture, its stage, its trends, the controversies, challenges, the ideological camps, etc. and the author's own system. Chapter 7 is an attempt at explicating his imagery. This is in fact the work which led us to the essential meaning.

Part Two deals with the author's cultural approach, which includes both his own credo as a writer and his assessment of culture as a

historical phenomenon, according to our analysis of HWS and our brief studies on his humanist tradition respectively. Chapter 8 is devoted to the analysis of HWS, a tale based on the Grail legend conventions which the author applies to contemporary social questions in order to bring forth both his critique of modern culture and his plea in favour of world peace. It also highlights his conception of freedom, equality, and fraternity. Chapter 9 seeks to throw light on the intellectual concerns of the author and his debt to the humanist tradition in thought on the one hand, and to the same tradition in literature and art on the other. His debt to French socialism, to the German philosophy and the scientific tradition in natural science. His debt to romantic, anarchist and socialist writers. Here many familiar names turn up: from Campanella and More to Engels and Marx, from Columbus to Rousseau, from Morris and Shelley to H.G. Wells, from Shakespeare and Dickens to Tolstoy, etc.

Part Three deals with the ideological question. It consists of seven chapters, each one devoted to some specific issue highlighted in the model. Since the author perceives them as part of an ideological battle, the subdivision "Protagonists" includes the relevant humanist trends that the author rallies round his cause, whereas the "Antagonists" includes trends which the author assesses as opposite to those of humanism.

Chapter 10 is devoted to highlighting the humanism that the author seems to have derived from Rousseau as his main source: his views on the respectability of the human race, on the origin of social inequality, on Man's perfectibility, etc. Chapter 11 explains the real interest of the author in Diffusionism and why he incorporated it into his model. The importance he saw in the mechanisms of the diffusion of culture, and the merits of the English School of Anthropology of G.E. Smith, Perry, and Rivers. Chapter 12 analyzes the influence Haeckel had on JLM/LGG. This provides scientific support for most of his conceptions, especially those connected with nature as a whole and of the inner connection and interdependence of all phenomena, and why as a monist he combats dualistic thought. Chapter 13 takes a look at the influence that Kropotkin had on

JLM/LGG, especially in relation to some specific humanistic views, apart from his subsequent anarchistic idea that his model pursues as ultimate target. This in turn explains his political strategy to the future. Chapter 14 is devoted to analyzing Bebel's influence in relation to the feminine question in History. It explains why some authors have detected a certain "feminine personality" in JLM.

The two antagonists are Spengler and Nietzsche who represent the pessimistic, elitist, bellicist, nihilist, etc. trends which the author sees as arising from the perceptions of an upper class social consciousness on the one hand, and from the neo-Darwinian notions on the other.

Finally, the work closes with some concluding statements, which, generally, assess the model as conveying a clear social content. The latter arises from a materialist analysis of the culture to his time, and an extrapolation of its probable outcome and destination in its movement towards the distant future and the distant stars in the cosmos.

INTRODUCTION

Broadly speaking, the subject matter covered by the present research belongs to the great theme of the relationship between art and society. In a more restricted sense, it deals in fact with literature and society. More specifically still, it concerns itself with the relationship between a particular fiction - the work of one author - and the society from which it arises. It seeks to highlight the character of the latter and the extent to which it is reflected by the former. In keeping with this, it sets out to explore its material along the guidelines provided by the general formulation that sees the art of a a period as

"closely and necessarily related to the generally prevalent 'way of life', and further that, in consequence, aesthetic, moral, and social judgements are closely interrelated."(1)

and intends to adhere to such formulation by analyzing part of the fictional work of James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassie Gibbon, 1901-1935.

The present work was motivated by the vivid impression made by the trilogy "A Scots Quair" (ASQ) and its suggestive wealth of sociological information, which, together with the author's social class origin - the son of a Scottish crofter - invited, especially in the light of the theoretical work of Lucien Goldmann (LG), a research based on his method. There was more than one possibility open to us. For a start, not only was there the First World War to be considered since JLM was only 13 when it began but also the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 when the author was still an adolescent, and also, since LG attributes relevance to it, the world crisis of 1929-31, which is especially relevant since it corresponds with the more active period of the author, and his life itself covers the period which corresponds with what LG describes as the great structural crisis of capitalism. Thus the possibilities open to research were very promising. For example, in the light of Towards a Sociology of the Novel, a study of

the hero offered itself as an important aspect, especially in connection with the relevant social issues of the period, in keeping with LG's view of the relationship between the mode of production and the character of the hero in the novel; and also by the idea he derives from Lukacs concerning the search for authentic values in a "degraded world". JLM/LGG's characters might well be studied in the light of the "problematic hero" in so far as they might well prove or disprove the principle of "individuals who are essentially problematic", especially when in the author's fiction they appear as "dominated by qualitative values", etc., for if the novel is but the history of a "demoniacal quest" for authentic values in a degraded world, then, all these elements seemed to be present in the work of James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassie Gibbon, the author. However, the aspect that seemed to contain the main challenge was related to the topic of the "disappearance of the individual" as a natural result of the social effects brought about by different phases within the same mode of production which LG explains as follows

"The two later periods of Western capitalist society, the imperialist period - which is situated approximately between 1912 and 1945 - and the present period of capitalist organization can be defined on the structural plane by the gradual disappearance of the individual as an essential reality and, correlatively, by the increasing independence of objects, in the case of the first, and, in the case of the second, by the constitution of this world of objects - in which the human being has lost all essential reality either as an individual or as a community - as an autonomous world with its own structuration which alone enables the human being to express himself, occasionally and with difficulty."(2)

There is in the fictional work of JLM/LGG enough material related to this topic, and therefore, this suggested a specific area of research. Notwithstanding all this, it was the problem of consciousness that I considered more relevant in relation to LG's theory, for if his theory is based to a large extent on the base superstructure theory of

Marxism, the key aspect of it then must revolve around the question posed by LG himself "as to how the link between the economic structures and literary manifestations is made" ("Towards a Sociology of the Novel" p.11) a question which LG has solved in a way that has triggered off much controversy.

The research could not deal with all these question, and it was necessary to delimit a specific object. This process together with that of finding the corresponding method was complicated by some serious doubts different authors had posed in relation to the consistency of LG's theory. This was soon complicated by the evidence that British criticism on the work of JLM/LGG was anything but scientifically oriented, and therefore, there was no unanimity in the assessment of the author let alone a dependable approach to the nature of his work. In trying to solve this, my own study tended to find means of casting light on the content of his work by way of counterbalancing the emphasis and the redundancy of formalistic subjective assessment. This I thought was prior to attempting ~~a~~ research on the disappearance of the hero for example. However, whilst working in this direction, it became evident to me that in pursuit of dealing with form alone and least of all with content, literary criticism had, if not 'killed' JLM's literary work, at any rate, seriously damaged it, depriving ~~the~~ culture of the more substantial part of JLM's contribution to it. I could see that here was an author who had fallen victim to a trend in literary criticism which not only disregards content in order to enhance form but also, and worse still, does not advance to establishing the internal connections between the different components of a work of art, and as a result, cannot advance toward a higher comprehension of the relationship between the work of art and its creator on the one hand, or between the creator and reality, and between reality and the work of art on the other. This is probably a case in point that justifies the assertion that

"Contemporary criticism is on the threshold of a new phase. This is expressed in its ever-growing striving not so much towards unimpeachable answers

as toward the verification of the current way of posing questions. Literary criticism is learning to ask; previously, it hastened to answer."(3)

And yet, just as the author had written under his pseudonym LGG that part of his literary work dealing with the less universal themes, so too, literary criticism had split his artistic work in two seemingly independent hemispheres as it were. The obvious question that arises then is: is it scientifically correct to pluck out from the whole of a creation by the same author different parts as if they were completely independent? That is, the question arises when the discrimination appears as entirely arbitrary since no factual evidence to justify it is offered, except that a difference of style is discernible. Or, is it sensible to see two authors in one as a kind of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of artistic creation? Diversity in the work of a writer cannot indicate double personality. Alongside this, the assessment of JLM's work attributed little relevance to the author's consciousness in the process of creation, and therefore, as a result, it paid a tacit tribute to a kind of god who, from the darkness of the unconscious seems to mastermind the creative process. And yet, it may well be that, in analyzing that which is clearly deliberate intellectual creation, both the intention and the sense of a work of art is to be found, and there is no doubt that literary criticism had failed to establish any channel of communication with this essential aspect of JLM/LGG's creations.

At this stage it was inevitable that another question arose - was it not more relevant to make these questions the object of research? i.e. was it not valid for research to find out what elements in the literary work of JLM had proved incompatible with the method of formal criticism? In other words, I was intending to attempt an explication of JLM's texts. This after all might prove a good beginning previous to tackling any more ambitious research based on LG's theory. But it was evident that before considering a study of the relations between JLM's literary work and his social group, it was more relevant to establish the nature and the import of the author's discourse. In due course, it was clear that this was a necessity, in so far as its

results would constitute useful reference for further work of a more theoretical nature.

Now, JLM's discourse does not imply content only, nor any other separate element that comes into the totality of a work of art, save perhaps some aesthetic categories, but in fact relevant aspects in relation to the author's conscious intervention in the process of his creations. Such a pursuit was expected to help establish not only the necessary coherence between the different internal connections of the work of art but also its coherence with Man's reality, and therefore, with the rest of the author's creations. For in the last analysis, if the unity of content and form is so fundamental, that unity must be meaningful in so far as it is likely to embody an original approach to the main aspects of culture. This is a different way of repeating the commonplace that a work of art, if art at all, has always something to say. The problem arises when criticism does not reveal that something. In that case, there are only two alternatives, either the work is not art or criticism proved a failure. The problem is how to determine who erred, the critic or the author. This seems to me to sum up the issues in JLM's case. For a preliminary stage in my study of part of his work revealed that he had been criticised for that which he did not set out to achieve, and praised for that which is not his real merit. At first sight one can detect that the critical analysis of JLM's work, in the British Isles and particularly in Scotland, is based on a method of analysis which seeks to highly <sup>comment</sup> certain elements of a given work whose importance depends on the subjectivity of the critic, and are not therefore examined in the light of their relation to the other elements within the totality of the piece.

This consideration is so evident that in its light it was difficult to come to terms with the conclusions of that criticism, especially when in my view the main reason for distinguishing that fiction which criticism regarded as JLM's 'English' fiction - as different from his 'Scottish' one - was the attitude concerning the connections between reality and the literary work whereby they are regarded as "unrealistic" whenever those connections are not direct or at any rate

not self-evident. My own certainty that such connections with reality were in fact far from self-evident and yet unmistakably present in JLM's 'non-realistic' literature, suggested the relevance of a new approach in my research: why not attempt what I might term the decoding of JLM's texts in order to bring to light that which was hidden and had, in my view, contributed so powerfully to misleading criticism? In other words, why not attempt to explore an area of JLM's literary work which evidently had not been trodden yet? Apart from the obvious reasons in support of this project, I thought that such a research might prove more rewarding in that it might at the same time contribute to answer in part at least, or at any rate to illumine from a new perspective, the questions that had motivated this research in its inception. In a way, this was tantamount to proposing a new reading of JLM's fiction, analogous to LG's method for approaching the novels of Malraux. What can be said in this connection is that, theoretically at least, the original intention of this research was to base it on LG's theory of the novel. Nonetheless, the new focus of interest, arising from different considerations, and the new direction of the research which they have determined, implies the gravitation towards a different theoretical approach, as will be seen. In fact although I am still interested in Goldman's view of the "disappearance of the individual as an essential reality", the present research is not seeking to deal with that topic, nor with any particular aspect of LG's theory.

The centre of interest has now been shifted to the nature and character of the internal connections of JLM/LGG's creations and of the connection of these with reality. That is, my basic assumption, in contrast with the opinion of literary criticism relevant to JLM's 'non-realistic fiction', or romances, is that there is both a close correspondence between these 'romances' and the social theory underlying his more obviously realist works, as well as between his literary works and certain developments in a scientific understanding of society. This assumption, however, should not be understood as based on LG's principle of the homology between the categories of the material base of society and those of the superstructure. It should be understood as based on the view that the connections referred to

above, and their function in literary structure, are likely to convey the meaning of the author's discourse, and that in view of the close relationship detected in his writings taken as a whole, they are likely to reveal a specific sociological discourse.

By and large, the present research concerns itself with a problem of meaning, since in my view, it was the defective grasp of JLM's meaning that has rendered a defective understanding of his literary work, although in the last analysis, there may be implied here an ideological problem. On a more immediate plane, what is apparent in JLM's romances is the relevance of imagery. In this connection, my assumption is that, ironically enough, this imagery may have been instrumental in causing criticism - provided that the comparison is apt - not to see the wood from the trees, i.e. the emphasis on form coupled with the search for direct connections with reality, or with a particular reality, obscured the meaning and the role of imagery, and as a result, of the work of art. Imagery is not the only complexity in JLM's texts.

The other difficulty lies in the wealth and significance of cultural references that his texts are fraught with. They appear to convey elaborate and relevant ideological content. Since the same can be said in relation to imagery, there seems to be a close relation between them. The important thing though, is that from this perspective, they both belong to the realm of the conscious activity of the writer in the process of creation and, as already pointed out, it is in these elements that I see the key to making out his discourse, in the way in which the author consciously relates his work to society, i.e. in the way individual consciousness relates itself through the work of creation to social consciousness. This means bringing the creator to the forefront of the picture. I am aware that in the light of theory, this view, in presenting the creator as the most important factor in the process of creation, implies not only a departure from <sup>GL</sup>GL's tenet, but also in fact, the adherence to another school of theoretical thought in the relationship between art and society.

In a way, I did not regret it that, in concentrating on imagery and cultural reference I had to move away from LG's theory, although I would not have been happy if in doing so, I had to turn my back on LG altogether, for I do feel attracted to his emphasis on the relationship he sees between the work of art and the prevailing mode of production in the society, and his stance on the role of social classes and social consciousness, etc., in so far as they are related to the theory of base - superstructure. However, various scholars, among them Javier Sasso in Latinamerica (4), have criticized his stance on the direct correspondence between base and superstructure in relation to art. In Britain, Terry Eagleton has written that LG's idea of social consciousness becomes

"an essential mechanistic version of the base - superstructure relationship."(5)

and it would be difficult to deny this, for in LG's view, that literature becomes the direct expression of group or class consciousness, there is implicit the notion that art, and the literary work in particular, does not play an active role in the complex process of formation and transformation of social consciousness. Having said that, and apart from the differences in approach, in focus of interest, in method, etc., there remains the fact that, from a different point of view possibly, I shall still be moving in the vicinity and/or the region itself of the base - superstructure theory. In point of fact, our highlighting the role of the creator brings into focus the role of individual consciousness and illuminates, as a result, their close relationship with social consciousness in that the latter conditions the former. The importance of this is self-evident. Yet, in so far as social consciousness is the necessary superstructural expression of the material base of society it is not a mere reflection of it, it is also, and mainly, an active agent whose action on that material base is necessary since it is clear that social consciousness contributes in a significant way to making possible the progress of society. That is, social consciousness helps to transform society, and in like manner, to transform nature, and as a result, to transform Man. In this light, it would appear that

individual consciousness is less relevant and probably, only a predictable by-product. If it were, my task would be probably much easier; but it is not so. For a start, it is necessary to consider the influence of social psychology and of ideology on individual consciousness, their inter-relation, and their dependence on social class. All this makes the problem of individual consciousness particularly difficult to determine in its relation to social consciousness, and more difficult still if it is seen through the mediation of the work of art. If from the point of view of ideology and social psychology the same material base of society in a given mode of production is reflected (or perceived) in at least two main different ways according to the interests and viewpoints of antagonistic social classes, it follows that individual consciousness will in turn reflect, in some degree, this discrepancy, and as a consequence, the degree of coherence in his/her model will depend largely on whether it is the one or the other that predominates. Fortunately, it is not my task to make explicit the individual consciousness of the writer. My task is rather to make explicit the synthesis of social consciousness which the individual consciousness of the writer has materialized in his literary creation. In the case of JLM/LGG's literary work, I have called this synthesis the model, and since it is mainly the result of his analysis of important social questions, I have called it "the model of society" (The results of the research will probably suggest that the "model of culture" would have been more accurate). For as we have already suggested, the idea is to explore the actual functioning of the work of art in relation to its inner structure, and the way in which it is related to the real world. I take it for granted that it is the ideological component that is going to play the decisive role in the whole process of inter-relations.

This new approach is the result of various influences belonging to the field of Marxist theory in relation to art and society, particularly the theoretical work of M.B. Khrapchenko, including a work that apparently has not been translated into English yet (6). In it he puts forward his view that the creation of a writer constitutes a systemic unity, or a whole organized in a system, since every writer

of talent is characterized by his set of themes, ideas, and images; above all when that set is very broad, that is, when the literary quests of the writer bear the hallmark of a peculiar universality. Khrapchenko says that the other reason why the creation of a writer possesses the properties of a system, is that all his works bear the expressive imprint of his artistic individuality. M.B. Khrapchenko adds that no matter how deep the contradictions that come with the process of evolution of a great master, they do not, normally, destroy the unity and systemic character of his creative activity (see p. 328 in the edition in Russian language, Moscow, 1976), a view which is confirmed again and again in the writings of JLM, no matter that they are signed by JLM or by LGG.

This was confirmed once more when the first results of my research indicated the need to broaden the scope of the material to be analyzed in order to comprehend the interconnections between the different individual works of the author. This was particularly the case whenever the presence of a cognate imagery seemed to be the only visible element that related the different works as belonging to a coherent system. More than just a mere coincidence, the fact that a study of the imagery had offered itself as relevant to the meaning and to the significance of each work, this fact - if it is true that "it is first and foremost in images that a writer thinks" - seems to confirm once more Khrapchenko's theoretical line of thought when he writes for example that

"The idea is often repeated of late in theoretical and literary-historical works that a writer's Weltanschauung is by no means confined to the views expressed straight-forwardly in his various articles; it is to be found in his works as well. Since it is first and foremost in images that a writer thinks, it is in his work that his ideological and aesthetic views, his outlook on life, will be most fully expressed. This idea, whilst not particularly novel, is on the whole correct."(7)

It may be opportune to clarify here that more than being guided by

the aesthetic views of JLM, I was being guided by his ideological ones, and generally, "his outlook on life", since my hypothesis was that, bringing to light the internal connections (or relevant part of them) of the literary work would also point to its connections with reality, i.e. with society. Society is such a general concept that if it is to mean something it should embody not only something significant but also something new by way of contributing to the advancement of culture and Man. The point is that I cannot see the study of creation as independent from the study of the social questions which are relevant for the progress of culture. Again, Khrapchenko is clear on this:

"To see the work taken apart, as the only legitimate object of study means, in essence, to negate the scientific study of literature as a social and aesthetic phenomenon. For literature is not simply a collection of written works: far from it. It is rather a system of complex relationships and interactions which it would be impossible to study and describe if we were to ignore the role of the artist as creator of ideological and aesthetic values. Literature is, moreover, a process, and the more vivid and significant the separate works, the more multivalent and complex the process."(8)

Again, it seems to me that the present work concerns itself more with the "role of the artist as creator of ideological" values than with the aesthetic ones, since all I am trying to prove in any case - and this of course includes aesthetic values, although not in their true perspective - is that there is such a "system of complex relationships and interaction", so vividly expressed in the work of JLM that, in a way, this same vividness, ironically, contributed to 'conceal' the system.

For it was necessary to analyze, to classify, to compare, to correlate, and in a word, to carry out a systematic work of interpretation or interpreting the meaning of that which was so apparent and yet less self-evident. That is, as already pointed out,

it was necessary to study imagery and cultural references in a systematic way.

It was necessary to devise a method to deal with JLM's allegories and metaphors, in order to make out the meaning and the function of his elements. It was necessary to collate these with the results obtained in analyzing the sense and the significance of cultural and ideological references, etc.

The first stage of the research sought to trace relevant elements of imagery in the fictional works signed by LGG. The operation was repeated in relation to the fiction signed by JLM, and subsequently, in relation to non-fiction in order to cover all the writings of JLM/LGG. The idea was to discover that which was common or similar, or just related, in spite of the diversity of texts. This operation envisaged uncovering, relating and classifying a constellation of elements which suggested a vertebrated imagery running throughout the writings.

The second stage envisaged analyzing the functioning of this imagery in a given individual work and the way this functioning related itself to the whole. The original plan was to analyze just one representative short story of the romance type, but it was necessary to repeat the procedure in at least two other stories of the same type, and even to resort to partial analyses of some others and of larger works, i.e. novels of the romance type. Connotation and denotation played an important role in this process.

Since the work already done had confirmed my assumption that all the writings were interconnected to form an overall unity, the next stage meant not only selecting relevant aspects of the imagery to trace them throughout the writings of JLM/LGG in an attempt to find the presence of an overall allegory, but also to relate all that to society. In other words, the process envisaged finding evidence in support of the assumption that the romances dealt with sociological issues.

In the meantime, and for the same reasons stated above, the operation was repeated with some changes, parallel with the work explained above, and/or usually in conjunction with it, when dealing with cultural and ideological references intended as semantic elements in the texts. It was expected that these would confirm the social content adumbrated in the romance texts.

The final stage was to examine the correspondence of the different elements analyzed and their coherence within the system, their relation to other systems, and to society. This led to explicating the real meaning or essential meaning of the texts especially those of the romances, also those of the author's production which have been regarded as realist. In turn, this essential meaning, or second meaning, made the presence of the model intelligible.

P A R T O N E

"THE MODEL"

CHAPTER 1  
THE NATURAL STATE. ORIGINAL HARMONY IN EQUALITY

The Term Model  
JLM/LGG' Basic Premise  
Phase I: The Natural State: Equality

CHAPTER 2  
A QUALITATIVE CHANGE

Phase II: The 'Accident'

CHAPTER 3  
A REVERSED SITUATION. THE DISEASE. INEQUALITY AND ITS AFTERMATH

Phase III: The quest for a new harmony

CHAPTER 4  
THE REVERSAL OF THE REVERSED SITUATION:  
ANOTHER QUALITATIVE CHANGE

Phase IV: the Second 'Accident'

CHAPTER 5  
EQUALITY IN FREEDOM

Phase V: a Higher Level of Social Harmony

CHAPTER 6  
F T S AS PARADIGM OF THE MODEL

A resume  
Partial Analysis of FTS

CHAPTER 7  
IMAGERY AS THE KEY TO THE SECOND MEANING

## PART ONE: THE MODEL

### CHAPTER 1: THE NATURAL STATE. ORIGINAL HARMONY IN EQUALITY

#### I. THE TERM "MODEL"

The term "model" in the present work may be a misnomer, and yet, it has proved a useful instrument. In fact, I needed a name that served to describe as inclusively as possible, the unity and structure of that 'something' whose presence one could perceive throughout the literary work of JLM/LGG. In order to be at the same time practical, that name had to be a one-word concept if possible, and "model" offered itself because, apart from anything else, it suggests a representation of something that has a structure, or again, "something that accurately resembles something else", and, in the case of the problem in hand, it suggests the presentation of something which is in itself an abstraction. Besides and no less important, it conveys the idea of something especially created for a special purpose and has, thus, the connotation of something that has been construed, and carries with it the signification of being the result of a conscious, intentional act.

Since the other element that was easily perceived, though not easily discerned, was the presence of a body of historical, cultural, ideological and, generally speaking, diverse intellectual issues related to the life of society, the name "model of society" seemed to me to convey the sense of the hypothesis of my work - that in the writings of JLM/LGG there was implied such a model. The results of my research, however, without contradicting the essence of that assumption, have nevertheless suggested that the name a "model of culture" might have been more appropriate. Moreover, a term such as model may be interpreted differently according to the field of knowledge in which it is used. Some authors may even select a specific connotation of the term, etc.

In the present work the term "model" is designed to highlight the role of the writer's consciousness in organizing in an articulate

complex his own intellectual representation of social phenomena and/or of human life in general. On the other hand it is also designed to enhance the role of the writer's volition in the process of artistic creation. For the model is thus conceived as a result which finds its material expression through the process of literary creation and can be made explicit by means of analysis in system, i.e. an analysis in which the different elements are seen as belonging to a system rather than to an individual work alone. It is probably unexpected to come across the term model in relation to literature, but it has been used in that field of artistic creation. Yuri Lotman can be mentioned as a theoretician who uses the word "model" in his "theory of the functioning of the work of art" as Ann Shukman informs us (1). Lotman, whose relevant work on this subject has not been translated into English yet, indicates that he conceives the model as something that can be conceived as having a structure and constituent elements, and whilst I am not claiming to have borrowed his model concept, my own usage of the word coincides with this interpretation. And yet, the idea which probably led me on to the importance of a model concept, may have been suggested by LG himself through his hypothesis that all human behaviour is an attempt to give a meaningful response to a particular situation, and that

"individuals, and therefore social groups, have a tendency towards creating some overall consistent pattern out of the totality of sectional parts."(2)

LG's idea is related to his hypothesis that

"the aesthetic fact consists of two levels of necessary correspondence (...) between the world vision as an experienced reality and the universe created by the writer; and the correspondence between this universe and the specifically literary devices - style, images, syntax, etc. - used by the writer to express it."(3)

In this light, then, I take it that the model, or rather what I mean by model, has to be related in some way to that "universe created by

the writer", for I see it as the "whole" into which the different elements of that particular universe thus created fit together, acquiring therein their individual relevance within the perspective of the whole, helping in turn, to reveal the import of that whole, and above all, highlighting its actual meaning - the essential meaning in fact. I also take it that this idea, or a very similar one, has been expressed by LG in *The Hidden God*. It must be emphasized, however, that the model as I understand it includes the "universe" created by the author's literary production as a 'whole'.

This brief explanation contains the basic principle that has inspired both the use of the concept model and, to some extent, the type of analysis that characterizes the present work in relation to the relevance of meaning. I am assuming that the social content in the works of JLM/LGG is conditioned by ideology. It is this content, structured as a new whole, which I have identified as the model. In this sense the model is related to meaning, or more precisely, to the "essential meaning" that LG refers to when explaining that the social consciousness finds its highest expression in the mind of a poet or a thinker and that it is the job of the historian to make out

"the essential meaning of the work he is studying and the meaning which the individual and partial elements take on when the work is looked at as a whole."(4)

Again, it must be pointed out that the present work concerns itself with the essential meaning that emerges from JLM/LGG's texts as totality.

Since my purpose here is not to theorize on whether model, is or not the right word, but merely to describe the structure and functioning of that which JLM/LGG's literature has produced and I have termed the model, an introductory description of it might help to cast some light on the nature and content of the chapters that follow.

The way I see the model arising from JLM/LGG's writings, indicates

that it can be described in its most compressed expression, as a movement which completes itself in three main phases only (instead of the five which, for the sake of clarity, I am using here) which describe allegorically the story of Culture. That is, the original situation dominated by nature is reversed when it becomes dominated by Civilization. That is, the original state of human life is dominated by nature until the process of civilization gets started. This means reversing the original situation and the reversion, in turn, calls for a new fundamental change. Once the latter is effected, the new state of human life will be dominated by Man. In other words, I assume that JLM/LGG's philosophy of human history, when transmuted into artistic language, takes on a representational form which can be described as a large movement consisting of three successive moments, despite the fact that the author has suggested five, whereby in the original one, humanity is still mainly nature, hence I have called it The Natural State even when the process of culture had already got started. I have called the second phase The Unnatural State mainly as a concession to the model since humanity's endeavour to master and harness nature may be regarded as the most 'natural' human tendency. What may not be so, especially from an ethical point of view is the bitter antagonism amongst humanity that the process of culture has engendered, so that from the viewpoint of the ethics of nature, the violent character that human relations have taken on in a divided society is unnatural. But JLM understands it as such in his model not in his concept of History which owes a great deal to Engel's OFPPS in this matter, i.e. on how the emergence of private property produced the irreconcilable cleavage as soon as it determined the division into antagonistic social classes, a view which harmonizes with Rousseau's theory of inequality. The last phase marks the successful outcome in which humanity has already conquered nature and, as a result, its true liberty. I have called it a Higher Level of Social Harmony which in a way is equivalent to the Reversion of the Reversed Situation, and marks in fact the advent of the kingdom of Liberty. For all the author's originality, his model may not be so since it is based on a specific world view. JLM/LGG incorporates in an original way the cultural tradition related to that world view. More evidence of this is to be found in chapt. 9 which is devoted to the author's cultural

background and the main literary influences which are apparent in his literary work. In so far as the model is concerned, apart from Rousseau, the name of William Morris appears conspicuously important not only because of what JLM/LGG himself acknowledges but also because his model is to a certain extent 'modelled' on Morris's views of the relation between Civilization as represented by Capitalism, and the lot of the human being in it as represented by the masses of workers and of the majority of the common people. Besides, as the author suggests (see chapt. 9) Morris introduced him into a new world where he became acquainted with such people as Lafargue, Bebel, Engels, and Marx. As a result it is often difficult to discern whether a certain aspect of the model is to be ascribed to the influence of Morris or of some other of the group of socialists, or whether it is simply the author's own thought that shows thus its identity with the socialist thought represented by them.

If it is true, as he confides in "TD", that it was through Morris that he "had discovered the socialists and their gigantic, amorphous literature" (see q. 8 in chapt. 9) and that whilst still a teenager he was already familiar with Engels (see chapt. 9), one can visualize the scope of his ideological horizon as reflected in his model. Just as it would be difficult if not impossible - to prove that his model is entirely based either on Rousseau, or the Romantics, or Morris, or Marx separately, it would even be more difficult to prove that neither of these views are represented in it, for their presence is even more conspicuous than that of the rest of the "protagonists" discussed in chapt. 9. In this connection, I would suggest that if he is indebted mainly to Rousseau for his approach to primitive man and to the origin of inequality, he seems to be more indebted still to Engels in his approach to the origin of the State, and to both Rousseau, Marx and Engels, for his optimism and certainty in the final triumph and conquest of freedom by humanity, although this may have been suggested first by Morris. However, Morris himself had benefited from Marx's theories. The fact remains, though, that the true essence of his model shows such a remarkable coincidence with Marxist thought that one might affirm that it is based on Marx's theoretical principles, especially on the "negation of the negation" concept which Marx in

turn had derived through the lenses of his materialistic method from Hegel's dialectics. According to that Negation of the Negation Law, the model should have been described in three phases only. But it is for the sake of clarity that I am describing it in five phases so as to highlight the other two relevant aspects which the author seems to value since one of them is related to the philosophical category of causality and the other to the social one of revolution, as represented by Phase II and Phase IV respectively in the model. That is, the present work deals in fact with five phases in spite of my awareness that what I have called here the "reversed situation" and the "reversal of the reversed situation" correspond in fact to the "negation" and the "negation of the negation" of Dialectics which could be better explained by quoting Marx. However, since for the purpose of the present work it might be more useful to quote Duhring, I give here his own critique of Marx's theories as explained in chapt. XXXII of "Capital" (vol. 1) which he assesses as the natural result of the 'nonsense' that "can be concocted with Hegelian dialectics" and explains as follows:

"For the benefit of the reader who is not familiar with these artifices, it must be pointed out expressly that Hegel's first negation is the catechismal ideal of the fall from grace and his second is that of a higher unity leading to redemption. The logic of facts can hardly be based in this nonsensical analogy borrowed from the religious sphere ... Herr Marx remains cheerfully in the nebulous world of his property which is at once both individual and social and leaves it to his adepts to solve for themselves this profound dialectical enigma.(5)

There is no indication that JLM/LGG subscribed to any of Duhring's views, although in his model, we shall certainly find in due course the themes of "the fall", "redemption", and even of "salvation", and possibly other analogies "borrowed from the religious sphere" which, in the light of the model, seems to owe less to Duhring than to Hegel, and certainly more to Marx than to Hegel. For the fact remains that JLM/LGG's model revolves around the "profound dialectical enigma" of

the negation of the negation, but as usual, understood by JLM/LGG intellectually in its scientific dimension, and metaphorically in its artistic one. For taking into account the fact that Marx and Engels were mainly concerned with the process of production and reproduction in History, obviously Marx's "negation of the negation" should be understood in terms of the qualitative changes in the mode of production, as explained in "Capital" (6).

Needless to say that JLM/LGG is doing something different from what Marx did and if he may also be concerned with the problems of production and reproduction, his model, unlike Marx's, is not a scientific but an artistic one. And yet, the content of the quotations given here is easily recognizable in realistic, or more realistic terms in his trilogy "ASQ". This should be seen in the following chapters of the present work.

The difficulty of explaining JLM/LGG's model in a concise manner lies in that it is too comprehensive to be described in full and at the same time at work, and too complex to be stripped to its bare essence without depriving it of its life and individual character. In my attempt I rely on the interdependence between the model and the content of JLM/LGG's writings, thus the reader may not find a full explanation of the model in this chapter since the model is in fact all his production as a whole. Here is an introductory explanation that hopefully, will enable the reader to bring all the rest of the material into focus and into the pattern of movement which gives the model its particular structure and dynamics.

## II. JLM/LGG'S BASIC PREMISE

The basic premise or *causa prima* that lies at the heart of JLM/LGG's philosophy is the conception of a universe in constant movement both at macro and micro<sup>cosmic</sup> levels. This constant movement determines the mutability of the world at large comprising the evolution of nature and, as part of it, that of humanity. The phenomenon of culture is but the result of this constant evolution. The peculiar thing about it being that whilst still subject to the general movement, changes, and laws of nature, the course that civilization takes is no longer governed by nature but by other specific laws in so far as the former is an artificial product of humanity's activity seeking to attain its own ends. In this sense nature and civilization comes into conflict, indeed into a major contradiction which in turn determines an inner contradiction between civilization and humanity. In fostering civilization humanity asserts itself in its battle to conquer and harness nature, paying at the same time a very high price for it since the progress of civilization produces on the other hand an increasing dehumanization that has affected very deeply the ethics of humanity and, as a result, the meaning of human life itself. Hence, this inner contradiction and its implications, and above all the feasibility of its favourable solution plus the paramount role played by the conscious activity of humanity, constitute the ultimate sense of culture and, therefore, the supreme concern of JLM/LGG's philosophy.

He borrowed materials from various sources as will be explained in due course. But the connotation he gives the term Civilization (written in capital letters here) appears as almost identical

"with the so-called civil, or bourgeois, society of to-day - i.e. with the social order that came in with the sixteenth century"(7)

In the present work, however, it is also used to designate feudalism, and even the slave system.

### III. PHASE I. THE NATURAL STATE. EQUALITY

This phase corresponds with the Golden Age of the poets - specifically Hesiod's,. It is also the Golden Age described by anthropologists - especially the Diffusionists. It is basically the age of Rousseau's Natural Man, and it is at the same time, the long period described by other scientists as the gentile society and its primitive way of life. It comes to an end with the introduction of Agriculture. It has also, its counterparts in the cosmogonies of some Mythologies and of Religions, especially the Hebraic with its Garden of Eden, its loss and, as a result, its difficult and tearful pilgrimage to heaven. If we compressed them down to their essential content, we would find that all these approaches, generally speaking, tend to imply that humanity is conceived as angelic, or, in this model's terms, a respectable and decent creature with no ill feelings towards its fellowmates and/or other species, in an age when social evil had not appeared yet. This view is at odds with neo-Darwinian social science, which postulates a war-like, bloodthirsty being. JLM maintains that civilization has distorted the good nature of humanity.

In his opposition to Neo-Darwinism JLM/LGG consistently tried to find scientific foundations to support his own theory; hence his interest in Anthropology, for he always knew that the most reliable evidence had still be to discovered by Science. This explains his interest in Anthropology. Nevertheless, the reason why JLM/LGG insisted over and over again on the theme of the innate goodness of the human being is not a purely sentimental interest intended to embellish its image, it is rather a much higher concern which he related both to a theory of knowledge and to the ultimate objective foundations of social ethics, for it can safely be said that he was consciously trying - as Marx pointed out - "to find what is newest in what is oldest" i.e. his faith in the ultimate triumph of humanism arises from his basic premise that the driving force that has been steering culture in its right direction is the humaneness of Primitive Man and therefore, the presence in it of whatever inhuman practices and tendencies take their origin in the internal contradiction that

governs the process of production. Phase I is intended to illustrate not only the qualitative difference between humanity and the rest of the animal world but also the qualitative difference between an egalitarian way of life based on a primitive mode of production and the new way of life determined by the emergence of new modes of production. At the heart of this development he sees the problem of liberty in its relevant connotations, including the philosophical one. This explains why his condemnation of society in Phase III cannot be seen as expressing his rejection of civilization. If his artistic model has incorporated Rousseau's Natural Man, and diverse other elements derived from different authors, plus romantic imagery, etc., his philosophy of History has incorporated not only Rousseau's ideas, especially on the topic of social inequality, but also Engel's view of human history, especially in connection with the relationship Man-Nature, Production and reproduction, the State, and the eventual conquest of freedom, as will be seen in Phase IV, and V. But the following passage may be relevant to the model not only introducing the difference between the animal kingdom and Man but also in anticipating the advent of developments which may explain the general movement of the model, and above all the state of affairs which the model highlights in its third phase:

"With man we enter history. Animals have a history, that of their derivation and gradual evolution to their present state. This history, however, is made for them, and in so far as they themselves take part in it, this occurs without their knowledge or desire,. On the other hand, the further human beings become removed from animals in the narrower sense of the word, the more they make their history themselves, consciously, the less becomes the influence of unforeseen effects and uncontrolled forces on this history, and the more accurately does the historical result correspond to the aim laid down in advance. If, however, we apply this measure to human history, to that of even the most developed peoples of the present day, we find that there still exists here a colossal discrepancy between the proposed aims and the results arrived at,

that unforeseen effects predominate, and that the uncontrolled forces are far more powerful than those set into motion according to plan. And this cannot be otherwise as long as the most essential historical activity of men, the one which has raised them from bestiality to humanity and which forms the material foundation of all their other activities, namely, the production of their means of subsistence, that is, today, social production, is particularly subject to the interplay of unintended effects of uncontrolled forces and achieves its desired end only by way of exception and, much more frequently, the exact opposite."(8)

The quotation belongs to a passage in the Introduction to Dialectics of Nature in which Engels points out the irony that whilst having "infinitely multiplied production" Man has caused "increasing misery of the masses" and that under "free competition" Society has made progress at the cost of coming closer to the **animal kingdom** on the other planes (see chapt. 3). This view of History is echoed by the model which, in this sense, can be defined as a strategy to fight that animal kingdom in order to usher in instead the 'kingdom of humanity'. The first phase of the model sets out to make the point that such a kingdom did exist once, and therefore, it might exist again, but under conditions laid down by humanity itself and not by nature, as confirmed in Phase V.

The novel TGB - having been written for that purpose - is naturally the most closely related to the natural state theme. My analysis of TGB, even if partial and intended to highlight a specific aspect of the model in chapt. 4 may be helpful. The novel illustrates at allegorical level how civilization came about. GH may also be regarded as a novel illustrating Phase I although its main intention is to illustrate why humanity must avoid the pitfall of Facism in Phase IV, or rather, to point out the possibility that Civilization might be heading to Fascism and as a result to a tragical outcome.

But Phase I, or the motif of the spontaneously good-natured human

being, is a recurrent motif and therefore we are likely to come across 'primitives' in every separate work. The trilogy is no exception, nor is SR which is mainly devoted to Phase III, i.e. to expose the extent to which this originally decent creature has been distorted and dehumanized by Civilization.

Phase I supplies JLM/LGG with rich material for his characterization which he uses throughout his fiction in order to enhance both the good qualities of Natural Man and the repulsive traits of the humanoid species which never evolved, for according to JLM/LGG these traits inevitably manifest themselves in 20th century civilization.

The good traits of Rousseau's Natural Man as typical of a healthy human society are confirmed by Engel's reference to

"the liberty, equality and fraternity of the ancient gentes"(9)

Among these qualities JLM/LGG highlights those of pity and compassion (see chapt. 10). Apart from their obvious sources, including Rousseau, I cannot leave out the possible influence of Feuerbach, for it is also worthwhile noting that there may have been moments when JLM was very near to Feuerbach in his glorification of love. Again, it can be said that Feuerbach's conception of man is recognizable in JLM/LGG's own perception, although as is usually the case with him, he may have adapted Feuerbach's idea to suit his own ends. At the same time we cannot help feeling that for JLM/LGG too

"the Christian god is only a fantastic reflection, a mirror image of man. Now, this god is, however, himself the product of a tedious process of abstraction, the concentrated quintessence of the numerous earlier tribal and national gods. And man, whose image this god is, is therefore also not a real man, but likewise the quintessence of the numerous real men, man in the abstract, therefore himself again a mental image."(10)

This may be aptly applied to JLM, especially in relation to the topics of pity and compassion and love, and also in the sense suggested in "Spartacus", particularly the closing scenes.

However, my impression is that despite his romances, and despite the allegorical tone of his works - to which such a notion of man might be suitable - his materialism predominates. In this connection, his treatment of the Grail Legend, as will be seen in chapt. 8 for example, incorporates the old pre-Christian elements, but restores their original sense and, endows it with a materialistic new look in that he incorporates into it the elements of scientific exploration, or research.

In this Phase I we find contributions from various sources, some of them even antagonistic, from the Bible (and pre-biblical was well and other Theological cosmogonies that present Man as originally good) to Marxism. Sorting out all that is secondary, the point JLM/LGG is making in relation to this phase is the nature of social relations in a society where no State has emerged as yet. This is well argued in TGB in which the key scene is that which describes the hunt of a mammoth. In it he sees the community at work organized on the basis of a natural understanding which springs from the tendency of mutual aid and co-operation, and each individual is shown as doing what is required of him/her. There is no room for authority nor, logically, for subordination in this egalitarian society where the group demonstrates its ability to work harmoniously without any bosses, like an "orchestra without conductor" (11) as he himself put it. And yet, the author is aware that those people are not free in the real sense of the term. So that he too like Engels can say that

"It is the greatness but also the limitation of the gentile constitution that it has no place for ruler and ruled."(12)

CHAPTER 2 A QUALITATIVE CHANGEPHASE II. THE 'ACCIDENT'

As will be seen in chapt. 12 it is possible to infer from JLM/LGG's thought that he saw no basic disharmony between Haeckel and Rousseau concerning the question of the evolution of man, let alone between Rousseau and Engels, although in this sense his literature does not cast so much light on his views as it does on his model, in which he seems, if not to ignore the transit from animal to Man, at least to give the impression that he assimilates the whole process of the transit from Natural Man to civilized humanity, or, in his own language, from primitive to savage. So long as the evolutionary process is at the same time natural in that it is governed by the laws of nature, JLM seems to take it for granted, and sees no qualitative change in it as the one he sees when the new movement of civilization runs counter to that of nature. The artificial character of the new process becomes central in relation to his concept of the reversal of the original state, and at the same time, the starting point of a major issue, for if humanity's way of life has become, or is becoming more and more artificial, it remains to be seen to what extent its own nature will become affected. This is a key element in JLM/LGG's model. Apparently he sees the relationship between civilization and nature in terms of a dialectical contradiction in that they are not two different worlds that have come together, or coexist in a mechanical way, but two antagonistic expressions of the same phenomenon which unites them. Out of this interaction a new movement is produced and neither nature nor civilization remain unaffected by it. In other words, as humanity causes civilization to make progress (see chapt. 3) it also causes its own process of dehumanization to make progress. The irony is that this dehumanization occurs because humanity seeks its own perfectibility, which, could never happen without the agency of civilization. It is, according to Marx and Engels, a dialectical contradiction, which, Rousseau had already described when pointing out that this talent for perfectibility is precisely the quality that has singled out humanity from the rest of the animal world and is, in fact, the ultimate cause of culture. No

wonder then that Marx and Engels had endorsed Rousseau's views on the analysis of this historical dialectical contradiction, especially in relation to his analysis on the origin of social inequality, which is so relevant to JLM's model:

"But these equal animal-men had one quality which gave them an advantage over the other animals: perfectibility, the capacity to develop further; and this became the cause of inequality. So Rousseau regards the rise of inequality as progress. But this progress contained an antagonism: it was at the same time retrogression (...) Each new advance of civilization is at the same time a new advance of inequality"(1)

Now, JLM/LGG's model is virtually based on this contradiction, and if he chose to compose it with the materials of romantic imagery, it may have been - among other considerations - for aesthetic reasons since, on the other hand, his writings reveal also that on the scientific plane he was based to an important extent on the materialist philosophy, as the quotation above already suggests. Now the same author explains in a very didactic manner how these quantitative advances made their way into History:

"By the combined functioning of hands, speech organs and brain, not only in each individual but also in society, men became capable of executing more and more complicated operations, and were able to set themselves, and achieve, higher and higher aims. The work of each generation itself became different, more perfect and more diversified. Agriculture was added to hunting and cattle raising; then came spinning, weaving, metalworking, pottery and navigation. Along with trade and industry, art and science finally appeared. Tribes developed into nations and states. Law and politics arose, and with them that fantastic reflection of human things in the human mind - religion. In the face of all these images, which appeared in the first place to be products of the mind and seemed to dominate human societies, the more modest

productions of the working hand retreated into the background, the more so since the mind that planned the labour was able, at a very early stage in the development of society (for example, already in the primitive family), to have the labour that had been planned carried out by other hands than its own."(2)

So that inequality did not turn up over-night on the stage of humanity's history, which thus was no longer gentile, or, in JLM's jargon, primitive.

In his model the transit from equality to inequality as described above appears as a reversal of the human condition since the author sees that the same process of stimulating further and further the development of humanity may also bring about its own negation. The reversal, in any case, appears in the model as represented by a number of human qualities in their process of being negated by their opposites. Such, for example, is the case of love which has become in fact the "lost constituent" (3).

Since the reversal has introduced another big contradiction: between civilization and nature, this movement can only bring about another reversal, i.e. the reversal of the reversal (see Phase IV). This is the development that gives origin to the Quest theme, for such reversal will only come about if humanity manages to effect it (as will be seen in Phase III) successfully. The active and central role which the author assigns to humanity in bringing about the 'reversal of the reversal' indicates that he conceives that in like manner, humanity did play an active and decisive part in bringing about the first reversal, even when the model is not particularly clear on this, for if the author has insisted on the role played by Agriculture for example, the model insists on the accident motif. Nevertheless, if he derived important humanist material from the theory of evolution and of Darwinism in general, from evolutionists like Haeckel in particular, from dialecticians like Hegel, Marx and Engels, he may have derived the theory of the 'accident' from the Diffusionists, although the original source seems to be Rousseau, not because his

adherence to that school of anthropology may have been a determinant, but because it fitted well into his model for at the same time it suggested the idea of coincidence or casuality. I would maintain that this does not imply a disharmony with the theoretical foundations of his philosophical stance. In fact, the movement which brought about the change in quality from the Natural State to the Unnatural one in his model, may well be defined as an 'accident' in so far as it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to establish accurately to a day, or year, the actual moment when it happened before there was an actual realization that it was there, that it had happened. More, that humanity had never planned it to happen, let alone expected it as a result. It is the change in quality which the author is describing as an accident, but above all the unexpected negative aspects of this new quality. In this sense the term lends itself as a very useful element that can explain in practical, or rather, imaginative terms in the model the irony that I have referred to above. In like manner, coincidence is a concept that does not contradict his scientific stance on the role that necessity plays in causing both natural and social phenomena. On the contrary, it seems to me that the author is working with the materials provided by the relationship that exists on this issue between the philosophical categories of causality and casuality.

CHAPTER 3 A REVERSED SITUATION.  
THE DISEASE: INEQUALITY AND ITS AFTERMATH

PHASE III. OR THE QUEST FOR A NEW HARMONY

"Now, there has been amongst people of different minds abundant discussion as to whether civilization is a good thing or an evil. Our friend Bax in his very able article on the subject, did, I think, really put the matter on its true footing when he pointed out that as a step to something better, civilization was good, but as an achievement it was an evil. In that sense I declare myself an enemy of civilization; nay, since this is to be a chapter of confessions, I must tell you that my special leading motive as a Socialist is hatred of civilization; my idea of the new Society would not be satisfied unless that Society destroyed civilization."(1)

This Phase is in fact based on that internal contradiction pointed out by Engels (see chapt. 2 Q. (1)) in that progress contains an antagonism since it brings at the same time retrogression when "inequality" makes more progress under the mode of production of Civilization.

This in terms of the model is expressed through a big metaphor in that the Reversal took away an essential constituent of humanity's innate spiritual health and that, as a result, it has become a diseased humanity whose return to normal health is possible and probable and that it is up to humanity to make it feasible. But this quest for normal health is, in terms of the allegory in the model, the most difficult task set before men, and at the same time the most dangerous one (see chapt. 8 A,I). Notwithstanding it can be effected by humanity as the successful outcome of a long **quest** for the essential lost constituent. Obviously, it is the process of civilization that has brought the disease and Civilization has made it worse and worse. But human life is quest, and therefore, it is the quest that dominates the model on the allegorical plane, and on the plane of its expression in real life, the quest becomes in fact

scientific research and social revolution in search of equality.

In so far as this part or phase contains JLM/LGG's critique of civilization, or rather of Civilization - understood in the terms explained in the Introduction - it is more easily recognizable in the model since there is here much more in common with different world views that have criticized the negative effects of industrialism. However, few are likely to coincide with the author, not even in their denunciations, not entirely at any rate. Although there is one who not only coincides with him but also, actually, gave him his inspiration, William Morris, as the epigraph to the present chapter shows (see Q. (1) above). In fact, the same hatred of Civilization as explained by Morris is present throughout JLM/LGG's writings and also the same longing that Civilization be destroyed by "the new Society" in future, i.e. by Socialism. Obviously, there may be many more whose analyses of Civilization have been as critical. Yet, it was Morris who defined our society as one

"which is nothing other than a close company sustained by violence for the express purpose of "the exploitation of man by man" in the interest of the strongest."(2)

But it was also Morris himself who pointed out his own coincidences in some fundamental issues with his "Anarchist-Communist friends" (Op. cit. Ibid). So that if Morris appears as his main influence in connection with his critique of civilization, it is not difficult to understand why we also find the influence of the founders of scientific socialism in JLM/LGG's thought as the next phases of his model will also reveal.

Apart from what the individual analyses of the stories and novels reveal, especially those included in the present work, the main issues of his critique are better explained in different chapters and sections of it, and in relation to Phase III, I suggest that in one of them JLM/LGG followed Kropotkin very closely in that he also sees that the State, its laws and its oppressive strength stand in opposition to

social freedom. But our author's critique of Civilization should be seen mainly in the light of humanist tradition since he has incorporated the most relevant humanistic ideas and attitudes in History, which, on the other hand, serve him to highlight the social values he propounds. Among the latter, given his ardent defence, it is obvious that liberty is his ultimate goal, but preceded by equality, and seeking to materialize the ideal of fraternity, and in one word, recover for humanity its naturalness.

As already indicated, his sources include the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, the German philosophers, the revolutionary romantics, the French socialists, and even early utopians such as Campanella and More, and one may presume, Owen, but always in keeping with the terms of Morris's critique of his 'socialist' ideas. For all his debt to Rousseau, his model in my view owes more still to the scientific socialists. Let us compare, for example, the foundations of this Phase 3 of his model with the following formulation:

"Since civilization is founded on the exploitation of one class by another class, its whole development proceeds in a constant contradiction. Every step forward in production is at the same time a step backward in the position of the oppressed class, that is, of the great majority. Whatever benefits some necessarily injures the others; every fresh emancipation of one class is necessarily a new oppression for another class. The most striking proof of this is provided by the introduction of machinery, the effects of which are now known to the whole world. And if among the barbarians, as we saw, the distinction between rights and duties could hardly be drawn, civilization makes the difference and antagonism between them clear even to the dullest intelligence by giving one class practically all the rights and the other class practically all the duties."(3)

which harmonizes with the model's ultimate objectives as explained in Phase V, i.e. with the quest for social equality and its concomitants.

But we also find here the clue to JLM/LGG's Greek civilization theme, which somehow, did not seem to fit into his model. I would suggest, however, that if he agrees with Engels in that "the most striking proof of this is provided by the introduction of machinery", he may then reserve for his model as the most striking proof the introduction of slavery in the distant past, of which Greece is a case in point, as a step forward in production and a step backward in the position of the oppressed class. Nonetheless, this cannot be accepted at face value either, for the same Engels accuses Herr Duhring of turning up his nose at Hellenism "because it was founded on slavery" (p. 251) unaware that

"In the historical conditions of the ancient world, and particularly of Greece, the advance to a society based on class antagonism could be accomplished only in the form of slavery. This was an advance even for the slaves; the prisoners of war, from whom the mass of the slaves was recruited, now at least saved their lives, instead of being killed as they had been before, or even roasted, as at a still earlier period."(4)

This, taking into account JLM/LGG's hatred of cruelty, must have also meant to him a step forward in spite of the evil that slavery in itself is. But we know for certain that according to his model his main concern was freedom and it is clear that according to the philosophies of both Rousseau and Engels, that freedom cannot be attained outside the long process of civilization. If in this we give his Phase V of the model its credit, we will find proof there that JLM, like Engels, even if *malgré lui*, can also say

"Without the slavery of antiquity no modern socialism."(5)

The relevance of the Greek civilization theme in his model, seen in this light, helps us to understand that his Phase III critique of Civilization is no romanticism but social science. His fiction is full of it.

The novel that can be identified with Phase III from the point of view of denunciation specifically is "S R", for even when directed with particular zest to expose the flaws of the progressive forces so deeply weakened by Civilization, it can be said to convey a kind of "J'accuse" and a denunciation of Civilization.

As pointed out earlier on, Phase III marks the immediate results of the Reversal, and it anticipates worse things to come. The author seems to develop and expand the repercussions of the dialectical contradiction that brought about the phenomenon of culture:

"the animal merely uses its environment, and brings about changes in it simply by his presence; man by its changes makes it serve his ends, masters it. This is the final, essential distinction between man and other animals, and once again it is labour that brings about this distinction.

Let us not, however, flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our human victories over nature. For each such victory nature takes its revenge on us. Each victory, it is true, in the first place brings about the results we expected, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel the first."(6)

On this 'cancelling effect' the author centres his Phase III, taking it to the extreme expression that this principle might end up by 'cancelling' humanity itself, as indicated by the recurring dread that haunts his fiction. This possible and probable negation of the human being might come as a result of either social violence aided by the power humanity has wrenched from nature whereby the power, if eventually used in war, might cause humanity's total destruction, or, by dehumanization in its outmost degree, aided by scientific and technological achievements. In this sense, the impending danger arising from this situation is that the continuous process which is at the same time making humanity's way of life more and more 'artificial'

might end up by affecting its inner nature to such an extent that he ultimately acquires a new identity which might be but the transmutation of its original being into something alien to nature itself. This issue can be better understood if compared with his stance of FWN's concept of the superman (see chpt. 16).

And yet, there is an element in that dialectical contradiction as explained by Engels, which JLM/LGG pursues with particular zest: that humanity is an important, in fact, a decisive factor which can, and must, decide the favourable outcome.

According to the model, agriculture marks the end of equality, of social equality, and the beginning of "compulsory labour" to use FWN's expression. From then on there has been a steady deepening of the dehumanizing process, and a worsening of the ethics of civilization.

JLM/LGG's anarchistic ideas originate in his rejection of the ethics of Civilization epitomized by its oppression of the vast majority of the people. Hence his theme of freedom and his propaganda in favour of political liberation, his condemnation of slavery and related social practices which have arisen in the course of History as a result of the spread of civilization. Hence his interest in studying how savagery intensified as Civilization progressed. These studies are well represented by his scholarly works, among which, the most lengthy is "C M" (1934). One of the issues which impressed his sensivity more deeply was the practice of human sacrifices. But alongside this, slavery is the historical issue which he regards as equally inhuman, or possibly even worse despite the progressive element involved in it, since in this practice there was no theistic belief involved. Hence his historical novel "Sp". In this same perspective he sees the problem of women whereby he regards prostitution as the worst manifestation of their degradation by Civilization., Where we see that civilization has done away with many evils in the course of History, JLM/LGG sees that they have only changed their form but not their essence and thereby their effect on humanity is nevertheless worse.

Hence his political stance has a more direct bearing on the issue of violence and cruelty, and therefore, towards the later part of his life he becomes increasingly anti-fascist in so far as he regards fascism as the final necessary outcrop of Civilization's dehumanizing drive. This conviction, plus the conviction that Fascism must be fought to death that it may be stamped out, gives JLM/LGG's political evolution a new turn which is beginning to delineate itself more definitely shortly before his death in 1935. In other words, his allegorical treatment of the problem becomes more down to earth and adopts a more realistic style after 1933 or thereabouts. In this connection, JLM/LGG is optimistic, for in spite of his forewarnings in the sense that Fascism will overpower all nations, he is convinced nevertheless, that humankind will ultimately triumph over Fascism eradicating it for ever from the face of the earth once the Revolution is accomplished. In his imagery the night of humankind symbolizes the reign of fascism, the Passage of the Dawn revolution and, the Dawn the ultimate triumph of humanity. This is the use he makes of romantic imagery. It is in this sense that his use of night as symbol derived from Romanticism becomes clear (see chapt. 7). Humanity's ability to love is the superior element likely to prevail over the anti-human forces. If the opposite of love is anti-humaneness this finds its most horrible expression by night, especially when related to human suffering, and still worse when that suffering is provoked by Man himself. Hence his depiction of human cruelty, especially war; and the symbolic scene of human beings screaming on the barbed wire. Some have seen in his treatment of love no more than a sentimental stance, a romantic subjective attitude. It may be so, but if we excluded his debt to various romantic authors, his treatment of love in his model might lead us to Feuerbach since

"with Feuerbach love is everywhere and at all times the wonder-working god who should help to surmount all difficulties of practical life - and at that in a society which is split into classes with diametrically opposite interests."(7)

especially if he has also derived his views on Christianity from the same author. But once more, JLM/LGG may have availed himself of the

motif in order to give it his own sense rather than embraced the German philosopher's position. Now the truth is that the model presents the problem of political revolution as an act of human love as opposed to hatred. Hence its redeeming character - in a Christian sense - for the oppressors. This is the reason why the problem of political revolution is not divorced from the Quest theme. Indeed, his imagery becomes part of the model, when the Quest as allegory becomes a central theme, changing to a certain extent, when it goes from one work to another, but basically, the backbone of the model from Phase III onwards. The Quest loses its traditional halo of romance when it becomes identified with the "Adventure" of humankind, or its great Expedition, but above all when the Quest becomes a scientific quest, i.e. scientific research and scientific exploration. Southcote in "FTS" is a scientist for the same reason that Lucius Ravelstone of "Cockrow", or Gellion, or Freligrath of "VM", Simon Mogara of "EIW", or Keith Landward of "GR", or, again, the Duke of Ravelstone and Mr. Koupa of "KE" are also scientists engaged in researches of one kind or another, not to mention Domina Riddoch of "TD", or himself.

It is symbolic that JLM's first book ever published was "Hanno~~f~~: Or the Future of Exploration" ("H"). According to his model, the sense of human life is based on a quest for something precious, on a risky exploration into the unknown in search of the most coveted secrets of the universe, of life, and of Man. That is why he also calls it the "Great Adventure", for this is the positive sign that the great contradiction has: humanity set on in its conquest of nature.

In fact, the materialization of the boldest "dreams" which include the ideal solution to all the social and human problems and the attainment of all the ambitious goals related to freedom, and similar ideals - depend on the successful result of that Exploration. This Quest has hardly begun yet its momentous phase, for as a quest it began in truth with Man himself. His youngest character, Steven Buxworth of "T D", hardly a toddler

"even this early, had determined to

become a traveller. He would pant up from the hall with messages, somewhat delayed owing to the necessary of "'splolin'" en route."(8)

The novel itself illustrates the point for "TD" is the Adventure as lived at personal level by M.M. As usual there are more meanings attached to the theme, but it is clear that to JLM, human life is the greatest of all since

"'the Adventure is a challenge to the stars'"(9)

The idea that JLM's supreme dream is a personal version of a return-to-nature type of dream is definitely ruled out by the evidence that JLM's adventure is far more ambitious, for he conceived (in Domina Riddoch's words) that

"'somewhere beyond the rim of the Galaxy and the rims of time, ten million years and a day away, men'll reach the palace of God and storm it, and capture the engine-room and power-house, and then ....'"(10)

quite apart from the philosophical implications which can be adumbrated through this metaphor, we can state here that his anticipation - a truly important one in my opinion, and not because of its anticipatory character alone - was written nearly 25 years before the actual space adventure had been inaugurated, at a time when even aviation was still a relatively new phenomenon. This conception, - which shows that JLM is concerned with the future rather than with the past - helps to understand the deep meaning of the contradiction he sees between humanity and Civilization as we know them now. But at the same time, it shows that no matter how bitterly he blames Civilization for the evils that it has brought upon humanity, he never renounced it, and if he often combatted it he did it out of his concern for the liberation of Man. The outer space theme recurs in "LDEC"

"- explorers from outer wastes of the universe, an expedition returned from deeds that men would sing for ever."(11)

The theme of exploration may help to explain, in part at least, his views on the dialectical contradiction he sees between the 'fortuitous' original of civilization on the one hand, and the inevitability of its advent, on the other.

The theme of exploration is also related to his battle against social Darwinism. In his model, he emphasizes again and again the difference between humanity and other proto-human or sub-human genera, that as a rule were "discarded experiments of nature", in order to contrast their non-human qualities with the superior qualities of homo-sapiens. Accordingly, the outer space theme marks the materialization of such unfathomable differences with those other genera. For Neanderthal Man for example, would never have reached the stars since

"The Neanderthaler prowling up wild canyons of France, where, two hundred thousand years later, descendants of his own conqueror were to indulge in an orgy of Neanderthaloid brutishness was no explorer. He was unamazed by glimpsed mountains and stirred by no desire to test the touchability of the horizon."(13)

The motif of the "discarded experiment of nature" recurs in different short stories and novels. The idea I am discussing here is highlighted also by the content of his story "L O" where he uses the "Thing" as another name for the Neanderthaler, and also the "Grey Demon", which reminds us of FWN who suggested that the colour of humanity should be grey. The theme of the grey primitive reappears in "TGB". In "LO" the Neanderthaler is described as

"browless and chinless, with arching neck and massive, down-thrust head"(14)

In JLM's model his 'brutish' characters always remind us of this

description, chiefly the "chinless" trait of the warlike characters which he sometimes compares to the gorilla. The cognate implication is that such a character belongs to the type of person who is "stirred by no desire to test the touchability of the horizon" (TD), unlike JLM's heroes - M.M. of TD, or Mungo Park or Magellan of NAU for example. In keeping with his view on the social role of literature, for JLM there are no greater heroes than the flesh and blood protagonists of the history of Humanity: not the protagonists of Civilizations, but the protagonists of the history of Humanity in what he calls the "adventure through the dark corridor" (see TD). Apart from Hanno, people like Akhenaton, Spartacus, or Columbus may be noteworthy. One of his famous books was published in 1934 under the name "Nine Against the Unknown: A Record of Geographical Exploration"; in the USA the book became "Earth Conquerors/The lives and Achievements of the Great Explorers". The American title conveys the factual topic of the book even if it misses its fundamental implications (see above). In it, each character (historical character) shows one trait or another of Primitive Man, or of the "hunter of the Golden Age", for in the case of Christopher Columbus for example, and his discovery of a New World:

"It may be said, indeed, with its influence upon Thomas More and Rousseau and the Encyclopedists, that Columbus fathered the French Revolution and modern humanitarianism. He was (a ruddy, horrified shade) the godfather of modern Rationalism, the Diffusionist School of History, the philosophy of Anarchism."(15)

This is the importance he attributes to Columbus, and in it we can clearly see the solid line of humanist content that gives unity to JLM/LGG's intellectual world view, Christian humanism, Rousseau and the Encyclopedists, the French Revolution and its ideals, the Romantics and their values, etc. until we reach JLM's philosophy of Anarchism, which sums up his view on Socialism, in the sense that the latter can only lead to the former. But this is not all, for in the case of Leif Ericsson for example, it is interesting to note that JLM valued the fact that his mother, Tjodhild, had become

"one of the first converts ... The ancient gods and the ancient rites were abandoned with a singular unanimity which suggests very strongly what a feeble hold the creeds of blood and war had truly upon the Northmen: they were as willing as most of the rest of humankind when unbedevilled, to acquire a gentler faith and a saner superstition"(16)

which, incidentally, throws more light on his appraisal of Christianity, and at the same time confirms that his literature contains in fact such propaganda against violence and war.

As for Mungo Park, the natural question is why he was also included in this book if JLM had already published a biography nine months earlier the same year, "Niger: the Life of Mungo Park". The answer may be contained in the following words in which JLM describes his view of Mungo Park:

"Cool, impassioned, cowardly courageous, imperturbable, Mungo Park's character in analysis after a hundred and forty years disintegrates into fragments seemingly irreconcilable enough. The fire that integrated them was the Niger, Timbuctoo, search of the mystery river to the mystery city; and when knowledge of both was in his grasp the fire burned through from its dark shrine and destroyed him."(17)

Mungo, in a sense, reminds us of Ewan of "G G". It seems that such heroism, cool, impassioned, and imperturbable, forms part of the real selflessness which he makes into a symbol of the greatness of Natural Man's soul, and therefore of the explorer's. This explains why he wrote about Mungo twice and about Sir Francis Drake not even once, for despite his contribution to exploration in that he emulated Magellan, there is - in JLM's eyes - an essential difference between his adventure and that of a true explorer like Mungo Park since

"Drake voyaged around the world, the

first of the commercial explorers, seeking very definite gains in loot and wealth, no magic islands of escape from his age or himself. Michael Drayton's doggerel embodies the creed and intentions of such with a fine explicitness:

"A thousand kingdoms we will seek from afar,  
 And many nations waste with civil war ...  
 And those unchristened countries call our own,  
 Where scarce the name of England hath been known."(18)

Drake embodies the spirit of the Civilization JLM abhors, not only because being commercial and not altruistic its main object is "loot and wealth" by means of laying lands "waste with civil war", but also because of its aftermath: the subjugation of people, and therefore, the alienation of Natural Man. In this sense Columbus embodies the real meaning of exploration, for more than a new geographically identifiable world, he opened up the road to a new mode of production to a scientific, philosophical, intellectual, spritiual, and political world, in his pursuit of the "touchability of the horizon". If there is any contradictory implication in this, I do not think it denotes a serious inconsistency in the terms of his model.

His humanism pivots on a scientific knowledge and its related fields in search of freedom, forming thus the warp and weft of the content of his literary work.

Geographical exploration lends itself more easily than scientific research for fiction. JLM has endeavoured to convey the idea that the greatness of the Adventure lies not only in the vastness of the space to be covered - comprising also outer space, but also the intricacies of the many queries which pose a challenge to Man's understanding: this is the concern of scientific research proper, although, it is also philosophical in so far as it deals with the problem of knowledge at large. Hence his theme of the glyphs and of the need to decode them. For the glyphs represent more than an incidental motif in IS, they rather lead the reader to see in them the symbol of an unknown

which is not so impersonal since it is related to Man himself whose own story is still incomplete. In this sense the glyphs represent more than a mystery surrounding those peoples and cultures long gone out of History. They also stand for the presence of an 'incommunication' between modern Man and his distant past. Hence the need to investigate that past. The quest for casting light on those millenia that lie the other side of the Egyptian Monuments (see Chapt. 7) gives the theme of exploration as explained in chapt. 7 a kind of epic dimension, in that it is also part of the Great Adventure.

The novel "L T" is intended to illustrate another aspect of the great Adventure, but in allegorical form. It puts the line that the *raison d'etre* of Science (or of scientific research) is to succeed in its quest to find the cure for the disease of humankind, since the implication is that that cure is the sense of the quest. In fact, in Dr. Adrian's words, he

"can diagnose the complaint of the world. But how to effect the cure ... The trumpet voice of human sanity was stilled long ago. It is the great Lost Trumpet of human history."(19)

But if it is still beyond Dr. Adrian's knowledge "how to effect the cure", the ending of the novel clearly illustrates that if it is true that

"the quest romance is the victory of fertility over the waste land."(20)

it is also true that according to the Grail tradition

"the woes of the land are directly dependent upon the sickness, or maiming, of the King."(21)

And we know that in JLM's interpretation of the Grail story, the Fisher King (or Sick King, or Sick Man) is Humankind (see HWS, chapt. 8). Therefore, the victory of fertility over the waste land depends

directly upon the cure of Humankind's disease, a cure which can only happen when the Walls of the World are pulled down. But it is for this purpose that Humankind needs a "companionable-looking stone" (TD).

However, the idea is not so simple. Knowledge is in actual fact the achievement of Civilization. As such, and according to JLM's model it can hardly become an ally to humankind unless the sane part of Civilization took over in order to mastermind it. But the power of Civilization's evil influence is such that even scientists - usually Natural Man types - can be poisoned by it, like Thibault Gellion of "V M", a story that shows the relationship between Science (or knowledge) and Love: brotherhood and peace and friendship as opposed to patriotism (chauvinism), hatred, and war. Thus, the theme of knowledge is not independent from the theme of love since, like love, it belongs to the big themes of reproduction of life and of production for life as shown in "G R" and other fiction. The story "C", shows that the love of knowledge is a form of love of humanity, which is the real meaning of love, as opposed to sentimental or erotic, individual egotistical love, no matter how important the latter may be.

The danger that knowledge may serve other purposes is highlighted in FTS. Also, the novel GH is a warning, illustrating what might happen to Humankind if the sort of 'madness' that had seized Southcote (see analysis of FTS in chapt. 6) failed to be cured by Natural Man's superior spiritual strength (see chapt. 4), for in that case, exploration, scientific power, technology, and knowledge in the hands of Fascism constitute a lethal danger. However, JLM seems to see another dialectical contradiction here. Writing about the conquest of our space for instance, he anticipates:

"Within the next half century there is no reason why the moon, at least, should not be reached, even though the main explosive force behind the projectical may be Signor Mussolini in pursuit of an Italian Empire."(22)

Keeping in mind the fact that the book was published in 1928, there is

much more than only political intention in this allusion. There is also the evidence of the deep understanding JLM had of the scientific principles that propel social dynamics and of the relationship between Science and Technology, Political Economy and power politics. Notwithstanding, in the context of "H", the conquest of the moon is but an anticipation intended to illustrate not only the immense scope of the Adventure, but in reality, to illustrate also the immensity of the achievements that Humanity can attain aided by Knowledge. But in "GH" the clear intention is to show that the conquest of the stars by ~~Fascism~~ - which is also possible - means the defeat of Humanity. Hence, the social role of scientific research - or the Quest - but by Natural Man. This is a good instance of the role the author assigns to humanity in helping, or causing, to bring about the second "accident" leading to their liberation. If this is a clear allusion to revolution in that the negation of the negation implies a major political change, then it is still clearer from what sector of society the revolution is likely to emerge. FTS 'anticipates' that the outcome of this confrontation will be favourable to humanity, and therefore - one infers - the conquest of outerspace will become true. The crucial thing, however, is how to effect the substantial change. It is at this point that JLM's model only insinuates the road that political theory and practice have to tread. For all his love of peace the author cannot help accepting as fact that political revolution presupposes violence. But his dialectics tell him that violence can put an end to violence since all our past history,

"With the exception of its primitive stages, was the history of class struggles; that these warring classes of society are always the products of the modes of production and of exchange - in a word, of the economic conditions of their time; that the economic structure of society always furnished the real basis, starting from which we can alone work out the ultimate explanation of the whole superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical, and other ideas of a given historical period."(23)

If most of his fictional work is impregnated with the vigour of his battling against that "superstructure of juridical and political institutions as well as of the religious, philosophical, and other ideas", there are also instances in it which show that he shared Engels's view both of the class struggle as well as of the origin of these "warring classes", and at the same time, his stance concerning the use of force Rousseau himself had already concluded that force alone can effect the liberating act, or, as Engels quoted him:

"the despot is only master so long as he is able to use force and therefore "when his is driven out", he cannot "complain of the use of force ... Force alone maintained him in power, and force alone overthrows him; thus everything takes its natural course.""(24)

In other words, Phase III is neither a purely romantic lamentation for the lost happiness of the Golden Age nor the embittered denunciation of an accursed fate, let alone a nihilist philosophy of defeatism. It is rather a rallying of forces in front of the momentous challenge, a plan of campaign, a journey into the unknown, a tremendous enterprise, but at the same time, a declaration of confidence in a materialistic theory of history, and above all a vote of confidence in the powers and attributes of humanity.

CHAPTER 4 THE REVERSAL OF THE REVERSED SITUATION.  
A SECOND QUALITATIVE CHANGE

PHASE IV. THE SECOND 'ACCIDENT'

This is the opposite of Phase IV. It is also an 'accident' but in the opposite direction; and just as the first accident ushered in the disease of humanity, this second one should usher in the cure of the disease, and therefore, it should lead to the original sanity of humanity's soul. Thus, this 'accident' must be caused by Man in a highly conscious way, for it is an accident that comes as a result of a long search, and as such, in terms of the allegory, it leads to the end of the 'disease' though not to the ending of "exploration", and/or the quest.

Even when Science and Technology had been instrumental in bringing about the accident, now, being as a result both wholly in the hands of Natural Man, they become momentous instruments in the next task of harnessing nature in the conquest of the universe. This may be identified with the Faustian Man theme of Spengler, except that in JLM's model it is not the Faustian hero that matters but Natural Man, for the main objective is not so much to reach the stars and storm God's palace and to capture the engine-room and power-house, etc. (see Note in chapt. 3), for the sake of capturing them, or for the pride of having achieved such a momentous deed, as it is to conquer humanity's true liberty. This will ensure the flowering of a society based on the ethics JLM attributes to Natural Man. Thus, the first and paramount objective is to cure humankind of its disease in order to ensure its survival, in keeping with its true ethics. The attainment of such an objective entails the need for a social revolution of vast proportions. Phase IV concerns itself with revolution.

Since JLM/LGG advocates such a revolution he regards himself as a revolutionary writer. If it be accepted that the concept revolutionary does not always designate a political revolution, one would find less difficulty in accepting his point of view. But this would happen in so far as we took the view that his revolution is also

allegorical. One must not overlook, however, the fact that JLM did advocate a social revolution - and a social revolution is a political phenomenon. The question is whether JLM/LGG is a revolutionary in a general political sense or whether he is only a subjective or sentimental, or even, only a 'romantic' (in the bad sense of the word) revolutionary.

In fact his revolutionary ideas originate first in the ideals of the French Revolution as echoed and propounded by most of the romantic poets who contributed to his formation. Since those poets had become increasingly disenchanted with the aftermath of the French Revolution and not even the subsequent defeat of Napoleon had done anything to bring about the reign of liberty, equality, and fraternity, these ideals could have no future except continuing to be real aspirations of those humanists, and obviously, of JLM/LGG as well. But unlike most of the romantics, with Morris, JLM had seen in Marxist theory, and probably in its historical validity as confirmed by the 1917 Revolution, a better instrument to bring about a new revolution which might be more dependable in materializing those ideals, or rather, in making feasible his ultimate anarchistic ideal which is what he really admired in primitive societies (see chapt. 9).

However, we are not discussing here the revolutionary strategy of a political theorist or the views of a political leader. We are discussing the model of a writer. Therefore, we are discussing literary content and form, and possibly, as a result, a more general art model.

In his article "Writers' International", JLM presents himself as a revolutionary writer whose aim is to fight Capitalism. He admits there that all his literature is propaganda. At first sight there is an apparent sharp contrast between this vocation and his proclivity to writing romance literature. The truth is that his romance stories may be revolutionary in so far as they constitute representative samples of his conception concerning the role of a revolutionary writer and also the role of revolutionary literature.

This explains his frequent references to writers, to different art forms and artists, and also his method of exposing the weaknesses of representative capitalist thought. And yet - JLM's "romance" literature does not concern itself with politics proper, but rather with the ethics of capitalism as a political system that transmits a given cultural pattern.

According to JLM/LGG, Capitalism can metamorphose into other forms, one of them being Fascism, although the latter he regards as the inevitable outcrop of Capitalism. His Polychromata series, or CC cycle of stories, is mainly concerned with Capitalism and Colonialism. Thus the intention of his 'romances' is threefold: to combat the culture of Capitalism; to put forward the cause of humanism (or humanitarianism) - or to propound revolutionary values; and to produce - one may presume - work of literary value.

In PDEN, two out of the three Il Penseroso mood stories in the Egyptian Nights sub-cycle, deal with politics, or rather with the question of liberation: "Revolt" and "Dieneke's Dream".

"Revolt" (R) had been originally published as "One man with a Dream" - a name possibly taken from Arthur O'Shaughnessy's "Ode" - in the Cornhill Magazine, May 1919; and "D D" had also been published there as "Thermopylae" in December 1931. "R" may be interpreted as a psychological study of the ethical conflict of a revolutionary leader concerning the humanitarian ends of the Revolution and its regrettable but 'necessary' violent and ruthless means (liberation, might be a better word in this case). As parable, the story can be interpreted as an irony whereby the same love of humankind that prompts a man to become a revolutionary can cause him to be so weak as to betray the success of the Revolution, unless we suppose the love for a woman to be of a different nature. It seems to me that his real intention may have been to explain his concept of **love** at social level rather than at individual or amorous level, not to use the words 'romantic' or 'erotic' since these do not interpret the author's attitude to the problem. In this light, in "R", the hero's ethical act of humanitarianism, being guided by individual love, became in fact an

unethical act since it ruined the humanitarian ends of the uprising. The lesson would be that not even romantic love and humanitarian feelings can be superior to the cause of freedom, especially when they lack a collective motivation. Freedom is supreme both as an act of love and of humanitarianism, when it is the freedom of a people that is at stake.

The theme of both stories is liberation. "DD" is a kind of allegory on the origin and nature of the exploitation of man by man, and the absolute need of liberation by means of force. "R" is more specifically anti-English rule in Egypt, but it also advocates the use of armed force against the colonial rule.

JLM's political thought arises from his supreme pursuit: total freedom for the human being. In this sense, he can be classed as an anarchist, although, not exactly in the common sense of the word. He advocates Revolution as a means to achieve a social relation amongst human beings, essentially similar to that fraternity of the Gold Age hunters' society. The pursuit of an egalitarian, peaceful and fraternal society justifies the Revolution, even when he understands that such a revolution will not usher in total freedom. Hence his deprecations against party politics, including even the bolsheviks as seen in the story "E". Also, this may explain his doubts about socialism, and also his listless militancy in party politics; and last but not least, his impatience, because he is going much further, past the Walls of the World and into the Galaxy":

"'---- if the socialism we aim for is what I used to believe it .... But is it? Once, years ago, when I was a boy ---- (...) I thought it the Wall of the World: I thought if I could get near enough I'd be able to break through to something tremendously exciting behind. I chased it all the afternoon with a stone .... Later, (...): that thing beyond the horizon was the Galaxy, the universe we focus, and we'd go out and conquer it yet' (...) "Socialism ---- I thought it was a planning for that, somehow'"(1)

He cannot wait. He is too impatient in his eagerness to free humanity from the hunger, the suffering, and the beastliness of this world:

"God, it was for this ---- this social spite and meaningless chatter of strikes and tactics which still left men hungry and misery an unapproachable reality ---- for this he had thought any weapon justifiable, any means honourable ...."(2)

Through the pages of "TD" these are the tribulations of teenager M.M.', i.e. JLM in real life. Apparently, his early militancy did not guarantee a long adherence to the praxis of party politics, even when he could not escape a major political development: World War I. His fictional participation in it did not prevent him from reacting to its cruelties:

"Excreted from the socialist stomach, I began to see the War itself as no struggle of capitalist states eager for fresh markets, but an international outburst of sadism."(3)

However, one must not confuse JLM's revolutionism with his socialism, for if he never ceased to be in favour of revolution, he was not always a 'socialist'. His disillusionment, in its gradualist form, seems to have increased considerably long before the 1926 General Strike, on the occasion of World War I when the Second International failed to stand by the proletariat and not only caved in but actually ended up supporting the imperialist war. So that if Domina Riddoch's words reflect JLM's viewpoint, we can understand then that he is talking of a socialism which, in his view, had drifted away from the path to revolution to such an extent that he thought it no better, nor different in essence from the strategies of the Conservatives, the Liberals, or any other bourgeois political part of the day:

"We can never do anything through the old, cobwebby religions, and the old and useless political parties ---- the Conservatives sighing for the eighteenth century, the Liberals dreaming of a

chloroformed world in sidewhiskers and crinolines, the Labour Party ---- like a Nonconformist dinosaur, with its nice little respectable brain in its spine, not its head! You can never fight the returning beastliness themselves."(4)

This is of course fiction. But the passage might not be entirely fictional. There is evidence that JLM, the revolutionary, never got on well with the praxis of revolution, probably because he could never get on well with party discipline. Some even maintained - as I believe MacDiarmid once wrote - that especially in his early youth, and probably during his 20s, he might have been under the influence of Trotsky. If we acknowledge his avowed anti-Stalinism, this may be so. For there is also evidence that, from the point of view of his model at any rate, 'his' revolution involves the whole of humanity. This, however, is far from leading us to any valid conclusion, provided that it is correct to seek such a conclusion from such a material. Just as I am in favour of assessing his model as a creation that puts forward a theory of society which implies a clear political theory, I am against the tendency that seeks to evaluate every separate item or sub-item as conveying his own political view on the topic in question. Besides, we already know that he seldom goes all the way with somebody's ideas. Thus, he may have sided with Trotsky, if at all, on some issues, just as he may have opposed Stalin on some others. It is difficult to imagine JLM on a different trench than that of Stalin fighting Nazi-fascism during the Second World War. In a more general sense, it is also possible to affirm that his attitude towards politics is typically intellectual, as different from active or militant politics, in the sense that it does not differ fundamentally from the attitude of most intellectual people who being in favour of socialism do not take any action on the issue. Secondly, as a writer JLM often mixed fact and fiction, and this may be a case in point, where he uses fiction to mean fact. Thirdly, his "TD" is not only autobiographical, it also traces, as D.F. Young observed

"his spiritual and intellectual development"(5)

On the other hand, according to his own model, not even revolutionaries, and revolutionary parties can escape the devastating effects of the "defile of the beast", i.e. the defile of civilization, as shown in his novel "SR". Hence his doubts:

"Perhaps we'll never escape from civilization except by fighting it. (...) All the signs of the change seemed clear enough, but now they're as muddled a riddle as your glyphs. It may come back worse than ever ---- wars and gods and classes and cruelty ---- unless we fight it."(6)

This seems to be JLM's crossroads: he feels the urgency of fight "the beastliness" but he cannot trust "the old and useless political parties", as a result, maybe, of another disillusionment: the 1926 General Strike. For it is symptomatic that in this connection M.M. declared himself 'neutral'. So, the inevitable reaction comes through Domina's reasoning:

"Start the fight. Organize a society for all the shocking people like ourselves. .... Something new in politics, with a platform of all those things that are never mentioned and are uncomfortable and real ...."(7)

More than a crossroads, this can be interpreted as the basic incompatibility of attitudes between JLM as artist and JLM as political leader. His goal is not just the revolution but in fact the cultural revolution that the former is called upon to usher in. Hence his impatience. Domina's opinion, at least, is clear in her assessment of M.M. as a revolutionary:

"You can never march with the others, but always on the flanks. You fret and toil organizing the Expedition, but advancing with it drives you frantic"(8)

This may be fact. Throughout JLM's "adventure", his "explorers" appear as either marching on the flanks or lost in front. His

'leaders' seem to be made of the same stuff - provided that we take the view that they are essentially different from the explorers, which is not very likely - particularly leaders like Spartacus and Ewan. There is some relationship with Spengler's notions, though not necessarily a correspondence. This may not be so simple since it would be interesting to analyze 'the leader' in JLM/LGG's literature, another aspect which cannot be included here (see chapt. 14 - Feminism). Let it suffice to point out that Ewan as a leader was still in the process of becoming one at the end of "G.G.". and at that stage he had already undergone a significant transformation. Maybe JLM himself was undergoing a transformation in his early thirties, he who after all was a child of his time and circumstance, for taking into account that most of his literary work saw the light between 1919 and 1934, it is apt to remember that

"The 1930s were the political decade. The rise of Hitler forced into political awareness a whole generation that had hitherto thought of politics as a dirty game or as an exalted activity for the chosen few. It was the red decade, too, for bewilderment and concern in the face of Hitlerism (whether aroused by Hitler's grandiose nihilism or by his organized cruelty) very frequently took the form of a rapid turn to the left, which alone seemed to have an explanation of what was happening all over Europe."(9)

JLM's political awareness is much older. It is not clear yet whether his 'socialism' of the Mackie Academy days was essentially different from his later socialism, but he himself referred to it at least once with something akin to amused condenscension. But his political awareness had been certainly awakened at an early age in so far as he had reacted with enthusiasm in support of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, and his literature is marked by it, especially his earlier work. It was marked not so much because of the themes of the exile, the bolshevik epic, the Revolution itself, but more so perhaps because of the ethical meaning, the immediacy and feasibility of the liberation theme. Of the many senses of the word 'romantic', there must be at least one that can apply to JLM's enthusiasm for the first

Socialist Revolution in History. Whether his early political awareness led him to Morris, Shelley, and the Romantic Poets; or whether it was they who put him on the road to the great theme of liberation and freedom may be worthwhile establishing, provided that it might be more relevant than the fact that these two streams converge to form and shape his political outlook.

Anyhow, his political awareness and his insight to weigh and assess the trend of social events, enabled him to foresee the impending danger of Nazi-fascism long before Hitler took over. He knew well what Mussolini had been doing during the 1920s in Italy and he could see through him and his political propaganda. That is why in "H", already, he concerns himself with "Signor Mussolini", and therefore, the rise of Hitler rather than forcing him into political awareness, forced him - if that is the word to be used - into a new stage: a more mature stage, of political awareness, marked possibly by a more explicit commitment, whereby his earlier 'romanticism' begins its metamorphoses into something more concrete, as if he had discovered other 'walls' that shun the possibilities of getting through the "Walls of the World". And his exposure of fascism becomes more urgent. But his line of development is consistent with his overall humanist stance, so that it is only natural that in the political development of the Europe of his time he had seen the materialization in real life of what his model represents in the language of imagery. One could even accept as a probable hypothesis that the model came about as a result of his battle against the social forces that generate wars. Fascism, in this light, can be seen as a result. But his novels and their sequence show that his analysis of social phenomena is much deeper, and at the same time, his effort to found them on factual evidence is apparent. Some of them are particularly relevant to the subject of the present chapter, and TGB and GH may be singled out as the more relevant, as a brief comment on them is likely to show.

Already in 1932, as a natural sequence to the line of thought developed from The Cornhill Magazine stories to "TD", apart from "SS", he published two other novels: "T G B" and "L T". Both have been

regarded as 'diffusionist' novels of the 'romance' type. JLM would have regarded them as propaganda novels, though not propaganda of Diffusionism necessarily, as we shall see later on. For "TGB" the novel of "primitive" way of life is above all an anti-war and anti-social Darwinism novel. These themes are introduced in sub-chapter ii of the novel through the agency of "Miss Kemp of the C.U.P." (10). Behind the personalities of Dr. Keith Sinclair of the "League of Militant Pacifists" - who, as such has been

"kicked out of Italy (...) and deported from Germany"(11)

- and of Conservative M.P. Sir John Mullaghan, the armaments manufacturer and "head of the armaments people" there lie the two camps in which JLM/LGG sees humankind divided: the forces of humanity and life and the forces of inhumanity and death. But this conflict might have passed unnoticed if previously JLM had not presented Clair Stranlay and her personal drama as a result of war and warmongering:

"Clair Stranlay could not forget her lover who died on the wire outside Mametz."(12)

Tentatively at least, in TGB, one can distinguish two climaxes - o rather a sub-climax and a climax - and neither may be diffusionist, for, the climax proper may be 'evolutionist' in so far as it resolves a conflict of the survival of the human race in favour of Golden Age hunter-men who triumph over the Neanderthals in a fictional battle and general situation with an evolution-theory basis. As for the sub-climax, it can be interpreted as political rather than 'diffusionist'. However, it should be considered diffusionist in so far as it argues that primitive men were not savages. In fact, Sir John Mullaghan - the Southcote of TGB - admits that having lived "in the midst of a Palaeolithic tribe twenty-five thousand years ago he had found no "howling primordial beast",; and that he had seen nothing to indicate that man is by nature a cruel and bloodthirsty animal, adding this revealing statement:

"It became plain to me that the vicious combativeness of civilized man is no survival from an earlier epoch; it is a thing resultant on the torturing dreads of civilization itself."(13)

Diffusionist or not, the real aim of T.G.B. is not concerned with the monogenetic theory of the origin of culture but with the most political of problems: war (or politics by other means). On the one hand, he wants to prove that the true inner nature of humanity is peaceful, and on the other, to attack war and the politics of war in modern society.

Even if he quotes Lao-Tze in a context which is diffusionist, he is really making the point that far from being savage, primitive men were gentle, kind fraternal and decent people:

"They loved one another without knowing that to do so was benevolence; they were honest and leal-hearted without knowing that it was loyalty; they employed the services of one another without thinking that they were receiving or conferring any gift. Therefore their actions left no trace and there was no record of their affairs ...'"(14)

It follows, then, that war appeared much later in human society: a thing resultant on "the torturing dreads of civilization itself". In other words, war is a political phenomenon. So, during the climatic scene (of the sub-climax), Sir John, like Southcote of FTS, is very ill, in fact a dying man whose repentance as an armaments manufacturer is such that in his delirium he cannot help realising the frantic nonsense he had been taught concerning the nature of humanity whose original aggressive instincts had to be brought under control by means of brutal punishment and the use of armed power. And he, Sir John, in the name of that Civilizing process had been engaged in the manufacture of arms necessary for warfare. In his delirium he realizes what arms and war mean for people like Clair whose fiance had been killed in World War I:

"He said, in a whisper: "We murdered her lover - a boy - on the barbed-wire outside Mametz"".(15)

But the real import of Sir John Mullaghan's words comes when, in his imagined address to his imaginary colleagues in the House, campaigning now for disarmament says:

"Mr Speaker, in moving support of this Bill for disarmament by example, I am aware that I am contradicting previous utterances of my own and taking a line of action in direct opposition to that pursued by the great party to which I belong, and to my own private interersts. But I plead for my former attitude an ignorance of the essential nature of man as crass as any member of this House may ever have confessed to. I lived the scientific delusions of my age - "(16)

Those "previous utterances" preaching that

"there would always be wars and that honest men prepared for them!"(17)

indicate the enormous distance that separates this moribund Sir John from the previous (indeed, 'future') civilized Sir John. According to him, those previous utterances must be charged to his ignorance of the true essential nature of Man (or of social science?) an ignorance which had made him believe that his own counterpart in the Stone Age might have been the warrior:

"'the warrior was probably the equivalent of their armanents manufacturer, (...). He brought order and a livable relationship into primitive anarchy. And his task isn't yet finished.'"(18)

But Sir John's ignorance had been countersigned by the scientific delusions of the age. So that, moving support of a Bill for Disarmament is only a partial solution so long as the scientific

delusion persists. Therefore, the novel has to deal with this problem as well since, as proved already in evolution, survival itself depends on it. Accordingly, almost immediately he moves on to the next theme: the triumph of that original good nature of humanity over everything which is beastly and inhuman. In the novel this is represented by the triumph of the Cro-Magnards over the Neanderthalers. Hence the highly symbolic battle in which the Cro-Magnards, i.e. humanity, fought their way through to the no less symbolic Morning Pass (also called Sunrise Pass in the novel, and the Passage of the Dawn in the story of that name in CC) which was found thanks to the humaneness of the Cro-Magnards in much the same way that the beastliness or brutishness, the ferocity and warlike nature of the Neanderthalers denied them the road to the future. This marks the climax of the novel, and in fact, it is at this point that the question of the survival of humankind is presented in its phylogenetic dimension - a theme which forms the basic structure of JLM's model.

In terms of his allegory, his hope is that humankind will find "the Pass" which will lead to the Hollow Land. His fear is that humankind might perish before getting through "the pass", or even before nearing it, or simply, that humankind might perish as a result of defective leadership, as it is in the case of the Great Hierarchies in "GH". An important part of JLM/LGG's imagery revolves around this theme.

In this way, in the novel TGB, the conflict of survival versus extinction, or rather, the human forces that work in the direction of survival versus the anti-human forces that work in the direction of humanity's extinction, affects the same protagonists who have to cope with the same antagonists, i.e. the protagonists are not the 20th century people faced with the stone age people, supposedly their antagonists. The protagonists are not the 20th century people either, since at least two of them, Keith and Clair, are representatives of Natural Man in the 20th century. Thus, Keith's older personality is represented by the Golden Age hunter Aertes, whilst Clair and Lizair appear in a similar relationship. The real antagonists are the Neanderthal men, and obviously Sir John in his capacity as an arms manufacturer and social Darwinist. But he is 'redeemed' since he is a

man also and not a Neanderthaler.

The plot of TGB, however, from the viewpoint of the Golden Age reality, reverses the situation in a way, and translates a number of symbols and allegories of the general model into factual concrete elements: the night of humankind, the natural dawn, the Morning Pass, the Neanderthalers, etc. In a way, TGB is JLM's model at work in 'real life' but in a past, which is - 'fictional'.

TGB suggests that in the past during the Ice Age there was a dawn for humankind in the crucial struggle for the survival of the species, when the chances were, comparatively, as bleak as they appeared to JLM in the 20th century. Therefore, it is still possible to expect another dawn at the end of the night of humankind: a night which is not far when Fascism has already triumphed in Italy and is also growing fast in Germany. This expressed in terms of his model means that the spirit of the Neanderthalers is rapidly gaining ground and rallying its forces in front of the Morning Pass. But humanity must fight their way through as they once did. Accordingly, in TGB the decisive battle between humanity and beastliness takes place right at the point where the Pass is and the imagery indicates that the battle must be interpreted in terms of his general model as symbolical, for that triumph of the Cro-Magnards over the Neanderthalers was in fact the triumph of homno sapiens, approximately 25000 years ago according to the novel.

When three "go back" - as far back as 25000 years - the author can still find some plausible fictional situation to solve the problem fairly well. But when the author adds that two of the three who went back had a real existence in the Golden Age; and on top of that, he has them landed back in the 20th century, his job becomes particularly difficult. It is not until reading "GH" that one becomes aware that more than following H.G. Wells and "The Time Machine" in particular, JLM had in fact been "experimenting" with J.W. Dunne's "An Experiment with Time" (1927), which JLM applied to fiction when writing both TGB and GH. It seems to me that his fictional idea that one person may 'incarnate' him (or her)-self into another in a different time must be

based on Dunne's "introduction to Serialism as a theory of the universe" as the author explained:

"Serialism discloses the existence of a reasonable kind of 'soul' ... an individual soul which has a definite beginning in absolute time ... a soul whose immortality, being in other dimensions of Time, does not clash with the obvious ending of the individual in the physiologist's Time dimension, and a soul whose existence does not nullify the physiologist's discovery that brain activity provides the formal foundation of all mundane experience and of all associative thinking.

2. It shows that the nature of this soul and of its mental development provides us with a satisfactory answer to the 'why' of evolution, of birth, of pain, of sleep, and of death."(20)

At any rate, JLM must have had this in mind when writing TGB, although in this novel he does not mention J.W. Dunne as he does in GH. I am not suggesting that JLM is endorsing J.W. Dunne's views. He is simply using his material to solve a problem of form in an attempt to give more plausibility to his fictional work.

In relation to content, the question of leadership is important for JLM since the direction in which civilization may advance depends directly upon it. Accordingly, the problem of the leadership and the advance of humankind are closely connected with the symbolism of the cardinal points. South lies the land of plenty and warmth, i.e. - life. The east is dominated by civilization. To the West lies the Unknown, yet humankind must go west in pursuit of Adventure: to the darkness of a terrible night. Hence the importance of the leadership. In JLM's literature it is clear that only those world views and philosophies of life whose content is humanistic and deep rooted in the knowledge of real people and their world are in a position to provide good leadership. Since the Ice Age is coming from the North, the hunters must push South, but

"'There's no road at all through the

southwards mountains. It is an absolutely impassable wall.'"(21)

(the wall symbol again). The leaders (Keith and Clair) have to make a crucial decision: the choice is between East and West. But if they go West

"... that will take them into a worse winter. It might even mean ... Extinction.'"(22)

Yet, the role of the leaders is to lead the hunters of the Golden Age away from death and extinction.

"We'd crawl through that pass sometime at night, so's not to arouse the Neanderthalers, and gain the country in the east.'"(23)

This decision as adopted by two 20th century leaders - who know that that had been the course of the Cro-Magnards in history - lends itself to some speculation in the book which JLM uses as a means of making more explicit both his symbols and the general sense of this model (see chapt. 14 - Feminism: the leaders). For going east means that

"... beyond that pass in the east lies: Your boy lover dying on the wire in France, Clair, and the crucified slaves along the Appian Way and the Pinkertons shooting down the starving strikers of a Scotch philanthropist.... Not if I know it! Better to end it here. Better to make this the end of the human adventure, or go west with the hunters tomorrow and lose ourselves and die in the clean snows of Atlantis..."(24)

Going east meant marching towards Civilization and its aftermath, 25000 years ago. The implication of the passage seems to be that whatever the role of leadership in the past, it is obvious that the absence of leadership ensures the way to extinction. Humanity could afford to dispense with leadership at the time when life was normal

during the Golden Age, like the hunters of TGB who created in Keith Sinclair the impression of

"an orchestra without conductor"(25)

but leadership is necessary whenever the survival of humanity is at stake, like in the past during the Ice Age, although 'salvation' then led to Egypt, i.e. to civilization. There is an interdependence and a close linkage between salvation and a number of previous achievements on which it depends. Salvation depends on the outcome of the decisive confrontation (the "accident") which will inevitably happen at the crucial moment. But the latter depends on the "pass" to salvation which must be found first, which in turn, depends on the strategy which must succeed in selecting the correct route to that "pass". And all this depends on the leadership. This in turn depends on knowledge.

In other words, Phase IV is the allegory of social revolution. Ironically, at the heart of JLM/LGG's concern lies the problem of militarism and war which he never ceases to combat.

TGB and GH are anti-militarist and anti-bellic novels. It is an anti-bellicism seriously concerned with the danger of self-destruction, a thing which can be understood in more ways than one. Within this perspective, a few words on GH.

"GH" is essentially a warning: if militarism and/or fascism is to govern Civilization, sooner or later - and probably rather sooner than later - an atomic war is going to destroy the world of 20th century humankind. JLM was anticipating the advent of atomic weapons eleven years before Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Apart from this, both TGB and GH are concerned with an impending danger of extinction of the human race. In this sense, the essential difference between TGB and GH goes with the nature of the agent that may bring about the catastrophe. That is, the danger is the same, even if the form of the extinction may vary, whereby FLW for example

is but another version of it. In "TGB" the enemy that endangered the success of the "exodus" (to salvation) was the Neanderthaler defined as beings that

"are men, but not Man."(26)

because

"Men - the Cro-Magnards and the stock that produced ourselves - are decent, kindly animals of anthropoid blood, like the chimpanzee and gibbon. But there is another strain - the gorilla and perhaps these Neanderthalers - the sullen, individualist beast whose ferocity is perhaps maladjustment of body and a general odd, black resentment against life."

"Like the militarists and the hanging judges and the gloomy deans of the twentieth century?"(27)

This quotation reproduces in a nutshell the essence of JLM's anthropological stance concerning the origin of Man within the terms of the Darwinian theory. But at the same time, it illustrates the correspondence between his scientific concern and his social concerns, i.e. the incongruity between Man's nature and the social nature of war, or, according to the model, the difference between the Cro-Magnards and the Neanderthalers is meant to represent the basic contradiction between the pacifism of Natural Man and the ferocity of men at war as illustrated over and over again in History. The Neanderthalers as the symbol of modern militarism - and possibly of fascism - is emphasized again in TGB towards the end of the novel:

"there are still Neanderthalers alive - in generals' uniforms."(28)

Apart from Kropotkin, whom he does not mention as one of his heroes concerning the anti-militarist fight, JLM never denied his debt to Karl Liebknecht, the German humanist and pacifist, and revolutionary. On the contrary, already in 1929 in his story "V M" refers to him as

"one of the public men of Germany who had tried to keep the peace."(29)

This admiration arises, perhaps, from Karl Liebknecht's stand as a pacifist and, as a result, from his clairvoyance in exposing the nature of militarism in his book "Militarism and Anti-Militarism". The Socialist Labour Press in Glasgow, published a translation of the book. There was a second edition in 1917, so that JLM might have read Liebknecht even before his hero's death or execution, in 1919, if he had not read it in the original. JLM evokes Liebknecht's significance in most of his anti-militaristic passages. IN "T D" he sees Liebknecht as a victim to the evils of Civilization and the politics of it:

"I'd still to learn of the murder of a Liebknecht"(30)

In TGB Liebknecht is mentioned alongside Anatole France as examples of the humaneness of humanity as opposite to the spirit of

"the head-hunter and the gangster"(31)

and in GH he mentions Karl Liebknecht in relation to militarism:

"Militarism! Karl Liebknecht had been right: it was merely a half-witted ape dressed in ..."(32)

Liebknecht, in fact, devotes the second part of his book to prove his case for an anti-militarist policy in the struggle for peace on behalf of the proletariat. There is little doubt that JLM sided with Karl Liebknecht in this policy., The objective fact is that most of his literature is anti-militarist. Also, there is little doubt that his anti-militarist stance - taking into account the fact that Liebknecht was executed in 1919, i.e. before either Mussolini or Hitler had taken over - transmuted itself into an anti-fascist struggle as soon as he became aware of its advance outside Italy and on to the rest of

Europe, judging presumably from the current developments in Germany. But those developments were taking place only shortly before his untimely death. Even so, his literature is dominated by this antifascist attitude, and GH is essentially an anti-fascist novel.

Now, "GH" - published in 1934, about one year after Hitler's take over in Germany - identifies the Fascist with the Neanderthalers, and it suggests that the great battle for the survival of humankind is going to take place in its last phase, or at the climatic point, between Humanity and Fascism. This, I think, is the sense of JLM's words in his address to Christopher Morley to whom he dedicated GH":

"This is not, in any sense, a sequel to "Three Go Back". But I suppose it might be called a companion book;"(33)

a companion book because it concerns itself with the same problem: survival versus extinction; war versus peace, Natural Man versus Neanderthalers and militarism etc.

TGB anticipates the ultimate triumph, and the dimensions of that triumph for humanity, once the unity and peaceful relations among all the peoples of the earth is achieved and humans can devote all their energies to creative activity of a higher nature:

""There are later ages than the one we came from, and AErte - he'll walk naked across the world again, and fearless; but with Orion's sword in his belt and the Milky Way for a plaything. The weeping and the tears - they're a darkness yet to fall on our hunters. But it will pass. I know. You know it will. And it is for that, though your own dream of changing that chance must finish, that you are to lead the Cro-Magnards east to the pass in the mountain-wall."

She could not see when she stopped speaking. She thought: 'Oh! I ache also, and I'm cold and hungry, and I've been ranting... And I'd like to lie down and sleep and forget it all -' She heard Sinclair speaking, and looked up and saw that Titan resentment gone from his face.

"You've won again, Clair. There was you, at least, in that age that is not yet.... We'll go east tomorrow."(34)

His idea of outer space conquest - already suggested in "H", then in "LDEC", and explained in "TD", etc. - is confirmed by the symbolic "Orion's sword in his belt", i.e. like Orion, Man is a giant of earthly origin who will end up in the skies of the galaxy; like Orion humanity is the son of Mother Earth, and like him a hunter; and like Orion humanity's brilliance is going to shine in the galaxy, etc.

There may be reasons to sense some confusion, and even for detecting some contradictory elements in all this, especially when in GH the first impression is that the novel is an anticipation, or a prophesy when 20000 years hence it is reported that Civilization has destroyed itself after having reached incredible heights of power over nature as the Voice of the Tower (q.v.i.) informs.

My impression is that there is no incoherence, for if TGB may have the character of a very general anticipation in reverse, GH is neither this nor a prophesy but simply a warning of what might happen, for as D.F. Young put it:

"Mitchell does not want to involve himself in prophesies"(35)

And yet, even if agreeing with D.F. Young, the fact remains that JLM/LGG is a prophet of some kind. For example, the achievements of the Hierarchies in GH - even when at the same time they mark their downfall - contain, in fact, some anticipations, like the test-tubes new life

"The great problem of surpluses was solved, and everywhere the Hierarchies entered into control of those States that have made our civilisation; so that in comparison with them the greatest achievements of the earliest scientific age of the old Christage superstition are little more than the fumbings of savages in the dark. We have measured the stars

and sent ships to the planets, we have prolonged life and mitigated death, created new life in the test-tubes of our laboratories, altered the periodicity of the seasons, reached in the arts the verge of a world that definitely marks a new and subtle transformation of the human mind. But now it seems that all this glorious fabric may be either completely or partially levelled in the Revolt of the Sub-Men -"(36)

It is not clear whether this was the Revolt of Humanity, but it is clear that the 'achievements' of the Hierarchs correspond to FWN's notion of a "higher culture", since in his opinion

"the point of view of the division of happiness is not essential when it is a question of the production of a higher culture"(37)

whereby it is clear that JLM is in fact attacking FWN's social and anthropological ideas, especially the notion of the Superman in so far as this is not independent from the idea of higher and lower castes.

Yet, JLM's true idea is, perhaps, only to suggest that the essence of a higher culture may not be based on the power to dominate, not necessarily at any rate, but rather on the power to know in order to enjoy life, as the verses of James Elroy Flecker suggest. This is probably the reason why JLM selected them for a suitable epigraph for his novel:

"I care not if you bridge the seas  
Or ride secure the cruel sky,  
Or build consummate palaces  
of metal or of masonry,

But - have you wine and music still,  
And statues, and a bright-eyed love?

- James Elroy Flecker"(38)

It would be proper to add that JLM is thinking of this as the enjoyment that all humanity should find in living on earth. No wonder

that some critics and poets have referred to his "Rabelaisian humour", although I would suggest that it is his Rabelaisian approach to human life. The creation of material and psychological conditions in society in order that every human being enjoy life, seems to be one of the fundamental premises on which his concept of culture rests. This explains not only one of the main reasons why he rejects FWN's social philosophy, but also and fundamentally, the reason why he rejects Nietzsche's concept of a higher culture. Therefore, he rejects FWN's ideas of Literature (poetry in this case) and its relation with the truths of life (see chapt. 9). The allusion to FWN had already been anticipated 15 pages earlier when Gay and the Old Singer discussed the relationship between poetry, life, and truth. Gay's mentality of the 20th century conceives lying and believing as natural:

"...You wouldn't believe me."  
 "Not believe?"  
 "You would think I did not speak the truth."  
 "But I also am a Singer - as Rem is. Therefore I would know your Song."  
 "Then only Singers do not speak the truth?"  
 "Surely. They set tales upon the truth, to make it more true." (39)

(Incidentally, the last sentence here may illustrate his personal philosophy if not of Literature, at least, of his own literature. Anyhow, something similar had been anticipated in "E"). The allusion to FWN is clear, especially if we compare this short dialogue with a passage taken from FWN where he wrote:

"But poets lie too much"  
 .....  
 But what did Zarathustra once say unto thee? That the poet lies too much? - But Zarathustra also is a poet?  
 .....  
 But granting that someone did say in all seriousness that the poets lie too much: he was right - we do lie too much.  
 .....  
 I became weary of the poem, of the old and of the new: superficial are they all unto me, and shallow seas." (40)

The passage speaks for itself.

I have already pointed out the relationship between "An experiment with Time" and GH. Another interesting thing is that in his Introduction to the Third Edition (March, 1934), writing of "Infinite Regres" Dunne says that his book

"it contains the first scientific argument of human immortality. This I may say, was entirely unexpected. Indeed, for a large part of the time that I was working, I believed that I was taking away man's last hope of survival in a greater world."(41)

From the point of view of JLM's model at least, this might not be so curious after all, since the ultimate intention that underlies GH seems to be precisely something very similar. The reader can arrive at the conclusion that in JLM's view the end of Civilization does not necessarily entail the end of humanity. For looking back from the distant future Gay can see that the civilization that was extinct was the Neanderthalers" - in terms of JLM's model - but humanity -"

"Man did not die. Even civilization had failed to kill him. Men died, but Man lived, a child as yet, but immortal and terrible in the eyes and hands he lifted to the skies. The fevers of religion and science and civilization had passed away, and out again, in the wastes of Time, spear in hand, he stumbled on a quest undying, with rain in his face and the wail of peewits to companion that endless trek...."(42)

This is JLM/LGG's Man. If in Spengler's view this Man may have more of the Apollonian than of the Faustian, the impression created by JLM is that for him, the Apollonian, the Magian, the Faustian, etc. blend in one main identity and one collective soul since there is but one Humanity: that of Natural Man. This Humanity is to survive.

JLM's idea is - one infers - to emphasize that, from the point of view of humanism, the primitive way of life of the Golden Age is by far better than the way of life dictated by Fascism. Yet the ending of GH suggests that Rem and his people are not going to remain forever in their Golden Age. There will be another civilization. Here again, we sense JLM's proximity to Spengler. Yet, the author of GH suggests that Rem's people might take a different route in their adventure towards the conquest of the stars, a route

"without any of civilization's attendant horrors"(43)

for the present route may not be the only one in the wastes of the universe and time

"Perhaps the future we came from was one of many possible futures -"(44)

because there are many different ways of life, or "songs":

"there are many songs"(45)

It could be inferred from here that JLM believes that the basic contradiction between Man and Nature might be resolved in an ideal way. Something which translated into political terms would be equivalent to conceiving a History of Humankind that would not be based on social class division, and therefore, without any class struggle, i.e. "without any of civilization's attendant horrors". If such inference were correct, the inevitable conclusion would be that this view is subjective. This may be so. But more that a subjective view, this may be a subjective feeling, and not of the author necessarily, but of his fictional characters, for I think it is unlikely that JLM would ever have given vent to any subjective view in his own "History of Mankind" had he lived long enough to materialize that project. What is at stake here, I think, is his intention to combat once more Spengler, and specifically that

"- Spengler, with his theories of cyclic

catastrophe, of the rise and fall of cultures, inevitable and unceasing. His slick, quack arguments, built of poor reasoning and worse research (...), but how they had moved her contemporary world! What a brainless and barren world that had been, heedlessly searching for a way of life!"(46)

In other words, the theme of a route to civilization without its attendant horrors, belongs to JLM's Quest: there must be a way out. And he insists on it despite Spengler's allegations that "only dreamers believe that there is a way out" (see chapt. 15). That is Spengler's "song"; but according to JLM there are many songs, so that Rem and his people may have a fair chance of avoiding the horrors of the present Civilization in finding their own road to the stars, for

"Even these Folk in this second Golden Age - they were out on an Expedition terrible and strange, into the wastes of time and space, on that conquest of the universe Men may not deny."(47)

In relation to the theme of survival versus extinction, GH goes a step further in clarifying the issue in the sense that his faith in survival is so adamant that even in the eventuality of an atomic war in which it will not be possible

"... to cope with the poisoning dust that comes from the atomic bombing ..."(48)

as the Voice reports from the Tower, humanity will still survive, reaffirming, thus, that 'even civilization will have failed to kill humanity' (see 42 above).

I have suggested before that "GH" is not a 'prophecy'. Notwithstanding this, the fact remains that the atomic bomb was a prophecy. Our hope is that his anticipation of atomic war will never be realized.

Even if incomplete, all these facts mentioned above indicate that if JLM/LGG is to be thought of as a 'revolutionary', this can be done within certain specifications in order to avoid getting involved with political ideology, for as I have suggested previously, that would call for a deeper, more extensive, and more specialized analysis. Such analysis would have to deal in the first place with the validity of his critical stance concerning the strategies, the tactics, and the praxis of the political parties that seek the path to Revolution. Secondly, it would have to throw more light on JLM/LGG's theoretical approach to the only triumphant revolution in his own time. And thirdly, it would have to establish the line of evolution in his political thought. From such a study it would be easier to examine in what way he related his art model to his political model.

As it is, all I can say here is that his model, in a way, is intended as a revolutionary model. At least, this present Phase IV symbolizes a revolution of some kind, leading to the cultural revolution, as already suggested.

The term revolutionary thought may be justified in so far as the content of his literary work reveals that the hall-mark of his thought and endeavour is to revolutionize civilization into a human one. But to transform a whole civilization - when that transformation implies literally that it is necessary to turn the existing social and cultural order upside down at universal range can only refer to a universal cultural revolution achieved at the other end of a long process intended to transform the infra-structural fabrics of Civilization, i.e. Capitalism. Whatever the praxis of his own politics in his own time, the fact remains that his literature reveals his concern about the need for the political revolution. The truth is that his literature, though, does in actual fact contribute to the cultural project of that revolution, which, his own model helps identify with the proletarian revolution.

In short, we find Phase IV the crux of the model in so far as it deals with the major issue of the advent of the "negation of the negation", i.e. the negation of the oppressors by the oppressed

because

"The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of the negation. (...) In the former case we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people."  
(49)

It is the successful resolution of the dialectical contradiction which humanity had got themselves enmeshed in. In Phase III we had seen how the author dreaded a fatal outcome due to the increased worsening of the situation as the contradiction approached its climax. But the favourable resolution of the contradiction ensures the advent of equality removing thus the cause and origin of social strife and violence. In this he is once more following the course set by both Rousseau first and Engels later when describing the dialectical contradiction that poses the big problem:

"All institutions set up by the society which has arisen with civilization change into the opposite of their original purpose. "It is an incontestable fact, and the fundamental principle of all public law, that the peoples set up their chieftains to safeguard their liberty and not to enslave them." And nevertheless the chiefs necessarily become the oppressors of the peoples, and intensify their oppression up to the point at which inequality, carried to the utmost extreme, again changes it to its opposite, becomes the cause of equality:"(50)

This would be, then, the true sense of the night of mankind which I mentioned in Phase III: "inequality carried to its utmost extreme"

which nevertheless, "with the inexorability of a law of Nature" is the key to producing the 'accident' that will effect the reversal of the reversal, i.e. the negation of the negation.

## CHAPTER 5 EQUALITY IN FREEDOM

### PHASE V A HIGHER LEVEL OF SOCIAL HARMONY

As already suggested, it depends on the successful outcome of the quest that humanity may find the path to escape death and/or extinction, or, the "passage of the dawn" that leads to the reign of life and happiness. In keeping with the convention of the quest tradition, success depends on the correctness in the performance of the deeds which humanity is called upon to go through in order to find the grail. Correctness, in turn, depends not only on human ethics and perseverance but also on good knowledge and, last but not least, good leadership. It is here that love, as understood by JLM/LGG plays the main role. It is love that will be instrumental in finding the path or passage and in getting humanity through, no matter that in the event love will have to transmute itself, even if temporarily, into sharp violence. It is this love that will cure the disease of humanity.

But Phase V, in point of fact, represents the actual finding of the Grail, for if it is true that, in terms of the legend, a recovery of something precious is implied, it is equally true that, in JLM/LGG's version, there is, apart from that, something else which is new in quality, at any rate. In effect, the grail - as described in my analysis of HWS in chapter 8 entails the conquest of a new quality of liberty not only in that there are no more unfathomable relevant mysteries in relation to human existence but also in that the horn of plenty is no longer a mere fantasy conceived by the mind of humanity but a normal reality now that humanity have finally found the means of materializing it.

Thus, Phase V might suggest a new utopia. Yet, JLM/LGG never suggested that it was his intention to depict one. Nevertheless, even when - contrary to his own intentions - it were proved that his model, in its last phase, does imply the idea of utopia, there might be some important and relevant differences with previous utopian conceptions. In the first place, JLM/LGG's 'utopia' would not be an imaginary and

impossible dream, for it does not arise from his own subjectivity and, in the last analysis, it is not his original idea let alone his own discovery. For in real terms not only Phase V but in fact his model as a whole is but the artistic expression of a well-defined and consistent world view which, in turn, is but the result of a long historical process - a quest as it were - in search of a scientific understanding of nature, man, and culture. In his literary work the author acknowledges, in one way or another, his debt to that historical process or tradition, since he himself traces it back to its most distant origins. So that his Phase V, in so far as it arises from it is but the 'utopia' of that tradition. In other words, instead of discussing utopia, the author is in fact discussing the feasibility of scientific socialism. In this sense, his socialism represents the higher stage of the progressive trend the author so consistently highlights in his writings. Hence, Phase V is not the result of subjective imagination but of objective extrapolation at work. According to his model, the egalitarian society he postulates has not only already existed but also proved to be the most natural way of life in the past, and hence, it should not be based on the better or worse regimentation of human life but rather on the complete absence of anything akin to it since, instead of envisaging the 'perfect State', he postulates in fact its complete elimination.

For his project envisages a society in which, first of all, there must be no private appropriation of production either. It is in this sense that he uses the example of the gentile society, or the primitive mode of production, in which there was no class antagonism and, consequently, no state, and as a result, no strife and its aftermath. This has something to do with his admiration of Campanella's utopia, although Campanella may not have been the first utopian to see a basic problem in the question of the distribution of the means of subsistence. In any case, JLM/LGG's model is based on the premise that the community of goods and the fair distribution of products forms the foundations of the natural way of life among human beings, being this the pre-condition for the flowering of equality, brotherhood, social freedom, and collective happiness. The originality of his conception lies in that he firmly believes that the

essential component of a way of life which once existed can be brought back to existence reversing thus the current situation and proving at the same time that there is great sense in the quest for a path that can get humanity through to that way of life. That path also exists and is called revolution, and since political revolution belongs to History, his 'utopia' may come true. In other words, he conceives the transformation of the current society into a perfect one as possible and feasible. The feasibility does not arise so much because of the natural movement of social change towards a perfect civilization, for if this Civilization as we know it can improve the means of production it can also distort the human content of life as long as its mode of production remains unchanged. It is precisely the current mode of production in the capitalist society that causes the division into antagonistic social classes, and therefore, it is the task of the revolution to alter that mode of production in such a way that the producers be at the same time the owners as it used to be in the distant past in the society of the 'primitives', i.e. the first historical negation must in turn be negated. His model takes it for granted that humanity has never abandoned the idea of recovering their natural fraternal social relations. This does not mean recovering the primitive mode of production necessarily - for such stance would be not only unscientific but in fact ridiculous - since a mode of production organized on a scientific basis can provide the necessary conditions for achieving a fair organization of social life for the benefit of every member of the society. JLM's model gives indications that the mode of production, of this 'utopia' would have to be very sophisticated if it is to succeed in providing abundance for all. Again, his emphasis on the freedom of the primitive does not indicate that JLM/LGG believes in a truly 'free' society among primitives if they depended on the rigors of nature for their subsistence and even for their survival. His model itself is evidence that he was guided by the philosophical concept of freedom. Besides, I have mentioned how his ideas have sometimes coincided with those of Engels, and I infer that he must have been familiar with his analysis which is relevant to the problem in hand that

"The first men who separated themselves

from the animal kingdom were in all essentials as unfree as the animals themselves, but each step forward in the field of culture was a step towards freedom."(1)

We have seen that his model revolves around this contradiction. Hence the freedom of the primitives is referred to the social aspect only but not the relations of Man with his external world. On this plane, JLM/LGG reveals what one can term a materialistic conception of his 'utopia' since in the solution of this problem he highlights the paramount role that human knowledge is called upon to play since necessity imposes its objective laws both on nature and on society and therefore on humanity. Humanity will not be entirely free until those laws come under their control; and just as social revolution is expected to free men from social oppression enabling them at the same time to change planned for anarchic production and consciously organized for spontaneously dominant living conditions, so too these conquests together with the control of those laws will make freedom possible, for

"Freedom therefore consists in the control over ourselves and over external nature, a control founded on knowledge of natural necessity; it is therefore necessarily a product of historical development."(2)

This seems to be JLM/LGG's philosophy although in his model he expresses it in a different manner, but he highlights both freedom and scientific knowledge. His 'utopia' of Phase V conceives humanity as having already taken full control over most laws of nature (and of society). In other words, he conceives the future of humanity not as utopia but as the natural result of the historical progressive trend of humanity. Obviously, at present, even more so in his own time, human society of Phase V is a utopia.

One of the most important elements in JLM/LGG's 'utopia', apart from its feasibility, is the emphasis in stressing that the revolutionary change will come as the inevitable triumph of the vast

majority of the downtrodden and oppressed of the earth. The suffering majority of the dispossessed will be the agents of the revolution thanks to their being endowed with all the highest ethical values which have always belonged to the human race. Like in the Grail legend, utopia would bring back those precious elements which humanity had once possessed and lost.

It is obvious that the excellence of JLM's 'utopia' is reflected in the quality of the freedom which Man might enjoy in it. His emphasis on the theme of freedom creates in most cases the impression of being perhaps the most romantic element of his romantic imagery, and yet, as already seen, it is not so. It is true that, as part of his artistic work, freedom appears related not only to romantic elements but also to romantic poetry and literature, and in general, to romanticism. But on the other hand, it is also true that his concept of freedom arises from his concept of History something which is particularly relevant when we consider that he was a historian. And supposing he regards Anarchism as the true expression of human freedom, we may presume that if it is true that he derived it mainly from Kropotkin, it can also be true that Engels's influence may have helped to clarify JLM's apparent discrepancy with orthodox Marxism in that JLM/LGG does not glorify the Socialist State, or for that matter, the states to come after the proletarian revolution. His model goes further than that: it concerns itself not only with the abolition of the state as advocated by Engels - hence his view of the need of revolution - and not only with the need to set up the state of the proletarians, an idea which he does not seem to like because such a state would still be a state. His goal is Anarchy in the grand sense of the word. His enthusiasm goes with that part of the process in which according to Engels even the people's state "will inevitably fall", or, as it has also been interpreted, is to "wither away".

But as is usually the case with JLM, he is not following Engels alone. If we have seen how this "dreamer of dreams" is indebted to Morris, we may also presume that he may be indebted to other "dreamers" as well as JLM/LGG himself has acknowledged in his literature. Not all those dreamers and not all his own dreams are

likely to be romantic. Like D.I. Pisarev (see chapt. 7) - JLM seems to conceive that the kind of dream he advocates is the dream that runs "ahead of the natural march of events" and which may even "support and augment the energy of the working men", and that instead of distorting or paralysing labour-power, such kind of dreams are but a good stimulus "to induce man to undertake and complete extensive and strenuous work in the sphere of art, science, and practical endeavour", and in short, that if there is "some connection between dreams and life then all is well".

His conviction that humanity will triumph in the end is not subjective wishful thinking but his certainty that according to the laws that govern History - considering in this the action of the vast majority of the people as decisive - this will happen of necessity.

CHAPTER 6 "FTS" AS PARADIGM OF THE MODELI. - RESUME OF "FTS"

His already vast and brilliant seismological research takes Dr. Richard Southcote, a dogmatic Calvinist nicknamed "Earthquake Southcote", to the ill-famed city of Mevr, the "Hell-Gate of the East", where he settles with his dear wife Jenny and his 18 year-old Dick, the apple of his eye.

Within six months his wife dies of malaria. Dick gets involved with the "scum" of Mevr in The Street of Ten and seduces Anah, a girl whom Mitri loves and whom her mother, the harlot Miriam, wants to rescue from prostitution. At the request of Miriam, Mitri kills Dick whom Anah tried to save, and remembers even now when she is to die soon. Southcote does not know anything about this and as a result of losing both his wife and son he goes mad. The people call him now "the mad hakim". He blames it all on Mevr and its sins and on its sinful people, particularly so on those of The Street of Ten, or the street of prostitution. Like an angry god he seeks to punish them severely, and accordingly he decides to use his scientific knowledge to attain that end. It is true that Mevr "the foetid city" seethes with criminals of all kinds - the grave robbers Abdul and Osman; the "thirstily vociferous cameliers"; the desert robbers and their spy Selim; the scavenger Ahmed; the prostitutes; Ali, "the murderer-bravo", etc., and all this may have added to Southcote's madness. He now pursues one single aim: to destroy Mevr and its inhabitants. The imminent invasion of Kuchik Khan's army "raised on Soviet gold", which would have cleansed the earth "in fire and rapine" as God has "cleansed the world with the sword of Tamerlane", had unfortunately "melted away, and Mevr breathed again". But Southcote would pray to "God's vengeance on the city of the Plain".

The story opens on a Easter Day with Southcote near his son's tomb up on a hill when "under the feet of the watcher on the Hill of Burial the earth suddenly shook, quivered for a moment as might one in a nightmare, and then slowly subsided" and as a result "the vacantness

vanished from the eyes of the watcher: they blazed with the hatred of the fanatic, the mono-maniac. A tall, gaunt figure, he rose from beside the dark mound where he had been crouching and outreached thin, clutching hands (...), he stood, threateningly, weird in his shabby black, a prophet of wrath over above Mevr". And there, deaf to any human voice, he refuses his professional assistance to the grave robber Abdul bitten by a viper. He simply "laughed, laughed aloud, ringingly, unemotionally".

Back in his laboratory he sees that the pointer in the seismograph "quivered above nine". At long last! It is near sunset, and the mad doctor gets ready to seek his own safety leaving Mevr and its people to their lot. Accidentally, however, on picking up Jenny's bible, "with a strange deliberation it opened in his hands.

"Peradventure there be fifty righteous men within the city. Wilt Thou also destroy and not spare the place for the fifty righteous men that there are therein?

"...And He said, "I will not destroy it for ten's sake"."

The path to the Southern Gate is blocked by "the stalls of the afternoon's chaffering". So that only "one other way out of the city remained for him to take - through the street unvisited and loathed, the place where his son had been murdered. Was it not fitting that he should pass through there?" That is none other than The Street of Ten and that figure, and its appeal begin to haunt him. And he begins counting the righteous men of Mevr.

First it is Ahmed, the scavenger - "impersonated in the foul carrion-grubber was Mevr itself ..." - who rescues a naked brown child from his mule's hoofs and Southcote unconsciously begins the count of the righteous ones. Then it is the "black bearded camelier" whose "insane ferocity" he had witness before in his cruelty to a woman. But now, repentant, he was assisting her kindly and sincerely, and in Southcote's mind that meant "'two!'" Then it is the two

grave-robbers. One of them, "a burly brute, bestial faced" sort of pariah, had saved his friends's life at the cost of his own.

And then thunder and lightning - his mule flings Southcote "violently against a great corner-stone". When he came to himself he was paralysed, and yet, in spite of lying now in the very same house where his son had been killed, and of being surrounded by his son's killer, Mitri; and by Miriam; and Selim; Ali etc. upon "his tortured brain (...) there came a great peace". He can see and hear and understand clearly, for he is in fact "a living soul in a dead body". He begins to learn now who his son had really been, "a seducer and thief"; and who these people really are, the righteous ones. But in spite of the "blinding revelation", he can count nine righteous ones only. But then, "in the shadows about the doorway, between Ali and the murderer and Selim the thief, he saw stand for a moment One whom he had never known, One with bleeding hands and feet and hidden face." Yet, the tenth one can be Southcote himself, now that he has been redeemed by the other nine. Salvation comes now when "through the multitudes a murderer and a thief, two of those reckoned in the sum of the righteous Ten, carried Southcote to safety."

II. - PARTIAL ANALYSIS OF "FTS"

April 4, 1927

Dear Sir

Very good story. Stick to it! You can do this sort of thing and will certainly come through.

Very sincerely yours

H.G. WELLS(1)

June 24, 1931

Dear Leslie Mitchell

I never write prefaces, but why not print this and my letter of April 4, '27?

It will add more to my reputation as a prophet - since I had then seen only your first short story - than to yours as a 'short story' writer.

Yours

H.G. WELLS(2)

These two short notes may be regarded as authoritative assessments, and at the same time, as the first clue to the second meaning in the author's writings. H.G. Wells's words indicate that he had seen more than what his laconic statement may convey. If he could realize that JLM could "do this sort of thing", then he must have realized other things as well, including the presence of the allegory and of the rich symbolism.

Now, the reason why I have regarded FTS as paradigmatic is that the movement of its plot is intended as an allegory of the general movement of History as understood by the author. As such, it embraces - also allegorically - most of the main issues which form the weft and warp of his literary content at large. Hence its role as Proem to the volume "CC" which is thus given a unity of content and of intention in as much as FTS, as its proem, may succeed in providing the key to their own code. This cannot be taken for granted, given the nature and the form of the stories, especially, their imagery. JLM was well

aware of that and, consequently, provided each of the individual stories in turn with a proem of its own. Each short story highlights at least one main aspect of his model. But it is FTS the story that almost anticipates, as it were, the model itself.

This Proem "FTS" is a parable intended to illustrate the basic optimistic view that despite the overwhelming weight of negative factors that presage a tragic end for our species, there can be salvation for both Civilization and Humankind if its superior humaneness has a chance to take the initiative. Along these lines FTS becomes an allegory whose secondary meanings deal with religious, scientific, social, historical, political questions subsequently recognized throughout the model (see Part 3). FTS as allegory is the model itself in a compressed version, and therefore, the story contains most of its constituent elements. The movement of the story could be summed up as consisting of five main phases, as follows: an original normal situation, in which human behaviour is also normally peaceful and industrious, suffers a decisive change which alters that behaviour substantially. This new abnormal situation, in turn, undergoes an abrupt change which reverses it back to normal, but with a difference: there is now a higher stage of consciousness even if as a result of physical mishap. In this continuous movement it is possible to distinguish give phases which, eventually, can be summed up and reduced to only three.

The original setting. - In a normal situation, a man whose body and psyche are also normal, finds pleasure - outside his loving family - in seeking knowledge over nature that humanity may control its destructive powers for self-benefit. His passion for scientific research takes him to a 'city' far away from his place of origin.

The decisive change. - Nature first and Civilization's work later deprive him of his loved one - shortly after the wife's death his son is killed - and of his ability to love. Suffering deprives him of his mental health.

A reversed situation. - He blames it all on the inhabitants of the

city. From then on he is governed by hatred and revenge. His knowledge of nature and its forces he now puts to use as a means of destruction and survival itself is put in jeopardy. The original normal way of life has been reversed.

Coincidence and reversal. - As a result of an accident that cripples his body the man recovers his lucidity which enables him not only to have a critical assessment of his own behaviour but also of his mistaken knowledge of human nature whose goodness he had never adumbrated before.

Salvation in the form of a restoration of human relations on the basis of an enlightened higher awareness.

His ethical values now reversed to normal make him use his knowledge of Nature's tremendous power on behalf of humankind who are thus saved from destruction whilst the old scientist himself is saved, and saved also from error, and therefore endowed with wisdom.

This story is also a parable. Apparently and at first sight it is religious whereby its differences with the biblical passage by which it is inspired (i) does not strike one as essential. But it is not necessarily religious. While the parable is based on easily recognizable biblical issues such as the fall, redemption, salvation, etc., the allegory is concerned with terrestrial social problems, and hence, introduces philosophical issues and also the theme of human knowledge and its role in society. It also highlights the question of social ethics. In sum, the allegory is concerned with Humankind and their crucial problems here on earth.

As for the parable, even when it reproduces the Christian teaching at large, it is not religious either in content or intention. What corresponds to the concept of the fall, may in any case be related also to Spengler's idea of a fall from Culture to Civilization. But JLM/LGG follows Rousseau rather than Spengler, and his fall is rather a fall from the stage of Natural Man to the stage of civilized man.

Likewise, the concept of evil and/or sin in the Christian mode, becomes evil in the form of offence against the human being, which is evil not because it offends God but because it offends humanity as a result of the dehumanization of its way of life. The concept of redemption, which in the Christian model is effected thanks to the intervention of God - the offended- on behalf of humanity in order to deliver them from sin, in JLM's version is effected thanks to the most human spiritual gift which the most humble and downtrodden section of humankind still preserves: sympathy for the sufferings of their fellows; this redemption is reversed in so far as it is the sinful and worthless who in fact redeem their accusers. Christian redemption by faith becomes enlightenment and understanding by reason and objective perception. It is also revelation, for humanity delivers their unjust judge's knowledge from error and prejudice, and therefore, from 'evil'. In short, the Christian redemption of the soul from sin, becomes the rational liberation of the mind from error. Finally, the Christian concept of salvation of the individual soul of a human being for an eternal life after death, becomes the salvation from death, i.e. from destruction and/or extinction, not of one individual but of all the collective body of humankind here on earth.

Like in the biblical allegory, at the centre of the problem lies (or stands) the question of Knowledge, for just as the tree of knowledge is related to the loss of Paradise for humanity - according to Genesis, - so the pursuit of knowledge causes Man to end up in the 'city', i.e. civilization, which, according to FTS, causes him to lose his true self and his spiritual peace.

Apparently, the first phase does not contradict the general sense of the biblical metaphor, although this may not be so simple for it is knowledge that will make salvation possible. But it is not so relevant here as the interplay of the oppositions at work is.

Apart from what it has been pointed out above concerning, in particular, the fall (and evil possibly), we can add that as a result of the fall - as seen by JLM/LGG - humankind lost their equality, and hence, they also lost their freedom, and their fraternity. All this

brings suffering to humankind not to God.

Inequality divides humanity into two irreconcilable camps. On one side the few who possess most of the means of subsistence. On the other side, the rest of humankind. The movement is, therefore, a fall from equality and its aftermath: a fall from plenty or scarcity for all to plenty for the few; from happiness for all to utter misery for the most; from dignity to humiliation and affront to humanity not to God. In this way, JLM translates the theological model into a sociological interpretation.

JLM may create the impression that he works with a kind of dualistic view in so far as his materialistic 'earthliness' does not prevent him from emphasizing again and again the spiritual and abstract aspects of the problem. Nonetheless, unlike the dualist proper, he always finds the mutual interdependence of these two seemingly opposite realms as just two different phases of the same phenomenon. In this he is clearly in the opposite camp of metaphysics. In FTS he sees the materiality of the two terms of the opposition as represented by a social contradiction which, having come as a result of the major contradiction between nature and civilization is nevertheless contained in it in the form of a bitter strife among human beings who are now divided into social classes and hierarchies but contributing nevertheless to their liberation from necessity. This strife had not existed previous to the emergence of civilization, since it can only take place where inequality reigns. In the story this is indicated by the fact that the protagonist's problems only begin with his arrival in the "city", which is the symbol for Civilization. The fall in JLM's model is in fact a 'loss'. Without its humaneness - which is its essence - humanity is not such. The recovery and restoration of humanity's essence is the true sense of redemption in FTS, and redemption, the condition sine qua non for attaining salvation, the salvation of the species. The need of salvation is created by the effects of the strife among human beings, which, being a component of the contradiction between nature and civilization creates conditions which increasingly put in jeopardy the very existence of humanity. In FTS this is indicated by the

earthquake motif which represents in fact the tremendous power of nature but humanity is not at its mercy, thanks to Man's ability to know. The contradiction nature versus civilization is seen as the process by which Man not only seeks to know, to elicit, and to master the secrets of nature but also to use that terrific and unfathomable power for his own ends. If this sounds a bit too removed from reality, let us keep in mind that JLM tries to examine all this in the light of the concrete society he knows and which he perceives not as free, egalitarian, brotherly, and peaceful humanity, but as a society dominated by hatred and violence. On this basis, the tremendous energy of Nature in the hands of Civilization i.e. of Capital may well serve to destroy humankind. The need to avoid such a fateful outcome gives its true sense to JLM's concept of salvation, and this is the way in which he conceives the incidence of knowledge and its role in the contradiction. FTS illustrates all this (I am not going to make separate comments on JLM's allusions to Calvinism since I regard this topic as incorporated into his critique of Civilization (see chapt. 16 FWN). Richard Southcote represents the social class that also possesses Knowledge and regards the people of Mevr, or the "rabble", as the sinners, and decides to use his scientific knowledge as a severe punishment, and in fact, as a deadly weapon. But the people - held by Southcote as the wicked and the worthless, etc. - redeem him by teaching him human values which he did not know and also revealing facts that he had got wrong. That revelation opens up the path to redemption. The original enmity that Southcote feels for the people represents in fact the hatred that the division into antagonistic social classes has created. No need to insist on the 'heretic' new meaning of **revelation**. Richard Southcote's attitude as "the watcher of the Hill of Burial" and as "prophet of wrath above Mevr" implies a twofold connotation.

On the one hand, it suggest a critical allusion to Calvinism, a topic pursued again and again in JLM's work, as for example in "Vernal" - to mention only the short stories of CC - where the 'prophet' is called James Freeman, etc. In "FTS" Richard Southcote may be said to play the role of a 'prophet' if JLM chose that name as a means of bringing to mind the image of Joanna Southcote, the

English woman who in 1792 declared herself to be a prophetess and that in keeping with Revelation 12, she was to give birth to a son, who in turn, was to be a Messiah, This allusion can be regarded as a secondary or background leitmotif intended to give the story a social immediacy, especially in connection with his criticism of Religion. The theme of Calvinism fits well into the avowed biblical derivation of the main theme and intention of "FTS", especially because of JLM's critique of it, as will be seen.

But Calvinism is not a main target here. It is rather a symbol, and as such, it embodies something more general and relevant to the problem in hand in his story. What he is really combatting in it is teleology. However, this is not all, for the author is also set on his course of combatting pseudo-humanistic philosophies such as the trend represented by FWN.

On the other hand, and also allegorically, he puts forward his own philosophy of history and the role that both the masses and their use of scientific knowledge are called upon to play in it in order to achieve the objective humanity is after. As seen in previous chapters, the author's analysis is based on the class conflict.

In JLM's view the antagonism that sets the social classes at each other's throats also unites them. The movement that the opposites engender seems to be regulated by a principle which works in terms of proportional inversions, so that, whatever element of material or spiritual (intellectual or psychic) nature becomes the endowment of one class, it causes as a natural effect, the destitution or loss of the other. However, since the antagonistic classes are intrinsically different, whenever they happen to possess something in common (usually at different times), that something has a different value for each, so that when an element of some particular nature passes from one class to the other, it automatically acquires a different quality and takes on a different value. Thus, if the upper class has become the main - if not the sole - possessor of all the achievements of Civilization, it has in turn - and as a result - lost its humaneness (although its individual members may not). Therefore, the only

meaning that redemption can have for this social class is the restitution of its lost humaneness. On the other hand, its antagonistic social class has never lost civilization because it has never possessed it (since it has been denied its benefits), but has in fact lost to civilization part of its own natural endowments as a result of the emergence of class division, whereby the supremacy of one class means necessarily the subjection of the other plus its subsequent negation of knowledge, freedom, etc. But the lower class possesses in turn - according to JLM/LGG - that essential element which the upper class lacks: humaneness, since it is the only thing which the upper class has lost. This humaneness is basically represented, in JLM's view, by pity and compassion, forgiveness, kindness and hope and fraternity since Civilization cannot deprive humanity of these components.

Redemption in this case becomes in fact redress. It is therefore, an act of justice, and the fundamental element to be gained is, apart from all those already mentioned, and as an overall result: dignity. In conclusion, the only social class that needs redemption - understood almost in Christian terms - is the upper class. The suggestion is that this class is not in a position to achieve salvation for themselves, let alone for humankind, and hence, it has to be redeemed, and it can only be redeemed by the lower class. Redemption, presented in these terms, becomes political allegory. Notwithstanding, FTS does not take on any step in that direction, and if it conveys any political allusion at all, the only overt indications are those of the gendarmes, the German Consul, and the Governor. But if any political intention is to be inferred, I would suggest that it is implied in the general sense of the allegory incorporating the overt indications just mentioned plus the deep-rooted presence of Calvinism, as an indication that in our Civilization the severe authoritarianism of the latter is exercised by the ruling class through its State apparatus, not only at national level.

JLM gives unity to his allegory in this full-circle movement that goes from the initial fall to the final salvation by suggesting that

the same principle which made possible the advent of the one can in turn make possible the advent of the other. That principle is change, or to use JLM's own term, coincidence, or even, 'accident', creating in the reader the impression that something is not quite right. This, however, may not be the case for even this may come as the result of causality (see chapt. 2 and 4).

Coincidence in FTS takes the form of an unexpected blockage in the street which causes Southcote to search for a different route. But for the new route - the only alternative in fact - the crisis might have been resolved in a different way, or not resolved at all. The fact that the coincidental element was related to the "afternoon's chaffering" gives it a relevant connotation which relieves it from its vulgar interpretation. Chaffering may be intended as a symbol for a civilization based on mercantile relations and where the division of humankind is determined by either possession or deprivation of the means of subsistence. If chaffering led to coincidence, then, JLM may be suggesting a use of the concept in the philosophical sense, i.e. indicating that coincidence is ultimately governed by the law of necessity. If this is tantamount to saying that Southcote came across the essential element that resolved the crisis in favour of humankind, not by chance but by necessity, the truth is that the mercantile activity gives the city its basic character in so far as that activity belongs to the essence of the power which set civilization in motion, and that, in this light, the chance element of the blockage is ultimately governed by necessity. If chance - understood in this way - saved humankind from extinction in FTS, it was knowledge that in the last analysis freed the people from the blind forces of nature, illustrating thus, in practice, the key role of scientific research in materializing freedom as behaviour based on the knowledge of the necessary causation of phenomena. In other words, if JLM is aware of the relationship between necessity and freedom, he must be also aware of the relationship between necessity and causality. JLM holds the upper class responsible for the direction in which Civilization advances, whereby Civilization is identified with that class in so far as it is the sole possessor of both the material and spiritual culture created by humanity as a whole, it is therefore the class that

constitutes the real social force that is pushing humankind towards its probable destruction. That is, redemption can still have another connotation.

According to JLM, the upper class possesses both the means to effect destruction and the means to effect salvation, whereas the lower class possesses only the key to redemption.

Summing up, it is possible to say that JLM gave a social connotation to the themes of redemption, revelation, and salvation, although, it would have been more apt perhaps to say that he chose to write a social allegory in religious terms as the most suitable means of exposing the flaws of the theological philosophy which dominates our civilization, on the one hand; and on the other, to advance his own conception of what human life should be like in a better society. The emphasis is laid on the friendly and peaceful nature of human relations.

Whatever his subjective attitude, the fact remains that FTS is social allegory. Southcote not only represents Science, and social ethics, i.e. religious ethics, as the possessions of the upper class, but also upper class Power in so far as the lives of the whole population depended on his will: the will of the class to which Southcote belongs. In other words, the allegory overlaps with some political aspects. The fact that the conflict is between this Englishman and the natives of an overseas Eastern (or Mid Eastern) community, and not between him and the English people is but an added political connotation concerning the theme that is going to turn up again in H W S and E and other works (see Part 2).

In this light, and provided that there may be other implications, it is possible to say in a very general sense that JLM's idea of redemption has more to do with the theme of liberation than with ethical concerns, since liberation and freedom rank among his highest ethical values. However, his theme of liberation and freedom is not only concerned with current issues of local or regional import, but also with a more universal allegorical meaning, for he is concerned

with humanity at large and this includes all social classes. That is, on the one hand, his more ambitious goal is to achieve the disappearance of the social divisions into classes that separate human beings and on the other, to advance humanity's knowledge of natural science and to undreamt-of heights, so as to give freedom its true stature. In this sense, FTS is not so much an attack against the upper class as it is a plea in favour of the superior ethics of the lower class, and a plea in favour of their social rights, or, of social justice. That is why FTS embodies the basic elements that come into the making of JLM/LGG's model of society. And, last but not least, it is not God who is to spare humanity, or to destroy it, but humanity itself. It is an intellectual stance that not only attacks the essence of teleology but also attacks the essential social science of Civilization, i.e. bourgeois social science of Capitalism.

NOTES:

(i)

The story was originally titled "Ten Men of Sodom":

"Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very greivous (...) Wilt thou consume the righteous with the wicked? Peradventure there be fifty righteous within the city: wilt thou consume and not spare the place for the fifty righteous that there are therein? (...) If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sake. (...): peradventure ten shall be found there. And he said. I will not destroy it for the ten's sake." Genesis 18 (20-32).

CHAPTER 7 IMAGERY AS THE KEY TO THE SECOND MEANINGRomantic Imagery?

The overall impression created by JLM/LGG's literary work is that the author has made ample use of romantic imagery, so much so that his own model can be considered romantic, an impression that may not be ill founded above all if we depend on the dictum that the innate goodness of man motif, coupled with that of the dehumanizing influence of civilization, belong to the lore of romanticism; so too the Golden Age of primitive man's spiritual health as the comely gift of the sinless simplicity of nature. No need to insist that in all this the central role is reserved for the relationship human being-nature, or, for that matter, humanity in a paradisiac relation to flora and fauna, atmospheric conditions, the seasons, etc., where the sunshine represents the glories of life, whereas the less friendly natural phenomena which associate well with darkness would represent if not the miseries of it, certainly its fearful anxious countenance. It would be impossible not to recognize, let alone deny, all this in our author's imagery, especially if his model comprises the whole span from the pleasant light of a distant past into the darkness of Civilization and from it, into the splendid light of a distant future. For it moves from an allegorical day to an allegorical night which should develop into an allegorical dawn - an imagery which is present even in his most 'realistic' work - the trilogy "ASQ"; and obviously it is always recognizable in his 'romances', especially in CC and even more so in PDEN. It is perhaps the movement that goes from an allegorical night to an allegorical dawn that hides his most concrete and realistic social content encased in poetic imagery.

Hence his recourse to symbolism in a work like for instance PDEN, a symbolism which is in tune with both theme and motifs of the whole volume. The content highlights his fundamental social concerns which go from Anthropology to Politics, from Religion to Science and research, from Mythology and legend to modern Culture and Literature. In all this, the key-note is the origin of humanity, its true innate nature, especially in its collective dimensions, and its true longings

for the most human way of life possible on earth. As a result of all this, and in particular of the dehumanizing effect of Civilization, we come across the topic of liberty which dominates his literature, made manifest through the agencies of knowledge, liberation and/or revolution. The one or the other enhance the importance of dominating nature, i.e. scientific research; and of providing dependable leadership. These in turn are accompanied by a host of familiar motifs which some have labelled under the term "diffusionist", and some - more aptly I think - under that of romantic. I do not think that the point is either to prove or disprove this; it is rather to explicate the function of his imagery in relation to his model. For the sake of brevity then, let us assume that as a general strategy, the author made use of practically all the relevant imagery of romantic tradition in order to give more consistency to his model, which is not to say that the latter should therefore be necessarily romantic in character. For we must admit at the same time, that the author gave this romantic imagery his own conscious added meanings as will be seen. Let us only point out here that both the question of the innate goodness of Man and all his positive traits, is in itself probably the most conscious element of imagery in his model. In fact, his adherence to Rousseau's doctrine of Man's self-perfectibility, so relevant to his model, might appear as incongruous if 'forced' upon an already 'perfected' "primitive" of the Golden Age hunters type (see also "E"), or, as we call him/her in the present work, using the Rousseauian concept - Natural Man. This Natural Man is none other than humanity at large and therefore, only real in terms of his model as Natural Man proper. But in order to avoid some possible confusion, let us clarify that the Rousseauian perfectibility process cannot be understood without taking into account the human being's innate potentials arising from a way of life which social science can explain in scientific terms, whilst the artist JLM explains in poetic ones. As it is, the equality of the gentile society is represented by the Golden Age hunters. The merit of TGB is to suggest in fictional terms the material basis that made possible such human social qualities in the past founded on a very primitive mode of production which determined social equality and as a result fraternity and harmony amongst "primitives". By extrapolation, JLM concludes that in a

distant future a highly sophisticated mode of production could provide the material basis for the flourishing of such basic human qualities. In this light, his Natural Man type people or characters in his fiction, are unreal in so far as they exist only at either extreme of the evolution line; but they are at the same time real, in so far as they are currently undergoing that process of self-perfectibility which, if successfully carried through, should bridge the gap. But the continuous progressive line of evolution is being built by the same agent - humanity, i.e. Natural Man.

Having said this, we may come back to the imagery of PDEN. The reason to focus our attention, for the moment, on this book is that the author himself held it in high esteem, according to a letter to H.B. Cruickshank saying:

"Persian Dawns, Egyptian Nights" is much better stuff (technically) than "Sunset Song" but nobody seems to think so except myself."(1)

Our respect for specialists who like I.S. Munro himself thinks that in these romances of PDEN

"there is little else to distinguish them from others of their kind"(2)

should not belittle our respect for the author's opinion. On the contrary, it seems to me that there is something meaningful in the discrepancy between critical opinion and the author's view on his work. I take it that his words to H.B. Cruickshank reveal his inner conviction that the content of PDEN is not only much more universal than that of "SS" but also that there is more creative talent at work there. And not without a reason. There is much more elaboration in PDEN. However, since I am discussing imagery, let us only take a few instances of this kind, which, if not paradigmatic, will in any case prove useful indicators.

Allegorically, "Egyptian Nights" represents the 'night of humanity'

under the sway of Civilization, whereas "Persian Dawns" seems to indicate the awakening, or rather re-awakening, of humanity's will which can manifest itself even in the unfavourable conditions of the 'night' in search of a new dawn for humankind. Therefore, the 'dawns' in PDEN provide us with such symbolism as that likely to be found in TSZ on the one hand, and on the other, as that which is recognizable in Spengler, for the simple reason that he sets out to combat their philosophies. In addition to this, the underlying theme is that of the quest which becomes clearly recognizable in at least two of the six stories of the sub-cycle where scientific research is the most relevant part of the quest, as "LC" shows, although as quest, "Cartaphilus" is nearer to it since it resembles HWS. But then, "FS", "LO", "DA" etc., also suggest it, a fact that should not lead us into thinking that the quest is not implied in the Egyptian Nights cycle. The quest is related to Phase 5 of his model, and in that sense, it is the symbolism of FS which is more manifest. In this connection I shall refer here only to "the Titans" motif for this symbol explains well the relationship between primitive man and the Phase 5 human beings. Thus, it is relevant that according to Greek Mythology the Titans were not only the ancestors of men but also the inventors of the arts and of magic. No wonder then that JLM uses the symbol in relation to the leadership motif as well. It is therefore no wonder either that he also includes the "dreamer" and "dream" motifs, and also, alongside it, the bigger theme of the survival of humanity. This would indicate that if taken as "ancestors of men", in this particular story FS, the Titans can only anticipate that men proper, according to the model, belong to Phase 5 only. For if Greek Mythology sees Titans as those who represent the first 'divine' race as the offsprings of Gaea and Uranus, her son, so too in the symbolism of JLM's story his Titans represent humanity as the paradigm of a race that should not be confused with any other humanoid of the Neanderthal type since the former are the offspring of Natural Man, or, of

"the Golden Age hunters - men perhaps mainly of Maglemosian stock, dark sinewy and agile, intermixed long ages before with other racial stocks, the stock of Cro-Magnard and Magdalenian who had followed the ice-caps north when the

reindeer vanished from the French valley."(3)

Just as in every true anti-hero character or antagonist of the human race we are likely to identify the alien traits of the Neanderthaler, so too in each of his hero characters we find the manifestations of those Titans who one day will people the earth and will no doubt conquer other planets and make the universe their habitat in the Third Civilization to come.

On the other hand, the symbolism of animals in PDEN reminds us of FWS's own use of it in TSZ, especially, for example, in relation to "The Three Metamorphoses", and also, "The Rabble", and "At Noontide", for even in "Lost Tribes" (a story published in the volume "Masterpiece of Thrills"!!) we come across the motif of the camel, the donkey (or mule?) that abandons its master, a motif which is repeated in "LO" where the animal becomes a pony. As for the lion in LO which is killed by the child, who is a girl, this becomes either a leopard in "IS" or a puma in "TD", but in these particular cases their symbolism harmonizes with the verses

"Through the great deserts beasts  
Howl at our backs by night"(4)

No attempt will be made here to explicate the symbolism implied in all this, for the topic might well be the subject for a special study, especially in relation to FWN. Nonetheless, it seems to me that the general meaning must be looked at from the viewpoint of the quest theme. In this light, one strong suggestion is the essential difference between humanity and beasts, in that it is only the former who consciously direct their action on to nature in pursuance of definite goals set down previously. I would think that animals are meant to symbolize different aspects of this, basic difference with beings that do not work to ends. In this, apart from what I have suggested above, we cannot ignore the author's awareness of the role animals have played in different mythologies, and obviously in symbology, in suggesting that they are, after all, part of humanity's great adventure. Some of them, if not the great majority, are

definitely useful allies, whilst others have been, or possibly still are in some cases, potential enemies. In the story "WLS", for example, we come across the horrific scene of a man being eaten alive by a bear. Yet the story deals with the "discarded experiment of nature" motif, i.e. with types of humanoids who were not Man, whereby the symbolism, in this case, is more complex. I would suggest that just as those flawed types were so helpless that they easily fell prey to wild beasts, human beings have proved superior to all of them, and if there are still beasts that "howl at our backs" they symbolize the distance that Man has been putting between them and his increasing perfectibility process. The more immediate connotation, however, is to suggest the dangers which nature poses for humanity 'by night'. An instance of this is presented in TGB when the 20th century people - in the natural environment of 25 thousand years ago - have to get rid of a marauding sabre tiger in a cavern, or when the Golden Age people help them escape from other beasts. And then the symbolism of the final scene in TD may illustrate the point in its more social dimension. Also TGB illustrates the clearer side of the problem in the mammoth chase scene. Such imagery, however, is likely to be found even in his non-fiction. What must be emphasized here is that JLM/LGG's imagery is meant to give coherence to his model, so that most of his symbols are to be found again and again in different individual works. The snake symbol, for example, may not be repeated in more than two works but it is used as part of the general imagery of the model.

The snake symbol suggests first of all a certain direct relationship with the question of freedom in so far as in "Sp" it appears as the symbol of the 'slaves' struggle. But JLM seems to relate it at the same time to the mysteries and/or menace and dangers coming from nature as suggested in FTS. There seems to be a good deal of correspondence in this, due above all, to the relevance that the question of liberty has in his model, and therefore, the relevance that natural science and scientific research have in it. In this he combats FWN's notions and consequently his use of the snake symbol also differs from the meaning Nietzsche suggests especially in TSZ (see "Of the Vision and the Riddle", 2). And so, it is obvious that

his snake symbol is referring to a deep-rooted meaning of human life. Now the snake symbol as recurring in different mythologies is, in some areas, acknowledged if not as the symbol of life, at any rate of its continuity, suggesting even the idea of eternity. This does not fall outside his own subject matter. On the contrary, as I have suggested elsewhere, JLM/LGG is concerned with all this in relation to human life in the wake of his themes of constant change, constant renewal, and survival of the species. If the snake symbol were used more in terms of the problem of freedom in the confrontation Man-Nature, the renewal of life - which is so prominent in his discourse - would more aptly find its symbolism in the Greek Mythology. Here, as suggested in "GR"m he uses the myth of Demeter and her daughter Kore identifying the latter with life, i.e. with the luminous aspect of it which the goddess symbolizes on her return from the underworld. In this connection, I have no direct evidence of his use of the myth of Adonis, but the god turns up in his synopsis of his proposed "Story of Religion" associated to Akhnaton, and I would be very surprised if in suggesting Kore, or Persephone for that matter, he were not suggesting at the same time Adonis, whose beauty at any rate seems to be embodied in his recurring depiction of "the Azilian boy" motif in stories such as LDEC. Here too, the theme of madness turns up again, a theme which can be easily associated to the myth of Dionysus. In Greek mythology there is a close relationship between the Demeter/Kore myth and that of Dionysus. There is something else to be said about this topic. Edwin Muir has referred to JLM's

"endless curiosity and sympathy for human life in its diverse forms, his Rabelaisian humour,"(5)

This view is confirmed by William Plomer, in relation to GG at least and in the person of Ma Cleghorn whom he considered

"a fountain of hearty humour of the kind usually called Rabelaisian"(6)

The difference between Rabelaisian and Dionysiac may be more temporal than conceptual, and in any case, I would prefer the latter to

describe JLM's approach to life and the former probably more so in relation to his fiction or to his ability to "juggle with magic" as Neil Gunn put it. Dionysiac, I think, would fit better into both his incorporation of the Greek civilization into his model, and of the Greek mythology in his imagery.

Even Religion, Science, the State itself, etc., provide him with material which form part of his imagery. Since his model revolves around the contradiction humanity-civilization, the author sees some intrinsic symbolism in the role played both by some State institutions namely, Law and Religion, and the people representing them. These represent **authority** and therefore social class division, and strife, and violence, and as a result, inhumanity. Hence his hatred of Civilization concentrates on the State. But Religion is probably more complex since it is not only a "corpus of archaic science" as he calls it in his essay "Religion" (in ASH), but also an earthly power whose historical role is so well known as to cause him to conceive a book on the subject (i.e. on the history of Religion). As it is, he can distinguish at least two other levels of different expressions of it which not always harmonize, namely, a humanistic concern - especially in relation to Christianity in his model - and a non-humanistic one in so far as it seeks to solve the problem posed by the dialectical contradictions humanity-nature and humanity-civilization by referring them to a truly utopian world whose immateriality is much at odds with the materiality of those dialectical contradictions, revealing thus a basic incongruity between the strategy of Religion and that which humanity in actual fact pursues. Accordingly, the strategy of religion does not harmonize with the author's model either. In that inner incoherence of Religion, and especially of Christianity, lies the explanation for his portrayal of different - usually antagonistic - types of religious people, especially ministers and priests. The worst is the Calvinist type and the best, the Natural Man type, i.e. the scientist type like the Reverend Ian Stevenson of TD,

"an enthusiastic anthropologist, and archaeologist of some note."(7)

In between there are at least two other types who are in fact opposites - the hypocrite, like Reverend MacShilluck of GG, and the naive idealist, but intrinsically 'natural' type like father Steyn of IIW, and probably the best of all, Robert Colquohoun of SS and CH. They are all, however, natural people, but with different degrees of distortion. The author suggests that in his confrontation with Religion, Natural Man tends somehow to get the upper hand. Hence the playful intention of some Chaucerian and/or Rabelaisian humour at the expense of respectable, or not so respectable, ministers. For the author is combatting first of all the Church as an institution which is part of the power machine of the State. Thus, in some cases his priests or ministers represent simply that secular power, a role which is comparable on the religious sphere to that of the policeman or the 'gendarme' at political level. In fact, if the policeman at home represents the State in its oppressive role, so too the gendarme in the overseas domains of the English Empire embodies at the same time a cruel irony, for he is in fact a blind instrument of foreign domination by using force over his own people whom he purports to protect (see "CC" especially "ChC", apart from FTS). Both the policeman and the gendarme symbolize the same affront to humanity - social inequality and its offspring, social violence, since the State which they represent in daily life, is verily the expression of the violence that one section of humanity exercises over the majority of their fellowmates in order to enforce an unequal distribution of goods collectively produced in Civilization.

His use of darkness as symbol suggests at first a melancholic mood very similar to that of his countryman James Thomson in "The City of Dreadful Night", especially when, as it often happens, it recurs in different works. It is in fact designed to suggest Phase III whereby the various gradations of darkness serve to reinforce the meaning attached to that phase according to the degree of dehumanization produced by the progress attained by the mode of production in Civilization. In like manner, he uses the different gradations of light for a similar purpose but in reverse, i.e. for suggesting the transition from Phase I to Phase III first, and then from the latter to Phase V, which is to say that light serves him to denote both

extremes of the total movement of his model in relation to the degrees of humanization (or dehumanization) that prevails in each particular situation. This imagery is connected to the seasons theme and therefore to the related symbolism, although here again, the author imposes connotations which arise from his model, especially in relation to the motif of fertility. The meaning of the seasons may be a case in point (see chapt. 16 on Spengler). Temperature also intervenes to give light or darkness an added meaning. In PDEN for example, it appears in relation to the L'Allegro cycle in "Egyptian Nights" collection in stories whose subject matter is love as the author understands it, together with the blazing-light-at-noon motif. Most of his works, including ASQ, show the use of the seasons theme zlongside the wider astronomic phenomena including the sun, the moon, the stars, and other celestial elements are all relevant to his model (see chapt. 1 in relation to his basic premise). The Pleiades, for example, suggest a reaffirmation of humanity's permanence as earthly or teluric in nature in the sense that it has not transmuted itself into something different. But at the same time, it suggests the relationship between humanity and the cosmos, so that it may be interpreted as a symbol which gives the old Greek legend a modern sense in keeping with the goals of Phase 5 in the model. Accordingly, Orion's belt is meant as a symbol of humanity's future triumph and domination over the forces of nature, including the challenge of the cosmos. But the Evening Star seems to convey a kind of counter meaning in relation to the Morning Star symbol as derived from the context of Revelation 2, 24-28. In any case, the Evening Star is part of the sunset symbol which according to his model, symbolizes our own age being both a farewell for what is gone and an omen of that which is to come. It is the symbol for what Robert Colquhoun of SS called "the sunset of an age and an epoch". The Evening Star is a kind of farewell to an old way of life at the threshold of the climatic moment of Phase III when Civilization will, reach its zenith, determining thus the nadir of humanity. From this vantage point, the Evening Star becomes a symbol of hope not only for the next dawn likely to arrive, since it already reflects its light, but also in Milton's words it is "love's harbinger" (Paradise Lost, XI, 588-9). More still, it symbolizes the staunch presence of love even in the circumstances of

the blackest night of humanity. The symbolism of the night is relevant to Phase IV in that it symbolizes the extreme expression of social inequality and violence, a violence which, it can be repeated here, the author identifies with the iron heel of fascism. In the last analysis it signifies the most crucial turning point: the dilemma of survival versus extinction. It is related to coincidence which he endows with a metaphoric sense (see chapt. 4, Phase IV).

The new dawn represents, obviously, Phase V, whereas the Passage of the Dawn, according to the dynamics of the dialectical contradiction described in Chapter 1 which gives origin to his model, may symbolize the historical moment when the qualitative change takes place and the extreme inequality changes into its opposite. This symbol is directly related to the Quest, and as such, it has direct relevance both to his scientific conception of History - whereby the principles of the dialectics of nature also intervene in shaping the laws that govern social processes - and to his conception of human ethics whereby it gives love and courage for example, a less conventional character, wherein courage, as an altruistic tendency, is but a sublimated if not a genuinely natural manifestation of love for the species. It is the one element that guarantees the survival of the species.

In the meantime all that remains is the moonlight, which indicates the presence of love and happiness but at a very low key as the comparison of the light reflected by the moon to that of the real source suggests.

Nakedness constitutes, obviously, the typical symbol for Natural Man and the spiritual, psychological, and social attributes of the Golden Age way of life. In the model it is intended as a symbol to enhance the social ethics of the Golden Age. This goes together with some bodily traits. Bronze colour, for example, is related to the Azilian man, usually an Azilian youth, and/or to the Cro-Magnards, the Magdalenian, etc. which in turn must be understood as the true representatives of Natural Man as seen above. There may be some debt to Lewis Spence for this, especially in relation to the theme of Atlantis (q.v.i.). JLM/LGG makes the Azilian into a symbol for the

physical and psychological traits of his Natural men and women. In his imagery, "Natural Man" stands simply for humanity.

His heroes display physical and psychological traits inherited from natural men. This explains why his 'hero' characters are modelled after some ideal type intended to be truly representative of the human being. In this he has found that some of the Tolstoy's characters are among those that embody his own idea in a more perfect way. In relation to feminine characters for example, the 'hero' types are lively and youthful and buxom, and even sprightly, or as more mature women, natural, genial, relaxed and kind, positive, broad-minded and sympathetic both in relation to people and to life: very much like Natasha Rostov. In like manner, his masculine characters are meant to highlight the good-natured Golden Age hunters, although this is not so simple, for the characters created by JLM also incorporate other traits as well, and since they belong to Civilization, these new traits are meant to typify the qualities that a Phase III hero requires for the struggle whose climax will be reached in Phase IV. According to JLM, the 'hero' living in the conditions imposed by this situation must do things which the Golden Age hunter did not have to do: he has to lead humankind to its new dawn. Hence, that character who pursues knowledge or is engaged in research, and therefore, 'explores' either the actual geography of the planet or any other domain of nature (be it macro or microscopic), and is at the same time a 'dreamer', and as a result a lover of peace and of his/her fellowmates, he/she is likely to one of JLM/LGG's 'heroes' whose personality is essentially unspoilt by Civilization. Usually such a character is also brave, although quiet and inclined to intellectual activity, but full of altruism to the extent of being ready to lay down his/her life for a humane cause, which is usually related to freedom - becoming thus both a leader and a freedom fighter; in this sense the highest merit in a 'hero' is to become a liberator. As it is, apart from what has been pointed out above, masculine characters are likely to exhibit some of the traits admired by JLM/LGG in, for example, Ferdinand Magellan, Christopher Columbus, Mungo Park, Fridtjof Nansen, etc. in his book NAU, where it is part of the imagery to leave out other famous explorers like Drake, Cook,

Rhodes, Livingstone, and others. The reason is that their exploration is not only different but actually opposed to that of the 'hero'. For it is guided by commercialism.

Something similar can be said about his women heroes, and in fact, some of them remind us even of Madam Curie as Domina Riddoch of TD for example. But the outstanding feature of all his women heroes is that they never present an undignified profile, likely to play into the hands of sexism, not even in "Sp" in fact. If the reader comes across any sexist element in a given work, that element is there as part of his battle against sexism in this Civilization (see chapt. 14 - Feminism). In keeping with his views on humanity, his women heroes appear always on a very equal footing in relation to men. This is shown not only in connection with their intellectual gifts but also in connection with the issue of leadership, which in turn, is closely related to both knowledge and liberation.

JLM/LGG is so keen in putting forward the excellency of the Golden Age human features which he regards as truly humane and 'superior' that for the sake of that "propaganda" he is ready to sacrifice, in part at least, long established convention of character portraying in fiction.

Accordingly, his 'heroes', then, must impersonate first of all Natural Man, or in his inner belief, the Phase V human being envisaged in his model. There may be differences according to either of the five phases pointed out above. As a means of directing the reader's attention to the fact that the spiritual, intellectual, psychological, and social qualities of a given character belong in fact to his 'hero' type the author very often resorts to the nakedness motif as a symbol, usually in the context of bathing and swimming. Or he may use any other bodily particular features or attitudes and gestures to signify the same idea, for he uses a set of such motifs to convey it - in contact with water and rain it means communion with nature and life.

The bodily features which JLM highlights are not bounded only by the romantic tradition. It is clear that they rather belong to the

field of his ideological battle against Neo-Darwinism which, among other things, had come to disprove the romantic idea of Man's innate goodness. JLM not only combatted that and their treatment of sociology as simply being sociobiology but also the ideological and political implications derived from such premises. One of these is racialism.

He fosters brown as the colour of humankind. Sometimes his characters are described simply as dark, particularly in his 'Scottish' themes. It is probably a tribute to some of the traditions of his homeland that his heroes always have black hair like the Golden Age hunters, and like them, are also grey eyed.

Just as the comparison of a person to a bull, usually referred to the body of a man, is meant for a 'civilized' man whose dominant spiritual or intellectual inclinations are nearer to the primitive man, and has therefore, something of the hero, the comparison to a gorilla type is meant to imply the opposite. The underlying idea is to refute the notion that the human species has any biological links with the apes. Since a gorilla type is meant to signify an inhuman being, he also represents brutishness, cruelty, and absence of intellectual light. Such characters are usually described as "chinless" for example.

There are other minor bodily signs which are meant to suggest the characteristics of Phase I people. Sometimes it is only a gesture, or a certain action, or simply the way people stand or sit. For instance, a walk in the countryside heading for the hills - or the presence of the hills, usually with either rain or the wind - indicates an action of a character reminiscent of Natural Man. Let us say here, just in passing, that the hills motif, as contrasted with the 'plains of civilization', represent

"that older civilization which was destroyed by the healthy barbarism out of which our present society has grown."(8)

The women - or 'natural women', if one can put it like that - are

recognizable through a gesture which is exclusively theirs such as their habit of sitting "with hands clasped round their knees".

So far, his imagery, save possibly some particular items and the different intention the author has endowed them with, can be roughly referred to the general lore of romanticism, or at any rate, to a more or less universal lore which is also recognizable, albeit with different meanings. There is, however, a constellation of elements that are more original and possibly also more relevant to the model, especially when they appear as more related to his idea of culture.

The ornithopter for example - one of the fashionable technological fantasies of the nineteen twenties - and in that sense, possibly, a romantic conception, is used as a symbol to glorify humanity's ability to transform nature thanks to his ability to organize production socially, and to imitate, if not surpass, the complex 'miracles' of nature. The ornithopter as symbol in fact, is the true harbinger of the marvels that will characterize Phase V of JLM/LGG's model and, in any case, it can be described as a symbol of power, humanity's power over nature which, in the last analysis, is what his model is about, and this may not be romanticism precisely. In point of fact, this carries us to the motif of the Walls of the World, which as a symbol is related to the challenge-of-the-stars motif (see TD p.83) and therefore to the "explorer" motif, to knowledge, and ultimately to liberty.

The Walls of the World symbol takes its origin in the medieval concept that the sky was a star-studded hemisphere or cupola beyond whose boundary lay the glorious world of Heaven, etc., as classically represented in an illustration in which a fortunate traveller is seen actually poking his head through the Wall of the World, witnessing thus the reality of the heavenly glories. This representation, which the author sees now in the light of both the geographical discoveries started by Columbus and the progress made by humankind ever since (see chapt. 3 Q.15) he transforms into the symbol that stands for humanity's endeavour to make out nature in order to master and harness it. This gives the quest allegory - of which it forms part - a truly

material character since the Walls of the World symbol appears thus related not only to a theory of knowledge but also, and mainly perhaps, to the true overall freedom for the whole species. Again, it is the theme of liberty that gives the explorer motif its true stature as the aptest symbol that represents humanity in relation to its plight with nature. It is within this perspective that the "companionable" stone motif, which in my opinion he hints at as an attack against FWN, acquires a more real and down to earth dimension symbolizing, perhaps, the relationship between human labour and the conquest of freedom. In other words, self-perfectibility has a material basis since it is by making tools in the process of production that humanity has made its progress from the animal condition. This activity has enabled us to discover and understand the objective laws of nature in order to make conscious use of them for the benefit of humanity, whereby this knowledge is the condition sine qua non for conquering the kingdom of liberty. Hence its central role in the model and also in its imagery which contains many other related motifs. The search for "flints" is one of the more conspicuous. In his fiction, it recurs associated with the hills motif. Again, this suggests another aspect related to the stone circles motif, which in turn is not independent from the sequence nature, labour, exploration, scientific research, knowledge, revolution, freedom.

The Stone Circles and/or Standing Stones motif, closely connected with that of the flints, designate an age long past and gone in history. Both the stone circles and the flints symbolize the materialization of genius - that of the tools manufacturer and transformer of nature, the maker of its own future way of life, the only being in nature endowed with the gift of self-perfectibility - humanity (see chapt. 10 - Rousseau). They symbolize in a way, also the last manifestations of a fraternal way of life, the presence of the humaneness of the species whose outstanding feature was its communal character both at social and production levels. Hence their close connection with the hills motif and the exaltation of outdoor naturalness. In a way, those ancient primitive monuments stand like mute witnesses to the cost of all this Great Adventure which humanity

got started unaware of its aftermath. For if their appearance on the stage of History indicates precisely "the reversal" or "the fall" or a "loss", it also indicates the beginning of the "great adventure", the beginning of the "quest", and the advancement towards the "passage of the dawn". In a word, they symbolize the inner contradiction in the dialectical contradiction between progression and retrogression. But the most important element which the author sees in these primitive monuments - one infers from the main content of the model - as compared with those that belong to later ages like the Egyptian Pyramids for example, is that in them humanity left the imprint of its own essence in that the circle as symbol is superior to the triangle. It is not so much the idea of perfection implied therein, as it is the symbol that materializes the idea of social equality. This marks the contrast with the symbolism of the Egyptian Monuments, namely, the Pyramids and the Sphinx, which symbolize Civilization. That is, like the stone circles, they stand as the unmistakable tokens of humanity's creative talents and its ability to transform nature. And obviously, like the circles, as the symbol of Civilization, what they really convey in a more forceful way is the figuration of the implicit internal contradiction described in Phase II of the Model, i.e. that progress is at the same time retrogression (see chapt. 2). For if the Pyramids suggest the greatness of Man, their shape suggests the very shape of social inequality - with privilege at the top, misery and indignity for the absolute majority of the people to the bottom - and their actual incredible construction in itself, the depth of that inequality in the form of slavery determined by the mode of production which brought them into being. For just as Ancient Greece is to JLM/LGG never the Parthenon but

"a slave being tortured in a dungeon of  
the Athenian lawcourts"

so. too Ancient Egypt to him

"is never the Pyramids: it's the blood  
and tears of Goshen."(9)

As for the Sphinx, it objectively embodies the combination of

theomorphic and anthropomorphic elements which relates it to the chimeras of Greek Mythology, a combination that also suggests the relation of the human race to the rest of animal life, which in turn, puts in mind Rousseau's idea that humans have been drifting steadily away from their original animal condition as a result of their ability for self-perfectibility. But its symbolic meaning as used by JLM must also arise from Greek mythology (q.v.s.). So that apparently, in JLM's fiction the Sphynx also poses an enigma to humanity, or rather to human life. In the story "Daybreak" JLM calls the sphynx the "riddle of the sands", which may convey an allusion of some kind to some current 'riddles' of his time, including perhaps even Erskine Childers' novel of the same name (1903) or, in all likelihood, an allusion to Haeckel's "The Riddle of the Universe" (see chapt. 12). In this sense the Sphynx may be understood as related to the universal phenomenon of biological life at cosmic scale, to that "chain of being" as some authors call it. If the creators of the monument ever sought to suggest a possible interpretation to the meaning of human life, it is not clear whether JLM subscribes to that interpretation. In fact, Connan, the hero of "E" is only "amused" by the Sphynx (see chapt. 12). Only amused because King Khephren did immortalize his name in it. But immortality for JLM is not much of an individual achievement as it is the collective achievement of humanity as a whole - the immortality of the species whose genius can achieve much greater things than mere cyclopean stone monuments. But Connan's amusement may have a different interpretation if, as I believe, the author had derived a socio-historic meaning from the original meaning the Sphynx had in Greek mythology, in which, it is a monster with a woman's bust and the body of a lion that haunted Thebes propounding enigmas and devouring the people who failed to solve them. If this legend were intended to illustrate the contradiction humanity-nature, highlighting thus the overwhelming power of nature as compared with the meagre possibilities of humanity given its great ignorance of natural science in that ancient world, then there would be a strong basis for inferring that in these two monuments - the Great Pyramid and the Sphynx - the author saw put together, by History itself as it were, the precise stone monuments to symbolize the two fundamental contradictions that propel culture and which have brought a twofold oppression on humanity

- that of nature and that of Civilization. In this connection, it would be apt to quote Carlyle. JLM may not have held him as one of his heroes but he may have seen in his interpretation of the Sphinx a symbol which he applied to his own society, a good basis which enabled him to use it as such for his own model. Carlyle wrote in "Past and Present":

"How true for example is that other old Fable of the Sphinx, who sat by the wayside, propounding riddles to the passengers, which if they could not answer she destroyed them! Such a Sphinx is this Life of ours, to all men and societies of men. Nature like the Sphinx, is of womanly celestial loveliness and tenderness; the face and bosom of a goddess, but ending in claws and the body of a lioness. There is in her celestial beauty - which means celestial order, pliancy to wisdom, but there is also darkness, a ferocity, which are infernal. She is a goddess, but one not yet disimprisoned; one still half imprisoned, - the articulate, lovely still encased, in the inarticulate, chaotic. How true! And does she not propound her riddles to us? Nature, Universe, Destiny, Existence, howsoever we name this grand unnameable Fact in the midst of which we live and struggle, is a heavenly bride and conquest to the wise and brave, to them who can discern her behests and do them; a destroying friend to them who cannot. Answer her riddle, it is well with thee. Answer it not, pass regarding it not, it will answer itself; the solution for thee is a thing of teeth and claws; Nature is a dumb lioness, deaf to the pleadings, fiercely devouring. Thou art not now her victorious bride groom; thou art her mangled victim, scattered on the precipices, as a slave ..." (10)

It looks as if Carlyle's interpretation is not only an apt way of putting into words the essence of what one may presume to be JLM's own interpretation of the monument, but also of suggesting the symbol's relevance and its relation to his model. For on the one hand, the four categories mentioned by Carlyle - nature, universe, destiny, and

existence, are all, albeit from a different perspective, discussed in the model. On the other hand, there is Carlyle's view of nature in terms of opposites, i.e. between celestial order and infernal ferocity, between wisdom and darkness, between the harmonious and the chaotic, even when seen as coexisting in nature it cannot be said for certain whether he sees any internal connections between them. But it is interesting to note that he implies the idea of knowledge and also that of freedom, although once again, it is not clear either whether he sees their internal relationship. However, the idea of necessity is clearly implied in that, quite apart from whether humanity may or may not be conscious of its ways, the objective laws that govern nature will express themselves all the same. Moreover, the close relationship between knowledge and freedom is expressed in the metaphor of the "victorious bridegroom" as contrasted with the "mangled victim (...) as slave". In other words, we can identify here not only Bacon's approach to the problem of knowledge but also in fact, Spinoza's view of the problem of freedom, a view which has been taken up by many later thinkers, among them Hegel, and notably Engels given his relevant influence on JLM/LGG. This is a clear indication that JLM/LGG is using the Sphynx symbol according to the basic meaning contained in Carlyle's interpretation and also in terms of his own model.

That is, unlike Carlyle, he sees humanity as the real "bridegroom" set on its course to not only "answer the riddle" and actually defeat the Sphynx but also to

"reach the palace of God and storm it,  
and capture the engine-room and power  
house."(11)

This may explain why the Sphynx 'amuses' Connan, the poet, for it is not just the 'riddle of the sands' since it points to what one could term the riddle of life, only that, in all probability, this meaning may have been unwittingly implied in this still too simplistic conception of the ancient artists. It is not only that poetry concerns itself with these riddles, and that in the content of this symbolism the poet is likely to find his/her most precious materials.

It is also that every poet's aspiration is to become "victorious bride groom" rather than "mangled victim". It follows that Connan's amusement may well convey his inner conviction that he is about to write his Epic of Life, i.e. to achieve the impossible.

JLM's choice of symbols, valid not only for a particular work at a time but chiefly for the model as a whole, has caused some trouble among critics and commentators. One of them for example, on reviewing "H" in "The Saturday Review" observed that

"- the 'Desert of Northern Arabia' on p.42 appears to be a slip of the pen: it ought to be 'Southern'-(12)

This particular inaccuracy where southern becomes northern - in a book on exploration! - is not the only one. A similar one will be pointed out again by Dr. Geoffrey Wagner but referring to the trilogy "ASQ" and involving this time eastern and western. The reason is, however, that the cardinal points are used symbolically by the author and his 'inaccuracies' serve a purpose within his overall allegory in the model. In this, again, apart from creating his own symbols JLM has either borrowed symbols widely used or has altered current accepted meanings in order to make them serve the needs of his own essential meaning. The Western Islands motif, for example, he incorporates to his Great Adventure theme but related to the salvation-of-humanity theme in keeping with his allegory of the road to survival and triumph which also includes the Passage of the Dawn symbol. All these are, to some extent, illustrated in the climactic scenes of TGB where the meaning of East and West becomes clear. West is the cardinal point which should lead to Phase V, for it points to the unknown, and therefore, to exploration, an exploration in which it will be necessary

"To sail beyond the sunset, and the  
baths of all the western stars, (...)"

and the dangers of that unknown which must be sought at all costs, even when

"It may be that the gulfs will wash us down:

It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,"(13)

In the distant past, however, humanity took East which, by that time, was the route to 'salvation' whilst in fact leading to Civilization. But now from this present Civilization it should be West which leads to the Passage of the Dawn in front of which humans are supposed to fight their decisive battle before reaching their goal - South. For Life lies South and the natural general route of humanity has been a steady getting away from an inhospitable and violent North. In his symbolism of the cardinal points he may have resorted to various sources which go from Rousseau to Spengler, amongst others. Yet, it seems that north as symbol is derived from Rousseau who in turn elaborated on Montesquieu's idea when he wrote

"Je remarquerais qu'en general les peuples du Nord sont plus industrieux que ceux du Midi, parce qu'ils peuvent moins se passer de l'être, comme si la nature égaliser les choses en donnant aux esprits la fertilité qu'elle refuse à la terre."(14)

Quite apart from the extent to which JLM/LGG may endorse the view, the fact remains that in his symbolism, north stands not only for peoples who are "plus industrieux", but also for those who are more belligerent, unloving, and merciless in war, i.e. more 'civilized', for in the realities of our planet it is Civilization that lies to the North. There is no contradiction with the terms of his model. There is, on the contrary, some degree of congruity. In his model the civilizing process - whether at the stage of savagery or later - comes as a rule from the north, no matter that the process involves either the use of brute force or of intellectual initiative. The story WLS highlights another aspect of the problem to which Rousseau referred - the inhospitable character of the northern regions, associated also to the Ice Age theme. WLS is strongly based on the theory of evolution, and also highlights the presence of the south as the symbol of life,

and the idea suggested there is that paradise, according to those primitive quasi-humans, should lie in that direction (one should not forget that our vantage point is the Northern Hemisphere and that 'South' as used here becomes 'North' in the Southern Hemisphere). In the same story, the suggestion is that the same land of promise is related to the "companionable" stone. As for the warlike spirit of the northern peoples, JLM associates it with the idea of the savage, especially when using the Mongols as symbol. His Persian Dawn story cycle in PDEN illustrates this issue, but the symbol implied is more complex since, at the same time, it denotes a basic opposition between the Mongols and Civilization in the sense that they can be identified as the embodiment of an anarchistic tendency which is incompatible with civilization. On the other hand, and especially from the viewpoint of the diffusion of culture they can be identified as destroyers. In FTS their power of destruction is equated to that of a cataclysm such as the earthquake that threatened Mevr. In that story the Mongols are represented by the army of Kuchick Khan who

"was sweeping down from the north"

The allusions may not be necessarily historical, but in its Political sense it may be related to the role of the barbarians in history. This would confirm my belief that just as the north as symbol is derived from Rousseau, the association of that symbol with the role of barbarians - represented by the Mongols in his model - is related to Spengler's idea of the role he ascribes to the Mongols in history, although other writers, Kafka amongst them, have used this leitmotif of the barbarians of the north.

With respect to other elements belonging to JLM's imagery there still remain some relevant items which in general might be better explained in the light of the actual analyses of texts as seen in Part Two. A good example is that of **love** when in connection with his recurring "in such a night as this" i.e. the night of Civilization as seen in chapt. 3. In using Shakespeare's verses JLM directs us to "The Merchant of Venice" (Act V, Sc. 1) for the connotation of 'romantic' or sentimental individual love; and to both "King Lear"

(III, Sc. 2 -43/Sc. 4 - 17/18, and even verses 76 and 166), and to "Pericles" (III, Sc. 2 -5) for the other connotation, i.e. the social, gregarious, fraternal love, or rather, the absence of it in Civilization ("This cold night will turn us all to fools and madmen"), despite its obvious presence amongst humanity, whereby even a king can be moved by human suffering. In keeping with his model human love cannot find its true expression in Civilization and thus, if love is warm and bright and goes well with the sunshine, love in Civilization can reach its fullness only if compared to the moonlight. Night in this symbol represents inhumaneness, especially when related to human suffering cause by other human beings.

What we have so far pointed out in the present chapter, should constitute the key or codebook to an interpretation of JLM/LGG's model although insufficient for an exploration of his essential meaning. In this connection, we still have to say something relevant concerning the relationship between the explorer and the hero, and between them/and the dreamer. These are all related to the great adventure. But before coming to that, a few words are necessary concerning other items which in a way are endowed with some symbolic quality since they are also part of the great adventure. One of them is Archaeology.

The archaeologist is a kind of "explorer" who is likely to find something precious but in the past, and nonetheless precious for humanity in that such findings might be relevant for those of the future. In any case, it is only for Archaeology to cast more light on the anthropological issue concerning the ascent of humankind and its real identity in the biological scale. Archaeology can also throw light on the questions concerning the beginning of civilization, as his allusions to Atlantis seem to suggest. That is the reason why in his imagery all those characters who go digging and trying to unearth archaic remains of the presence of Man, can be identified as Natural Man; hence their connection with Diffusionism. Archaeology is part of the quest, and this, forms the backbone of the model. The quest is made into the most important symbol, for in a way, it gives life a very significant sense - Life is Quest. And this quest gives origin

to the Great Adventure since in actual fact, it is the conquest of the unknown. It is an epic of momentous importance. If Columbus, Bering, Ericsson, Polo, Burton, Junez Cabeza de Vaca, Nansen, Park, and Magellan braved the unknown in a quest whose achievement contributed to effecting the "conquest of the earth" - of its surface at least as suggested in "H", - humanity as a collective force braves the whole universe seeking to achieve the conquest of Nature by Man and for Man. It is the genius of humanity at work seeking to reaffirm itself and to prevail over nature.

The model itself is but an allegory of how humanity will prevail over its own internal problems of dialectical contradictions in the process of production and reproduction. In this process Man will also conquer nature to become finally free.

As allegory it suggests comparison to other 'roads to salvation' that can be identified in universal literature, especially with "The Pilgrim's Progress". But any comparison should emphasize an essential difference. Whilst Bunyan's allegory seeks salvation of the soul by faith, depending on God's mercy for pardon and an eternal life in heaven as a reward, the model conceived by JLM/LGG seeks something entirely human, material, and earthly, where the main role belongs to humanity not to God, as already explained.

As suggested earlier on, the explorer as hero of the quest, becomes an emulous of Columbus and of all the 'earth conquerors' (NAU) when it comes to geographical - and one may presume, cosmic - exploration; and researcher when we come to the challenge posed by nature. Both the explorer and the researcher or scientist are identified with the essential spirit of Natural Man and as such, with that other symbolic character, the dreamer, that "dreamer of dreams" whom we come across so frequently, especially in his 'English' fiction. As for his probable sources, the obvious one seems to be Morris. The dreamer suggests an attack on nihilistic philosophies whose defeatism in relation to the future of humanity is well represented by Spengler. The dreamer is first of all a humanist in the modern sense of the word - one whose superior values go with

everything that dignifies and elevates human life on the basis of the essential excellencies that make humanity the only beings in creation capable of mastering the earth and the skies in the wake of their own freedom. The 'dreamer' is therefore related to the innate goodness of the human being, and as a result, to love, fraternity, and all the endowments of a sound social ethics harmonizing with the dignity of such a superior being. On the historic plane, therefore, the dreamer is the offspring of that early tools manufacturer, i.e. the flints maker and builder of stone monuments. This early manufacturer and builder is first of all a creator, and as such, has created civilization and its culture. In point of fact, it is this dreamer who is the real creator of Phase V of the model. The 'dreamer' is not a sentimentalist, for there are dreams which are not dreams when they are the mere anticipation in abstract of that which is feasible in reality. A dream may be another word for an ambitious project before it becomes a reality, or as D.I. Pisariev (1840-1868) put it

"My dream may run ahead of the natural march of events or may fly off at a tangent in a direction in which no natural march of events will ever proceed. In the first case my dream will not cause any harm; it may even support and augment the energy of the working men ... There is nothing in such dreams that would distort or paralyse labour-power. On the contrary, if man were completely deprived of the ability to dream in this way, if he could not from time to time run ahead and mentally conceive, in an entire and completed picture, the product to which his hands are only just beginning to lend shape, then I cannot at all imagine what stimulus there would be to induce man to undertake and complete extensive and strenuous work in the sphere of art, science, and practical endeavour ... The rift between dreams and reality causes no harm if only the person dreaming believes seriously in his dream, if he attentively observes life, compares his observations with his castles in the air, and if generally speaking, he works conscientiously for the achievement of his fantasies. If there is some connection between dreams and life then all is well."(15)

So that according to Pisariev's words, JLM/LGG's conception of such a future way of life as the one envisaged in Phase V of his model can be called the dream of dreams, and those who hold it as their truth that such a world can be built, are in fact the "dreamers of dreams", i.e. his true fictional heroes. If such a dream were purely subjective and no more than a fantasy or at best mere "romantic dithering" (16), the 'dreamer' would be just that, a utopian idealist or a subjective builder of "castles in the air", and the whole model would be little more than a flight of fancy, a mere romance. But the model was built on the basis of the "negation of the negation" law that governs qualitative change in the Hegel-Marx dialectics. It follows that if this law is scientifically correct the objective reality and feasibility of a model such as the one conceived by JLM/LGG should also be possible and probable. If dialectical contradiction is the driving force that propels the process of culture forward, then our author is correct in conceiving Civilization as the result of successive dialectical contradictions which in due course should give origin to a new world born out of the old one, then it is equally possible that the new society of Phase V arises from within the one of Phase III. Consequently, there is the possibility and the probability that the dream may come true, and that the dreamer become the true protagonist or main hero. But then the dreamer should not be thought of as an individual creator, for the dreamer is in fact humanity itself; or, if you like everyman, only that this connotation would suggest "Pilgrim's Progress" whereas the model of our author suggests 'everywoman' as well. Thus, the old flints maker and builder of stone monuments would have become a freedom-maker and the creator of his/her own perfection. The individual hero can only make sense as a reflection of this multitudinous, collective hero - **humanity**.

Last, but not least, a few words on a theme which dominates an important part of TGB - the legend of Atlantis. The theme turns up again in different guises and in at least three of the "master-piece of Thrills" group of short stories, namely, "ASFA", "KE", and "WLS". In connection with that theme the Author suggests that there was once in the distant past a civilization so advanced that it had produced

the ornithopter. In general, in his different works there are allusions to the theme, especially also in relation to the "Azilian boy" or likeness of a person in his romances. But Atlantis also turns up in TD and even in "Sp".

Even if regarded as belonging solely to his imagery, there may be more than one reason to treat of the theme separately, it being the one that lends itself admirably to bridge the difference between fact and fiction as understood by the author, or rather, to suggest that the boundary between the one and the other is somewhat elusive and might be nonexistent, or, provided that it is understood metaphorically, the theme symbolizes the author's ability to create a realistic atmosphere when dealing with friction and a fictional one when dealing with fact. It is part of his "magic" in that sense that this could be included in that ability of his to "juggle with Magic" as Neill Gunn put it when in 1938 he wrote

"The two qualities of Leslie Mitchell's writing that move me to delight are his profound sense of Tradition and his eye for, and power to juggle with, Magic. These qualities I find at their most potent in "Sunset Song"; less so in the succeeding two parts of the "Quair"; and scarcely discernible in such of his purely English fiction as I have read."(16)

even when he failed to see that Magic in his "purely English fiction" which, I think, is the aspect of his work which shows it even more potently if taken as a whole. In it, Atlantis is one of the motifs which help to create that 'magic', for even in the cases when it appears purely fictional, its inclusion responds to a non-fictional concern. His real intention may have sought to highlight something more important, a something that has to be related to the essence of his model, as is suggested in Chapter 11 (see "Diffusionism"). Atlantis is not a whimsical theme; it is related to Anthropology and specifically to the question of the origin of civilization. It is also related to the question of the origin of the human species. The predominance of the Egypt theme in his literature is not so much the

result of his living experience as an army serviceman in the Middle East, as it is the result of his concern about two fundamental issues, namely, the theme of colonization with its natural response - liberation (see "Diffusionism"); and the scientific question of neo-Darwinism which had divided social scientists into two camps. In so far as Egypt is regarded as the cradle of civilization, it also becomes the centre of JLM's attention, and incidentally, the 'cradle' of his own literary career. It is also symbolic that he had called one of his short stories "Gift of the River", giving thus Herodotus's name for Egypt - "Gift of the Nile" - his own use in his fiction. The problem of the suddenness of the historical change may well be related to his double line of thought on the question of the monogenetic theory on the origin of culture (see chapt. 11). His imagery in any case, presents us with the recurrence of the foreign element as conveyor of culture and agent of social change. Hence, most of his heroes are foreigners or 'outsiders' whose personal gifts and higher culture turn him/her into a leader of some kind. I have pointed out elsewhere that this may have something to do with Spengler's views but this neither invalidates his stance on the diffusion of culture nor does it weaken his imagery which in fact, insists on the outsider-leader motif in keeping with his views on the phenomenon of the diffusion of culture as will be seen in Chapter 11, where we shall also see why this motif is related to that of the exile. But the leader, who in essence is a liberator, is almost always either related to the upper class or to a higher culture, when not an actual member of it. If in view of what the model emphasizes in its first four phases this may strike the reader as inconsistent with his democratic views, the overall sense of the model, however, shows that this only confirms the role that his model gives knowledge in general and to people with more highly-trained intellects in particular, a role which harmonizes with his concept of freedom as founded on the knowledge of necessity by the human being. His leader-liberator-hero thus conceived - also a "dreamer" and explorer, with a streak of Natural Man, etc. - represents the author's perception of culture in a class society in which even knowledge is the privilege of the ruling or upper class. Again, this may not be an original idea, for Bebel had already expressed it in relation to the liberator (see chapt. 14. Q.

12). In my view JLM followed Bebel's analysis and not Spengler's, for as will be seen in Chapter 15, his viewpoint on social science is different, as are his views on humanity. The upper-class leader-liberator-hero, on the other hand, gives consistency to his unyielding belief in humanity's innate gifts which single the human being out as the superior species in nature not only for their love of fellowmates, but also for their ability to feel pity and compassion, their sense of ethics and human values, and above all, their intelligence and consciousness which makes them feel the urge to make out the mysteries of nature and their determination to gain control over it. To JLM/LGG the division into classes is a temporary calamity. But even then, the worst of oppressors is still a human being, so that it is no wonder that from amongst the oppressive classes there can emerge truly human heroes who are more identified with humanity than with their social class. For if according to his imagery, Natural Man appears as exiled from Civilization, so too his antagonists of the upper classes appear as exiled from the realm of humanity. This explains the relevance of the motif as confirmed by the fact that even two of his narrators AS and SL are exiles - political exiles at that - and so are a number of his fictional characters (see also chapt. 8 in relation to the biblical motif - Adam as exile). But JLM's exiles are mainly political in character, and in so far as the narrator of CC, PDEN, and LT, upper-class Russians who had fled from the Bolsheviks. In his model, however, these exiles, once turned from oppressors into the oppressed, or at any rate sharing their lot with those peoples who suffer as victims in the colonies of political powers such as the one destroyed by the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, are in the long run 'redeemed' by the essential goodness of Natural Man for so long 'in exile' within Civilization.

I would suggest that both the exile and Atlantis as symbols stand for the two possible directions of diffusion - from and to Civilization. This would enhance a qualitative aspect of diffusion in the sense that diffusion is usually understood as coming from part of Civilization to enrich a more primitive way of life, by different processes as described at the beginning of chapter 1. The novelty in JLM's imagery is his suggestion that diffusion can also come from

'outside' Civilization, or more precisely, that Civilization can also benefit from an 'alien' culture. In order to grasp the meaning of his, it is necessary to recall that in JLM's imagery Civilization stands for any mode of production which divides society into producers and owners of the means of production, whereby only the latter are 'the civilized'. It is also necessary to recall that this division lies at the basis of the dialectical contradiction that leads to the theme of the negation of the negation. According to JLM's imagery, it is the producers (and all those who share their lot) who are normally 'exiled' in Civilization. Notwithstanding, these producers are the creators, and if not the sole creators, at any rate the bearers or conveyors of a higher culture in so far as their aspirations include not only love, but also freedom, and as the pre-requisite social equality since it envisages doing away with any form of state. Therefore, that higher culture - if ever materialized in real life - should in turn be diffused into Civilization itself. This is the sense of his 'redemption' as implied in his model. In actual fact, it is the sense of revolution. As a result, it is in this sense that JLM acknowledges the merits of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, in much the same way that he finds fault with the regime set up by the Bolsheviks. It is obvious that he reprobates the "iron" government of Stalin, but then it is also obvious that in his model the only human regime is that which does not require any state apparatus. However, it is significant that in spite of his contempt for Stalinism, he still sided with the Bolshevik Revolution, as it is also very significant in this sense that like Kropotkin in real life, AS in his fiction had gone back to work with the Bolsheviks (see also the short story "E" in "CC"). This confirms that his ultimate goal is not democracy, since this cannot exist without one form of State or another. No matter how advanced, this State is still a class instrument. Therefore, no need to emphasize that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is far from being his ideal, for not even the Socialist State is. His real goal is to be found beyond democracy: when the State has already "withered away", in that still distant higher stage of Socialism.

Atlantis, on the other hand, suggests first of all an emphasis on the role of diffusion in fostering culture, even if on this count, it

refutes the basic premise that holds Egypt as the origin of civilization. It is true that JLM is not wholeheartedly in favour of that theory since his line on this topic is not consistent. The reason, I think, is that he is much more interested in propounding his own views on the role played by what he calls "coincidence", or the theory of the 'accident' as I have called it in Chapter 2. His theme of Atlantis proves that he was consciously ruling out Egypt as the origin of civilization, which proves in turn that this is not after all relevant to his model, since his true explanation of that origin is implied in Phase II and then emphasized in Phase IV. What is indeed relevant to him is the plausibility of his model, particularly that phase of it which I have called Phase V. And if this phase - in fact the Paradise-on-Earth idea - may appear as doubtful as the virtues of his Natural Man, then Plato's theme of Atlantis in "Critias" and "Timaeus" may help to give his Phase V more coherence. Besides, the idea of the sunken continent, and of the superior race turns up again in Engels himself (see chapt. 11). If that were one of the purposes of Atlantis as imagery, then there is all the subsequent literature on the subject, particularly, that of Ignatius Donnelly ("Atlantis: the Ante-deluvian World") and K.T. Frost ("The Lost Continent" - a scholarly article/1909/). But if we are to accept the idea of some contemporary influence, it looks as if the works of Lewis Spence would be the more relevant - he published three books between 1924 and 1926, just before JLM/LGG began writing more regularly. In fact, Spence refers to the theme of the relationship between Atlantis and the people of the western Europe Stone Age - the Cro-Magnon, the Magdalenian, and the Azilian. Instead of any possible contradiction, JLM may have seen some coherence between this and Engel's "highly-developed race of anthropoids" (see chapt. 11). If it were so, we might infer that Atlantis serves him, if not to trace back, at least to provide him with some suitable basis for his assumption that humanity and Neanderthal men are separate species. But it is on the topic of diffusion, again, where Spence, in bringing into focus the relationship between Atlantis and the origin of the Mayan Civilization, provides JLM with a good argument in favour of his own stance that the pre-Columbian civilization of Latin America did not spring up independently from those of the old world.

"If outside cultural impulses are denied, this is a necessity. For in the great area of the Maya Old Empire that civilization has the appearance of uprising, like Athena from the head of Zeus, young, yet fully-grown and equipped."(17)

Naturally, all this is hypothetical, and it seems to me that it is justified only in so far as the author makes use of an hypothetical theme also. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to suggest that the theme in question denotes an inconsistency in his model. For even if all the previous considerations, theoretically speaking, were invalidated by the argument that in the last analysis, the only concrete fact is that, in the eyes of scientific evidence, Atlantis is still a legend, and at best an hypothesis; there would remain at least two reasons in favour of the consistency of the model and its inclusion of the theme of Atlantis.

Firstly, and in tune with his basic premise derived mainly from Greek philosophy - specifically Heraclitus, as seen in Chapter 1 - that all nature, including humanity, exists thanks to an external movement of matter, and therefore of change, it stands to reason to infer that the author may have included in this general principle the phenomenon of civilization as also cyclic in nature, but not necessarily cyclic in culture (see chapt. 16 - Spengler). But assuming that even this is arguable, we can at any rate say finally that his theme of Atlantis has to be seen in the light of the importance he attributes to his theme of Archaeology in his model. In fact, they both form a whole which reaffirms the author's more decisive stance that it is only through scientific research that we can make out the mysteries of both nature and society, i.e. culture.

P A R T T W O

THE CULTURAL APPROACH

A. THE CREATOR

CHAPTER 8

HE WHO SEEKS, A TALE IN THE LIGHT OF ITS ESSENTIAL MEANING

Preamble

A resume

The Proem to HWS

Analysis of HWS through its proem

B. THE INTELLECTUAL

CHAPTER 9

THE CULTURAL QUESTION

The Background and the Humanist Tradition

The Writer and the Writers

A. THE CREATORCHAPTER 8 "HE WHO SEEKS",A TALE SEEN IN THE LIGHT OF ITS ESSENTIAL MEANINGI. PREAMBLE

HWS opens the cycle of short stories that form "The Calends of Cairo" (CC). The volume contains twelve stories preceded by the story "For Ten's Sake" (FTS) which is used as the "Proem" to the volume CC. Then each story is preceded by its own individual proem in which the narrator supposedly 'talks' to an imaginary interlocutor who may well be the reader. But each individual proem is designed to provide the reader with the clue to the second meaning of each story in much the same way that the Proem FTS as proem to the volume CC is designed to provide the clue to the second meaning of the cycle of stories CC, formerly published as "Polychromata".

The narrator of HWS - AS, also the narrator of the remaining 11 stories of the cycle, and of the novel "The Lost Trumpet", is in fact one more character. AS is possibly one of the main characters in the same way that the reader may well be the real protagonist in the grand metaphor conceived by JLM/LGG, or rather, conceived by JLM and expressed jointly by both JLM and also by LGG - his alter ego.

HWS is the romance version of one of the central themes in JLM/LGG's grand metaphor. In terms of the model, this theme belongs to its third phase which is explained in Chapter 3.

Before examining the proem of HWS, it may be advisable to have a look at the movement of the story itself. Its plot has been compressed into a resume (q.v.i.).

## II. RESUME OF "HE WHO SEEKS"

A young Russian aristocrat, Andrei Bal'mont, was a captain who had "come south to fight the Red Terror, even as thousands beyond Perekop had come south with the Sovyeti to fight the White Reaction". Defeated, during his retreat he came across Natasha Grodin, a "refugee from the Sovyeti". Lost and desolate as they were they fell in love instantly and Andrei felt that "all his years (he knew) had been but prelude to the moment when Natasha's lips touched his".

They found a refugee boat bound for Stamboul and Natasha felt that she had lost Russia and "all its days and sunshine and kindness", etc. She succeeded then in saving Andrei's life but as a result Andrei lost her.

Discharged from hospital "he came not back the same Andrei," for he had come out on to a "world that had dimmed and blurred at the edges. One memory, one hunger of desire alone possessed him," and therefore, "he set out to seek Natasha as once men went forth to seek the Holy Grail," and though he could find no trace of her in Yalta or Sophia, "the story of his quest long followed after him in rumour and surmise" due to the "ache and sympathy which every lost lover may stir," and therefore he was helped "by the stray and the waif with whom he would never have associated the pity of the Christ."

He was able to make for Palestine because "a Greek boat of the coast took him for deck hand." Here he not only learned about "the ways of a ship and the loves and beliefs of the men who with him worked," but he also "entered their poor, stupid dreams, and forgave those dreamers of their kind who had driven him from Russia."

At Jaffa he only saw "street-fighting between the so brave Arabs and the immigrant Jews." Wherever he went he had visions of Natasha. He landed in Alexandria where "he heard by chance of me, 'English' Saloney, the hotel guide" who kept the old Committee records with the "addresses of every White Russian in Egypt." But the quest did not come to an end there.

"It was sunset when Andrei came to Cairo and sought his way to the Khalig-el-Masri, through the throngs of "Polychromata", and once more he had a vision of Natasha. But the quest did not finish in the Khalig either, and so Andrei, on and on "tramped forth again on his quest."

### III. THE PROEM TO "HWS"

"Many-coloured? It is one of the names of our little Cairo - Polychromata. She has many names, the Gift of the River, and nowhere do her colours flaunt as here, in the Khalig el Masri. Long the evenings I sat and puzzled till I knew the Khalig and Life for one. Key-colour to the kaleidoscope, master-note in the syncopation - it is Quest.

For what? Full bellies and purses, the laughter and love, woman and fame and fantasy .... All the so-desired apples of that mirage-orchard that flourishes by the Dead Sea ... Eh? A cynic? God mine! I am only a dragoman!

Happy he who finds not what he seeks - it is the oldest of axioms. But when the desperate seeker himself acknowledges it, he grows the wonder and the legend in the eyes of men. As, indeed, may yet the tale of Andrei Bal'mont and his quest ....

But of course... And beer - English beer. I think the gods must drink of English beer in Olympus these days, when they have laid aside their bowler hats and the last so-bluff American has made his tip and gone. The little Simon first stocked it here, not by command of the Anglo-Saxon, but at wish of me, Anton Saloney, dragoman, guide, ex-colonel of horse in the army of Doniken, and one-time Professor of English Literature in the Gymnasium of Kazan.

The tale of Andrei? See, I have become a teller of tales - I have invented more so-scandalous royalties than ever the dynastic tables held, I had a madam-tourist in the tears this morning when I told of the suicide of Rameses II from the top of Kheops' Pyramid, because of the false love who jilted him - yet this tale of Andrei.... I have loved and hated it, as must all men, felt the ache of it and the beauty of it. Yet it needs some subtle tale-smith as your sweet Morris to tell it. Indeed, I think the little Andrei himself was of the Hollow Lane, a faery-knight and a faery-saint....

Yet perhaps he was a Russian of the Russians, the Slav eternal.  
Perhaps he was Man himself.

Look, my friend, I once knew and talked with this Andrei, yet already to me he is half a myth, a figure on that painted guaze of legend that covers the face of the East. How shall I make him live in English eyes - he and his tale and his quest?"(1)

#### IV. ANALYSIS OF HWS THROUGH ITS PROEM

The proem introduces the narrator - Anton Saloney (AS). His name is the result of the transliteration of a Russian word meaning something like **of the salon** (or Salon man), that is, one of the habitués at the gatherings of notabilities in fashionable salons in the XIX century. He is a symbolic character like his alter ego Sergei Lubow - where the word lubow is the transliteration of the Russian word for love - the narrator of a different cycle of short stories also signed by James Leslie Mitchell. He (or rather, they) represent(s) the cultured elite that was defeated by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 in Russia. The introduction of such narrators and guides may suggest a political allusion relevant to the main theme of the story. This may be so in a very general sense, especially in connection with Adam's "paradise lost" as will be seen further on., But what reality matters for JLM's purposes in this particular story is that these white Russians are exiles. This does not rule out, however, the political implication that in more specific terms the concept may have. In effect, AS introduces himself as a high-ranking officer "in the army of Deniken" (Sic). There can be more than one political connotation of this, but the theme of Denikin's army is intended to bring to the reader's mind the notion that there was a common ground between AS's political cause in Russia and Britain's involvement in the international political arena of the time, so that it is not mere chance that before becoming "colonel of horse" AS had been "Professor of English Literature in the Gymnasium of Kazan". Thus, in terms of JLM's allegory, the "gods in the bowler hats" cannot claim impartiality concerning the devastating civil war and the savage cruelty in the confrontation that ensued after the bolshevik takeover in Russia since

"The Volunteer Army of Denikin was created with the financial and technical help of Great Britain and France."(2)

and JLM may have known this well enough since there is evidence, which he himself supplied, of his involvement in the political upsurge in Scotland coming in the wake of the developments in Russia, such as

"the founding of the Aberdeen Soviet when the news of the Bolshevik Revolution came through from Russia; and how I and a cub reporter from another paper attended the foundation meeting; and were elected to the Soviet Council, forgetting we were pressmen;"(3)

This throws some light on the reasons JLM may have had in mind when introducing the theme of Denikin's army, but AS - as it becomes clear in the other stories and confirmed again in "The Passage of the Dawn" (4) - more than the political exile represents, in fact an exile from the earthly paradise since he has something in common with the 'first exile' - Adam: "in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken:"

And in fact, this "ex-colonel of horse in the army of Deniken" has to eat bread in the sweat of his face now working as a dragoman in exile.

On the other hand, the rather ironic change from his old role as Professor of English Literature to that of **guide** in that particular **city** Cairo, invites the reader to recall Virgil and Dante, especially when through the pages of CC Saloney seems to be guiding him/her round the different circles of a recognizable Inferno of the living. This does not conflict with his role as an exile for he is as ironic a guide as Man himself is, if regarded as his own guide in life through a Civilization in which - according to JLM - Man is an exile.

His implied similarity with Adam gives AS a more universal dimension as a symbolic character and even when, like Adam, he has to make his living by the sweat of his brow after his 'fall' (5), he does not lose his specific status as political exile since it is precisely in this capacity that he has to assume this new role: to earn a living by toil. What is more, it is AS who gives Adam's case a

certain political connotation in that AS was banished from his paradise on earth where he used to be lord by those who challenged that power and successfully reversed that social order. Their action - unlike Adam's - was not 'sinful' though, since in the course of time AS (like Andrei Bal'mont in the story) arrives at an understanding of the rebels' motives and 'forgives' them. As compared with Adam, their roles are reversed, for he was never a lord in a paradise that was not his and therefore he had to rebel, though unsuccessfully, and being the loser, his Lord charged him with the sin of disobedience. So the relationship between AS and Adam, rather than reversed, is in fact dialectical in the sense that AS also has something in common with Adam's Lord in that AS was also a lord in the paradise he lost. In this capacity - unlike Adam - he participated in the tree of knowledge since he was Professor of English Literature at a time when not only knowledge but the whole content and form of the Culture came as the spiritual and intellectual achievement of Civilization, which JLM identifies with the British Empire. That is why English literature represents that spirit and that intellect, and is therefore taught far and wide throughout the dominions of this Civilization, in fact, as far as the Gymnasium of Kazan ... By means of explicit and implicit contrasts and comparisons JLM suggests that the same similarities that identify AS with Adam also constitute their dissimilarities, for if they both "lost" a paradise on earth, they were expelled from it by different 'lords' and for different reasons. Besides if each one suffered a reversal of situation, that reversal proved calamitous for Adam only in that he not only lost a paradise (although this expression is not correct) but also his dignity as a human being. Adam, therefore, seeks to have his present situation reversed in order to achieve redress. In this sense, the contrast with AS is apparent, for the latter has already recovered part of his dignity as a human being precisely as a result of having lost his 'paradise'. Again, Adam as a 'fallen man' represents humankind after the 'fall of Man', whereas AS also represents humankind but after 'the fall of the lords', i.e. as a 'redeemed' man, or rather, as a result of his own fall as a lord. In JLM/LGG's view, it is the poor and the downtrodden who are going to 'redeem' humankind, although the sense of 'redemption' in that view takes on a quite different meaning. (see

also the story FTS, in chapt. 6).

This is the way in which JLM portrays a time which is out of joint, suggesting at the same time that the current situation must be reversed in order to set it right. The reversal of situation, a recurring motif in his imagery, is also suggested directly in his Introduction to Heinrich Mann's "The Blue Angel" which, in his opinion, reversed the established conventions since he described it as

"a fairy-story reversed, with the ogre as hero, a the princess a drab, the young knight a prig, and neither vice no virtue rewarded, defeated, condoned."(6)

and therefore a story which is more true to life, which interprets better the human side of life (since it reverses the values of Civilization). This reversal of roles includes an aspect which he emphasizes, concerning the question of good and evil where there is neither reward nor punishment, even though he seems to live

"hoping that in one at last will the villain triumph ..."(7)

The motif is recurrent in his imagery, but expressions such as "the Slav eternal" (q.v.s.), or "the axioms realists?", or "the story scandalous" - which presumably contribute to that "irritatingly mannered style" (8) of his - should be regarded rather as a reminder that the narrator is not a native English speaker (hence such style in these constructions similar to that of "the home ancestral" (9) and the like;) but the intention in such cases seems to be to emphasize the relevance that the topic in hand has in relation to the overall allegory.

But it is not AS's adjectives alone that make up his peculiar style. His role is to remind the reader of the theme of the exile, and therefore, his foreignness must be made manifest:

"The little cluster of bell-flowers -  
From Scotland? But it has travelled far!

I may smell it? ... God mine, it is  
heather!"(10)

JLM used his short story FTS as the Proem to the other twelve stories that form the collection CC whose overt intention can be traced from HWS to PD, having FTS as the compass that points in the direction of the overall meaning.

Since HWS is the first story in CC, we have here before us the first proem. Thus, the first paragraph is intended to explain some central issues, where life is introduced as being multi-coloured and therefore called "polychromata", meaning that life contains all the themes and all the motifs but that in this limitless variety the quest dominates, because it is both master-note and key-colours but whether "syncopation" or "kaleidoscope"

"there is one colour that abides and  
changes not."(11)

That particular colour is none other than the eternal renewal of life, having love as its key-note as the quest of Andrei Bal'mont proves once again. Civilization is identified with Cairo, the city, which is also "many-coloured" and has one area, Khalig el Masri - the oldest part of the city - which represents its very heart. It is there that Man is to be found. It contains, therefore, all the themes of life in their most vivid light - in their essence. Yet, this "little Cairo, for all its colours, is treated with disapproval although it is "little Cairo" in that derogatory sense that implies something akin to "neither vice nor virtue rewarded, defeated, condoned", let alone punished, for it is the city of man; i.e. civilization, where man lives in exile, because Cairo is but the personification of the generic Mevr, the 'city' anticipated in the Proem (FTS as proem to CC) which is described not as "many coloured" but as

"the Hell-Gate of the East (...)"(12)

which is his own alternative to T.S. Eliot's "Unreal city/Under the brown fog of a winter noon" of the Waste Land. An alternative after

all, since his Polychromata is

"the city of many colours (... Gift of  
the River,"

(because Heredotus had called Egypt "gift of the Nile")

"and what gifts but the miraculous does  
the Nile bring?"(13)

as he wrote in "GR" (see Bibliography).

"GR" is an allegory which, on the social plane, seeks to expose the negative effects of Civilization on the currently distorted manifestations of human love.

The second paragraph of the proem quoted above introduces the idea of destination or objective, and of purpose, implied in the conventions of the quest. As usual JLM uses the external form whilst changing the content, and thus, the grail becomes neither a dish or a vessel, but a virtual horn - The Horn of Plenty, which in a way amounts to restoring to the old legend its real content as arising from the fertility rites. The horn theme, in any case, is not at variance with the concerns of most writers and artists especially of those belonging to the Dionysiac tradition as expressed in different historical periods through history, the Renaissance in particular. In fact, the Rabelaisian mood haunts the second paragraph of JLM's proem to HWS. His allusion to the Renaissance provides him with another historical line that connects with the distant past. So, if for form he went back to the Medieval Romance, for content he has gone back to the Renaissance, which in turn has also enabled him to reach as far back as the fertility rituals. In this connection, even though the Rabelaisian component is apparent, "full bellies and purses" strikes us as the compressed version of

" And then, the justice,  
In fair round belly, with capon lined,  
.....  
With spectacles on nose, and pouch on

side,"(14)

-serving the purpose of directing us into those aspects of Shakespeare's play dealing with both reversal or circumstances and the opposition between plenty and scarcity (or rather starvation) in the field of social life, plus other similar concerns that are to be found in JLM/LGG's own line of thought, particularly in his critique of Civilization concerning social inequality and human enmity instead of love between brothers. "Full bellies and purses" stands in sharp contrast in relation to

"O I die for food.  
Here lie I down, and measure out my  
grave."(15)

This together with the "mirage-orchard that flourishes by the Dead Sea", harmonizes with the main situation of the Forest of Arden as in Act II particularly with scenes 3, 6 and 7, although it is scene 1 that presents the theme JLM/LGG is interested in:

"Now, my co-mates and brothers in  
exile,"(16)

It is the theme of exile and its social and political implications as seen by Shakespeare, but JLM is probably more interested in both the social causes that have originated it and in the dreadful effects it has on the human being whose very existence is put in jeopardy when forced into exile. Whatever the nature of his coincidence with Shakespeare JLM's treatment of the problem takes on a different look when set against the background of the XXth century world view. In fact, the social intention of "full bellies and purses" emerges in its specific social sense when the meaning of the fourth paragraph (beginning on line 15) of the proem is made clear and as a result casts more light on the previous paragraphs

Simon's cafe and its owner - as part of the general structure of CC (and of "Polychromata") - remind us of the Tabard Inn and its host in a very general sense, and the customers remind us of the pilgrims in

much the same way. Yet this Simon plays a more general role as becomes the representative of a worldwide culture that is a kind of bridge between the ancient world and our own. He is Greek and his cafe in Cairo is like the meeting place of civilization as a whole where not only three historical ages meet but in fact three different 'ways of life', or rather, three different cultures belonging to other three different social systems respectively: the dynastic Egypt of the Pharaohs with its elaborate hierarchies and its sharp social division among human beings, and above all with its slaves; then the Greek version of Democracy of some but not for the mass of slaves; and finally, our own culture represented by the British Empire and its particular brand of social relations where the absence of the word slave did not prevent William Morris from calling the late XIXth century workman

"the slave of division of labour"(17)

at a time when England - in his own words - had

"become the mistress of the markets of the world, and also, as the people of that period were never weary of boasting, the workshop of the world:"(18)

But AS reminds us of a new phenomenon in our time: a new Revolution has taken place and a new social order has been set up, which, in a way, suggests a reversal of the present way of life - or, does he suggest a fourth historical order in which "at last will the villain triumph?" - in Russia at any rate.

Simon's cafe also brings together another two Mitchellian 'characters' - the exiled and the traveller (or possibly, the explorer). It is at this cafe that AS tells all his tales to the young traveller who may well represent humankind, and/or Man the explorer bound for the future in his eternal quest, for

"(... Even though this is your last Egyptian night), and tomorrow await you the sea and ship and weeks wherein your

Cairene days and I will fade to the merest names"(19)

To this guest AS has told twelve stories dealing with both a past - that has led to our present tribulations - and our collective dreams of a future without them.

"Bowler hats" and "English beer" are key words in JLM's fictional Olympus - or allegorical castle of the grail legend? - of the 1920s in which "the gods" - the rulers of this world, and hence the curators and preservers and guardians of Civilization - are English. These "gods" will be English for some time yet, but this is not to say that the English are superior. It simply means that the current ruling Empire is still English, and that it has not been superseded as yet, for it still prevails over the Americans.

Among the gods "full bellies and purses" should not be a surprise, nor "laughter and love" since these are the items that bring to mind the earthly paradise of the mythical Mount Olympus - or of the "solemn feast" of the grail legend?

But for humankind the world is like a Dead Sea with only a mirage-orchard that flourishes near by, but not a mirage-orchard for the gods who can in fact have "all the so-desired apples".

In this way JLM/LGG presents the fundamental issue around which all his literature revolves: he is questioning the foundations of modern society where a tiny section of humankind has made an earthly paradise for themselves laying the land waste for the rest of the fellows. That is why in his Proem to CC (the story FTS), the city - Mevr - resembles very much a "city of dreadful night" (on the allegorical plane at least), even if this resemblance is not so apparent in the city, Cairo, which as an allegorical city has much in common with T.S. Eliot's "unreal city", although their roles are opposite. The Dead Sea might be but another name for the Waste Land, even though JLM may not agree with Eliot, not in point of view at any rate. For a start,

the author of "The Waste Land" has never questioned, as JLM has, the validity of the premises on which Frazer founded his scientific work; on the contrary, he acknowledges his debt to "The Golden Bough". This difference may account for the difference in their conclusions even if Eliot's poem contains the same analysis of the problem of civilization as his use of the symbology of the Tarot pack shows. However, if their diagnosis may be said to coincide in general terms, they mean something quite different since their respective models are different. Thus, T.S. Eliot nears the end of his poem "with the arid plain behind: and no hope to offer ahead whilst the 'London Bridge is falling down'. If Eliot vaticinates that civilization is doomed, JLM may agree. But T.S. Eliot identifies civilization with humankind. For JLM these are opposites. And here is the difference. According to JLM/LGG there is the possibility of 'salvation' as he suggests in the closing story of CC - "The Passage of the Dawn" and also in FTS where salvation is shown as feasible. But the 'passage of the dawn' is meant for humankind not for Civilization (i.e. the prevailing social order of his time). In HWS, however, the only prospect is the Evening Star while the night of Civilization is coming down on humankind.

But the quest is still on.

JLM's theme of the quest and its dependence on the romance form was bound to introduce the name of William Morris since HWS is modelled on Morris's "The Hollow Land" which opens as follows:

"Do you know where it is - the Hollow Land? I have been looking for it now so long, trying to find it again - the Hollow Land - for there I saw my love first."(20)

"The Hollow Land" is a romance which complies with the basic conventions of the genre. It is a land that lies somewhere in this world, similar to the one Florian - its hero - found after the battle of Goliah's land, right at the moment of their defeat at the hands of Red Harald. There Margaret awaited her love Florian. The Hollow Land

is lost to humankind, very difficult to find, and which only very few do find. It is found unexpectedly, the way Florian came across it. Once found in this way, it may be lost again if only temporarily since those who have found it once can find it again. It is a kind of earthly paradise for love as it is explained in the text of "The Hollow Land" by the heroine Margaret, in the scene before the burial of Arnal (Florian's brother):

"'O brother! the Hollow Land is only second best of the places God has made, for Heaven is also the work of His hand'"(21)

It can be confused with the "mirage-orchard that flourishes by the Dead Sea". This is the Hollow Land not the place of 'Nowhere', i.e. it should not be confused with Utopia. Like Morris, JLM was also in search of it, but he never made a direct reference to the "News From Nowhere" (by Morris). He led us to regard "The City of the Sun" as his most admirable utopian city:

"Campanella! God mine, it is thirty years since I read him, since I too walked the City of the Sun (...); perhaps in those pages long forgotten lies interpretation for another dreamer."(22)

This other dreamer may well be himself (JLM/LGG follows Morris even in using "dreamer" with a similar connotation).

Now in keeping with the tradition of the grail legend, JLM's "mirage-orchard" stands for the earthly paradise and his Dead Sea for the Waste Lane. It would follow, thus, that in keeping with the convention of the fertility ritual legends, there should appear another basic element which so far has not turned up in HWS: the Sick King (or man), or, the Fisher King (or man), whose sickness indicates the barrenness of the land since

"the woes of the land are directly dependent upon the sickness, or maiming, of the King,"(23)

According to J.L. Weston the fish is a life symbol, a fact that relates the grail legend with the earliest ages of civilization and

"with deities who were held to be especially connected with the origin and preservation of life."(24)

and consequently with rituals and lore that are as old as humankind. It is this aspect of the legend that provides us with the clues to JLM's meaning, which has more to do with the ancient tradition - that became part of the Christian cult, or rather, that was incorporated into it, where Christ himself became a 'fisher of men' - than with the Christian elements themselves, which were introduced at a much later age. In J.L. Weston's words:

"Can it be denied that, while from the stand-point of a Christian interpretation the character of the Fisher King is simply incomprehensible, from the stand-point of Folk-tale inadequately explained, from that of a Ritual survival it assumes a profound meaning and significance? He is not merely a deeply symbolic figure, but the essential centre of the whole cult, standing between his people and land, and the unseen forces which control their destiny. If the Grail story be based upon a Life ritual the character of the Fisher King is of the very essence of the tale,"(25)

The particular thing is that the Fisher King convention (or an equivalent) is not mentioned in the prologue or proem (not in the story itself either), although the Holy Grail is mentioned in the story HWS (p.44 of CC). It would seem that JLM departs from the romance at that point and that he turns now to pursue his own ends. (Morris includes a kind of fisher in "The Hollow Land" - in the character Swerker - who saves Florian's life, who thus, did not suffer "death by water". The fisher can obviously be one of the forms of the Fisher King). JLM, one is tempted to infer, may well have decided to stick to this theme of the quest and to that theme alone, and he may

have chosen only to insinuate the other elements of romance conventions, leaving out, therefore, the sick king. Nevertheless, if Miss Weston is right in that the Fisher King is the essential centre of the whole cult, it would be very symptomatic that JLM had chosen to ignore, of all the conventions of the grail legend, precisely this one.

The fact that his theme is the quest as allegory is significant. It is the allegory in the terms conceived by JLM that gives the quest convention a totally new role, since it is obvious that JLM is using this literary form because he values the extent to which Life itself is implied in it, and also the convention that the quest is likely to bring about a spiritual benefit of tremendous importance, as important to humankind as the quest for Natasha is for Andrei Bal'mont on the personal plane, for

"He set out to seek Natasha as once men went forth to seek the Holy Grail. Found - God mine! he would have peace, would kneel at Natasha's feet and lay his head in her hands, and sleep and sleep till the world died ..."(26)

Or, in J.L. Weston's words referring to the Grail story:

"The sense of mystery, of a real danger to be faced, of an overwhelming spiritual gain to be won, were of the essential nature of the tale. It was the very mystery of Life which lay beneath the picturesque wrappings; small wonder that the Quest of the Grail became the synonym for the highest achievement that could be set before men,"(27)

This is the sense in which JLM is using the story - a pursuit for the highest achievement that he sees as already set before men, and at that, the achievement is so momentous that it cannot be a one-man's task only, for the quest is of such a nature that it can only be achieved by the whole of humanity. That is to say, the quest acquires a social dimension in that it becomes the collective task of

humankind. In this alteration to the medieval legend we may find the explanation to the difficulty in identifying the Fisher King, or rather, in realizing his transformation. It is true that

"A prototype, containing the main features of the Grail story - the waste Land, the Fisher King, the Hidden Castle with the solemn Feast, and mysterious Feeding Vessel, the Bleeding Lance and the Cup - does not, so far as we know, exist."(28)

Nevertheless, in HWS one can recognize most of them for, apart from those already mentioned above, the "Hidden Castle with the solemn Feast" together with the Vessel can now be assimilated to "the gods" who "must drink of English beer in Olympus these days, ...".

But the Grail legend is not only related to Christian lore, there is also and mainly the pagan element like the one contributed by the Celts (especially through the Arthuriad). They have played an important role in the diffusion of the grail legend. Their earthly paradise, according to Marie-Louise von Franz, seems to bear great significance since

"An extremely prominent feature of the Celtic world of fantasy is the belief in a Beyond which is not so much a dwelling place of the departed as a 'land of the living', as it is also called, a kind of Elysium inhabited by immortals. It was a land without sickness or death, where men with god-like natures lived in everlasting youth, enjoying delicious food and drink and listening to sweet music, to which, however, since it had been lost to mankind, only a few of the elect could find the way."(29)

This brings us back to William Morris and at the same time to JLM's probable ultimate intention, especially in so far as "enjoying delicious food and drink and listening to sweet music" is concerned (see "Vernal" for example, p. 185 of CC). But in order to enjoy that earthly paradise good health must be restored to the Fisher King, and

hence the quest for that particular element which will restore it once it is found. In relation to the Celtic ideal, however, JLM intends to have it reversed and so make it possible for all to find the way to the earthly paradise, not just for "a few of the elect", coinciding once more with Morris whose ideal of a new social order does not exclude any, not even the rich. Yet, as it has already been pointed out, JLM is not using the story in an utopian sense proper, but rather in the 'utopia' of the quest where the fundamental element is love as in Morris's Hollow Land, for this is the element that will restore his health to the Fisher King. So that love is not love in the abstract, nor sentimental love only, nor, again, love in its individual dimension alone. It is love in its social dimension as opposed to social violence. It is love as the basis of fraternity among human beings. Note that Florian finds the Hollow Land in the middle of a fierce battle (or at the end of it when the army of the House of Lilies is defeated) as he recalls in his old age:

"in my ears a confused noise of trumpet blasts singing over desolate moors, in my ears and eyes a clashing and clanging of horse-hoofs, a ringing and glittering of steel; drawback lips, set teeth, shouts, shrieks and curses."(30)

Here is complete coincidence with Morris in the essential content of their respective romances: the opposition love: hatred and its concrete social expression in the opposition peace: war (i.e. violence of man against man). In very similar circumstances to those in which Florian found Margaret in the Hollow Land,

"and I saw the blessedest sight I have ever seen before or since; for I saw my love."(31)

Andrei Bal'mont sees his love Natasha first: as a result of his defeat in the fierce battle between Whites and Reds, i.e. between White Russian and the Bolsheviks during the Civil War that came about as the result of the widespread reaction against the new power in the Russia of the deposed Tsars.

Like Florian of "The Hollow Land", Andrei was able to establish a more peaceful and even fraternal relationship with his former enemies as soon as he learned about "the lives and beliefs of the men who with him worked" on the ship and being their work-mate

"he entered their poor, stupid dreams, and forgave those dreamers of their kind who had driven him from Russia."(32)

Florian and his brother Arnald had also been driven from their own land - "the House of the Lilies" - by Red Harald, their enemy, the avenger of his mother previously executed by Arnald, But Florian, in the end, sets off together with his former enemy in search of the Hollow Land. These are essential coincidences where the social meaning is quite clear and as I have pointed out earlier, it emerges again and again in JLM/LGG's fiction work (and in the non-fictional as well), for he firmly believes that the little hollow which Andrei loves in Natasha Grodin's throat exists also in the soul of humankind as the token of their original gentleness and human kindness to which Rousseau referred in similar terms. Therefore, his diagnosis is that human life has been maimed by violence among human beings, and that violence has come from without as the result of a deeper contradiction that lies at the heart of this momentous human achievement called civilization. Yet, practically all human History is full of barbarous violence where human cruelty reaches incredible degrees. This, then, is the fundamental contradiction, and Man's peaceful nature is at variance with his greatest achievement - civilization - whose violent nature threatens to annihilate him. In terms of the quest convention this could be both the "sense of mystery" and the "real danger to be faced".

Therefore, the Sick King (or Fisher King) is Man himself because originally he was healthy, i.e. he was neither cruel nor violent, yet in the course of time he has become both violent and cruel to his own species ever since he got sick with hatred. He is sick because he has lost his ability to love in a truly human way. What is even worse, he has acquired the unhuman ability to kill those of his own species.

Since the "woes of the land are directly dependent upon the sickness, or maiming, of the King" it is clear that the "Dead Sea" (or the Waste Land) in JLM's text is civilization, and its King - Man - is sick. The sense of the quest is then to restore good health to the King and consequently, as an outcome, also fertility to human society. The 'grail' which is not a fiction, exists in reality because it is love: once it is found (or rather, recovered) and restored to Man he will recover his health, and the "woes of the land", i.e. of our Civilization, will vanish. This 'fertility of the land' must be understood in its figurative sense first since the real sense of the fertility of plenty - the Horn of Plenty,

"The grail is therefore a real **Tischleindeckdish**, a horn of plenty, a wishing object or vessel such as also frequently appears in fairy-tales in the form of pots, baskets, cups or cloths. The connection of **gratum, gratia, grace** with the Christian relic is obvious and accords with the concept of the grail as a relic of this kind."(33)

- depends directly on the 'spiritual fertility' (and vice versa). That is, love in human life means a human society without violence, without wars, which is only possible in a society in which there is enough for everybody, or better still, where there is **plenty** for everybody - "full bellies and purses" for all as it were. In other words, in a society without social inequality: without 'gods', without exiles, without unfair distribution of the means of subsistence, without wars, etc., where the 'villain has at last triumphed'.

The problem for JLM is not whether the Hollow Land - i.e. love - exists; the problem is whether man is in a position to find it: the problem is how to find it:

"How was it that no one of us ever found it till that day? for it is near our country: but what time have we to look for it, or any good thing; with such biting carking cares hemming us on every

side - cares about great things - mighty things: mighty things, O my brothers! or rather little things enough, if we only knew it.

Lives past in turmoil in making one another unhappy; in bitterest misunderstanding of our brothers' hearts, making those sad - alas, alas! what chance for any of us to find the Hollow Land? what time even to look for it.

Yet who has not dreamed of it?"(34)

The coincidence in thought is so obvious between Morris and JLM that one does not need to emphasize his influence on James Leslie Mitchell/Lewis Grassic Gibbon, so much so that Mitchell's reason for using Morris' romance as his model for HWS is based on the fact that he too sees that men pass their lives "in turmoil" and "in making one another unhappy" where the worst degree of turmoil and unhappiness is war, which is his main concern for he is a pacifist, as shown in his cycle of short stories PDEN, in his novels TD, IS, and of course in his famous trilogy ASQ.

At the crux of JLM's humanism lies his staunch condemnation of war. He regards war as the most uncivilized (or in his own lingo, the most 'civilized') practice not only because it conveys the most antihuman actions but also because it is antihuman in nature. The irony is that war was engendered, or rather, evolved, by civilization, for - in keeping with the terms of his overall allegory - there will be more violence and each time more as civilization makes its progress towards the 'night of mankind': we are now approaching its evening - it will soon be the sunset, and therefore the story of Andrei Bal'mont's quest, who more than the "Slav eternal" stands in fact for Man eternal, 'finishes' just at the point when "overheard, faintly, came the Evening Star" after sunset, and he has reached the most difficult and decisive stage of his quest "tramping forth again to the night and the high road and the sting of the wind" (CC, p. 53). He will have to fight his way until dawn through the deepest darkness of the night. If he survives he is going to enjoy the splendour of dawn (in his general allegory), i.e. the Hollow Land in HWS, or again, in terms of

his 'realist' fiction - true and total freedom but a freedom that surpasses the concept of political freedom, and comes closer to the Rousseauian freedom of Natural Man (see chapt. 7). This is the sense of his literature as a whole, but of course that sense is much more complex and calls for a separate analysis. For the time being let it suffice to point out that the end of the trilogy is similar to the ending of HWS in that, like Andrei, Ewan's night is just about to begin while he is also about to tramp forth "to the night and the high road", etc., on a hunger march (the problem of hunger again) in his quest for freedom, and the need for

"establishing a righ fellowship  
Forever free of the belly-grip"(35)

It can also be said that humanism for JLM, regardless of the form in which it is presented, arises from his deep concern for down-to-earth problems which affect the essence of humankind's existence upon earth. The principal streams that concur to form the backbone of his conceptions can be traced back to Heraclitus from Ephesus. But in short, one can mention as the sources of his humanism that of Rousseau, the humanism of Christianity; Socialist humanism - probably as represented by Morris; and the humanistic tradition in Literature - where Shelley stands out as prominent. Some critics have seen in JLM/LGG's defence of Diffusionism a kind of absurd caprice which has damaged his credibility both as an intellectual and writer. Yet he is not a diffusionist for the sake of 'diffusionism' itself, but rather because of his different approach to social science, specifically anthropology and above all, because he saw in diffusion (see chapt. 11) a scientific process that fosters the spread and the advancement of culture, which is what he himself pursued as a writer and humanist. From the view-point of his humanism humankind has 'descended' not ascended he suggests in his article "The Diffusionist Heresy" where he attacks those who maintain that

"There was never a golden age of  
primitive simplicity. Rousseau's Natural  
Man was a myth."(36)

according to them, man was originally a savage animal whom civilization has tamed and improved, etc., and as a result humankind is held to be intrinsically cruel and naturally inclined to violence and uncivilized behaviour, which is the opposite of what Rousseau maintains (and JLM/LGG also). That is why in his critique of that premise in anthropology, which he attacks, JLM writes:

"Caricatured, this is still in all essentials the primitive man of the twentieth century anthropologists and ethnologists. That he is also a fiction, that he never existed, that not Rousseau's Natural Man but this raving primitive is the myth - such possibility seldom troubled the specialists until recently, and as yet troubles their interpreters not at all. Popular literature is filled with references to the 'caveman'. Halted, but snarling still"(37)

As it can be appreciated his interest is not guided by a purely scientific concern. It is rather that he is guided by the notion that literature should use reliable scientific approaches. In so far as he suggests that social science may be biased, he is suggesting that scientific fact is being distorted, or at any rate, misinterpreted. Therefore, in the name of science a pseudoscientific concept has been distorting the true physiognomy of Man to the extreme that the concept 'savage' is taken for granted too readily, and alongside that it is made into the synonym of the true nature of Man and

"Drs. Freud, Adler, Jung, psychologists by the score and 'sexology' study circles by the gross, see him grinning in every suburban cradle, so that as infants of three months we longed to rape our mothers and hamstring our fathers"(38)

Worse than that. JLM/LGG suggests that he is aware not only of the political implications that the 'caveman' concept presupposes but also of the social consequences that its acceptance may entail, when he writes:

"Mr. Baldwin invokes his gory shade as an argument against disarmament, for, below spats and accent, he asserts, he is still the Essential Combative Man"(39)

The politicians's assertion explains the core of the problem: the core of JLM, the pacifist, the humanist; and the core for those who endorse Mr. Baldwin's position, i.e. the use of 'scientific fact' serving certain interests which may not be the interests of humanity. On the contrary, it serves certain other interests which in the end constitute political issues, which in turn, affect peace among human beings, and also, most aspects of modern 'civilized' life, for, in this need of having to tame a purportedly savage animal such as man, not only aggression and war are justifiable (and probably even 'necessary') but also other social evils that presuppose the existence of 'gods' (who "must drink of English beer" or other) in other Cairos and elsewhere. A story like HWS cannot contain all the social aspects that this situation entails, but JLM presents them in most of his CC short stories as well as in some of the PDEN cycle (such as "East is West", "Dieneke's Dream", "One Man with a Dream", etc.).

HWS is socio-political allegory of the fairy-tale type in which the conventional theme of love serves to introduce a non-conventional social theme whose real aim is to suggest that man's real world is a land without wars, without violence among human beings, a land where love reigns in its original dimension both at individual and collective levels. JLM's allusion to Rameses is a means of bringing home his idea of how Civilization has destroyed the man-woman love relationship, for among other things, it has introduced harems and similar forms of prostitution which have deprived women not only of their right to love but also of their freedom and dignity. The sense of bitter sarcasm in the imagined 'suicide' of Rameses II "for the false love who jilted him" can be better understood in the light of his overall idea concerning this theme in most of the stories of CC (especially "The Lost Prophetess", and "Vernal") and in some of PDEN (especially "The Children of Ceres" and also "Forsaken") and certainly in his "English Novels", including "Spartacus". Prostitution is no better than war but like war it is the other visible 'swab' of this

illness which in the convention of the romance has been equated with the "woes of the land" and the Sick King (see chapt. 14 - Feminism).

In short, JLM conceives that love and peace belong together and that they are the gifts of Man, of Natural Man in Rousseauian terms. The corresponding opposites, hatred and war, which also belong together, are the 'gifts' of Civilization.

Since this opposition - love-peace versus hatred-war - lies at the very heart of the matter, JLM derives from this some basic conclusions concerning the "illness" of Civilization which, ultimately, affect the ethics not only of socio-political practices but also those of literature and intellectual truth.

AS's insinuation: "See, I have become a teller of tales -" conveys a wider connotation in so far as he has already suggested that he represents modern culture, or at any rate, the man of letters of this Civilization. A man of letters who also "must drink of English beer" since that drink is sold at Simon's cafe in Cairo "not by command of the Anglo-Saxon, but at wish of me, Anton Saloney, dragoman," etc. This AS has "invented more so-scandalous royalties than ever the dynastic tables held", and has excelled as a teller of tales and, as a token, he boasts

"I had a madam-tourist in tears this morning when I told of the suicide of Rameses II from the top of Kheops' Pyramid, because of the false love who jilted him -"(40)

The suggestion is that as a teller of tales AS has invented his content and has, therefore, failed to be true to facts and to life, as his tale of Rameses II proves with its obvious distortion of historical fact, and of human nature.

This is, then a critique of Culture, Literature, and writers - a topic which seems to have preoccupied him right from the beginning (see chapt. 9).

It cannot be purely coincidental that both the content and the intention of HWS reveal that JLM was as familiar with Morris's romances as he was with the mysteries of the Grail legend. In all probability he had also read Miss Weston's book "From Ritual to Romance" which had been published nine years before the first publication of HWS. This possibility becomes almost a certainty when we compare what J.L. Weston suggested and what JLM did concerning the theory that the Grail story is based upon a Life ritual. J.L. Weston wrote:

"If the Grail story be based upon a Life ritual the character of the Fisher King is of the very essence of the tale, and his title, so far from being meaningless, expresses, for those who are at pains to seek, the intention and object of the perplexing whole. The Fisher King is, as I suggested above, the very heart and centre of the whole mystery, and I contend that with an adequate interpretation of this enigmatic character the soundness of the theory providing such an interpretation may be held to be definitely proved."(41)

JLM seems to have accepted the challenge in his story HWS in so far as this romance may well be regarded as "an adequate interpretation of this enigmatic character" called the Fisher King in that he makes Humanity the Fisher King, and thereby the woes of the land are directly dependent upon the sickness of Humanity. Her cure is essential, and the search for it gives life its sense of mystery, of a real danger to be faced, of an overwhelming spiritual gain to be won, which in turn gives origin to the **quest** - the synonym for the highest achievement that could be set before men. This justifies the romance form of JLM/LGG's story. But we must admit that the content of it is not romance, especially when it aims at pointing out the causes of the sickness to Humanity, i.e. the violent character of the class society that can lead to increasingly more devastating wars that in the long run might put in jeopardy not only culture but the human species itself. Hence the quest for that modern 'grail' capable of

guaranteeing peace on earth. Hence his indirect allusion to Tolstoy's "War and Peace". In fact, Andrei Bal'mont is but a disguised name for Prince Andrei Bolkonsky of Bald Hills in Tolstoy's novel. Apparently JLM was struck by his story and that of Natasha Rostov wherein he may have seen symbolized his own view of how civilization distorts love, the most natural and healthy manifestation of human life; and how this same civilization completes its ironic task in war, in which so many precious lives are barbarously destroyed, in fact, as barbarously as the way in which Prince Andrei's body was crippled in war beyond any possibility of survival. Had he survived, would he and Natasha have been happy, now that Natasha and Andrei had both repented and forgiven each other? That may have been JLM's hope, or at any rate, we may presume that he saw in this hope a suitable symbol related to the future of humankind.

## CHAPTER 9 THE CULTURAL QUESTION

### I. THE BACKGROUND AND THE HUMANIST TRADITION

The next chapters in PART THREE will show something of JLM/LGG's method in dealing with relevant aspects of modern culture. They will show how his line of thought has found inspiration in humanists of all times and how it has antagonized main reactionary world views concerning humankind.

By humanist tradition I mean much more than what the Renaissance and its cultural renewal is commonly credited with, in the sense that the movement in question represents, in my view, a beginning rather than an efflorescence since in our own day the process which gave origin to its inception, or at any rate, its name, is still in progress. Depending on the vantage point it can be said, however, that the Renaissance proper and its humanism had their efflorescence with the Enlightenment in the XVIII century. But then they had the same limitations that their cognate ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity were bound to have. In other words, humanism remained an unaccomplished pursuit and will remain such in so far as certain fundamental social issues remain unsolved, among them the question of progressing to a mode of production capable of creating favourable conditions for harmonizing people's common interests instead of segregating them. For in the last analysis humanism as a supreme objective deals with the question of establishing among absolutely all human beings in society truly human relations whereby not only the ideals of the French Revolution become fully materialized, that of liberty in particular but also the question of dignity and the conquest of social peace, not as an exception but as the most normal way of life in a fraternal society. In this connection, there is a system of progressive ideas - or general 'model' probably - which can be regarded as the continuator of the guidelines put forward by the enlightened social thought of the Renaissance. It is to this tradition that JLM/LGG belongs but understood as the humanism of the 20th century.

It would have been desirable to discuss at some length his position concerning different schools of thought as well as different religions - whereby he did not separate culture or religion between East and West, as his story IIW implies, - but only a brief reference will be attempted here in so far as they are necessary to attain the objectives set down in the General Introduction.

His literary work is full of cultural references which indicate both his vast cultural background and his incisive critical approach to the prevailing cultural values of his time. He is mostly concerned with cultural values even though he is at the same time aware that these, together with the host of related elements of knowledge, ideology, ethics, psychology, aesthetics, etc., that shape culture, depend largely on the prevailing mode of production, whereas both in turn, depend on the historical process that has yielded them as result, which, as such, is subject to change. In essence, his first cultural aim is to combat the values of bourgeois culture in order to foster a new culture based not only on higher and more ethical values but also on the fundamental premise that it should become the natural collective patrimony of each and all the members of the society, in opposition to the elitist culture of Civilization. In general, he advocates both the mode of production and the culture likely to characterize the real society which scientific Socialism envisages achieving in its higher stage. In this sense his 'Spenglerianism' goes no further than conceiving a long historical cycle that moves from primitive anarchism, or the anarchism of the primitive, to what, in tune with his model, might be termed 'scientific' anarchism. This is reflected in his over-all concept of History. As a historian, his writings reveal a particular interest in the neolithic cultures both in the old and the new world, especially those of dynastic Egypt this side of the Atlantic, and the Mayan and Incaic Civilizations in Latin America. In this, his interest is apparent in the role played by Religion not only in these civilizations but also as a relevant development in the cultural formations up to his own time. Had he lived longer, he would no doubt have written his "History of Mankind" and his "Story of Religion". Of the former he had already submitted a synopsis to Heinemann who on 17 May, 1934 wrote to him:

"I have carefully read the synopsis of the proposed 'Outline of the History of Mankind' with very great interest and I should certainly like to talk to you about it."(1)

At the same time he was in dealings also with the American Simon and Schuster:

"I'd like very much to know more about the History of Mankind project; how will it differ from the H.G. Wells book and Van Loon's"(2)

Munro leaves no doubt that the project was under way. Now, the project itself casts much light on his own view of History:

#### BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF A HISTORY OF MANKIND

1. The Background of Human Life	10000 words
2. The Ascent of Man	20000 "
3. The Stone Age	25000 "
4. The Archaic Civilization	20000 "
5. Spread of the Archaic Civilization	20000 "
6. Empires of War and God	20000 "
7. The Dawn of Independent Reason	15000 "
8. The Second Empires	15000 "
9. A Thousand Years of Barbarism	20000 "
10. The Modern Civilization	20000 "
11. Spread of the Modern Civilization	20000 "
12. The Empires of Gold and Greed	20000 "
13. The Renaissance of Reason	20000 "
14. Commercial Crisis and the Third Civilization	20000 "

Total 250000 words  
(3)

It is impossible to recognize his model in this chronology which goes from the Background of Human Life to The Third Civilization leaving in between an Archaic Civilization and a Modern One, whereby the project reveals in fact three main phases of History. However, if the different phases were not suggested clearly enough here, then probably his synopsis of the Story of Religion might cast more light on it:

- "1. The Coming of the Gods
2. Akhnaton finds Adonis
3. Guatemala breaks the chain
4. The Road of K'ung-Fu-Tze
5. Christ and the Fatherhood of God
6. Mani seeks the Light
7. Prophet of the Pitiful
8. The Life and Death of Calvin
9. Joseph Smith and the Angel of Moroni
10. Karl Marx and the Kingdom of God on Earth"(4)

Apart from other possible relevant commentaries concerning the importance of the trend of thought that these themes may reveal in relation to his intellectual approach to Religion, I would like to point out something which I regard as a key question: the turn he gives the theme of Religion when we come to chapter 10 of the synopsis - "Karl Marx and the Kingdom of God on Earth". For to anybody who is not familiar with the author's model, this synopsis might look 'eccentric' if not something worse. Yet, I would suggest that it harmonizes with his synopsis of his History of Mankind and therefore with his model. In fact, his synopsis of the Story of Religion clarifies, in my view, the meaning of his Third Civilization in his synopsis of the History of Mankind, and, at the same time, it indirectly proves as correct our initial proposition of a model whose movement comprises three stages of phases. Indeed, his Third Civilization, in my view, is none other than that of "the kingdom of God on earth", i.e. the earthly paradise, which is thus conceived as superior to The Hollow Land of Morris (see chap. 8 HWS), and as the materialization of the 'dream' (see chap. 7 on Imagery) and in general, the triumph of humanity. Since he has always combatted theological thought and teleology, his kingdom of God must be understood as the peak of the process of self-perfectibility of Man who thus 'becomes himself God'. Hence that extraordinary thing - the wording of chapter 10 in his synopsis of his proposed Story of Religion, "Karl Marx and the Kingdom of God on Earth". Being just a heading, or a very general designation for a chapter whose content we do not know, the relationship between Karl Marx and the kingdom of God can have more than one interpretation, and at least a minimum of two - either as opposites, or as equivalent terms. My proposition is that

the author suggests the latter, although I am aware that there may also be the possibility of simply intending a comparison between the Christian outlook and the Marxist one. However, his model is clear in assigning Christianity a positive role in so far as its aspirations and motives is concerned, but a negative one in terms of the feasibility of achieving its social aims in this world. Perhaps, it would be even more precise to say that according to his model, the aspirations of Christianity can only be achieved in actual fact by Marxism (see his stories *IIW*, *Forsaken*, etc. and more prominently the *trilogy*).

Unexpected as it might appear, his evolution toward the world outlook of scientific socialism as explained by its founders, Marx and Engels, should not be surprising, especially if we consider a number of relevant factors. First of all World War I as the greatest tragedy in the collective experience of his time. Secondly, the 1917 Socialist Revolution in Russia - i.e. the beginning of Socialism in the History of Mankind - which restored the collective hopes for a better world, especially amongst the world proletariat and also amongst the progressive intellectuals of the time. Thirdly, the author's own personal experience both in his private life and as a member of the military might of the British Empire overseas. Fourthly, his encounter with those overseas peoples whom he as a serviceman was helping to dominate, and also, to bring into the fold of Civilization. And lastly, his own vast cultural background especially in relation to the evolution of Man's social organization and ways of life in history as seen above. In this, his own inclination always went with the life that the common people have to live, and therefore, this tendency to sympathize with democratic thinking came only as a natural development. Once on this road, it was only a question of time for him to come across the decisive influence. It was indeed William Morris who opened up a window on to a new world for him - that of Socialism.

Morris's influence appears as a turning point in his intellectual development, and it is not difficult to see that from here there was only a step to scientific socialism, the socialism of Marx and Engels.

It might be essentially correct to suggest that his line of evolution is in fact very similar to that of Morris himself, for no matter how short his literary career and therefore, his development as inferred from his writings may be, it is still possible to see a progressive line in his social thought which may have led him even further than Morris. In my view JLM/LGG's allegory of evolution, whatever its limitations, is founded on a theory of knowledge which seeks to establish the objective laws on the origin and development of Man's comprehension and command of the material world at large, including obviously society, as the most reliable means of being able to improve the conditions of human life on earth. In other words, his artistic model is based on an ideology which sees in scientific knowledge the only dependable approach to both nature and society, and therefore, to the human being.

His position concerning culture can be assessed as that of a humanist who sees progress resulting from the movement engendered by the principle of dialectical contradiction which governs history and in fact all spheres of life, including those of the superstructural levels of society with which his model is basically concerned (see also General Introduction). In line with this view, the progress of humanist thought is also subject to it and, therefore, the active role of opposing ideas and conceptions is part of the phenomenon of culture and so is the constant battling against them. But it is the presence of this battling which, in his literary work, makes the reader aware of the two camps at war - the reactionary and the progressive ones, whereby the latter is the one which represents the genuine universal humane interests. As it is, his humanism can be traced back basically to Jesus Christ's social doctrine, although this might not be entirely correct since that doctrine had already incorporated old forms of humanism, and besides part of his humanism is pre-Christian, as his admiration for Akhnaton, the Greek civilization, Spartacus and the slaves' cause for freedom, and other progressive people and trends in ancient history prove. But certainly, what is relevant to modern culture is a humanism that can be traced back essentially to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. Obviously, not all the Renaissance ideas belong to his brand of

humanism which, if in general terms acknowledges the significant contributions of the giants who shaped the Renaissance, nevertheless found a better inspiration among those who, like More, took up the cause of the vast masses. Hence also his admiration for Campanella. Naturally, his humanism also acknowledges the contribution made by the Renaissance thinkers and artists to non-religious thought, and above all, to a scientific conception of the world whereby he valued most of their achievements in natural science.

However, due perhaps to the inevitable limitations of knowledge at that time, it was less difficult to incorporate the utopian dreams of the Renaissance 'dreamers'; although this might not do justice to it, since the true contribution of the Renaissance to his model is apparent when we turn to his themes of exploration, scientific research and knowledge, and, possibly in their connection with freedom, the meaning of courage and social ethics of his heroes. His symbol of the relationship between these heroes and the Walls of the World, as he calls them in his model, sums up his assessment of the Renaissance (see chap. 7 cf. the walls of the world).

The Enlightenment seems to have left a still more significant imprint on JLM/LGG's humanism for, as will be seen, Rousseau's ideas were to have such an influence as to become the core of his humanistic outlook. Thus, in keeping with some of the prevalent ideas of the Enlightenment, JLM/KLGG is also a soldier in the battle against theology, the Church, and religious dogma. But above all, he is a freedom-fighter charging against scholastic methods and principles both in thought and particularly in scientific research. Chronologically speaking, he incorporated the humanism of the French Revolution in the same way that he incorporated subsequent humanistic ideas both from schools of thought and from individuals, specifically from the Romantic poets. There is also evidence of his leanings towards German humanism specifically in relation to philosophy, science, literature, although it may always be possible, if his substituting the immortality of the human race for the immortality of the soul when dealing with the problem of immortality were an idea which he did not derive from Fichte, for he also seems to have

coincided with Fichte in other views, namely, the purpose of human life in relation to freedom and society. Naturally, the fact that they discuss the same subjects along the same general lines does not necessarily imply that they are putting forward exactly the same thoughts and views. For something similar can be said concerning Schelling and JLM/LGG, in their views of the relationship they see between art and science, although I do not think they might have arrived at the same conclusions. There is more evidence of his debt to Feuerbach even when their respective models begin to diverge. But he has given enough evidence of his coincidence with Marx and Engels, particular with the latter, if "the incomprehensible Marx" (5) was ever incomprehensible to the creator of M.M. too, for there is no disagreement concerning the essence of their respective models, not even if such conclusions were challenged by his adherence to Rousseau's view that civilization dehumanizes in direct proportion to its own progress. In fact, this stance appears opposed to Marx's view that the process of civilization is progressive in so far as the constant change from one socio-economic formation to another gives rise to a more advanced social system and that it is the production of material goods which forms the source of spiritual progress whereby such a process is achieved, thanks to the collective activity of the vast masses of people. But the discrepancy may be more apparent than real for Marx and Engels did not disagree with that progression-retrogression analysis of Rousseau. On the contrary, as was pointed out in the description of Phase II in chapter 2. So that JLM/LGG's model harmonizes with Marx's for he also postulates that the process of civilization is progressive as his views of the problem of liberty proves. In point of fact, JLM/LGG saw in Marxist humanism - above all as compared with Christian humanistic ideas - a truly realistic approach since it arises from a concept of history that claims a scientific basis because it studies the general laws that govern the development of human society - which may well be JLM/LGG's own concept - and above all, perhaps, because as a philosophy which claims a scientific foundation Marxism seeks not only to interpret the world but also and fundamentally to transform it, a principle so often quoted. None so interested in such a transformation as JLM/LGG himself, and if at one point his dissent with Christianity is

expressed in sharp terms, it is precisely here, i.e. that Christianity, or rather, the Christian doctrine, will never - in his view - be able to effect the transformation required since it can put forward no credible strategy seeking to materialize its 'dreams'. But then, it is Marxism that can transform them into social actuality. What is more, his model is based on the acceptance that the ultimate triumph of humanity will only come when civilization has reached its superior stages thanks to scientific knowledge and the active role of the species whose courage and other human virtues will make the revolution possible. After Marx, there is a further coincidence with modern Marxism in combatting fascism as the main enemy of humanity's road to the future. This may be a very significant stance considering both the period and the political complexities of his time, for the fight against fascism gives his humanism its real significance. It should not be a surprise if a study of his model in the light of political theory revealed that his model, more than mere poetic image, is but a big metaphor which duly translated into political terms, far from clashing with Marx's theory, would probably harmonize with the main aspects of it.

As pointed out in other chapters, TD appears as the most autobiographical of his novels and if one could use the expression 'intellectual autobiography', it could be applied to this book at least as that of his adolescent period, even when it gets entwined with a fictional exploration intended to suggest a kind of allegorical Man on "the verge of Adventure", i.e. the Great Adventure which, as we already know, is a challenge to the stars. TD is a book which contains as in a syllabus not only the relevant authors but also some or most of the relevant ideological questions highlighted in the model. For a start, the dedication of TD (to his daughter Rhea Sylvia) is followed by two important epigraphs quoted from Anatole France and H.G. Wells respectively. Since the content of the quotations is so relevant to his model, they are reproduced here:

"It was the anarchists of Rome and the East who originally brought about the victory of Christ. And still today, as then, they are the true fighting forces,

the sole resources of the Christian hosts.

Anatole France"

"We are all things that make and pass,  
striving upon a hidden mission, out to  
the open sea.

H.G. Wells"

And then, the epigraph to Book I, *Anti-Natal*, is from Swinburne:

"Through the great desert beasts  
Howl at our backs by night.  
A Marching Song"

which is relevant to the symbolic ending of the book.

Giving a complete account of all the names falls outside the aims of this work, so a simple list of names which the author mentions in TD will be offered here, though necessarily incomplete, with the main purpose of giving an idea of his range of interests when not yet an adolescent; for example his dislike of the poet John Donne who is mentioned in relation to his wife's sufferings and subsequent death on account of repeated maternity, whereby we understand his respect and admiration for women like Marie Stopes (see chap. 14 on Feminism), so that it is not for aesthetic reasons like his reaction to Virgil, "I have still to meet a drier than Virgil ..." (from MM's diary). But the author himself includes a list of authors found in father Ian Stevenson's (i) private library: "a tattered Burns" (...) "Marryat, Ballantyne, Henty, Stevenson, Scott, Dickens, Fielding, Smollett, Thackeray, Flaubert in a horrible translations. (Oh, Salambo! Matho! Spendius! Hamilcar!). The early Wells, Haggard, and Jack London, Hardy (queerly he liked Hardy), Kipling (whom he could not abide), a stray volume of R.H. Benson's which left an unfortunate and uneradicable conviction that Roman Catholics were of necessity bores;, and brainless bores to boot ..." (p.37). This in relation to fiction. He had previously informed us that he had read both Einstein and Reimann. "But fiction palled quickly. By the time he was 13 years of age he was reading the "Origin of Species" - and enjoying it ..." (p.37). Of this he comments always telling it as MM's autobiography,

or as his own autobiography in third person singular, that it is inexplicable " "for the Origin, re-read, is dry stuff, dry and heavy, mental dyspepsia in tabloid." But at 13 it was wonder. He read and understood and pondered and agreed." (Ibid.). From Darwin to Matthew Arnold and from him to the Bible "as literature", and the "QURAN", and from there to "translated sagas of Morris and Magnusson and Greek stuff in translation" (p.38). In the meantime he learned about pre-Columbian discoveries. In Anthropology he read "the early Arthur Keith (...) Avebury in archaeology, Haerschel and Proctor in astronomy ..." (Ibid). As for Freud, apart from allusions elsewhere in TD we come across his sarcastic remark " "I had no idea that all civilization is a by-product of sex, that my book-passions, my early socialist dreamings, my self-trainings in Stane Muir, were the results of early sexual repression." " (T.D. p.44). Of his interest in Latin America we learn from his studies of "Prescott's conquistadores against the Tlascalans and Monctezuma and the knighly Guatimozin" (p.48). He refers to Prescott's "History of the Conquest of Mexico". He does not comment on this, so I infer there is nothing wrong with him, whereas it is clear that he does not approve of Guizot's "History of Civilization" nor of Frazer's anthropology. The important thing now is that he had done all this reading whilst still a young adolescent, and most of it in his early teens when, although he abhorred Donne and thought Keats even mistier, he had also read Engels and probably, like in the case of Darwin, had "understood and pondered and agreed", if we are to interpret correctly the context in which Engel's name appears on p. 85. In spite of his reference to an "incomprehensible Marx" (p.60) the passage of p. 61 would indicate that he had understood him, and an any case his references first alongside of Shelley (p.143) and then in the context of p.278 would indicate to me that he also understood that there were 'marxist' whose good faith did not constitute a guarantee that they had really understood the true sense of Marx's Socialism. At this stage too, he must have read Rousseau since his criticism of Guizot is clearly based on Rousseau's idea of civilization as already explained. It should not be a surprise since he had already read Lucretius (or was soon after to read him), if not the first at least one of the earliest influences concerning a theory of knowledge founded on scientific

method instead of theological dogma. But he is not against those who invoke the gods as his epigraph of Book II Birth-Pangs proves:

"Some work of noble note may yet be  
done,  
Not unbecoming men that strove with Gods.

Ulysses."

And this is not the only quotation from Tennyson. Sometimes his praise of an author is only partial since according to his model he/she may have some flaw or another which JLM may not point out but just express a negative opinion about. Bernard Shaw may be a case in point, and it is not so certain that Carlyle may be another; probably not, for reading his "Past and Present" he found that

"there was nothing in him" (p.237)

This quick bird's-eye view may give an idea, and no more than that is expected, of his early intellectual awakening, just as the following chapters may give an idea of his intellectual approach to different aspects of culture. It is worthy of note, I think, to include here his harsh criticism of

"those who have never known mental  
discipline"

and have as a result

"a cocksure certainty derived from the  
study of innumerable 'popularizations'  
apparently written by the half-educated  
for the benefit of the half-witted." (p.  
268)

## II. THE WRITER AND THE WRITERS

Of all those who have written about the author, quite a few have referred to his "communist" leanings, or at any rate, to his revolutionary stance. The author thought of himself as a revolutionary. Hugh MacDiarmid, however, seemed to find fault with JLM's brand of communism, but he also found fault with his intellectual stature"

"in other words, Gibbon was not an intellectual. In the same way his socialism was not scientific (...) would be better called Mentalism than Communism."(6)

Even when there are good reasons to infer that MacDiarmid knew his countryman better than others, his assessment seems to be much at odds with reality, especially with respect to his intellectual stature and his conception of socialism. MacDiarmid is probably thinking of JLM's active political life. But then it would be very difficult to establish the consistency of the political ideas of somebody who seldom or never had a real chance to take an active part in politics ever since he became a military man, and after that, he remained in the R.A.F. for most of his adult life. The remaining part of that short life he spent writing at an incredibly high speed and with such a dedication that it would have been a miracle he had any time left for active political life. Therefore, one should not be surprised if further research confirmed that in so far as his politics is concerned JLM/LGG may have been a revolutionary in a general sense, and probably more so as a writer, i.e. moving mostly at superstructural level rather than on the real basis of the material life of society. In the last analysis he was, in fact, concerned with the cultural revolution rather than with the political one. It is clear, however, that he could see the necessity of political revolution as a condition sine qua non for the flowering of the cultural one. If it were correct to put it like that, I would say that he was a strategic revolutionary rather than a tactical one. As for his being an intellectual or not, I shall leave it to the reader of JLM/LGG to draw his/her own

conclusions. An analysis of his letter to "Writers' International" would help to clarify some aspects of his revolutionary stance since that short tract is levelled at what he considers serious flaws of the revolutionary writers. Quite apart from his tone and style, that letter reveals at least three main facts. Firstly, he knows well what is required of a revolutionary writer in the general battle against Capitalism. Secondly, he knows his duties as a revolutionary, being the first one to assess correctly the import and quality of the enemy forces. Thirdly, and no less important, it shows his awareness of the difficulties of a necessary protracted campaign. Finally, the most important thing perhaps, it reveals that he does not regard himself as a writer but as a revolutionary 'soldier' in the battle for a new culture:

"Be a shock brigade of writers, not a P.S.A. sprawl. I hate Capitalism; all my books are explicit or implicit propaganda. But because I'm a revolutionist I see no reason for gainsaying my own critical judgment -"(7)

His first short story ever published - 'Siva Plays the Game', is centred round the topic of the discrepancy between the world created by pseudo-artistic writers and the actual world of humankind. His own credo seems to arise from the premise that Literature and Art should not be based on fictional subject-matter made to look 'realist', but rather that they should be based on actual historical, human, and social facts, and on dependable scientific data to which some fictional elements can be added so as to differentiate them only in form from non-fiction. Even if this compressed way of putting it may have its limitations, the fact remains that all JLM/LGG's literature bears this hallmark. His allegorical short story "HWS" can also be interpreted in this light as a creation very much in tune with his own credo. In this connection, AS's anecdote of the "madam-tourist in tears" is a good example of a critique of current trends in literature. Some see a danger in that his pursuit may cause him to neglect, or sacrifice, some other aspects of the craft of writing, especially concerning the question of form. Notwithstanding, this has not happened in the case of his "ASQ" which is also pervaded by his

allegory of humanity marred by Civilization, by social violence and strife, and other themes that belong to his model, like peace.

JLM/LGG the pacifist, did not live long enough to witness the horrors of W.W.II which he had already anticipated, as he had anticipated the advent of fascism. In like manner he had anticipated that this crazy activity of Civilization based on warmongering would only lead to creating increasingly more lethal weapons such as to have the power to destroy the whole world. It is this fear, this terror, that Man may be the cause and the agent of the disappearance of Man from the face of the earth that stimulated JLM/LGG to pursue his quest (see Phase III).

But see also, in particular, HWS (and chap. 8 in the present work) which is first of all about the struggle for securing peace on earth; but it is also about the responsibilities of intellectuals and artists in that task and helping to find, as it were, that symbolic grail. For if HWS is an allegory concerning the sense of human life, AS's anecdote as "a teller of tales", more than a critique levelled at pseudo-writers, in its deeper sense, is levelled at the values of Capitalist culture that holds those who 'invent' content in literature as creators, and their product as art. In JLM's opinion the object of art and literature is first and last humanity, and therefore, the content of it should correspond to the realities of Life. In the Proem to "The Epic" in CC, AS states that "the theme is the man" and that "the tale without theme, the poem without purpose - it is salt without meat", making thus explicit the author's stance concerning the doctrine of art for art's sake and other expressions of aestheticism, and reaffirms his own aesthetic views through AS's assertion that it was primitive men who "honoured the stylist long before there was a written style", for it was in that society of 'primitives' (see Proem to "E") that "art was of art, not of life".

The figure that dominates T D is obviously Morris, who was instrumental in getting JLM - in his role as M M in the book - acquainted with socialist literature

" through a stange love for the limpid childish verse of William Morris, he had discovered the socialists and their gigantic, amorphous literature. Here were people who, like himself, had shuddered in sick horror at sight of the dehumanized and wandering crucified; people who also had known the challenge of the winters' stars and seen solution of all the earth's bitter cruelties in a gigantic expedition against the World's Walls ... though they seemed vaguely in dispute over plan of campaign."(8)

Since he does not indicate the names, one can only imagine the more likely authors he may have come to discover through Morris's influence - Marx and Engels among them I should imagine. Liebknecht he may have come across via other authors. MM remembers as "great stuff" P. Lafargue's "The Right to be Lazy". It is not altogether clear whether his own story "Sim" owes more to Lafargue or to Morris's "Useful Work Versus Useless Toil". But then, this is typical since more often than not his idea is to blend the different approaches and to credit two or more authors with a common view on some particular issue.

But he ended up rejecting the intellectual stance of H.G. Wells, one of his beloved idols. According to his own figure of speech,

"Mr Wells it was who, scattering feline Shavian and amphibian Blatchfordian, finally ran me to earth near the drinking pools, sprinkled me liberally with a scientific Epsom salts, and devoured me at a gulp ..." (9)

Metaphorically at least, this was only natural since he had already informed us the following:

"William Morris led me into the jungle and without apparent qualms abandoned me to a voracious fauna."(10)

But it must have been this same voracious fauna that like in a reversed version of Little Red Riding Hood operated the miracle of

providing him with something better than scientific Epsom salts as a scientific method in his search for the truths of Life, Humanity, and Culture, in spite of his self criticism:

"At odd moments I still suffer from the bleaching effects of my intra-Wellsian immersion"(11)

I was not intending to include his colleague writers in this sketch since a topic like that calls for a separate discussion. Nevertheless, I can point out here that the most general link that relates them is their common regard for suffering humanity together with their longing for a freer, more unselfish, less brutal, better and more human way of life. Intellectually these writers belong to the Renaissance tradition. Politically, they are committed - very broadly speaking - to the original ideas of the French Revolution, which in varying degrees, they expect to see materialized in a society that is still to be brought about by the new forthcoming Revolution. This is a generalization which, as such, cannot expect to avoid the pitfalls of inaccuracies in so far as, for example, not all the writers admired by JLM/LGG advocated a political revolution - as it was the case with Swinburne and notably Tolstoy - even when it can be safely said that they were all concerned with freedom and human brotherhood, and with the universal feeling that the joy of living should not be a privilege for a few but the innate right of every individual. JLM saw these ideals best expressed by those poets who gave rise to a school of literature commonly known as 'romantic'. The term, however, has taken on different connotations in the course of time and is, therefore, understood in more ways than one. If it is true that the origin of the term is related to the form rather than to the content of a type of old tales known as 'romances', this does not suffice to justify the fact that the real content of romanticism proper has been glossed over through the decades by insisting on questions of form. If any element of original content has survived, it has not emerged unaltered in our time, so that the nearest term is 'sentimentalism' used as a synonym of humanitarian feelings. However, I do not intend to discuss the concept romanticism here, but just to point out that JLM/LGG was certainly influenced by the social

humanistic content of romanticism and that not all his romanticism should be confused with sentimentalism, as seen in chap. 7.

He was influenced by the social humanistic content of romantics like Tennyson whose "Ulysses" JLM quotes both for the epigraph of "H" and of "NAU" because the pursuit of the Happy Isles is one of the motifs which he uses in his symbolism since he, like Tennyson, thinks that

"It is not too late to seek a newer world"(12)

although seeking that newer world is not free from dangers, not only because

"It may be that the gulfs will wash us down"(13)

but also because

"Through the great desert beasts  
Howl at our backs by night.(14)

Yet, despite his reservations on Swinburne - due probably to his attitude of turning his back on politics - his poetry recurs in JLM's literature like the verses quoted in (14) prove, so that it cannot be mere coincidence that in "Spartacus" the Strategos's message to Rome (and to Lavinia) used the same Latin locution which Swinburne used for his poem in memory of Baudelaire - "Ave Atque Vale" - although, of course, JLM might have had in mind only the meaning of the locution: a greeting to the dead as symbolic of what Rome represented as compared with the cause of the rebel slaves in the general context of "Spartacus".

Among JLM's countrymen, James Thomson (1834-82) is also one of the influences. His "City of Dreadful Night" is not only discernible in F T S but it is also present in JLM/LGG's model as a whole (as symbol). Yet, it is in poems like "A Voice From the Nile" and "The Naked

Goddess" that Thomson's 'diffusionism', or rather Rousseauism, can be more clearly seen. But it is in poems like "Sunday at Hamstead" that the golden age theme is both rich in symbols and motifs which JLM also utilized, and where we find Thomson's concern for the myriads more that toil day by day and the poet is aware

"of a vast machinery roaring  
 .....  
 Where the poor slaves peace imploring,  
 Found peace alone in the tomb."(15)

This was only natural. Thomson's pseudonym - Bysche Vonalis or 'B.V.', acknowledged his admiration for both Shelley and Novalis, so JLM must have seen that there was much in common between Thomson and Shelley.

As has already been seen in Part II, Shelley is possibly his most admired poet since at times he gives the impression that he likes him better than Morris himself. Thus Shelley's name recurs very frequently. I have not emphasized enough to what extent works like "The Triumph of Life", "The Masque of Anarchy", "Queen Mab", or, "The Revolt of Islam" - to mention only some of the most important - have contributed to his own humanism and in fact, probably, to shape his social thought, which is so dominated by his pursuit of freedom much in the same way that liberty is one of the main concerns of Shelley's poetry. JLM gives us the impression that he regards Shelley as the poet who gave poetry its real sense and its real content too, so far as his concern for humanity led him not only "to the love of mankind" (q.v.i.) but also to bring to light the social causes of oppression, civil war, famine, plague, superstition, etc., denouncing the "transient nature of ignorance and error" and reaffirming the "eternity of genius and virtue" (q.v.i.). No need to insist that all this is clearly recognized in JLM/LGG's own literature, especially his ineradicable faith in the "eternity of genius and virtue", or his defence and propaganda of what I have called the humaneness of our species and which incidentally, is the best way to understand his respect for primitive man, for his own model indicates beyond any doubt that he was far from idealizing ignorance, error, superstition,

etc. His identity of purposes with Shelley can be better seen in the light of Shelley's own words in his Preface to "Laon and Cythna"; for we could also describe JLM/LGG's literature as

"..... a succession of pictures illustrating the growth and progress of individual mind aspiring after excellence, and devoted to the love of mankind; its influence in refining and making pure the most daring and uncommon impulses of the imagination, the understanding, and the senses; its impatience at 'all the oppressions which are done under the sun'; its tendency to awaken public hope, and to enlighten and improve mankind; the rapid effects of the application of that tendency; the awakening of an immense nation from their slavery and degradation to a true sense of moral dignity and freedom; the bloodless dethronement of their oppressors, and the unveiling of the religious frauds by which they had been deluded into submission; the tranquility of successful patriotism, and the universal toleration and benevolence of true philanthropy; the treachery and barbarity of hired soldiers; vice not the object of punishment and hatred, but kindness and pity; the faithlessness of tyrants; the confederacy of the Rulers of the World, and the restoration of the expelled Dynasty by foreign arms; the massacre and extermination of the Patriots, and the victory of established power; the consequences of legitimate despotism, - civil war, famine, plague, superstition, and an utter extinction of the domestic affections; the judicial murder of the advocates of Liberty; the temporary triumph of oppression, that secure earnest of its final and inevitable fall; the transient nature of ignorance and error, and the eternity of genius and virtue.(16)

This may not be his "manifesto", but Shelley and his poetry recur. In the short story IIW the main character is compared to Shelley as a means of indicating that in spite of being "fantastically medieval" in his world outlook because of his Christian faith, he (whose name is

Steyn) is still the

"boy Shelley in a world of Anarchs"(17)

for, as a priest, Steyn - like other Mitchellian characters - having seen

"evil and cruelty crowned and robbed and  
acclaimed in an incense of blood"(18)

was seeking the way to humankind's salvation, according to the message of Christ; for as an ex-soldier who had fought in World War I he realized that humanity was living in a chaotic anarchy much in the same way that Shelley had perceived and expressed it in his "The Masque of Anarchy". Shelley, apart from what is commonly known about him and his poetry, is after all one of those figures in History who may have captivated JLM/LGG's imagination in the light of his world vision, because he possessed the essential qualities of the 'hero', especially if Shelley had been described as

"pure-minded, earnest-souled, didactic  
poet, philosopher, prophet,"(19)

The poet, the philosopher, and the prophet are but different guises for the same basic humaneness of our species according to JLM/LGG's model. No matter how romantic, Shelley's poetry reflects some degree of concern for scientific truth, and the same can be said of JLM's literature. Shelley and JLM/LGG shared a common interest in their approach to human life from the point of view of the actual workings and the laws of nature. In point of fact, if some critics have detected a certain pantheism, or an animism or demonism - whereby all nature becomes a kind of living impersonation, etc. (20) - in JLM/LGG's literature, this would denote a degree of identity between him and Shelley, who has translated, as Aveling and Marx Aveling put it, into his own pantheistic language and doctrine of the eternity of matter and the eternity of motion, of the infinite transformation of the different forms of matter into each other, of different forms of motion into each other, without any creation or destruction of either

matter or motion, etc.

"that he held these scientific truths as part of his creed, there can be no doubt."(21)

argue the authors mentioned above. If so, we can conclude that it is not only because

"the system of human society as it exists at present must be overthrown from the foundations"(22)

that JLM/LGG saw a hero in Shelley. There was also a common interpretation of the world at large, humankind and society, based on a materialist (as opposed to subjective and theological) approach which enabled them to see the same evils in society which were caused by the same factors:

"Kings, priests, and statesmen, blast  
the human flower,  
Even in its tender bud: their influence  
darts  
Like sudden poison through the bloodless  
veins  
Of desolate society."(23)

What makes the similarity more meaningful, though, is that they not only interpret their world but also that they would like to contribute to having it changed for the better. This is the sense of their revolutionary stance. It remains to be seen, however, whether they were agreed on the "plan of campaign" - provided that they were concerned with any political action to bring about the revolution. Probably not, for in this sense JLM was more like Morris - the earlier Morris, anyway - in the sense that their love of humankind did not arise from any political concern since it might have been more correct to put it the other way round: that their love of humankind kindled their social consciousness and their political awareness. This love of humankind, no doubt, stimulated JLM/LGG to devote his literature to awakening people's hopes for a better way of life, inviting them to

participate actively in this search for improvement and perfectibility (or the Faustian spirit probably). Judging from his own admiration for P.B. Shelley, one would imagine that JLM derived all this mainly from him and Morris, and the romantics in general, although there may have been other sources. Anyway, like Shelley, what JLM/LGG seems to be after with his literature is

"the awakening of an immense nation from their slavery and degradation to a true sense of moral dignity and freedom; the bloodless dethronement of their oppressors, and the unveiling of the religious frauds by which they had been deluded into submission"(24)

The identity of purposes, plus an identity of views and motives, explain some formal questions as well, which characterize JLM's literature. But the detailed explanation of all this would give rise to a separate study, and in any case, it might not be relevant here. In essence, this is not a work concerned with literary criticism, and no 'parallel' between these two writers has been attempted here.

As seen above, JLM/LGG is obliged to William Morris for having introduced him to socialist literature and to Socialism. But it seems that Morris did more than that. For a start, we find in JLM the recurring idea of a "dream", associated with the future of our species - where humankind is conceived as capable of incredible dreams that have guided them to incredible achievements and will certainly guide humans to still more incredible ones - and therefore, it is an outstanding characteristic of JLM's heroes, to be capable of "dreaming" and to have something of the "dreamer of dreams" quality. This is a tribute to Morris, for according to Noyes, in Morris's tapestries and poems we come across

"the very of stuff dreams (...) dream within dream."(25)

although according to A.L. Morton

"Morris, for all his talk about dreams, was essentially practical and combative and the next part of his life was taken up with the search for a satisfactory battleground."(26)

It is in fact talk about "dreams" and not dreams as explained in chap. 7. In other words, their common dreams are related to the great theme of Socialism, in itself the major dream of all, since they both conceived it - if Noyes is completely right - as much on behalf of the poor as of the rich. In so far as JLM is concerned this may be so since it is perfectly in line with his equality-love theme of the golden age fraternity, which is probably one of the reasons why JLM has been regarded as romantic, and even as sentimentalist by some others. It is necessary, in any case, to keep in mind that JLM/LGG used more than once the adjective romantic signifying that he strongly disapproves of a certain type of romanticism. The romanticism he makes use of seems to be based on material fact as a necessary complement to the creativity of human intellect, implying thereby that artistic creation cannot go far without the necessary assistance of scientific knowledge.

The literary forms he cultivated depend on his subject-matter in hand to serve a cause: his creative mind is concerned with the collective 'soul' of humanity, not with his individual soul. He is concerned with the future of humankind rather than with the present, and therefore, he turns to the past in search of a necessary connection. He may owe an important part of his romanticism to Morris who maintained that what romance means is

"the capacity for a true conception of history, a power of making the past part of the present."(27)

But Morris's concern is not so much with the present either, or if it is, it may be more so out of his concern with the future, which in any case seems to explain his early socialism, since D.R. Gardner says that

"without identifying it as such, Morris forecasts the Socialist millenium."(28)

And in fact, the theme of socialism may well represent Morris's fundamental influence on JLM, even when it can be

" "Socialism seen through the eyes of an artist" as Morris describes it in a letter of Sep. 5, 1883, to Andreas Scheu"(29)

But this is not so clear, for want of more explicit references to Morris, concerning the degree of correspondence in their political conceptions. So, I regard as a matter of speculation the probable contradiction arising from JLM's anarchistic leanings and his socialist ideals. If JLM had been a follower of Morris's brand of socialism, it would have been difficult for him to conciliate these two divergent tendencies, especially when we know that Morris had clashed with the Anarchists in the Socialist League and had been actually ousted from the executive committee by them, until in 1890 he had to leave the League, to end up founding the Hammersmith Socialist Society. Here was an example of "dispute over plan and campaign" since Morris acknowledged his debt to Anarchism in these words:

" "Such finish to what of education in practical Socialism as I am capable of I received (...) from some of my Anarchist friends, from whom I learned, quite against their intention, that Anarchism was impossible...." "(30)

In fact, Morris defined himself as a Communist at that time but even then he would not be seduced by Communist-Anarchism. As for JLM, he never defined himself politically except as a revolutionary writer, and therefore it might be misleading to define him as an Anarchist, especially if, following Morris, he also thought that complete equality for all people was the real aim of the revolution, even if Morris defined this as communism when he wrote that

"The aim of Communism seems to me to be the complete equality of condition for all people; and anything in a Socialist direction which stops short of this is merely a compromise with the present condition of society, a halting-place on the road to the goal,"(31)

Nobody should be surprised to learn from future research on JLM/LGG's politics that, not being concerned with what he called the "plan of campaign" in politics, and only with the aims of Socialism, he found no essential antagonism between the aims of Anarchism and the aims of Morris's Communism. In his view, they both express the same basic hopes and longings, even when Morris maintained that no matter how free the ideal society of the future, it could not possibly do away with some sort of authority, especially if it was to be the authority of the majority of the people. Neither in TGB nor in GH does JLM assign any role to authority - among the protagonists - except in the form of some sort of respect for old age and for the "singers" (32). And yet, admitting that JLM like the Anarchists advocates the liquidation of all types of organization after the triumph of his revolution, he is not in favour of that liquidation - unlike the anarchists - during the period of the struggle for bringing about that anarchism of the future. If any different motion had crept in his earlier work, in his subsequent fiction the theme of the leader is relevant. The leader and leadership imply politics. But they certainly imply the idea of authority and of organization. I have already suggested that JLM/LGG's anarchism should be understood as a social order generated by Socialism in its higher stage, i.e. his own Socialism goes father than that of Morris. This, then, would be a case in which the "explorer" JLM surpassed his "guide" Morris, because the latter could not avail himself, in his time, of the rich socialist literature which the former could study at leisure in the 1920s. And yet, it was Morris who 'planted' the right seed in the right soil, since he was first to realize that

"while modern technique can imitate old forms, the life behind them comes from the whole man, totally engaged in what he is doing. Such work cannot be reproduced

by the wage-earner under capitalism who is required to be no more than a hand.

It was this conviction which led Morris in the end from artistic criticism to social criticism and from social criticism to political action. He came to think that while capitalism exploits the worker economically by the extraction of surplus it exploits him no less grievously by robbing him of his humanity, of work which he could enjoy and which calls out all his powers of hand and brain. Morris never used the term alienation and the writings of Marx on the subject were unpublished and unknown in his time. Yet, starting from his own particular standpoint, Morris reached a position pretty well identical with what we know now, though he could not have known it then, had been earlier developed by Marx."(33)

So that, it is possible to say that in JLM's evolution Morris's influence is like a bridge between the lights perceived by JLM of French socialism and Marxism, or their scientific expression in the future. Although in this, as suggested earlier on, JLM is concerned chiefly with the ultimate results, i.e. the culture of a fair and humane social order. His novel "G G", however, shows that by 1934 he was equally concerned with the immediate problem of how to bring about the fundamental change in the society of his own time.

In so far as the literary forms cultivated by JLM/LGG, Morris can be also credited with being the fundamental influence as his short story cycles so clearly show, since they are practically modelled on Morris's romances (some of them at least). The resemblance in form is so close that, like in Morris's romances, JLM's appear as if divorced from any social or political concern, and if concerned with any social question at all, they appear more as a sentimental desire seeking escape from the bitter realities of life, 'dreaming' instead, like Morris, of the waters at the world's end, as Thomson put it. I have suggested that in the case of JLM/LGG this might apply more to form than to content since in most cases he works with Morris's dream forms which the latter used to construct

"a world with values and conditions totally unlike his own, only in order to be able to criticize and understand his own the better."(34)

This, in my opinion, is the real sense of JLM's romances, and as is clear, he found inspiration in Morris's romances. I shall leave it to the researcher of the JLM-Morris influence theme to establish in full detail JLM's intellectual debt to William Morris.

Obviously, many other writers had an influence on JLM/LGG, but it is not my purpose to deal with them all, and that is why I have pointed out the main sources of social influence coming from the field of literature, but in doing so, I have left out many more authors than those I have mentioned here. Among the most conspicuous I should mention Wilde, Wordsworth, Blake and Shakespeare. Some of them appear in context in other sections of the present work. I would like to remark nonetheless, that in general, JLM/LGG was particularly impressed by the social role that in the history of humankind the unequal distribution of what Hesiod called "the means of subsistence" has had, and this is the theme which, apparently, he followed up more assiduously in Shakespeare, particularly in plays such as "As You Like It", and "The Tempest", not to mention "King Lear" and other plays. The theme is the dispute among close relatives who usurp the possessions or the social position, or the political power, or all of these together, belonging to near relatives whom they leave destitute, etc.

I might as well emphasize that I have not dealt here with literary influences proper, not even with formal influences that other writers exercised over him, for the field is too wide. I have only pointed out the most outstanding influences on JLM/LGG's thought, but in a very incomplete way. It is a description which seeks to suggest rather, that there is here a topic of research which might be worth the trouble to attempt, for it is important to establish the relation between the author and the cultural question in more depth and detail. By way of example I could mention that I did not include here people

like G.B. Shaw, nor did I discuss Rudyard Kipling, and others. But the truth is that the essential content of their intellectual stance and its relevance to JLM/LGG's thought might repeat itself especially when dealing with the other sections of this same chapter. Thus, concerning literature proper all I did was to draw attention to the influence that the poetic tradition - especially the poetry imbibed in the true revolutionary content that inspired the French Revolution - of humanism has had over him and which JLM/LGG found best expressed in the poetry of the Romantics as seen above.

It should be pointed out, that apart from the tradition of England and of the British Isles JLM/LGG was also influenced by the universal tradition in fiction. But outside the U.K. such universal figures as Flaubert, London, and especially Anatole France and Tolstoy should be mentioned as relevant, apart from other influences coming from German literature.

As for the British tradition, obviously, the evils that industrialism brought about were best portrayed for the purposes of JLM/LGG's model of society, by those writers who had developed critical approaches towards British industrialization and its effects. So, if it is true that he was familiar with the great tradition, he was not an uncritical admirer - whenever he admired a writer. Among the Scottish writers of the past he seems to hold Smollett in great esteem together with Stevenson and Scott, not to mention Burns. He seems to admire Fielding, Chesterton, and Hardy among the English. He also mentions Joyce but it is not clear whether he really admired him. But maybe none of them is his 'hero', i.e. somebody who may have contributed something significant to his model of society (see chap. 7). Dickens may be more relevant for his model, for in a way he stands as one of the most influential, particularly in novels such as "David Copperfield" and "Oliver Twist". But I would suggest that it is the novel "Hard Times" that can be regarded as really relevant to JLM/LGG's model of society. This novel highlights two of the main premises that characterize the model, namely, that industrialism (or Civilization on JLM/LGG's terminology) is intrinsically dehumanized and has a dehumanizing effect on people; whereas people are

intrinsically good, honest, worthy, loving and dignified, etc. - even if poor and miserable. It could be added that Dickens, like JLM/LGG, seems to believe that even the hard-hearted members of the ruling class are after all good at heart, and some of them can even recover their essential humaneness.

This is far from being all that can be said about the influence that literature, in general terms, had on JLM/LGG. As might be expected, the list of authors would be too difficult to determine accurately, but in any case it would be too long, especially if we take into account influences coming from literature in other languages, German and French in particular, and possibly Russian, whereby Tolstoy's influence is relevant as seen in the analysis of  
H W S.

P A R T T H R E E

THE IDEOLOGICAL QUESTION: HUMANISM

A. THE PROTAGONISTS

CHAPTER 10  
HUMANISM: ROUSSEAU AND OTHERS

CHAPTER 11  
DIFFUSIONISM: G.E. Smith, Perry and Rivers

CHAPTER 12  
MONISM: HAECKEL

CHAPTER 13  
ANARCHISM: KROPOTKIN AND OTHERS

CHAPTER 14  
FEMINISM: BEBEL

B. THE ANTAGONISTS

CHAPTER 15  
SPENGLER

CHAPTER 16  
NIETZSCHE

IN CONCLUSION

NOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

A. THE PROTAGONISTSCHAPTER 10 ROUSSEAUISM

HUMANISM is in itself a very big theme, and the whole model could have been analyzed in its light. Since our subject in hand is in fact the model, and for the sake of explicating it better, there is here both a subordination of the former and a combination which seeks to show on the one hand what relevant influences from the humanist tradition are recognizable in JLM/LGG, and on the other, those aspects of humanism the author himself highlighted in his model. In other words, the following chapters are intended to illustrate rather than discuss, let alone to establish, the whole range of his main intellectual concerns. It is rather an attempt at pointing out his stance on key issues of modern humanism. Some of them - hopefully the most relevant ones - are included here in an attempt to explicate the content of his ideological battle against pseudo-scientific conceptions of humanism and culture. The idea is not so much to systematize as it is to offer a broad view of the author's own idea of culture in which the forces of progression and retrogression contend. Hence this otherwise unnecessary subdivision into "protagonists" and "antagonists". In this light, the term "influences" may not be very appropriate in some of the cases, but it can be applied to most despite the fact that sometimes the terms "coincidence" and/or "discrepancies" might describe the relationship more accurately.

The field of philosophical thought is also difficult to tread since JLM/LGG seems to have gone through the contents of various systems of thought. His literature leads us to understand that he had examined the range of the most outstanding philosophical trends including positions so dissimilar as those of FWN and Karl Marx, for example. Whatever the character and the scope and depth of his philosophical formation - he never intended to create the impression that he was concerned with philosophy for the sake of philosophy - his philosophical views are dominated first and last by humanism in as much as he was mainly concerned with social questions, particularly with the question of setting right the problem of social ethics. This

he thought was the fundamental issue lying at the foundations of Civilization (Capitalism). But philosophy as such - at superstructural level in Civilization - had been unable to deal with it correctly. JLM/LGG suggests that the thought of Civilization cannot in fact even perceive the problem correctly since it has, on the contrary, contributed to glossing it over, whenever it has not led it to error. His idea is that even the scientific thought of Civilization is not free from error when it tackles anthropological issues that affect Social Science, contributing thus to increasing the depth of the rift between humanity and Civilization. This explains his social commitment as a freedom fighter seeking to combat the most erroneous ideas in order to establish those which belong to the essence of humaneness. In this sense his literature is in fact propaganda.

In this battle of ideas, he regards as enemy of humankind anyone who goes along with the neo-Darwinian conceptions. On the other hand, anyone who is basically in agreement with the Rousseauian idea of the innate goodness of man (or of the origin of inequality, etc.) is his ally, even if he/she is only a reformist like Bradlaugh, or like Ingersoll. What he appreciates in them is above all their tendency towards humanism. At least in one of his books, he mentions Ingersoll in a context which reveals that he is sympathetic. This is due, perhaps, to the fact that Ingersoll, like JLM himself, is so concerned with the problem of freedom, condemning above all the practice of slavery, the slavery of women in particular. Ingersoll also realizes that the law, for the most part, destroys personal freedom. But Ingersoll is not a revolutionary in the sense that his ideas are not likely to affect Civilization in a significant way, even when his intention may be to change it; at least that is the central idea involved even in the title of his book "How to Reform Mankind". Yet JLM does not ignore him. He respects his humanism. His humanism gives JLM/LGG's literature its unity, and determines its relationship with the work of different authors covering fields so dissimilar as Natural Science, Anthropology, Philosophy, etc. This humanism determines his battle against FWN's ideas as will be seen.

In the Neo-Darwinian readiness to identify the laws that govern the development of civilization with the laws that govern the workings of nature, JLM/LGG sees a twofold implication. On the one hand, Neo-Darwinism assumes in consequence that there is no contradiction between nature and civilization in so far as it fails to perceive that Society, if not alien to nature, has in fact given origin to new laws which had not occurred in nature prior to the beginning of culture. It follows that if this issue lies at the basis of their theory of knowledge, that theory must perforce be wrong. And if such a theory forms the foundations of this Civilization - as defined in the model - then its whole trend must be equally wrong. The pseudo-scientific dictum of the innate beastliness of Man is the most vivid example, for in this original error JLM/LGG sees repercussions that affect not only the social sciences but also social ethics, not to mention the consequences if used to explain the origin of wars. JLM sees in this original error, a principle which works - and has consistently worked - against the interests, feelings, and spritiul and intellectual tendencies of humanity. To him this is unnatural and in this unnaturalness he sees precisely one more piece of evidence of the contradiction between nature and civilization, for the ethical tendencies of humanity belong to nature whereas the unethical ones arise from Civilization (see Chap. 13 on Kropotkin). In his view this is crucial for out of this contradiction humanity will have to emerge triumphant, i.e. it will have passed from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. It is worth mentioning that in this sense his position can be compared to that of Marx's in his critique of Darwin's work. In a letter to Fendinard Lassalle in 1861 he had explained that "The Origin of Species" was very important and served him as a basis in natural science for the class struggle in history, and also in that the book was a death blow to teleology, etc. But in his letter to Engels he pointed out that

"Darwin rediscovers his English society, its division of labour, competition, the opening up of new markets, 'inventions', and the Malthusian 'struggle of existence', among the animals and plants. It is Hobbes's bellum omnium contra omnes, and it reminds one of Hegel and

the Phenomenology where bourgeois society figures 'spiritually as an animal kingdom,' where in Darwin the animal kingdom becomes bourgeois society"(1)

To my mind, these words express more accurately what JLM/LGG really thought in relation to Darwinism as applied mechanically to society, especially in connection with social ethics in so far as it is clear that for him too, it was simply

"ludicrous to attempt to derive a meaningful ethic from the Darwinian natural world."(2)

The fundamental result of those ethics is the question of war as seen above. JLM explains his position in fictional terms in TGB. His own insistence on emphasizing the spiritual malformation of the warrior is not so much based on the importance he may attribute to innate drives as it is in fact based on his intention to show that Man has become a warrior malgre lui, the most conspicuous case in his fiction being that of the good-natured 'primitive' Ewan Tavendale, the husband to Chris Guthrie in "SS". Hence his distinction between primitive and savage, whereby the latter corresponds to a stage of Civilization (see "E" in "CC"). 'Primitive' is another word for the Natural Man of Rousseau.

The theme of Diffusionism reveals the relationship between JLM/LGG and Rousseau, although he may not have derived all his 'Rousseauism' from Rousseau, any more than he may have derived all his Christian-humanism from Jesus Christ, or his Monism from Ernst Haeckel alone, or again, his Diffusionism from G.E. Smith and the British School of Diffusionism, etc. His cultural background seems to be much broader, including the founders of scientific socialism. Besides, one must not forget that JLM/LGG received an influence also from his own peasant community and national environment.

The aim of this brief note is just to point out a possible and probable source that helped to shape JLM/LGG's intellectual world and is far from attempting to examine in depth his debt to Rousseau.

Thus, some items, from among a host of possible ones, have been selected as samples that will help to visualize the common ground covered by both. It is neither a comparison, let alone an attempt at suggesting that their coincidence is complete. For in the field of their inevitable differences, it would suffice to mention Rousseau's ideas on education as propounded in his "Emile" as contrasted with JLM/LGG's view of the role knowledge is called upon to play in culture.

JLM/LGG's model is based on Rousseau's idea that humankind gets corrupted by Civilization to the same extent that every progression of civilization produces more inequality (see chap. 3 Q(1)). Obviously, Rousseau was the only thinker of his time to lament that civilization spoils 'natural man', but JLM coincides with him in assessing the gifts of natural man as well as the favourable social conditions contained in the essence of the 'natural state'. The important thing is that JLM/LGG associates his humanistic idealization of Primitive Man with his battle in favour of social revolution as a pre-condition for his final goal: cultural revolution. In point of fact it is not "primitive man" that the author glorifies but the resultant relationship among its members that their natural state could afford to provide. Since it was based on social equality, their problems - big problems indeed as JLM acknowledges in TGB and other writings - did not have their origin in the dynamics of their social life but in nature which, in turn, fostered the emergence of feelings of solidarity and cooperation in their common strategy for survival. In JLM's opinion many other related social values and ethical human behaviour had their origin in this common strategy. One of them is pity, and once more, we find here his coincidence with Rousseau, but also with Jesus Christ, although there are good reasons to assume that he valued the latter in a different dimension.

Whatever the difference between Christ and Rousseau, JLM/LGG's supreme pursuit is humanity - or humaneness, and since he is concerned with non-religious philosophies, one can assume that Rousseau's approach is closest to JLM/LGG's intellectual view on the issue, especially when the former writes:

"Let it be admitted that pity is only the feeling that makes us put ourselves in the place of those who suffer.

The assertion does not weaken but lends force to the declaration that in this natural feeling we have the origin of sentiments of humanity and justice.

No man becomes humane until his imagination carries him beyond his own sensations, and extends his sensibility to other beings."(3)

JLM/LGG finds in this at least two of his fundamental principles concerning the substance of humaneness, namely the "sentiments of humanity and justice" and the active principle by which a human being "extends his sensibility to other beings". His idea of the 'hero' arises from them. Pity is an essential constituent element of humaneness in JLM/LGG's model. His literature is built around it and he never tried to create a different impression, on the contrary, he wrote in plain words:

"To me it is inconceivable that sincere and honest men should go outside the range of their own species with gifts of pity and angry compassion and rage when there is horror and dread among humankind. I am unreasonably and mulishly prejudiced in favour of my own biological species. I am jingo patriot of planet earth: 'Humanity right or wrong!'"(4)

This is probably the true source of his great admiration for Christ whom he regards as the supreme example of altruism since his deep sense of pity and his irresistible feeling of compassion for suffering humankind impelled him to sacrifice his own life on their behalf. In A S's language this becomes "the pity of the Christ".

This is precisely the reason why JLM/LGG wrote so much about cruelty, about those

"frightful, unthinking cruelties"(5)

which John Lindsay, for example, detected in "S R". The truth is that his insistence on the theme of cruelty is but his own insistence on the need for a permanent denunciation of the social causes that are responsible for the reign of cruelty in human life, and essentially on the need to eradicate them. So that it would be fairer to speak of

"his passionate hatred of cruelty"(6)

as H.B. Cruickshank does, especially in relation to his seeming tendency to elaborate on cruelty as has been said of "SP.". But it is precisely this novel that supports Miss Cruickshank's view when we read that the slaves were

"one by one nailed on the new-made crosses. And at length even the men of the legions turned in horror from looking back along the horizon at the stretch of undulating, crying figures fading down into the sunhaze."(7)

If in writing "I S" JLM had been really

"obsessed with thoughts of "Sadism and cruelty beasts tearing and stabbing slime and blood"."(8)

he would have finished "Sp." in a different way. But the ending of the novel shows that JLM was in fact 'elaborating on pity and compassion,' and still more important than that, he was putting the case for humanity as contrasted with the cruelties of Civilization. It is the humaneness of the species that prevails over so much cruelty and inhumaneness:

'O Spartacus!'

It was a cry of agony in his brain and heart, but he heard it only as a stifled grunt from his lips. Then that agony of mind went as well, in a sudden flow of memory, a glister and flash of imaged memories: the first Bithynian camp, the horreum on the road to the South, Papa in

mist, the battle-games of Crixus, the defiles of Mutina, Rome shining at dawn, the snows of Rhegium, the passes of Petelia - he fought and marched and debated again, heard cry in his ears the myriad slave voices, heard the ghost of that Hope and Promise wail away as the morning came upon the Appian Way. And then again pain seized and tore at his heart and passed again; wildly, a last wild moment, he raised his eyes.

And he saw before him, gigantic, filling the sky, a great Cross with a figure that was crowned with thorns; and behind it, sky-towering as well, gladius in hand, his hand on the edge of the morning behind that Cross the figure of a Gladiator. And he saw that these Two were One, and the world yet theirs: and he went into unending night and left them that shining earth.(9)

Apart from the unyielding hope and faith in the final triumph of humankind as represented by Christ and the slaves, the allegory is self-evident. But as is typical of JLM, he also endows Christ with a more earthly dimension and a truly human nature, since Spartacus, or what he represents, is also Christ. We recognize here JLM's old motif of the essential identity of humanity no matter what external differences may separate men. In this light the pity of the Christ is in fact the pity of the human race of which Jesus Christ is the inheritor. The reader of "Sp" on the other hand, cannot remain indifferent to the closing sentence which JLM writes in italics:

It was Springtime in Italy, a hundred  
years before the crucifixion of Christ -  
(10)

For as already suggested in chap. VII, JLM sees the intervention of humanity's social ethics not only in Religion, but also in Mythology, and in Legend. In relation to Greek Mythology - to which he often resorts in search of symbols and deeper connotations - we have already pointed out some aspects of what has been called the Dionisiac element. In this connection now, we can say that if it cannot be doubted that JLM's motif of human madness has been derived from

Rousseau's idea of this being yet another difference that separates Man from animals, it is nevertheless interesting to observe that the story of the Thracian god Dionysus offers itself as a probable source too. For it can be inferred that he combined elements from both sources, and perhaps also from others and his intention, more than to simply echo Rousseau, may have been to attack other antagonistic views such as that of FWN.

In "FTS" Southcote suffered from one of the many types of madness which JLM seems to acknowledge: the destructive one, which seems to me to be a veiled allusion to FWN (see chap. 16).

The theme of madness emerges from JLM/LGG's fiction in at least two main roles - either working in favour or against humankind. Among the former Titul and Spartacus himself in "Sp" represent two different types of madness, but Spartacus resembles Christ in many aspects, so that it is possible to venture that JLM probably saw some aspect of human madness in Christ. In fact, JLM leads us to think that some forms of love are actually forms of madness. The relationship between love and sanity, and their opposite seems to take its origin in both Rousseau's concept of the difference between animal and man, and JLM's idea of the contradiction between humankind and civilization. Rousseau wrote:

"Pourquoi l'homme seul est-il sujet à devenir imbécile? N'est-ce point qu'il retourne ainsi dans son état primitif, et que, tandis que la bête, qui n'a rien acquis et qui n'a rien non plus à perdre, reste toujours avec son instinct, l'homme, rependant par la vieillesse ou d'autres accidents tout ce que sa perfectibilité lui avait fait acquérir, retombe ainsi plus bas que la bête même? Il serait triste pour nous d'être forcés de convenir que cette faculté distinctive et presque illimitée est la source de tous les malheurs de l'homme; que c'est elle qui le tire, à force de temps, de cette condition originaire dans laquelle il coulerait des jours tranquilles et innocents; que c'est elle qui, faisant éclore avec les siècles ses lumières et

ses erreurs, ses vices et ses vertus, le rend à la longue le tyran de lui-même et de la nature."(11)

JLM must be strongly based on this since he seems to agree with Rousseau's analysis concerning the difference between man and the animal, and as a result, he also accepts the consequences of such essential difference. Moreover, he also emphasizes this concept by contrasting it with madness and with the fact that "only man is subject to becoming imbecile". In his 'Scottish' fiction alone, two examples are conspicuous: those of "A S Q" and that of the short story "Sim" where Sim Wilson the father of Jean, the girl who turned out to be "a daftie", asks pathetically at the birth of his second daughter:

"Is it right in the head?"(12)

But this is nature at work. And this is 'real' madness in Rousseau's terms.

The madness that JLM highlights in his model has a social character. In "Sp" the madness of Titul has a social meaning in so far as it is related not only to cruelty and to the theme of the "vanished Western Isle" but also to that of religion - his people had

"neglected to sacrifice to the God Kokolkh. So he (had) whelmed their country in mud and sand; ..."(13)

and to the idea that cruelty does not come from the people. But Titul's faith in that cruel god was his madness. His madness has something in common with the two types of madness in "LDEC" where the

"half-crazed negro"(14)

goes fully mad on account of his jealousy and 'kills the thing he loved'; whereas Elia goes mad because Salih ihn Muslih (the crazed negro) had killed his love who means more than his love for a woman since her symbolic name is Kalo.

Titul thinks that by placating Kokolkh the old way of life in the "vanished Western Isle" might come back, hence his madness. But the real reason suggested by JLM may be related to the loss of that old way of life, which was better than the Roman civilization, although the worship of Kokolkh indicates that the way of life had ceased to be "primitive". In other words, the madness of Titul may have been provoked by Civilization, and this implication determines that the material cause was cruelty, i.e. the absence of love, or the expression of its opposite.

As for Elia and Salih ibn Muslih, the ultimate cause was love. This is a very interesting implication since the contradiction is apparent. Practically all JLM/LGG's literature is guided by love; it is a kind of 'Campaign' for love. And yet, people go mad because of love. Better still, love is made to appear as a kind of 'madness' in itself, since JLM actually uses the description of "mad" for some actions and reactions of his characters, usually in connection with love. This poses the problem of the meaning of love.

It appears that love for JLM/LGG has only a social meaning. He does not think of romance-love, or sentimental love when he uses the word love in a symbolic way. In this sense he comes much nearer to Christ, but obviously much closer to Morris (q.v.).

Madness as a product of Civilization has two different and opposing expressions. First, the predominance of humane traits in a person - traits that are supposed to be alien to Civilization - constitutes a type of madness like that of Spartacus's who, instead of putting Lavinia, his mortal (or class) enemy, to death, sends her back to her people, the Roman oppressors, not only unharmed but actually protected. This was so against the grain of what was held as normal and sane that

"It was said that the Thracian savage was mad, mad not with the brutality that might have been expected, but insane, being clement, one who neither tortured

his captives nor looted unnecessarily. And Rome had listened open-mouthed, and laughed, knowing that only the feeble minded could antic in such a fashion;"(15)

This is then, human madness as seen from the viewpoint of Civilization. This human madness is not madness when looked at from the viewpoint of humanity, or from the point of view of "primitives".

Secondly, the madness is anti-human, or the madness of Civilization. As seen above, it is based on the absence of love and on the reign of cruelty. It is therefore, blind and ruthless, and is therefore, much worse than biological madness. It is represented by the madness of Southcote in "F T S" (q.v.).

Most of JLM's humanisitic concerns can be traced back to pre-history and possibly even to that period when, according to anthropologists, human life was, strictly speaking, still passing through its animal stage. Hence the difficulty of ascertaining whether his stance on different issues took its origin in previous theoretical approaches, or whether he simply incorporated them into his own view, derived in turn from his own studies in human history and - using Engel's term - his "materialist conception of history" (letter to H. Bloch), and I am not in favour of dismissing the possibility that he also gave religion, myth, and legend their credit as mirrors of empirical knowledge, and above all, of social ethics, as suggested earlier on when discussing the problem of madness.

But the topic of woman in history is much more than a motif, and again, the degree to which Rousseau's views on the topic must have influenced JLM may not be irrelevant, hence this brief reference. Nevertheless, given the importance JLM/LGG gave this subject, I shall deal with it in more detail under Feminism in chap. 14.

It is in this connection, however, that we come across some other related topics, such as human perfectibility - which JLM relates to freedom - highlighted by Rousseau as the fundamental factor that

differentiates human beings from the rest of the animal world. From this perspective of the differences, Rousseau includes the topic of death which JLM carries forward to its relation with immortality. But this trend of analysis takes Rousseau to the problem of coincidence and its role in the inception of culture, a topic which JLM also echoes (see Diffusionism in chap. 11).

"Après avoir montré que la perfectibilité, les vertus sociales, et les autres facultés que l'homme naturel avait reçues en puissance, ne pouvaient jamais se développer d'elles-mêmes, qu'elles avaient besoin pour cela du concours fortuit de plusieurs causes étrangères, qui pouvaient ne jamais naître, et sans lesquelles il fût demeuré éternellement dans sa condition primitive,"(16)

But in pursuing the differences between the animal and the human condition Rousseau comes across the dialectical contradiction between the progress of human culture and what to him is something akin to the 'deterioration of the species'

"il me reste à considérer et à rapprocher les différents hasards qui ont pu perfectionner la raison humaine en détériorant l'espèce, rendre un être méchant en le rendant sociable, et d'un terme si éloigné amener enfin l'homme et le monde au point où nous le voyons."(17)

The gist of this idea recurs in different contexts in JLM/LGG's fiction and non-fiction, and in so far as it elicits the metaphor of the 'fall of man', it forms part of an essential element in his model, and therefore, it also recurs in as many contexts in this work, so that in this chapter I shall only repeat that JLM/LGG like Rousseau also sees that progress contains an antagonism. For this is the key factor that relates him to the Rousseauian philosophy, a factor which he accordingly turns into the axis of his model as seen in chap. I. But then, Rousseau is in turn one of the many protagonists of this 'materialist' way of thinking which JLM/LGG traces back to

Heraclitus's time. No matter that later scholars have adopted this particular view of Rousseau, and JLM may have benefited from their further elaborations on the theme, the fact remains that apparently his point of departure is Rousseau's doctrine of equality. JLM uses that doctrine so staunchly that the reader cannot help seeing it as romanticism. But his insistence on the innate goodness of humanity, for example, is in fact directed to enhance that uniquely human quality pointed out by Rousseau: the ability of the species to develop further, i.e. their gift of perfectibility which serves JLM/LGG only too well to bring to the fore the irony of civilization which he highlights in Phase III of his model. As it is, once he has adhered to all this, it is only logical that he should adhere to Rousseau's theory of inequality as well, which he obviously does. In this, he too, like Rousseau, regards the advent of inequality in the evolution of humanity as progress. The general movement of his model revolves around this kind of 'prime mover' of culture - the antagonism created by inequality which, in fostering progression it fosters at the same time retrogression. What is more, he also adopts, initially at least, Rousseau's idea that the natural resolution of this dialectical contradiction will transform inequality into a new equality.

## CHAPTER 11 DIFFUSIONISM

Some critics and commentators have made much fuss about JLM/LGG's "diffusionism". They have related it to Rousseau and the Romantics but not to the problem of liberty and culture, and as such, it has been singled out as a weakness in his intellectual background and as a blemish on his literary creations.

An attempt is made here to examine the issue from a different perspective according to the role that the **diffusion of culture** plays in the model

Anthropologists use the term **diffusion** to designate the process by which culture spreads from one ethnic group to another, from one area to another. It is related to tradition but unlike this - which operates in time - diffusion is spatial. These two factors are related to both invention and imitation. The process by which two different cultures come into contact can be peaceful or violent. In general, migration, commerce, and missionization are peaceful (although, not always in the case of missionization, at least in so far as Latin America is concerned), whereas colonization and conquest are less likely to take place without violence. Revolution and infiltration are also mentioned as mechanisms of diffusion.

JLM/LGG may have had a fair knowledge of this subject since in his books one is likely to come across some form of diffusion at a time, but he seems to include them all, without neglecting those of infiltration and revolution.

It is commonly agreed that the discovery of America stimulated the imagination of anthropologists concerning the problems of diffusion. Edward Tylor is usually mentioned among the most prominent diffusionists. He maintained that the geographical distance between two similar culture traits, be it ever so great, did not suffice to disprove diffusion, and yet, he was not a "diffusionist", not a diffusionist of the British (or English) School anyway. There are two main schools of diffusionism; the German-Austrian and the British.

The difference between them is that the British defends the monogenetic origin of Culture in that it maintains that Civilization emerged from one place alone - ancient Egypt (or Sumeria, or a neighbouring area). It maintains that primitive culture was essentially stagnant, that coincidence played an important role in creating favourable conditions for the rise of a civilization in Egypt, but that 3000 years B.C., the rapid development of agriculture stimulated all the other developments so that at super-structural level they finally generated organizations and institutions, and that this social organization gave origin to religion, social classes, and politics, etc. They maintained that the cultures of North, Central, and South America - and in fact all the rest of the world - had been diffused from a singular cradle round the Mediterranean, namely, Egypt. At this point, they clash not only with the German-Austrian diffusionists but also with the evolutionists. However, the brunt of the confrontation was to rise between the Diffusionists and the neo-Darwinians, or neo-evolutionists. It is at this point that JLM/LGG tackles the problems, since the dispute incorporates another issue, which is the one that preoccupies this author: the question of the true nature of the human being.

"For the leaders of the heresy championed by Domina on Stane Muir were assailing the comfortable certitudes of half a century, and the startled evolutionists were retorting with a barrage of invective and insult. A fight affecting the very foundations of human society, it went unnoticed in the Press. Not so in the Hanno Society. Malcolm discovered members who would have delighted in burning the heretic diffusionists as an auto-da-fe in the middle of Bloomsbury Square. He had difficulty in preventing each issue of the Society quarterly from developing into a concentrated assault and battery on Professor Elliot Smith and his lieutenants. He himself, his sympathies instinctively with the root-beliefs of the heretics, maintained a disappointed neutrality.

For this new-old view of history - that man, like the other anthropoids, had been

originally a decent and kindly animal, no blood-drinking ghoul of the fevered Darwinian imagination; that civilization - wars, cruelties, gods, agriculture, temple-building - had been no more an instinctive and inevitable development in the wide-scattered communities of the early world than it is instinctive and inevitable for an oran-utan of the forests to develop the tea-drinking habits of his kinsmen in the Zoo; that with the passing of civilization's codes and tabus the aberrant horrors of ten thousand years might pass away as well: with all these opinions Malcolm agreed."(1)

The British Diffusionists - whose activity seems to have withered away after the 1920s - maintained, like Rousseau and other humanists, that primitive human beings were peaceful, kind, and loving creatures; whereas to the neo-Darwinians it was plain that if humankind had evolved from the beast, primitive men and women had to be savage and ferocious, conditioned as they were by nature in their struggle for survival and subject to the law of the supremacy of the fittest, etc. The role of Civilization was in consequence, to curb this innate savagery of primitive humans. The Diffusionists retorted by accusing Civilization of being responsible for the real cause of savagery. Behind this anthropological dispute there was something more serious for the majority of humankind: the implications of a social and political character affecting the current affairs of the society of the time, for as Douglas F. Young put it

"This theory of independent evolution, as expounded by anthropologists like Tylor and Frazer, was both neat and comforting, for it encouraged people to see late nineteenth-century civilization as unquestionably good, the logical climax of the human endeavour, and gave assurance of a future which would see further progress along the straight road of social evolution. The theory was a goodsend to the imperialist for the white man was revealed as simply helping the native along the evolutionary road which he was bound to travel anyhow, drawing him out of his savage bestiality by

bringing him some of the benefits of western civilization."(2)

These are the main facts concerning an issue which was crucial to JLM/LGG. These facts explain why he sided with the Diffusionists (or British, or "English Diffusionists"), which in turn explains why he has been pigeonholed as "diffusionist". Very few would even attempt denying this assertion, and still fewer would suggest that his brand of diffusionism was in some way different from that of G. Elliot Smith's school. However, Dr. Geoffrey Wagner suggests that JLM did not subscribe to the monogenetic aspect of the theory in his series of scholarly articles for the journal "Antiquity" (Sep. 1930 to June 1931), even if

"in all his subsequent fiction he does so"(3)

But none of his critics, reviewers or commentators denies his adherence to Diffusionism. On the contrary, they often tend to overemphasize it, and some suggest that JLM/LGG's social thought arises from his unmitigated faith, or belief in, or even fanaticism about, Diffusionism. Apart from what has been pointed out here, his personal contacts with the Diffusionists, his borrowings from them, his friendship with Professor G.E. Smith - the founder of the anthropological school known as the Diffusionist school - even his own articles on the subject, have been used as unmistakable proof that JLM/LGG was above all a 'diffusionist'. The obvious conclusion arising from all this - as anticipated above - is that Diffusionism forms nothing short of the very backbone of what has been called his intellectual background, a conclusion that might be somewhat misleading if accepted without reservations.

In fact, the English School of Diffusionism did not come into being before 1911, the year of the publication of Professor Grafton Elliot Smith's book "The Ancient Egyptians", that is, shortly after the German-Austrian school. By 1915 - the date of the publication of "The Migration of Early Cultures" by the same author - JLM, who was not yet 15 years of age, had not only read Darwin's "The Origin of Species",

but also most of the authors who were going to really have something to do with the formation of his intellectual background, as will be seen below. In any case, I would suggest that 'Diffusionism' should not be used as an inclusive term as if it stood for a whole body of thought or a philosophical school. 'Diffusionism' as a school, defines one aspect - an important one given its social significance - that differentiated the English from other schools of anthropology. JLM/LGG was attracted by the social significance of Diffusionism in its confrontation with social Darwinism. All indicates that this came to happen precisely because his intellectual background made him realise that the humanist contents enunciated here were those which contained his own views and had the respectability of being a scientific theory.

Moreover, if Diffusionism were of such centrality in building JLM/LGG's intellectual background, how are we going to reconcile the apparent contradiction between this anthropological theory concerned specifically with the distant past - in so far as the origins of civilization are concerned - and JLM/LGG's paramount concern with the future of humankind? For even if admitting that this difference does not imply any contradiction, it still confirms once again that pigeonholding JLM as purely diffusionist and - practically nothing else, may be misleading unless we accept the notion that JLM's literature is mainly concerned with the past - an assumption that his own literary output disproves again and again - and that his interest in the past is merely methodological in so far as it enables him to explain his theory of the future better. But this may not be so. I would suggest rather, that it would do him more justice to establish first within what perspective JLM saw Diffusionism, and hence, establish what role it actually plays in his model, rather than seeking to establish how good a diffusionist he himself was.

Thus, instead of classifying JLM/LGG as a Diffusionist, I would prefer the more explicit term humanist, which is at the same time more inclusive, although as such it may include more than one brand of humanism. But JLM/LGG's literature shows that his humanism is materialist as opposed to subjective, even when as a rule he presented

it in allegorical form. His essay "The Land" illustrates very well his interest in people - at any rate, his interest in his people of the Mearns peasant community - and this concern for the everyday life of real people (throughout history) may have laid down the foundations of his humanism, for it seems that this feeling is not alien to that which awakened his interest in History, that is, the people of other places and also of other times, and the same basic interest that awakened his interest in other disciplines. In this way, it seems to me, his tireless activity in search of his fellowmates was found to lead him to the solid line of humanistic thought which humanist people of all times have handed down to us throughout the ages from Akhenaton to Heraclitus, from Greeks to Spartacus, from Rome to Jesus Christ, from Christianity to Mohammed and from humanism to all the host of writers, thinkers, philosophers, scientists, freedom fighters, people's heroes and poets of all times. So, I would suggest that it must have been his tireless quest for humanity that brought him to get acquainted with the English Diffusionists, since he himself acknowledges that in his early teens he had already read a great deal and had subsequently

"passed to the early Arthur Keith in Anthropology, Avebury in Archaeology, Herschel and Proctor and Ball in astronomy"(4)

which shows his wide range of interests in natural science, and also that he was not only concerned with the distant past of Man. This suggests that he discovered the school of Diffusionism of Professor C.E. Smith, W.H.R. Rivers, W.J. Perry, and H.J. Massingham precisely because he was engaged in a search, and he had discovered already Sir Arthur Keith and other anthropologists and men of science (who were not 'diffusionists'). In fact, by the time JLM was still attending the Mackie Academy in Aberdeen he may have been already familiar with Keith's "Ancient Types of Man" (1911) and with his "The Antiquity of Man", and by the time he was in the army, or before joining the R.A.F. in August 1923, he may have read "Nationality and Race" by the same author. From the first book he may have derived his idea that not all the human types had survived through the long process of evolution,

and that among the extinct species there were flawed types. JLM chose the Neanderthal Man as the representative of the latter, a motif that is recurrent in his works, but a motif that becomes a theme in at least three works, namely "L O", "W L S" (5), and his so-called "diffusionist" novel - or evolutionist for some - "T G B" in which he describes the homo primigenius as opposed to Homo Sapiens. According to Arthur Keith

"the man who lived in Europe during the earlier and the greater part of the Glacial Period - one estimated to have extended over a period from 500,000 to 1,500,000 years - were of the Neanderthal type."(6)

JLM seems to have put forward this view in "T G B", even when he dates it back to 25000 years ago only, especially in relation to the "grey beasts", or men, so effectively contrasted with the Golden Age hunters. JLM calls them "Neanderthalers". In a way, he seems to be following Professor King's theory (rather than T.H. Huxley's) on the dispute over the identity of the Neanderthal Man - confirmed later by the researches of Professor Schwalbe, Klaatsch, and Boule - that

"Neanderthal man represents a separate species"(7)

and not

"an extreme variant of the modern type of man"(8)

as Professor Huxley had wrongly concluded in "Man's Place in Nature" (1863), since JLM has one of his characters in "T G B" say in respect of the Neanderthalers in that novel:

They are men, but not Man."(9)

In JLM/LGG's model, Neanderthal man embodies all that is negative and inhuman which survives in modern civilization, particularly the

warlike role played by peoples and political powers in History which JLM directly or indirectly ascribes to the Neanderthals or to humankind's hangovers of a Neanderthaloid nature. For the benefit of his model, the Neanderthals did not disappear during the Glacial Period - not altogether. But all this belongs to the big anthropological theme which lends vertebration to JLM/LGG's model, in the form of an irreconcilable dispute between Rousseauians and social-Darwinians (q.v.)

Even when in scholarly works such as "Inka and pre-Inka" and in diffusionist articles such as "William Perry : Revolutionary Anthropologist" JLM used the term "Manchester School" as a synonym for the "Diffusionist School" of Anthropology, and even when Professor G.E. Smith himself suggested that he may not have been happy with the term when he wrote:

"what our opponents call the  
'Diffusionist School' of  
Anthropology"(10)

I have no choice but to use the term which seems to be the most widely accepted designation for the English School of Anthropology.

It is out of all question to attempt a complete analysis of JLM/LGG's 'diffusionism'. The problem is not only quantitative, judging from the bulk of his production, but also qualitative as suggested above. The scholarly works Dr. Wagner mentions (as having appeared in "Antiquity" (qvs)) may not be the only source that indicates JLM's ambivalence concerning the monogenetic theory of the origin of culture. His letter of May 1930 to Professor G.E. Smith is another example, and probably more revealing (11), and also his lecture entitled "Religions of Ancient Mexico" (12) constitutes posthumous evidence that he was still undecided by the time he produced the paper published only some eight months after his death. It must be pointed out, however, that not all JLM's "subsequent fiction" shows his adherence to the monogenetic theory. Actually in "T D" - despite its autobiographical character - he criticizes the Diffusionists as follows:

"But the diffusionists enormously weakened their case by maintaining that civilization first arose in but one locality, and that locality Ancient Egypt. To Malcolm it seemed plain that the germs of the world-disease had fecundated in at least two or three localities, and spread about the world and met and overlapped and stewed to a greasy ferment."(13)

Admitting that JLM presents this as an inner thought of the hero of "T D", this passage strikes one as a 'confession' of his own thought on the subject, for if not his own inner thought, it reveals at least his doubts, because the fictional M.M. is after all his alter ego, for in spite of JLM's method intended to

"set the author at a distance from his subject it soon becomes clear that what Mitchell is doing is tracing his own spiritual and intellectual development,"(14)

Admitting also that there may be some suitable explanation, it is still possible to ascribe JLM's double line of thought in this matter, to either contradiction or inconsistency, or similar flaw. Or again, it could be interpreted as a compromise between independent evolution and monogenetic origin of civilization theory. However, without denying this last possibility, there is factual evidence that JLM was deeply interested in Archaeology. Not to mention his non-fiction, or his active participation in the field of scientific research, there is scarcely a novel - apart from "Sp" maybe - where the theme does not turn up in one way or another. "Antiquity : A Quarterly Review of Archaeology" published a series of lengthy studies by JLM (15) on the subject. On the other hand, his novel "L. Tr." is but another allegory in which Archaeology is not only a symbol of Science, since it illustrates how Archaeology (or scientific research) constitutes the only reliable method of 'revelation' and hence, can help to reveal even the most important scientific truth of all - the humaneness of primitive men. The allegory illustrates how Science (Archaeology) is

the agent that liberates hidden truths, contributing thus to liberating man.

In this light it would not seem misleading to conjecture that he knew for certain that controversies of that type can only be resolved by further scientific research. In the particular case of the controversy in question, one of the best arbiters could be Archaeology itself. Even when this interpretation would explain why he did not side with the Diffusionists when treating the subject academically, it would not rule out the presence of some kind of contradiction or inconsistency, for, as a ready example, the conjecture may not be valid for "C M", especially when reading its sub-chapter "Early Man in America". Here he not only sides with the Diffusionists on the question of the monogenetic theory of culture, but actually combats the theory of independent evolution on the grounds that

Modern evidence, as we have seen, demonstrates that the belief that cultures developed independently at different points on the surface of the globe "through the similarity of the innate disposition of the human mind" is a belief without objective foundation, a theory not evolved from facts, but superimposed upon them. Civilization, culture, did not arise independently at various points all over the earth: there was no slow upward climb from primitive to savage, savage to barbarian, barbarian to civilized man, in the ordering beloved of the older school of historians. Civilization rose from the midst of primitive freedom, with comparative suddenness, revolutionizing human life and spreading abroad the planet much as the technique of the Solutrean blade, from one accidental point in the Old World.

That accidental point was Ancient Egypt, and the history of the beginnings of the strangest adventure of the human spirit has been set down in considerable detail by such competent investigators as Professor Grafton Elliot Smith (29), and Dr. W.J. Perry(16)

Now "C M" is not only a scholarly work; it is in fact

"a great contribution to the great task  
of Anthropology"(17)

This justifies the lengthy quotation which shows, on the one hand, that JLM's acceptance of the monogenetic theory was not confined to his fictional work only, and on the other, that there must be a different explanation accounting for his double line of thought provided that the fact must not be ascribed to his defective grasp of the subject. The assumption that his ambivalence is the result of an evolutionary line of thought is disproved by the fact that his latest published works adopt either line. In view of these facts, there is another way of looking at the problem.

Departing from the obvious and logical classification of his literary work into fiction and non-fiction, in the particular case of JLM/LGG it would be more apt to classify his work into these other two categories: **Explicit propaganda and implicit propaganda.**

I have quoted earlier on his famous assertion:

"all my books are explicit or implicit  
propaganda"(18)

whereby implicit would apply to "Religions of Ancient Mexico" for example, and explicit to "C M", and thus, more than an ambivalent line of thought, one should speak instead of a kind of tactical line of propaganda, for the recurring evidence is that he is a staunch supporter of "the Black Trinity" as he humourously called G.E. Smith, W.H.R. Rivers, and W.J. Perry, the leading figures together with Massingham probably, of the Diffusionists. This amounts to accepting that all his literature is propaganda. If so, there is no need to make any fuss about it since the present work is not intended to discuss aesthetics but only second meaning and general content. As it is, the question is then, to discuss **what** propaganda instead of

discussing why he made propaganda.

A glance at the title and at the text of this short article "Writers' International" shows that the what is of a political nature since he writes in his capacity as "revolutionary writer", stating that "not all revolutionary writers (...) are cretins". He devoted 42 lines to criticizing the thesis that advocated the formation of an organization of revolutionary writers, and reserves his last 14 lines to "a little construction":

"First, I'm in favour of a union of revolutionary writers. But this union would ..."(19)

and he contributes 4 propositions - or probably only three, for the last one says

"(d) Be a schock brigade of writers, not a P.S.A. sprawl. I hate capitalism; all my books are explicit or implicit propaganda. But because I'm a revolutionist I see no reason for gainsaying my own critical judgement - hence this letter!"(20)

It is the author who says it. But then, what is the relationship JLM/LGG's revolutionary ideas and the monogenetic theory that the Diffusionist school put forward?

A bizarre tentative answer would say that the relationship lies in the fact that the anthropologists of the Diffusionist school built their theory on the assumption that

"man is by nature conservative, a hater of change, one who clings passionately to the outworn belief as sacrosanct -"(21)

and yet, even if not altogether incorrect, it would be inappropriate, anyway. A more correct approach is to relate the problem to the controversy about whether the human being had been originally a decent

and kindly animal or whether he had been a blood-drinking ghoul of the fevered Darwinian imagination. The political implication concerning this controversy, as explained earlier on, was that the noe-evoulutionist theory

"was a godsend to the imperialist"

and JLM's literature, as political propoganda, is anti-imperialist. In his battle against capitalism (he does not seem to see any substantial difference to imperialism) JLM's decisive point - the raison d'etre of his 'war' - is that the human being was not a savage beast. This is precisely the core of the problem, and it is at this point that the Diffusionist School comes in support of the Rousseauian idea which takes them to explain the origin of culture as a fortuitous event since man "is by nature conservative". This seems to me to be the real reason why JLM/LGG became a "diffusionist". And just as

"the Diffusionists see themselves as taking over from Rousseau; (and) they take his "Origin of Inequality" and claim to put it into scientific terms"(22)

so too JLM/LGG sees himself as taking over from Rousseau and the Diffusionists and he takes their "golden age of primitive simplicity" etc. and claiming to put it into fictional terms, he puts it in what I may term political terms. This may be an oversimplificaztion, because it is obvious that JLM never launched his literary work in the arena of political fighting proper in an explicit way. But he participated in it 'actively'. Since he was not a politician he did not fight with the weapons of the politician but with those of the artist - the writer-artist, or the artist-writer. His letter "Writers' International" is in a way a kind of declaration of principles. It is his strategy and tactics which we see displayed throughout his literary production.

In the last analysis, however, one thing emerges more clearly, namely, that the author abides by the academic concept of diffusion as understood by anthropologists (see above) and therefore, his

literature includes the different processes of diffusion. In this, however, his apparent tendency is to highlight the importance of colonization and conquest on the one hand, and of revolution on the other. In the unity of these opposites, the author sees a dialectical relationship and possibly the governing principle which propels culture forward. This does not contradict the central role which his model attributes to revolution. On the contrary, it reinforces it, for conquest, and also colonization, contribute to hasten revolution which, on the one hand, is primarily a movement coming from within a given cultural group, and on the other, once triumphant, it turns itself into a powerful source of new cultural values which are subsequently diffused. In this sense, it is clear that to him, the most important revolution of our time has been the October 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. Conversely, it is also clear that to him, the presence of English imperialism overseas, in worsening the conditions of life for the majority of the people, especially the producers, was at the same time, albeit unwittingly, fostering the cultural advancement of those people, an advancement which can only lead to liberation, a process which in turn might well entail a revolution even if the mode of production remains unchanged.

This relationship between colonization and revolution may not be the only reason why the author highlights diffusion, for it is obvious that the latter presupposes the existence of a higher culture **outside** the habitat of a given cultural group, and hence, it depends entirely on making contact with a given **foreign** element according to either of the processes of diffusion. Practically all JLM/LGG's fictional work highlights this relationship and his non-fiction is to a great extent dominated by it in so far as it concerns itself mainly with: conquest - in "C M", or with exploration - NAU, H, NLMP etc., and in general with cultural questions. There may be in this some degree of correspondence with Spengler (see Chap. 15) even if for different reasons and, in any case, correspondence is only partial, since it is obvious that Spengler does not analyse the phenomenon in terms of dialectical contradictions as JLM/LGG does.

It is this principle of dialectic contradiction which, in my view,

determined another relationship in connection with diffusion - that colonization and/or conquest, whilst contributing to the dominated culture a more advanced technology and science as well as a more complex organization, also contributed a worsening in the general conditions of life for the majority of the people, thus fostering the general conditions which sooner or later will have to lead to independence. In other words, the real cultural role of colonization - more than conquest probably - is to provoke a cultural progress of significance in so far as it makes the dominated culture advance, even if unintentionally, toward a higher cultural stage by means of a process of liberation which emerges necessarily in the colonized society, and which may well lead to social revolution although not always to a new mode of production. In this relationship conquest/colonization: liberation/revolution it is easy to visualize the significance of the exile, if not as a symbol of, at least as a product of a diffusion of culture in progress either at the stage of conquest, or colonization, or liberation. This would explain why it is possible to come across exiles belonging either to the old decadent culture or to the new progressive one. It would also explain why in his fiction the exile belonging to an old culture is finally won over by the new one.

This would also explain his position concerning the relationship Egypt, the colonized: British Empire, the colonizer, and also, even if indirectly, his position concerning ancient Greece. In this connection, it might be inferred that just as he saw Christianity - and possibly, also, Islam - as the epitome of diffusion by missionization (not always it seems), he may have seen the Greeks as the best representatives of diffusion by conquest, and the British by means of colonization, with the advantage that Britain presented a modern development whereby he could see the process at work. This in turn, may be one of the main reasons why all these cultural developments become so prominent in his fiction. By contrast, this would also explain the Mongols motif - as destroyers of culture, but not as agents of diffusion. Along these lines one can also understand his interest in the Mayan civilization. In this, however, we find one of his further motifs - the relationship between the ancient Egyptians

and the Latin American cultures. His conviction that the intervention of the different processes of diffusion in History is so firm that it prompts his suggestion that these two worlds which Columbus brought into contact in the 15th century had been very closely related in the past. His section on Leif Ericsson in NAU may not be the only overt hint in that direction. But his view of diffusion as a historical necessity answers both for his apparent double line of thought on the question of the monogenetic theory concerning the origin of culture, and for his seeming romanticism concerning the incorporation of the Atlantis theme in his fiction. In doing so, he in fact leaves a door open for further research on both the origin of civilization and on Anthropology for further scientific evidence concerning the origin of humanity.

The fact that he presents Atlantis as a higher culture in relation to the beginnings of the present civilization may not be purely romantic since, in tune with his model, it may have something to do with the problem which has preoccupied men of science concerning the topic of Egypt - the question of the suddenness, in terms of historical time, with which the Egyptian civilization developed as if it had been either the product of an impressive leap forward, or as Basil Davidson puts it, the suddenness of all this growth and lavish diversity, even when the change had taken several hundred years

"has suggested a crucial political intrusion into the Nile Valley, which may have been associated with the arrival of new rulers from elsewhere (...) "It would seem probable", in Emery's view, "that the principal cause was the incursion of a new people into the Nile Valley, who brought with them the foundation of what, for want of a better designation, we call Pharaonic civilization". The late Gordon Childe was among those who have thought otherwise. He agreed that "new ethnic elements from outside the valley" may have helped towards the unification of Egypt after 3400 B.C...."(23)

Not that JLM had ever proposed a direct relationship between Atlantis and Egypt as Lewis Spence does, for his purpose, as will be seen

below, seems to go much farther than the mere origin of Egyptian civilization.

Even when his theme of Atlantis may be at odds with his motif of the 'accident' in relation to the origin of civilization in Egypt, the fact remains that in his fiction there is an Atlantis lying somewhere between Spain and Antilla thousands of years before dynastic Egypt had come into being. The implication, however, is not so much that this would rule out the 'accident' motif but that it would propose that there has existed a previous human civilization. Consequently, our civilization, or Egypt, if its origin is to be identified with that historical development, is not the only development of this kind in the history of humanity.

Certainly, this would not be an original idea since we have known the legend of Atlantis through Plato's "Critias and Timaeus", and from then on from different sources and versions. When we come to JLM/LGG the question is whether he depended more on Ignatius Donnelly's "Atlantis: the Antediluvian World" or whether on K.T. Frost's "The Lost Continent" (for there is the possibility that he might have read his article). But despite the fact that he may have had reservations, it seems that the most probable influence would have been that of Lewis Spence, for not only has he published more on the subject (three books) but also published them between 1924 and 1926, right before JLM began writing more regularly. The reason is that Spence refers to the theme of the relationship between Atlantis, Mayan Civilization and, the people of the western Europe Stone Age - the Cro-Magnon, the Magdalenian, and the Azilian, all of them so relevant in JLM/LGG's model in his battle against neo-evolutionist views on humanity. Notwithstanding this, JLM/LGG's views on Atlantis appear if not as a personal proposition on the theory of human history, at least as a compromise on the theory of evolution in relation to its relevance to his model in that there is no doubt that he was also familiar with Engel's view that

"Many hundreds of thousands of years ago, during an epoch, not yet definitely determinable, of that period of the

earth's history known to the geologists as the Tertiary period, most likely towards the end of it, a particularly high-developed race of anthropoid apes lived somewhere in the tropical zone - probably on a great continent that has now sunk to the bottom of the Indian Ocean. Darwin has given us an approximate description of these ancestors of ours.(24)

As I see it, Engels' view supports his position on two counts. Apart from confirming the idea of a sunken continent, it also highlights the notion of a highly-developed race of anthropoid apes, probably the ancestors of the Gro-Magnon, the Magdalenian, and the Azilian (see T.D. p.223). This in turn - and quite independently from the fact that Engels's sunken continent had produced or not a civilization of the Atlantis type - would provide support for his stance of Neanderthal Man as a different race that has nothing to do with Man. But above all, it would confirm diffusion as decisive in History. Now all this, taken together as part of a bigger generalization, forms the foundations of what we might call JLM/LGG's theory on origins, for there is little doubt that the author has a personal form of putting forward as a writer the truths on evolution which he has derived from scientists and which Darwin's scientific research came to confirm. This is the material he has organized in a particular way in order to combat both teleology and neo-evolutionism on the one hand, and on the other, theological faith and the Bible in particular (see chap. 7 on Imagery), i.e. there has been no creation only evolution; and there is only scientific research instead of revelation, (and as a result there is no paradise without them). Atlantis, in any case, is a challenge to Archaeology, and the latter has always been a witness to diffusion. No wonder that JLM/LGG's 'diffusionists' in his fiction are almost always related in one way or another to archaeology whenever they are not themselves archaeologists.

Summing up, JLM/LGG may be labelled "Diffusionist" in so far as he sided with the English School of Anthropology in his crusade against neo-evolutionism, being the reason why he incorporated two basic elements into his model - the Rousseauian elements of the

Diffusionists in relation to primitive man and early cultures, and their theory that Egypt was the cradle of our civilization. The Egypt theme provided him with a suitable argument in favour of his 'accident' motif which he relates in his model to the question of revolution. Revolution he sees as the most important cultural achievement. So, he was basically concerned with the role of diffusion in history as one of the processes by which culture spreads from one cultural group to another, revolution being one of the components of diffusion. But the author related diffusion to scientific research for both have a role to play in the conquest of liberty for humanity, and this is much in tune with his model since it envisages the highest culture to be achieved subsequently, both for humanity and by humanity, in that period he called The Third Civilization (see chap. 9).

CHAPTER 12 MONISM (1) - HAECKEL

Even if JLM/LGG had not bothered to guide us to Haeckel it would not have been difficult to detect his influence on him for anyone conversant with Haeckel. For my own benefit, though, JLM took good care to tell us about his early familiarity both with Haeckel and scientists like Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, etc. He tells us, for example, that when he was only 13 years of age, in his role of M.M. he voyaged the unplumbed seas with the Beagle of Captian Fitz Roy through the pages of "The Origin of Species", or that he

"secured books by Huxley and Haeckel and rejoiced with them at the discomfiture of the Deity. ("That gaseous vertebrate!")"  
(2)

It is worth noting that according to the convention of "T D" which JLM himself set down

"The passages enclosed in double quotation-marks, ("...") are taken chiefly from the autobiography"(3)

of M.M. so that the phrase within the brackets could be understood as a quotation from MM's diary, but in actual fact it is quoted from Haeckel who used the expression in his "General Morphology" of 1886 and quoted it again in his "Monism" where he refers to "homotheism"

"the anthropomorphic representation of God"

which in his opinion

"degrades this loftiest cosmic idea to that of a "gaseous vertebrate"(4)

Two years later, JLM now in his role as Gershom Jezreel in "I S", tells us that once in his childhood he went 'exiled' to bed, but in fact reading Jaeckel's "Descent of Man", which strikes one as a slip

of the pen (5), but on the next page he writes:

"The evolutionists took him to history and back, Haeckel was an early discovery, and far in the depths of time with the early Humanoids ..."(6)

Then he mentions Haeckel elsewhere. This forms part of his method, intended in my opinion to make easier for the reader the operation of interpreting his second meaning (whereby the mere name of a well-known author may stand for a whole philosophical or scientific, or intellectual issue).

JLM's literature is full of what I might term 'Haeckelism'. The climax of the story "Daybreak", for example, owes something to Haeckel's discussion of the origin of the concept psyche or spiritus whereby he quotes the old connotation of the "breath of wind", which JLM, as is typical, transforms and gives the corresponding symbolic turn.

JLM/LGG may be said to be the writer of life which is why he is also so much concerned with the problem of death. In this connection his view is similar to that of Rabelais, and, his Rabelaisian mood has been pointed out at least in relation to his trilogy (7). It is little wonder then, that he should have been impressed by Haeckel's approach to the problem, especially as dealt with in "The Wonders of Life" where he relates life to the cosmic unity of matter ruled by the law of eternal change:

"Nothing is constant but change! All existence is a perpetual flux of "being and becoming". That is the broad lesson of the evolution of the world,"(8)

he states by way of the general premise on which he then explains that

"The "miracle of life" is in essence nothing but the metabolism of the living matter, or of the plasm".(9)

And by way of conclusion he adds in a chapter which he headed "The Value of Life"

"Every special form of life - the individual as well as the species - is therefore merely a biological episode, a passing phenomenal form in the constant change of life. Man is no exception. "Nothing is constant but change," said the old maxim."(10)

which allows him to solve the problem of the human soul (and also the problem of immortality, etc.) in the following terms:

"What is briefly designated as the "human soul", is only the sum of our feeling, willing and thinking - the sum of those physiological functions whose elementary organs are constituted by their microscopic ganglion-cells of our brain."(11)

This view of life is reflected in different ways in the literature of JLM, and one is thus naturally inclined to see Haeckel's influence when John Metaxa - one of JLM's most representative characters - reflects on the chances of getting killed in the battlefield:

" "And it doesn't matter, because - already we don't exist .... Only a temporary grouping of atoms endowed with a conceit called personality ...." (...)"(12)

It is true that, as is typical in JLM, he may have blended it with other authors' views.

Admitting, on the one hand, that Haeckel is not the only scientist who may have influenced JLM since Darwin himself must be included, it would be difficult on the other, to prove that he did not derive any themes from Haeckel. Apart from the theme of constant change, which comes from the Greeks to be expanded by Engels, Marx and others as seen in Chapter 1, there is also - what can be regarded as but its

natural consequence - the relationship between decay and rebirth, for example, and the problem of immortality which is also related to the preceding ones, and even when they may have been propounded by various other authors, it looks as if JLM had actually derived them first from Haeckel. For if some scholars have detected a certain "animism" - in that the impression is that JLM's literature achieves the affect of making us feel that

"the whole environs becomes a living impersonation, an active force"(13)

- the roots of it should be sought in Haeckel's monistic philosophy chiefly (for there are other sources as well), especially when he defines Monism as a scientific approach that in relation to the existing world

"recognizes one sole substance in the universe, which is at once "God and Nature"; body and spirit (or matter and energy) it holds to be inseparable ... the intra-mundane God of the monist leads to Pantheism."(14)

Taking for granted that Haeckel influences JLM chiefly on the scientific plane (concerning human life and its relation to Nature and the Cosmos) it is also possible to credit him with having helped to reveal to JLM/LGG some social implications arising from Monism, all this, despite the fact that ultimately, their social views may diverge, especially on the ideological plane. Quite apart from Haeckel's own views on Christianity, his analyses on the subject help to elucidate JLM/LGG's position in relation to that doctrine. It is relevant to mention Haeckel's distinction that on the ethical plane Christianity is but the inheritor of much older humanistic trends, coinciding thus, with JLM/LGG's basic historical approach in general - as seen in his Diffusionism for example - and with the social and historical role of both Christ and Christianity in particular. In this connection, Haeckel wrote:

"As to the real teaching and aims of

Christ (and as to many important aspects of his life) the views of conflicting theologians diverge more and more, as historical criticism (Strauss, Feuerbach, Baur, Renan, etc.) puts the accessible facts in their true light, and draws impartial conclusions from them. Two things, certainly, remain beyond dispute - the lofty principle of universal charity, and the fundamental maxim of ethics, the "golden rule," that issues therefrom; both, however, existed in theory and in practice centuries before the time of Christ (cf. chap. xix.). For the rest, the Christians of the early centuries were generally purer Communists, sometimes "Social Democrats," who, according to the prevailing theory in Germany to-day, ought to have been exterminated with fire and sword."(15)

This idea is also recognizable in JLM as stated elsewhere in the present work.

When LGG wrote that religion is but "a corpus of archaic science" (16) he was probably thinking of Haeckel's idea that

"religion and science, would indeed blend into one"(17)

although JLM/LGG makes it clear that Religion cannot possibly succeed in any field outside the ethical one precisely because he agrees with Haeckel in rejecting

"what is called "revelation", the poetry of faith that affirms the discovery of truth in a supernatural fashion, without the assistance of reason."(18)

This idea is developed by JLM in his short story "I I W" in parable form. The social implication of the limitations of religion - Christianity in this case - are dealt with in realistic style in "A S Q" especially in connection with Robert Colquhoun.

However, JLM/LGG's literary work is pervaded by Christian

principles. Again, Haeckel wrote:

"The best part of Christian morality, to which we firmly adhere, is represented by the humanist precepts of charity and toleration, compassion and assistance."(19)

and JLM/LGG too, like Haeckel - as the latter repeatedly suggests in his works - thinks that all these virtues

"are by no means original discoveries of Christianity"(20)

It is the humanism of Christianity, or still better, the humanism of Christ's preachings, which attracts JLM/LGG. According to his model, some priests in his fiction are very much like Natural Man - Godfrey Stein of "IIW", the Reverend Ian Stevenson of "TD", the minister Robert Colquhoun of "ASQ", etc. But the same reason makes JLM/LGG reject the Church which he regards as part and parcel of Civilization. Again, this difference becomes apparent in "ASQ" and in the cycle Persian Dawns. This does not mean that JLM is a Christian of some denomination, although at times, he may react in what one may term a Christian manner - educated as he was in a Christian community. He makes reference to this, especially in his autobiographical novel "TD".

If Haeckel thought that science and religion could blend given certain preconditions, JLM (or rather his "distant cousin" LGG) has suggested that Christian and Socialist humanism are going to blend, as his theme of the story "Forsaken" insinuates, even when differing at an essential point (21). The idea is also illustrated in other works, including the trilogy, but the afterthought is that the longings and dreams of Christianity will only come true when Socialism in History creates the necessary conditions to effect the necessary changes.

Another instance of Christian themes that both JLM/LGG and Haeckel have in common is that JLM's autobiographical novels refer to the generalized attitude among Christians of regarding sex as "unclean",

whilst Haeckel accuses Christians of neglecting their bodies out of their concern with their soul alone - in this Christianity is at odds with the third "golden rule" of Haeckel, that of glorifying the beautiful. This in Haeckel's view leads to a

"false anthropism of Christianity"(22)

in the unique position it gives to humankind - purportedly the image of God - in opposition to the rest of nature and its workings, which ultimately leads to justifying

"that woman is subordinate to man, and intercourse with her is "unclean" (...)"(23)

This is part of the teachings JLM received in his peasant community, that sex was unclean, something he criticizes in his English novels, and beyond them, it also turns up in the trilogy.

The other great theme that JLM/LGG and Haeckel have in common is that of eternal change. JLM may have derived the theme of constant change from other sources directly, including Heraclitus himself (24), but he may have been introduced to it by repeating that "nothing is constant but change" (qvs) and teaching that

"Every living being is an end to itself. "Nothing is constant but change", said the old maxim." (q.v.s.)(25)

The theme of constant change is already part of a general conception of life in the universe, and it is this philosophy which JLM appreciated in Haeckel. Haeckel may have contributed most significantly to forming JLM/LGG's views of life in the universe. It is noticeable how JLM was influenced by Monism, but although he may be called a Monist of some kind I do not believe that he is the same type of monist that Haeckel was, for if JLM borrowed from him, he also disagreed with Haeckel's views, especially when referred to social questions. JLM/LGG is a monist to the extent that

"Monism ... removes the antithesis of materialism and spiritualism (or mechanism and dynamism), and unites them in a natural and harmonious system."(26)

In this, one is inclined to appreciate that Kropotkin's philosophy is essentially similar, and JLM/LGG may have borrowed from both. In any case, his disagreement with Haeckel might be better explained through his coincidences with Kropotkin, especially in so far as social and political views are concerned.

There are other discernible coincidental views and, also, some more probable influences, but what has been pointed out will suffice to give an idea of JLM/LGG's debt to Haeckel.

The problem, however, is whether Haeckel is more important in JLM/LGG's intellectual concern because of their coincidences or because of their implicit discrepancies. It is true that the same scientific facts shared by both led them to divergent interpretations of social life and social science. Nevertheless, Haeckel provides the necessary scientific basis for JLM/LGG's otherwise 'romantic' theory of humankind. For instance, Haeckel provides a scientific basis for the concept of love that JLM propounds, a concept which he shares with Rousseau and Morris, and also to a considerable extent with Christ, for love as understood by JLM can only have a social dimension. Hence when Haeckel analyzes the reason why love became one of the essential constituents of Christ's doctrine, he explains:

"Love remains the supreme moral law of rational religion, the love, that is to say, that holds the balance between egoism and altruism, between self-love and love of others. "Do to others as you would they should do to you." This natural and highest command had been taught and followed thousands of years before Christ said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself". In the human family this maxim has always been accepted as self-evident; as ethical instinct it was an inheritance derived

from our animal ancestors. It had already found a place among the herds of Apes and other social Mammals; in a similar manner, but with a wider scope, it was already present in the most primitive communities and among the hordes of the least advanced savages. Brotherly love - mutual support, succour, protection, and the like - had already made its appearance among gregarious animals as a social duty; for without it the continued existence of such societies is impossible."(27)

And yet, ironically enough, it is Haeckel who raises the question of the "conflicting theories of the origin of civilization" which is the theme that inspires as it were JLM/LGG's literature but defending other views than Haeckel, and which, incidentally, poses the controversy in terms of the contradiction between religious dualistic thought and (monistic) natural science. This controversy Haeckel explains as follows:

"The thorough and careful study of the mental life of the savage, supported by the results of anthropogeny and ethnography, has in the course of the last forty years decided the issue of this struggle between the conflicting theories of the origin of civilisation. The older theory of degeneration, based on religious beliefs, and so preferred by theologians and theosophists, declared that man - the "image of God" - was created originally with perfect bodily and mental powers, and only fell away from his high estate after the original sin. On this view the present savages are degenerate descendants of the first god-like men. (In tropical lands the anthropoid apes are in similar fashion regarded by the natives as degenerate branches of their own stem!) Although this Biblical degeneration theory is still taught in most of our schools, and even supported by a few mystic philosophers, it had lost all scientific countenance before the end of the nineteenth century. It is now replaced by the modern theory of evolution, which was represented by Lamarck, Goethe, and

Herder a century ago, and raised to a predominant position in ethnography by Darwin and Lubbock."(28)

Perhaps, it would be opportune to point out here that at first sight JLM/LGG's stance, or rather, his model, appears to have in common with the religious view of the concept of "degeneration", due probably to their common concern with the problem of 'evil'. If so, it must be emphasized that the difference in their opposite approaches to the concept of evil makes all the difference and disencumbers JLM's theory from any truly religious hangovers. In the first place, if there is any 'degeneration' connotation in his model, it has nothing to do whatsoever with the 'image-of-God' original man. Secondly, his concept of degeneration might be better termed 'pollution', although not in a Neitzschean way, and therefore, the concept of 'evil' transmutes itself into an offence committed against humankind and not against god. And thirdly, JLM/LGG is talking of dehumanization caused, among other things, by the belief in gods, which he considers totally alien to human nature. So, in relation to Haeckel's assesement of the controversy, what must be added here is that just as the religious model was replaced by the theory of evolution, so too, that theory was in turn replaced by social or neo-Darwinism and it was against this that JLM/LGG reacted, finding in the researches of the Diffusionists the scientific evidence with which he sought to disprove the neo-Darwinians and to combat social Darwinism both in culture and in politics and above all on the question pf peace! This item takes us back to our third consideration, namely, that Haeckel's Monism, if not his "monistic ethics", may have provided some of the basis for JLM/LGG's revolutionary ideas, for as Haeckel put it

"Against this monistic ethic founded on a rational knowledge of nature, it has been objected that it is fitted to undermine existing civilization, and especially that it encourages the subversive aims of social democracy".(29)

Ironically, this statement may well indicate the point where JLM/LGG both meet, and at the same time depart, for in keeping with the truths

of Monism, the flux of movement in nature includes, obviously, humanity. And if, as part of nature, there are aspects of that movement and constant change which humanity cannot be spared, the truth is that humanity in turn has created a new reality called civilization which is alien to nature - although it cannot escape the universal law of change. But it is at this point where scientists, artists, scholars are divided. For some, the same laws that govern nature are also governing humankind's social life and civilization as a whole. For others, civilization has engendered its own laws which belong to nature in the same way that culture ultimately belongs to it. The new element which intervenes, i.e. humanity itself, makes all the difference. So that, if as Haeckel explained, the brunt of the "conflicting theories of the origin of civilization" lay at the point where scientific method confronted religious belief, the triumph of the scientific approach created in turn a new different type of "conflicting theories" of the origin of civilization. This split in natural science, had its corresponding expression at social level, especially in the field of politics. Thus, if on the question of the origin of civilization JLM and Haeckel defend opposite theories, it is no wonder that as a consequence, they should end up defending opposite views on politics as well. Haeckel for instance, has even been accused of having provided some sort of scientific support for Nazi-Fascism in Germany (30). This work is not the place to discuss this topic, although, it would have been interesting to correlate FWN's ideas with some aspects of Haeckel's Moism, especially with those neo-Darwinian ideas that prompted him to maintain against Virchow that it is absurd to conceive that Darwin's contribution to science gave support to socialist theories

"For the theory of descent proclaims more clearly than any other scientific theory, that equality of individuals which socialism strives after is an impossibility, that it stands, in fact, in irreconcilable contradiction to the inevitable inequality of individuals which actually and everywhere subsists. Socialism demands equal rights, equal duties, equal possessions, equal enjoyments for every citizen alike; the theory of descent proves, in exact

opposition to this, that the realisation of this demand is a pure impossibility, and that in the constitutionally organised communities of men, as of the lower animals, neither rights nor duties, neither possessions nor enjoyments have ever been equal for all the members alike nor ever can be."(31)

This statement deserves comparison with Marx's analysis of equality, especially as expressed in his "Critique of the Gotha Programme", which, incidentally, is relevant to JLM/LGG's model since in this, he is likely to be on Marx's side. Haeckel insists on this point arguing that there is in nature a "cruel and merciless struggle for existence" which leads on to his using concepts like the "fittest" or even the "chosen ones", until by way of conclusion he asserts that

"this principle of selection is nothing less than democratic, on the contrary, it is aristocratic in the strictest sense of the word."(32)

Here we find the symptom, or the result, of an overall intellectual battle which having started as a theory of the origin of civilization, centred round the question of evolution, which united many scientists against religious dogma and then divided them politically as soon as the scientific truths affected the foundations of humankind's social organization, and the ethics of such a way of life in particular.

"A strong counter current of mystical and irrational thought was to appear towards the end of the period. A much more pervasive influence came from the biological sciences, particularly the new enunciated theory of evolution, though psychology was also influenced by physiology, and archaeology by palaeontology. The association of the social and the biological sciences was to bring to the social sciences something of the habits of observation and inductive logic, and thus to break down to some extent the habit of using deductive argument from first principles that they

had inherited from Aristotle and the Church. But it was also to produce a belief that sociology was simply human biology, which was to have such catastrophic results in our own time."(33)

In this way, the problem of evolution ended up by pushing scholars to the political arena whereby most of them sided with an aristocratic interpretation of evolution whilst another group - apparently less numerous - interpreted the laws of evolution as confirming the natural ethics of democracy. I am far from intending to suggest that the split takes its origin in a purely scientific dispute. But nobody can deny that the antagonism is expressed in scientific terms when people like Haeckel maintained that

"In Nature, as in human society, reigns everywhere a battle of all against all, remorseless and unceasing. And as the number of places in the world is limited, as space and food only exist in sufficient quantity for a very small proportion of the germs, the majority must of necessity perish.

Now it is clear that, on the average, in this fight for existence, those individuals of the same species will conquer and outlive others that are in any way better organised, possess more strength to withstand their adversaries, greater readiness to beget offspring, or in some other way have, through any special quality of organisation, an advantage over others. On the whole, it will always be the weaker and worse individuals that succumb and die out, the stronger and better that survive and propagate their kind. As this advance is repeated by the same species through many generations, a continual advance in perfection of organisation must result."(34)

Again, this deserves comparison with Engels' views on Darwin's discoveries.

These two paragraphs in the quotation contain the gist of the problem. The first paragraph poses the problem, but not all agree on the assumption that the battle for all against all reigns everywhere in nature and in human society. There are those who while admitting that it happens thus in nature, deny that it may happen in human society. But there are also those who deny that it may happen in nature itself, on the grounds that the real principle in nature would be that of mutual aid, as Kropotkin, for example, maintains. Now, there is much in common between Kropotkin and Haeckel and still more between Kropotkin and JLM/LGG, as will be seen.

CHAPTER 13 ANARCHISM - KROPOTKIN

A chapter in "TD" contains some valuable information concerning part of JLM's intellectual background, part of his biographical experience, and also, part of his political development. In that sub-chapter, despite the hero's state of mind, JLM not only mentions Kropotkin but also suggests his sympathy for him. The context is somewhat misleading in view of its sceptical political line which in the end leaves us with the impression that M.M. had joined the political group mentioned there more as a result of his being "anti" most things rather than for being "pro" anything. This was at least so, during that period of life when as a young man M.M. was still to go through a tragic experience which was going to mark a turning point in his life:

"After extensive research among the war-shattered fragments of the British Socialist Party he had joined a seceding wing, the Left Communist Group of Glasgow. That was in January. In mid-February, such the power of his youthful enthusiasm and sincerity, he found himself elected the Group 'co-secretary.' The other secretary was the white-bearded Anton Meierkhold, then a Professor of Russian Literature and now an exile in Siberia from the Soviets. The Group was aggressively anti-war and anti-constitutional, and Malcolm, crusader against both the challenge of the stars and that savage cruelty which sent old men to beg their bread in the streets, went to the logical extreme of his knighthood. He was far from the 'National Socialist' patriotism of Dundon."(1)

What we really have in this passage is some information concerning JLM's (in his fictional role as M.M.) political interests motivated by his loathing of authority, violence, and cruelty - all of them highlighted in his model - but at the same time, concerning "the challenge of the stars", signifying generally the unknown. Thus the passage conveys a twofold symbolic meaning. On the one hand, the motif can be associated with religious belief and its relationship

with authority, and hence, the relationship of authority with violence and with cruelty. We know that JLM maintained that Religion had been introduced by Civilization and that it is both an archaic science of theory of knowledge and a form of domination over human beings. On the other hand, "the challenge of the stars" is associated with the Walls-of-the-World motif (see chapt. 7). JLM saw the foundations of his literary subject-matter, for the challenge implied a crusade against the unknown - a crusade intended not only for those "Nine Against the Unknown" but for humankind as a whole - intended to both liberate Man and transform him into the conqueror of the Galaxy, although, according to JLM's views such a conquest is meaningless without the previous humanization of civilization as G H suggests (2). The need for a humanization of civilization becomes, thus, an immediate challenge and, therefore, this challenge calls for a political action of some kind. This seems to be the reason behind that "extensive research among the war-shattered fragments of the British Socialist Party", (q.v.s.) etc., shattered not so much by the effects of the war as by its policy previous to the war as JLM would emphasize again in other works. In this political context he introduces "the white-bearded Anton Meierkhold", who, apart from reminding us of AS, anticipates in fact Kropotkin, not only because of being described as "white-bearded" but also because, like Kropotkin, he returned to Russia after 1917 even if as an "exile" of some kind. Nevertheless, it is significant that JLM presents a fictional A M, impersonating Kropotkin, "exiled in Siberia" when in real life Kropotkin lived unmolested - and in fact very much respected by the bolsheviks including Lenin himself - in Dimitrov near Moscow until his death in 1921. Provided that JLM really meant Kropotkin, it is significant also that eleven months later when "PDEN" was published AS (also a Professor of (English) Literature as seen in chap. 3) is reported to have

"gone home to work with the sovyets"(3)

when the reason for his exile in Egypt had been motivated by the fact that he had been on the side of the reaction against the bolsheviks, the same bolsheviks with whom he has now gone to work in the soviets.

The information contained in the passage quoted above can be best understood if set against the information contained in the concluding paragraph of the same sub-chapter since they are closely connected both in content and intention:

"Meierkhold was a sentimentalist, a gentle soul as much out of place in the Left Communist Group of Glasgow as he was later to prove in the blood and iron government of Stalin. He suffered agonies from the War. Each recorded battle, each list of casualties made him wince as from a personal hurt. 'Akh God, this carnage!' he would say, and cover his face with his hands and then in self-defence grope back into dreams with his beloved Kropotkin, to picturing a future earth of grain and flowers, a paradise of the leisured craftsman and the happy peasant, without sin or blood ...

These three were representative socialists. Probably, indeed, they were the flower of the Group, and to Malcolm, oddly romantic realist that he was, they were presently to seem as sincere and selfish and utterly silly as three Neolithic shamans plotting the perpetuity of desirable Neolithicisms in the Druid's Circle of Stane Muir."(4)

This is the passage that introduces some confusion at first. However, taking into account JLM's general pessimism in politics, his subsequent anarchism, together with his romanticism - no matter how "realist", and especially, taking into account the social ethics on which his model is founded, one cannot help feeling that Meierkhold, as a fictional character, might have more in common with JLM himself in real life than with Kropotkin, and therefore, he was bound to be out of place in the "blood and iron government of Stalin". And yet, JLM leads us to regard both A M and Kropotkin as "dreamers" in the negative sense of the word - for JLM uses the term in his own model, and so does Kropotkin, in a positive connotation - since M M, being "romantic" can also be a dreamer, but being at the same time a

"realist" is different from those two who seek a social order which may have more real existence in their imagination than in concrete reality. It seems to me that here JLM is pointing out what to him is like the Achilles's heel of Kropotkin's anarchism.

The word "perpetuity" conveys the idea of a conservatism which is recognizable at times in Kropotkin's works due perhaps to his emphasis on the role of the peasantry in the anarchist society of his dreams. But this is not the place to pursue this idea. What can be said in brief here, is that his allusion to Kropotkin is in fact a critique of his model which in the eyes of JLM may appear as unfeasible even if altogether "desirable". But this critique does not disqualify Kropotkin's theories for inclusion in his model, as will be seen below. Apart from this, the notable thing is that M M's political group described as Left Communist Group, in what I regard as a symbolic connotation, is said to possess characteristics which correspond to other three conceptions of Socialism, namely, the Christian, the Anarchistic, and what in JLM's own words we may term as 'Romantic Realism'.

The Christian brand of socialism is represented by one of the leaders of the group, the evicted schoolmaster, who

"would prove that God had always been on the side of the working man, that Isaiah was an early Engels, Christ a practical revolutionist, St. Paul a more enthusiastic socialist than Proudhon."(5)

The other conception of socialism was AM's Anarchism modelled on Kropotkin's ideas. And the third conception of Socialism was MM's 'Romantic Realism' which seems to be after all the type of Socialism JLM may have conceived to be his own, by 1931 -. It is interesting to observe that by then JLM defined his alter ego MM as a left Communist and as a "romantic realist" who shared the philosophy of his political group which was "aggressively anti-war and anti-constitutional" and was at the same time the co-secretary of a political group that harboured at least three socialist approaches. The two paragraphs

quoted in (1) and (4) go respectively at the beginning and at the end of Sub-chapter xi of chapter III The Walls of the World in "T D". In between there is both political data of highly autobiographical value, and plenty of critique of the politics of Civilization as well as denunciation of social evil. The relationship between MM and AM suggests a kind of father-son relationship, just as Kropotkin would have stood in relation to JLM. In the novel "I S" there is a similar relationship between Gershom Jezreel and George Shaw, his uncle. Now Gershom has a lot in common with MM, and JLM leads us also to associate Shaw with Alfred Percival Maudslay, the archaeologist whose book "A Glimpse of Guatemala" must have proved very valuable to JLM's scholarly interests. There is little doubt that JLM expressed in this way his admiration for the scientist and his work. At the same time he weaves a number of symbolic connotations in leading us to associate his fictional names with those of real people, the author himself being one of the most important of those real people. The father-son relationship may adopt the form of an elder brother-younger brother relationship. This may be the case in "T D" in the friendship between John Metaxa - the elder brother - and MM now in his role of younger brother to Metaxa. This may also be the case in the implied allegorical relationship between AS in the Polychromata series (or in CC) and his young interlocutor - presumably the reader him/herself. The relationship is marked by an essential identity of their views of society and especially of humankind, which can be defined generally as their love of humankind, even when this love is usually expressed in different ways: love of exploration and/or of science (archaeology in the case of George Shaw and Gershom Jezreel), self-sacrifice on behalf of social change in search of freedom (MM and AM), and even hatred of social evil (JLM and MM), etc. The psychoanalyst will probably see here some sort of connection with JLM's childhood and family background, especially the father-son relationship. But JLM, the 'diffusionist', is pointing to one of the mechanisms of the transmission of culture, and the way in which the new is born out of the old, and how the former's powerful drive can break through class ideology. A similar relationship contributed to changing Kropotkin's life in his early youth when Prince Kropotkin became a revolutionary anarchist. In fact, whilst still a junior officer in the Czar's army

serving in Siberia, Kropotkin's first appointment was as aide-de-camp to General Kukel, a friend of Bakunin, and probably as a result, himself an anarchist of the Bakunin trend. It is not a question of deciding whether it was the social impact of the prisoners in Siberia, or whether it was Kukel's political teachings that were decisive in changing Kropotkin's social thought for it may have been the combination of various influences. The fact is that Kukel played an important role in the formation of Kropotkin's intellectual and political background, just as Bakunin had played an important role in the political education of Kukel, Bakunin in turn having been influenced by Herzen, etc.

The fictional relationship Malcolm Maudslay-John Metaxa in "T D" is almost a copy of the real-life relationship Kukel-Kropotkin in Siberia. Obviously this could be regarded as coincidence, and only as mere coincidence if, on the other hand, JLM's literature were not so full of the social content which Kropotkin's anarchism was concerned with. Not only that, JLM's production is full of the point of view, or ideological stance of Kropotkin, which is recognizable in his solid line of thought.

I would suggest that the passage quoted from "T D" indicates a connection of some kind between JLM and Kropotkin's ideas - where the latter is represented by AM and the former by MM - and that there is also something in common between Kropotkin, AS, and possibly other characters in other works. As seen above, the difference with AM is that he went into exile in Siberia on his return to Russia. Kropotkin, despite his detachment from the Bolsheviks, did help them discretely. Lenin was an admirer of Kropotkin, and the Bolsheviks never molested him in spite of his refusal to get involved with them. But in his fiction JLM was certainly at liberty to suggest that the anarchists who did not collaborate with the Soviets were likely to end up in exile, which in any case harmonizes with an earlier view of the author on the subject of the Bolshevik Revolution whereby it is clear that he was highly critical of it just as Kropotkin himself was, even when towards the end of his life he admitted the historical significance of the 1917 Revolution. It would be interesting to draw

a parallel between Kropotkin and JLM concerning their political ideas especially referring to the issue of the 1917 Revolution. For the time being it is useful to include the following quotation intended to illustrate Kropotkin's basic position on the issue:

"Irreconcilable as he was to the Bolsheviks, Kropotkin even more vigorously opposed foreign intervention in Russia or counter-revolutionary movements"(6)

According to what he wrote from Dimitrov near Moscow where he had settled, the reason seems to be that

"the Russian Revolution - which is trying to build a society in which all productive work, technical ability and scientific knowledge will be entirely communal - is not a mere accident in the struggle of contending parties. It was prepared by almost a century of socialist and communist propaganda, since the days of Robert Owen, Saint Simon and Fourier."(7)

That is to say, in Kropotkin's view, this revolution was removing the causes of social injustice which he had denounced, and it was carrying through the changes he himself had advocated. He had written for example:

"We must understand and admit without hesitation or reserve that all the instruments and products of human labour are due to the united labour of all, and have but one proprietor - Humanity"(8)

And he had also advocated that:

"We need above everything to spread the truths already mastered by science, to make them part of our daily life, to render them common property. We have to order things so that all, so that the mass of mankind may be capable of understanding and applying them; we have

to make science no longer a luxury but the foundation of everyman's life."(9)

and Kropotkin was aware that the bolsheviks were also making "communal" both the technical ability and the scientific knowledge. This may have contributed in part to his becoming more sympathetic to the bolsheviks in his last years.

JLM's views on the social role of scientific knowledge may have much in common with Kropotkin's ideas. He may be indebted to Kropotkin alongside Engels and others. As his story "FTS" shows in allegorical form (and other stories also confirm) JLM sees science and technology as the material base that can make possible and feasible humankind's salvation, for science means knowledge, and therefore, power over nature. Hence his theme of the geographical exploration and the symbolic meaning of the explorers (see chapt. 7). It might not be mere coincidence that Kropotkin had done geographical exploration in Siberia in his youth and that he was in fact a geographer. JLM makes exploration into a symbol of scientific research, and at the same time, into a symbolic psychological trait that reflects humaneness in one of its utmost degrees. All this has much in common with Kropotkin's assertion that

"science has taught man how powerful mankind is in its progressive march, if it skillfully utilizes the unlimited energies of Nature."(10)

JLM's literature is full of this thought and hence of scientific research and of characters whose passion is research or exploration. It would be easier to earmark the works in which the theme is not present, for it normally is in one way or another.

When JLM/LGG traces the origin of social evil back to the inception of civilization, he may be following Rousseau, but he is following Kropotkin, and possibly Engels also, although in a somewhat different way, when insisting on the negative role of the State as the true oppressor of humankind (see also chapt. 4). It is true that this idea

can be traced back to Bakunin - and even further back - together with the idea of opposition to all authority, but JLM never referred to Bakunin. I assume that he derives his anarchistic views mainly from Kropotkin. Thus he is close to him when he deprecates law and authority, although both are part and parcel of the State. To JLM law and authority not only represent repression and its aftermath: violence, cruelty, and dehumanized savagery (see gendarmes motif in chapt. 7). Some critics have pointed out the recurrence of cruelty in JLM/LGG's works and have deduced some negative effects from it. The explanation however, lies in his deep concern for human suffering, which makes him in turn see in pity and compassion the real human tendency. His political stance as to the relationship between cruelty and the State, between dehumanization and law, between suppression of freedom and authority, etc. owes a great deal to Kropotkin's conception of the State as irreconcilable with the real longing of humankind. Deprived thus of his most natural possession, Man is bound to rebel and to seek the road to freedom through Revolution:

"Rebels are everywhere to be found, who no longer wish to obey the law without knowing whence it comes, what are its uses, and whither arises the obligation to submit to it, and the reverence with which it is encompassed. The rebels of our day are criticising the very foundations of Society, which have hitherto been held sacred, and first and foremost amongst them that fetish, law. Just for this reason, the upheaval which is at hand, is no mere insurrection, it is a Revolution.

The critics analyse the sources of law, and find there, either a god, product of the terrors of the savage, and stupid, paltry and malicious as the priests who vouch for its supernatural origin, or else, bloodshed, conquest by fire and sword. They study the characteristics of law, and instead of perpetual growth corresponding to that of the human race, they find its distinctive trait to be immobility, a tendency to crystallise what should be modified and developed day by day. They ask how law has been maintained, and in its service they see

the atrocities of Byzantinism, the cruelties of the Inquisition, the tortures of the Middle Ages, living flesh torn by the lash of the executioner, chains, clubs, axes, the gloomy dungeons of prisons, agony, curses and tears. In our own days they see, as before, the axe, the cord, the rifle, the prison; on the one hand, the brutalised prisoner, reduced to the condition of a caged beast by the debasement of his whole moral being, and on the other, the judge, stripped of every feeling which does honor to human nature, living like a visionary in a world of legal fictions, revelling in the inflection of imprisonment and death, without even suspecting, in the cold malignity of his madness, the abyss of degradation into which he has himself fallen before the eyes of those whom he condemns."(11)

I have quoted extensively so as to show more clearly how Kropotkin transfers to his canvas his own vision of reality. This corresponds to Phase III of JLM/LGG's model. It can be said that an important part of JLM's literary work finds its materials in this picture of civilization. His characters are mostly rebels, revolutionists, and freedom fighters. He denounces everywhere atrocities and bloodshed against humanity perpetrated by the law and by authority, by war and conquest, and even by religious ritual or by fanaticism. There is also his condemnation of human suffering, be it the pain of the living flesh or the agony of the gloomy dungeon or prison, etc. His "Polychromata" series and his "PDEN" short story cycles contain all these themes, and his novels are either based on one or more of these themes or include a number of them. Even his non-fiction is guided by some form or another of human suffering or cruelty. A great part of his diffusionism in "C M" is concerned with war and conquest and cruelty, religious ritual in the form of human sacrifices, etc. His essays do not fail to refer to human suffering either.

I am not suggesting that JLM's intellectual background must perforce be understood as modelled on Kropotkin's intellectual approach. I have already shown sundry sources for JLM's themes and motifs, and therefore a good deal of content which is related to other

influences which can, nevertheless, be identified as belonging to the humanist tradition. But his views on social questions seem to owe a great deal to Kropotkin. Let us examine as an example, Kropotkin's analysis of the origin of wars in one of his pamphlets:

"All States - we saw in our previous article - as soon as the great industries and the huge trading concerns develop among their people, become unavoidably involved in wars. They are driven to them by their own manufacturers, and even by their own working classes, in order to conquer new markets - that is, new sources of easily obtained riches. Moreover, in every State there exists nowadays a class - a clique, I should say - infinitely more powerful than the manufacturing class, and which also incites to war. It is composed of great financiers and rich bankers, who intervene in international relations, and who foment wars.

It happens nowadays in a very simple way."(12)

We have already seen how JLM deals with the theme of war in allegorical form in "HWS". War is present in most of his novels, and in all of them JLM blames Civilization, i.e. the State. The novel that seems to have been inspired by Kropotkin's ideas of the type quoted above, is "T G B" (q.v.p.) in which one of the main characters is an arms manufacturer, or "great financier", and therefore, one "who foments wars". For the benefit of such a character - and of all those who like him have justified wars on the basis of accepting as valid the premise of an 'ascent' of Man from savagery to civilization - JLM organizes his setting for the novel in the Stone Age 25000 years ago to show that the Golden Age hunters were not only peaceful and kind and gentle, etc. but also did not know concepts such as enemy or war. This line of thought - surprising for many, no doubt - is also related to Kropotkin's influence.

Kropotkin is acknowledged to have been one of the first to react against the evolutionists' interpretations of Darwin's scientific work

because such a trend of scientificism ran counter to his own ethics which he claimed to be in harmony with the morality of nature. This is not surprising in Kropotkin since he is not only a geographer, he is also credited with having contributed scientific support to the theory of glacialization of continents in his research on the glacial period, a problem which reappears in JLM's fiction (see TGB for ex.) so that he is not a mere dilettante whenever he discusses scientific questions. What is surprising in Kropotkin is that in his view of natural science there is a remarkable coincidence with some of E. Haeckel's ideas, not only in that, like him, he conceives that every organism is the product of its environment as a result of an incessant process of evolution through growth and decay in which living matter has evolved from the simplest forms to the infinite variety of beings, but also in his appreciation of the law of the indestructibility of energy through all the ceaseless transformations which it undergoes in the universe, a discovery which he assesses as the greatest achievement of modern science since the knowledge of that principle

"accustoms man to conceive the life of the universe as a never-ending series of transformations of energy: mechanical energy may become converted into sound, light, electricity; and conversely, each of these forms of energy may be converted into others. And among all these transformations, the birth of our planet, its evolution, and its final, unavoidable destruction and reabsorption in the great Cosmos are but an infinitesimally small episode - a mere moment in the life of the stellar worlds."(13)

That there is a surprising coincidence with both Engels and Haeckel in this there is no doubt, or so it seems to me, but I shall leave it to the specialist to establish in what way this is different from Haeckel's Monism, especially when Kropotkin even coincides with him in the concept of the "unavoidable destruction" of our planet and its "reabsorption in the great Cosmos", etc. (see chapt. XIII, VIII of "The Riddle of the Universe" (p. 198 in the 1913 ed.)). Whatever the situation, one thing is clear: JLM's coincidence with both is obvious, except for the last part of the quotation, since apparently, he never

referred to it, or never put it like that. Notwithstanding, there is evidence, as shown in V above, that JLM had read Haeckel directly, so that there is no cause for inferring that his 'Haeckelism' may be but a different form of his 'Kropotkinism', or vice versa, for in fact the coincidence of thought with Haeckel comes to a sharp ending as soon as they consider the problem of evolution, or rather of neo-Darwinism evolutionism. The discrepancy is not only scientific, it has far-reaching political, sociological, and ethical implications.

This brings us back to Kropotkin's contribution to the theory of evolution in so far as its anthropological implications are concerned, and it is at this point that JLM comes still closer to Kropotkin and where he objectively departs from E. Haeckel, and from Huxley and the evolutionists, including Herbert Spencer and of course Mr. H.G. Wells, his former idol of his early years (see literary influences in chap. 9). It must have been through William Morris that he came across Kropotkin's literature since Morris had not only met Kropotkin in London but had collaborated with him in some sort of political or editing work.

Kropotkin's merit lies in that he opposed the principle of "mutual aid" to that of the struggle of all against all as the real force behind the process of evolution, since it makes possible the preservation of the species both in animals and in humankind. He does not deny the struggle between different species but he denies that this should be understood as the rule, for the only rule is that of mutual aid, especially within a given species or, as he himself put it:

"Without trying to minimize the fact that an immense number of animals live either upon species belonging to some lower division of the animal kingdom, or upon some smaller species of the same class as themselves, I indicated that warfare in Nature is chiefly limited to struggle between different species, but that within each species, and within the groups of different species which we find living together, the practice of mutual aid is the rule, and therefore this last

aspect of animal life plays a far greater part than does warfare in the economy of Nature."(14)

The gist of this concept is generally illustrated in the so-called 'English' literary production of JLM or 'diffusionist' works. Mutual Aid as the natural instinct among human beings is highlighted in all his works even in those that deal with war, for in his model at least his battle against the "Darwinians" and the "evolutionist clap-trap", for example, is related to his battle against war (15). But if JLM found in Kropotkin, and particularly in his "Ethics", the general formulations of a humanistic philosophy, he sought the scientific foundations for his convictions in the validity of the research work carried out by the English Diffusionists (see chap. 11). Having followed Huxley and even Keith at first, apart from Darwin himself, and later Haeckel to a considerable degree, he does not seem to go along with Kropotkin's idea of mutual aid as the general rule in the realm of animal life. At any rate, it is not clear whether he accepts Kropotkin's notion that

"Figuratively speaking, it is a universal law of organic evolution, and this is why the sense of Mutual Aid, Justice, and Morality are rooted in man's mind with all the force of an inborn instinct - the first instinct, that of Mutual Aid, being evidently the strongest, while the third, developed later than the others, is an unstable feeling and the least imperative of the three."(16)

although it looks as if he accepted it partially only as being valid for the human species in so far as he agrees with Kropotkin in conceiving altruism and self-sacrifice as normal - most natural and most humane of the attributes of our species - which in Kropotkin's opinion deserve

"the name of morality, properly speaking, although most writers confound them, under the name of altruism, with the mere sense of justice."(17)

And yet, he may, after all, accept such an idea if, instead of interpreting it as sheer romanticism, we interpret his tame-wild-beast motif as a tribute to Kropotkin's Mutual Aid principle, of which, the black-maned lion of FOS in PDEN, and Rem's wolf in GH would be cases in point. But then, they are both related to the Natural Man of the Golden Age motif. Anyhow, there is no doubt that JLM/LGG agreed with Kropotkin in their common views about Christ and Christianity in so far as the humanist content of the doctrine is concerned. This humanist content both JLM and Kropotkin seek to find materialized not in a religious social order set up in accordance to Christian conceptions but in a communal anarchist society. For JLM like Kropotkin conceives Anarchism as a

"conception of the Universe based on the mechanical interpretation of phenomena, which comprises the whole of Nature, including the life of human societies and their economic, political, and moral problems. Its method is that of natural sciences, and every conclusion it comes to must be verified by this method if it pretends to be scientific. Its tendency is to work out a synthetic philosophy which will take in all facts of Nature, including the life of societies, without, however, falling into the errors of Comte and Spencer, which were due to reasons already pointed out."(18)

There is plenty of evidence in JLM's literature that he is guided by this philosophy in general, and also that his philosophy of literature is mainly guided by this monistic sort of view of nature, life, humanity and society, etc., for there is also evidence both in his personal literary style at least and in his admiration for the Romantics in particular, especially Shelley, that he conceived - like Kropotkin - that

"If the contemplation of the Universe and a close acquaintance with Nature were able to infuse lofty inspiration into the minds of the great naturalists and poets of the nineteenth century, - if a look

into Nature's breast quickened the pulse of life for Goethe, Shelley, Byron, Lermontov, in the face of the raging storm, the calm mountains, the dark forest and its inhabitants, - why should not a deeper penetration into the life of man and his destinies be able to inspire the poet in the same way? And when the poet has found the proper expression for his sense of communion with the Cosmos and his unity with his fellow-men, he becomes capable of inspiring millions of men with his high enthusiasm"(19)

The presence of such feelings in JLM's literature has made critics react in different degrees of disapproval (see chap. 2,II) and some have even confused with conservatism this anarchistic philosophy which as Kropotkin himself points out came as the inevitable result of the intellectual movement in natural science which began towards the end of the eighteenth century. He also points out its relationship with the French Revolution - or with the "defeat of the French Revolution" as he puts it - and with the revival of science in the middle part of the nineteenth century.

Whilst it is true that JLM felt identified with this anarchistic philosophy in general, it would be wrong to infer that he accepted every aspect of it all the time. A similar caution must be adopted concerning the social implications of that philosophy, especially when Anarchism transmutes itself into a political doctrine. For the sake of clarity, let us quote from Kropotkin's writings once more:

"The Anarchists conceive a society in which all the mutual relations of its members are regulated, not by laws, not by authorities, whether self-imposed or elected, but by mutual agreements between the members of that society, and by a sum of social customs and habits - not petrified by law, routine, or superstition, but continually developing and continually readjusted, in accordance with the ever-growing requirements of a free life, stimulated by the progress of science, invention, and the steady growth of higher ideals.

No ruling authorities, then. No government of man by man; no crystallisation and immobility, but a continual evolution - such as we see in Nature. Free play for the individual, for the full development of his individual gifts - for his individualisation. In other words, no actions are imposed upon the individual by a fear of punishment; none is required from him by society, but those which receive his free acceptance. In a society of equals this would be quite sufficient for preventing those unsociable actions that might be harmful to other individuals and to society itself, and for favouring the steady moral growth of that society.

This is the conception developed and advocated by the Anarchists."(20)

The essential element that captivates JLM's sensibility is the question of human freedom in a society "in which all the mutual relations", etc. are regulated by "mutual agreement ... stimulated by the progress of science, invention," etc. On the issue of the innate goodness of human nature, there is something in common between Kropotkin's anarchism, and Diffusionism, in that the original good nature of the human being is implied in his allegation that the

"man who is called "criminal" is simply unfortunate; that the remedy is not to flog him, to chain him up, or to kill him on the scaffold or in prison, but to relieve him by the most brotherly care, by treatment based on equality, by the usages of life amongst honest men. In the next revolution we hope that this cry will go forth:"(21)

Now, this view is the dominant note in what I might call JLM's ethics of evolution. We have seen in "FTS" that Southcote does not receive any punishment since JLM is not concerned with 'justice' as understood by Civilization, let alone with punishment. We also saw in "HWS" that Andrei Bal'mont forgave those other "dreamers" who had driven him from his country. In "CC" there is a dramatic illustration of this scene

in which Elia treats the murderer of his love as an "unfortunate" person. The last story in the same volume also illustrates the point even if in a more allegorical way. The clearest case, however, - considering the popularity of JLM's works - is probably the scene we find in "Sp" in which the Strategos refuses to punish with death the aristocratic Lavinia, the Roman woman who had so badly harmed the slaves (see chap. 7).

JLM's political ideas may be a bit puzzling for us, but whatever his proficiency in politics, he had a clear idea of what he wanted by way of a more human relationship among human beings. What he wanted can best be summarized in Kropotkin's views of what the "next revolution" was expected to achieve:

"Burn the guillotines; demolish the prisons; drive away the judges, policemen, and informers - the impurest race upon the face of the earth; treat as a brother the man who has been led by passion to do ill to his fellow; above all, take from the ignoble products of middle-class idleness the possibility of displaying their vices in attractive colours; and be sure that but few crimes will mar our society."

The main supports of crime are idleness, law and authority; laws about property; laws about government, laws about penalties and misdemeanours; and authority, which takes upon itself to manufacture these laws and to apply them.

No more laws! No more judges! Liberty, equality and practical human sympathy are the only effectual barriers we can oppose to the anti-social instincts of certain amongst us."(22)

This excerpt contains the essential revolutionary creed of JLM/LGG, at least in so far as the aims and ultimate results are concerned although not so much probably in terms of the ways and means to attain those ends. But we can also notice a difference in their diagnosis of the causes of crimes. According to JLM, the problem takes its origin in the question of social inequality, specifically in relation to the

unequal distribution of the means of subsistence as seen earlier on. I have pointed out above how JLM was critical of Kropotkin's political model as seen through his criticism of A M in his capacity as co-secretary of a political group which in the eyes of M M (co-secretary of the same group) had no future because it was not founded on reality. That passage was somewhat weak because, among other things, the criticism in question was not intended for Kropotkin directly, nor was it levelled at his Anarchism specifically, but to the Left Communist Group as such, or more precisely, to the three leaders of it - or again, to his distinguishing three different conceptions of Socialism - so it can now be seen that JLM may have agreed all the time on the question of the objectives in general, but not in the means of achieving that liberty, that equality, and that practical human sympathy. Thus, reaffirming that JLM was an anarchist of some kind markedly influenced by Kropotkin, it must be kept in mind however, that JLM may have believed in a different political road to follow, since he acknowledges that he was also

"vaguely in dispute over the plan of campaign"(23)

with another socialist. It is also possible to affirm that JLM, as a 'politician', was not in a position to determine any political road leading to the Revolution he advocated, although he thought he could see the flaws of the anarchists. Notwithstanding this, we must not forget one of JLM's most attractive characters of the "Polychromata" series: Utro (the Russian word for dawn) in the story "Vernal". Utro is described as

"ex-aristo, revolutionist,  
anarchist."(24)

who at the time of the 1917 Revolution in Russia

"had passed to the Sovyeti, to Lunacharsky and the Department of Education and Culture"(25)

in his sincere decision to help to carry through the Revolution

"But his anarchism was of the soul, and there was no discipline that might tame him."(26)

Utro is a symbolic character as his very name indicates, and his greatest symbolism lies in that being a revolutionist - in spite of being an "aristo" he is still Natural Man at heart - he cannot surrender his zest for freedom even to the Revolution he advocates, for, in JLM's views, he is guided by the longing of the soul of humanity whose true nature is neither captivated by strife nor by discipline, but only by anarchy.

There are two planes in JLM/LGG's symbolism which correspond to the essential contradiction between Nature and Civilization. One is the plane of the innate humaneness of the human being which JLM identifies with freedom in the first place. The other is the 'Faustian' component of Civilization which looks forward to conquering the Galaxy and the stars. JLM sees a basic dialectical contradiction in those two aspects of humanity's personality, for in this gigantic struggle intended to tame nature in order to harness its tremendous energy on behalf of humankind, humanity must perforce lose their original freedom, but this loss must in due course transmute itself into material power and freedom, all in one. This may be another difference with Kropotkin even when the latter had first adumbrated the same relationship between humankind and the "unlimited energies of nature" (q.v.s.), and had also emphasized the need for having "dreams".

In short, JLM's anarchism pursues a superior type of human society that lies ahead in history. His conviction is that it can be achieved with the assistance of scientific knowledge and social Revolution, but that Anarchism is an end in itself. His view is that scientific knowledge will help to solve economic and material problems, but Revolution will make it possible for that knowledge - a power in itself - to serve the right ends in order to bring about Anarchism. That is why JLM's anarchism does not combat politics. He accepts the

politics of Revolution as a means even if as a 'necessary evil'. Hence his critical stance and his criticism which becomes harsher when levelled at the political parties of the Revolution which he sees as not doing their job correctly. Nevertheless, it must be pointed out here that when he brings his model of society down to earth, his heroes do take the responsibilities of Revolution. The most conspicuous case is that of Ewan Tavendale in GG. If this development is not essentially different from the guiding force in "Revolt" (1929) and "Dieneke's Dream" in 1931 (short stories in "PDEN") one may presume that his anarchism was not of the brand of anarchism which combats all kind of political power including the proletarian political power. It is even possible to conclude that by 1934 he was undergoing some sort of a political evolution. Nevertheless, this would not necessarily indicate that his views on Anarchism as an end had changed, that is, he might never abandon his dream of a society without a State, without institutions, etc., and without political parties. But he saw in Fascism an antagonistic force of such a nature that only a well-organized proletariat guided by both a scientific ideology and better leadership could defeat.

CHAPTER 14 FEMINISM: BEBEL. OTHER PROBABLE INFLUENCES

In a letter to Joseph Bloch, dated September 21-22, 1890, Friedrich Engels wrote:

"According to the materialist conception of history, the ultimately determining factor in history is the production and reproduction of real life."(1)

It seems to me that JLM/LGG was one of those people who understood the founders of scientific socialism in these terms. For, in my opinion, there is little doubt that in the last analysis he was concerned with the problem of production as the material basis which determines social equality, or its opposite, and reproduction as the material basis for human perfectibility, the quest for happiness and survival. And I would suggest that it is in this connection that he sees the role that woman is called upon to play in every aspect of life in society.

He can understand reproduction only as a social phenomenon which is part and parcel of production. If on an intellectual plane he appears deeply interested in that as a positive result this two-fold movement should in fact lead to freedom in so far as it should enable Man to gain control over nature, on another plane he appears equally concerned with the process by which human beings gain control over themselves. It is in this sense that his attention in the process of reproduction goes to the producers in relation to their own perfectibility and progress rather than to the improved reproduction of machinery, for if it is important to him that the

"reproduction of the working-class carries with it the accumulation of skill, that is handed down from one generation to another."(2)

it is still more important from his humanistic point of view that in Civilization the producers become in actual fact "the living machinery" (i) which, in keeping with the laws of capitalist

production and its fluctuations is, in due course, "turned into a relative surplus-population" (ii) which "forms a disposable industrial reserve army" (3).

This is the scientific formulation of a social phenomenon which arouses not only the author's humanitarian feelings but also his awareness of an ethical problem whose various connotations his model highlights in different degrees. But in most of them he sees the problem of women in the process of "the reproduction of the working-class" as central, and yet neglected and glossed over by Civilization. It is true that in this respect women stand in a specific position determined by nature. Yet, it is not nature that causes their indignity and misery, but the specific position that society has determined for them in keeping with the historic laws that have been at work in favouring such developments. That this issue becomes prominent in his literature is only natural since his model is essentially humanistic. On the other hand, it is precisely this stance that prompts his battling against pseudo-humanistic conceptions on the subject, especially when antagonists such as FWN can be singled out as one of those who wrote a good deal about women.

It is interesting to note that JLM/LGG took up some of FWN's views, although he seems to have reversed their meaning and their intention. For example, FWN's "last Man"

"Lo! I show you the last man"(4)

becomes the 'last women' in LGG's "First and Last Woman", a science-fiction story in which the question of the reproduction of the species is highlighted, and his fears of what can happen in the distant future in the wake of humanity's higher knowledge of nature and resultant more sophisticated technology in the wrong hands. The author includes the problem of women in society in his view of inequality, and therefore, his approach is historical, i.e. basically historical, but evidently he uses various sources. As suggested in chap. X one of these sources is obviously Rousseau, but the particular work which systematizes the study in a more specific and concrete way

is August Bebel's "Woman in the Past, Present, and Future" (WPPF). Most of Bebel's concerns in this book are reflected in the fiction of JLM/LGG; a case in point is the theme of prostitution as analyzed by Bebel. Even the theme of equal opportunity and his stance against sex discrimination are embodied in characters such as Gilliflower Arnold of IIW, Flore Gellion of VM, Joyce of EIW, and Jane Hatoun of LP, in the volume CC alone. In this connection it is possible to discern the author's own background which is no doubt directly related to his interest in the theme since most of the problems and conflicts his women characters have to cope with were wellknown to him both as peasant (in origin), as a British military man serving in the overseas dominions, and as a writer and intellectual identified with the historical lot of the common people.

His particular inclination towards using the symbol of Kalo or Kore (in GR and CC), and also of other Greek goddesses, indicates that he also related the theme of woman to the great and universal theme of the renewal of life. This is coupled with the theme of love as JLM understood it, and also with the problem of exploitation of woman throughout history. The writer is adamant in his campaign against prostitution, which, together with war, serves to illustrate the spiritual degradation of modern Civilization in spite of its material achievements. His short story cycles devote several stories to this theme (both in CC and in PDEN). Among his novels, IS, LTr., SR, and TD highlight the theme. The third and the last one couple it with the theme of war, echoing the denunciation of these two swabs of the illness of Civilization as anticipated in "E" (see chap. 11).

The influence of Bebel is apparent, but this does not obscure Rousseau's influence since it is not a question of either one or the other. Bebel contributed an important scientific study of woman in history. For JLM/LGG the problem of woman - and also of man - is the result of the civilizing process. Therefore, the cause of woman forms part of the universal cause of humanity seeking liberation from all social structures and forces that fetter humankind. This overall battle includes, obviously, the political front and that of ideology in particular, as Domina Riddoch - one of JLM's outstanding heroines -

proves in T D.

Notwithstanding, one could not ignore Spengler as a possible and probable influence in this field, since JLM may have derived his cosmic view of women from him. Again, Spengler's idea of the "separation into two sexes" - even if dualistic in conception as opposed to JLM's monistic outlook - reminds us, somehow, of Sp. once again. Spengler wrote:

"A fathomless secret of the cosmic flowings that we call Life is their separation into two sexes (...).

The feminine stands closer to the Cosmic. It is rooted deeper in the earth and it is immediately involved in the grand cyclic rhythms of Nature. The masculine is freer, more animal, more mobile -"(5)

Depending on the reader's interpretation, these words are likely to put in mind Darwin, who, in Marx's opinion, had rediscovered his English society in what Hobbes had already designated bellum omnium contra omnes. So too, Spengler might just be rediscovering his in like manner. In consequence I would suggest that it is far from certain that JLM might have accepted his assertion at face value, but the fact remains that the feminine element pervades his writings as a "cosmic flowing". As for the masculine element, more than "freer, more animal" etc., JLM/LGG certainly sees it in society as more ruthless and brutal, especially if arising from war situations. In "Sp." for example, we have not only masculine extreme sexual violence but also a symbolic obliteration of life in both the rape and subsequent twofold death of Elpinice and her newborn child, in a war situation.

In his model war and prostitution appear as the two main antagonistic forces which arise from Civilization to counteract the renewal of life. They go together for they symbolize the absence of love in human society, i.e. social love, not erotic, or heterosexual love, although he also refers to the love between man and woman not

only in its natural and social function, the reproduction of human life, but also in its more poetic beauty. Now we have already seen that to him that absence of social love is a symptom. Of his battling against war, there is plenty in the present work. As for his battling against prostitution we can say that it is not only relentless and staunch but also pervasive. It is not only his defence of women that is at stake but his defence of a higher culture as well. And yet, his love of the women's cause is so committed and passionate that some critics have not failed to notice it as a peculiarity which even if differently expressed, conveys, nevertheless, a common deep feeling that made one of them detect that

"the whole Gibbon personality is intensely feminine".(6)

The point is, however, that his "feminism" arises from the fact that he saw in the position occupied by women in Civilization the most palpable example of the extremes to which social inequality has pushed humanity. His sympathies begin with his awareness that in the process of production it is women who suffer the most brutal exploitation, not by the husband, or not caused by him necessarily, but by the mode of production which needs a superabundance of producers for the farm, the factory, and/or the battlefield. It is women who ruin their health and sometimes their own lives in producing them for the system. This view harmonizes with his concept of History from very early stages. In this, in turn, we see once more the influence of Engels, and in relation to women, OFPPE as the most probable source. No wonder then that one of his recurring motifs is that of the wife burdened with children and worn down by maternity and the agonies of childbirth. Hence, the motif of the mother who commits suicide rather than face the realities of a new pregnancy and its aftermath. It is in this trend of thought that he appreciates the work and attitude of women like Marie Stopes (see T D p. 31). Besides, it is women who suffer again when war takes away their husbands and their sons. For it is the same mode of production which sends millions into farms and factories that in so producing material goods, i.e. for real life, also produces wars in search of higher profits and so trundles down

millions to the battlefields, i.e. to kill real life. And just as it can do this, it can also create the social conditions for pushing women to their own over-exploitation and over-degradation - prostitution. It is in this sense that JLM/LGG becomes not intensely feminine, but surely intensely angry with Civilization whose ideologists, in general, try to gloss over, when not justifying the odious further inequality - not only of class but also of sex - and moreover go to the lengths of alleging a purported biological difference whereby that social inequality would be in fact determined by nature. It is this ideological fallacy which JLM has set out to combat. In this his debt goes to Bebel who, like the author, bases his own democratic viewpoints concerning human equality on historical fact and factual observation of sociological behaviour as the findings of historical anthropology indicates. Bebel himself writes:

"In the horde as in the cattleherd, sexual impulses were gratified without order or separation according to pairs. We have no grounds for assuming that in this primitive state men were physically or mentally superior to women."(7)

which he contrasts with his assertion that

"Woman was the first human being that tasted bondage. Woman was a slave before the slave existed."(8)

But Bebel differentiates between slavery proper and what he calls "sexual slavery", the latter being the way in which woman became the first type of slave in history. According to Bebel the bondage of sex persisted even in modern marriage, despite the fact that he admits that industrialism created, even if unwittingly, the objective conditions for overcoming the situation. He also admits that despite the fact that some other forms of sexual bondage have disappeared and others tend to do so, industrialism has also intensified the practice of prostitution since this has become a necessary institution of the bourgeois world. Hence, JLM/LGG's theme which he endeavours to use not only as a burning denunciation but also as a weapon to combat

bourgeois civilization. Hence his approach to the relationship between men and women in his more "realistic fiction". Bebel sees the problem of prostitution as part of the problem of woman in general in modern society and warns that this question

"coincides with the question as to the form and organization which the entire community must receive."(9)

and there he connects it with the

"solution of the Labour Question under the existing social and political institutions"(10)

whereby the solution of the 'labour question' is none other than introducing an essential change in the mode of production which is what JLM advocates, especially in Phase IV of his model. In the latter, women are given a dignified status both in society and in their standing with respect to men. In his fiction, JLM anticipates the new look of what the prospective truly liberated woman would be like. Even Chris Guthrie exhibits already some of the forthcoming traits. Some other feminine characters, especially those of his 'Scottish literature' type, also appear endowed with such gifts, and certainly most of his 'romance' feminine characters do, to the extent that they may strike the reader as truly 'improbable'. By way of example, let us quote one of the author's countrymen who wrote that the trilogy "ASQ" denotes an

"increasing dehumanization of the characters until towards the end they become as improbable and puppet-like as the Princess Pelagueyas, Gillyflower Arnolds, and Gay Hunters of Gibbon English pot-boilers."(11)

Without stopping to discuss the characters of "ASQ" here, there can be no doubt that JLM/LGG would have strongly rejected the concept dehumanization on the grounds that nobody would have been able to demonstrate scientifically that his women characters do not possess

truly human gifts. He would have admitted that they appear as 'improbable' if judged from the viewpoint of values set forth by an already dehumanized society, but not from those of a human one. This would be in tune with his motif of the reversed situation.

The important thing is that the reader of JLM's romance not only gets used to such 'improbable' characters but also actually gets to like them, possibly because they reaffirm the optimism and joy of life. In this connection, it is noteworthy to mention their natural attitude, their open-mindedness, their goodwill and tolerance to their fellows, their social consciousness, and with this, their selflessness, which makes them anything but 'improbable'. They represent 'natural woman', so that with JLM/LGG it would be better to use the term 'natural humanity' rather than 'natural Man'.

Back to the labour question, like JLM/LGG, Bebel sees the interdependence of all phenomena, and accordingly sees no separation between modern natural science and our entire social life. Consequently, he sees the question of labour also related to natural science, since he believes that

"scientific laws applied to human society can explain conditions, which without they would remain obscure"(12)

relating thus the question of woman's situation in society not only to History, Religion, Civilizations, and Societies but also to Natural Science, Social Science, Politics, etc. Therefore he does not see any substantial difference between the problem of women in society in the works and concerns of people like Haeckel, Darwin, Malthus, Marx, Virchow, etc.

My aim is to just give some idea of Bebel's influence on JLM/LGG, so I will proceed to mention a few items that the two have in common. For example, there is a motif related to the theme of the leader and of leadership - and also probably to the theme of the diffusion of culture - which had always puzzled me since JLM/LGG made practically a

rule that the leader, almost always a liberator, came from an upper social stratum or from an upper social class, or from a more advanced civilization, and sometimes, even from the camp of the explicit oppressor. It was puzzling because this appeared as being at odds with his revolutionary stance and his democratic views. In actual fact, some of his esteemed intellectuals, like Morris and Kropotkin, came from the upper class - Kropotkin was actually a Russian prince. This can be part of the explanation but not all the explanation. Here, Bebel may be an important indicator when he writes:

"Were there not also millions of slaves who thought slavery right and natural, and would never have become free if liberators had not arisen out of the ranks of slave-holders themselves?"(13)

See chap. 7 - IMAGERY, for more details on this topic.

Bebel may have had an influence in abating JLM/LGG's enthusiasm for Haeckel's Monism since according to Bebel, Haeckel and his adherents ended up denying that Darwinism led to atheism:

"Of course Professor Hackel and his adherents deny further that Darwinism leads to Atheism, and after they have dethroned the Creator by all their scientific proofs and arguments, they make the most violent efforts to smuggle him in again by the backdoor."(14)

On the other hand, there is little grounds for attributing to coincidence the fact that JLM/LGG had made the problem of "the means of subsistence" (see chap. 3) into a kind of power unit which sets his model in motion, and that Bebel on the other side - when discussing industrialism in agricultural countries (Scotland also mentioned as a case in point) and its aftermath, including: pauperism, diseases and depopulation, etc. - concludes:

"These facts in connection with all that has been already said in this book on the effects of the capitalistic mode

of production show us that the misery and distress of the masses are not the consequence of an insufficiency in the means of subsistence, but, firstly, of unequal distribution, leading to superfluity on the one hand and starvation on the other, and secondly of the constant destruction and waste of material, and neglect of production and cultivation."(15)

Another important theme which JLM/LGG must have derived from Bebel is Bebel's view on Darwinism, although, JLM may have derived it from Kropotkin alone, as will be seen. But Bebel - like Kropotkin - reacted against what has been called social Darwinism. The reasons are interesting in so far as his views of the future of humankind are optimistic in that he sees that finally all humankind will exist under equally favourable circumstance. However, Bebel, unlike JLM/LGG, accepts laws as necessary restrictions to our individual freedom. But they may be agreed on the basic question, the difference is that JLM/LGG is using literature as a means of expression whereas Bebel is using the language of science, and in fact expresses without figures of speech or metaphors or allegories what may well interpret JLM/LGG's own ideas

"The Darwinian Law of the struggle for existence, which finds its expression in nature in the elimination and destruction of lower by stronger and more highly developed organisms, arrives at a different consummation in the human world. Men, as thoughtful and reflecting beings are constantly altering, improving, and perfecting their conditions of life, i.e. their social arrangements, and everything connected with them, until finally all mankind will exist under equally favourable circumstances. Humanity will gradually create conditions, laws, institutions, which permit each individual to develop his talents and faculties, to the advantage of himself and of the community, but which deprive him of the power to injure any third person or the community, because, in so doing he would injure himself. This state of things

will by degrees become so impressed on his intelligence and discernment that there will be no more room in his brain for thoughts of supremacy and the damage of others."(16)

An important part of JLM/LGG's literature is devoted to demonstrating that the Darwinian law of the struggle for existence arrives at a different consummation in the human world. This idea has brought him near to people like Kropotkin as well. It is possible to state also that practically all JLM/LGG's literature is guided by the supreme ethical value of equality among human beings. This value is so important to him that his Anarchism must be understood in this light.

B. THE ANTAGONISTS

CHAPTER 15 SPENGLER

"- Spengler, with his theories of cyclic catastrophe, of the rise and fall of culture, inevitable and unceasing. His slick, quack arguments, built of poor reasoning and worse research"

- GH, p. 48

All indicates that JLM was also concerned with Spengler's philosophy of History, and his views on humanity. Here is another subject worth exploring in more depth. By way of presentation, this is a beginning.

The reader of C C will come across a direct allusion to Spengler whilst reading "Daybreak" (1) where Roger Mantell's passion for History has made him conceive the idea of writing a book

"to refute the foolish Spengler - him who believes all history goes in cycles, like the mad dog chasing its tail."(2)

One would have thought that after such a verdict on his theory of History, Spengler would be the last to be expected as having an influence on JLM. And yet, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove that JLM's literary production is free from any Spenglerism. There are themes and motifs that one cannot help feeling he has derived from Spengler. To be more precise, Spengler's themes are recognizable in JLM's literature - the doubt is whether JLM included them consciously, and if so, for what purpose. As seen earlier on in the present work, I have assumed that JLM has done it consciously both because his allusion to Spengler in "D" is intended to draw our attention to him, and also because JLM not only defined himself as a historian but also had planned to write a History of Mankind, or a Story of Civilization (3) intended to challenge H.G. Wells' History, a challenge which he may have founded on their opposed views on evolution. But if JLM included Spengler's themes consciously the

question is whether he did it in order to echo Spengler's ideas or in order to refute them as suggested in his story "D". However, knowing that for JLM neither things nor people nor ideas can be black and white only, which is why he often borrows some of the aspects of the philosophies he combats, or, criticizes the scholar he admires, for some flaw or other he has detected in his body of ideas, so it seems that these principles operate again in relation to Spengler. I would suggest, however, that whenever JLM seems to come nearer to Spengler, it looks as if the issue in question had been derived from Danilevsky either by Spengler or even by JLM himself although I have no other clue to this assumption than JLM's overall attitude and general method. Thus, if the presence of Spengler's ideas is clearly seen in JLM's literature, JLM's attitude in relation to those ideas do not appear quite clear to me - not all the time, anyway. That is why the following items are seen as an attempt at introducing the subject rather than as a conclusive evaluation.

"T G B" for example is based on a philosophy of history which can pass for Spenglerian, above all if we accepted that Keith Sinclair, one of the main characters in the allegory - the second part of the novel can be regarded as an allegory - stands for the Faustian man of Spengler. That is why, I think, he called Book Two of T G B, "WHENCE? WHITHER?" in what I take as a clear allusion to Spengler's assertion that each of the different Cultures, which he perceives, has pictured world-history in its own special way

"Classical man only saw himself and his fortunes as statically present with himself, and did not ask "whence" or "whither". Universal history was for him an impossible notion. This is the static way of looking at history. Magian man sees it as the great cosmic dream of creation and foundering, the struggle between Soul and Spirit, Good and Evil, God and Devil - a strictly-defined happening with, as its culmination, one single Peripeteia - the appearance of the Saviour. Faustian Man sees in history a tense unfolding towards an aim; its "ancient mediaeval-modern" sequence is a dynamic image. He cannot picture history

to himself in any other way. This scheme of three parts is not indeed world-history as such, general world-history. But it is the image of world-history as it is conceived in the Faustian style. It begins to be true and consistent with the beginning of the Western Culture and ceases with its ceasing; and Socialism in the highest sense is logically the crown of it, the form of its conclusive state that has been implicit in it from Gothic onwards."(4)

This passage is interesting not only because of its relevance to TGB, but also because it calls to mind the figures of Kleon, and Gershom ben Sanballast as representing Classical man and Magian man respectively in "Sp". The comparison would be complete if identifying Spartacus with the Faustian man, only that this last comparison might not be apt. One of the reasons is that if JLM accepts the classical and the magian, and even the Faustian cultures, he is not likely to accept any other man different from Natural Man. However, if JLM also accepted the Faustian man idea the concept would not be the same: it would mean something different for him. As it is, both his model and his characters confirm the presence of something Faustian in JLM's conception, especially in that his own model moves "towards an aim" and his literary content denotes an "'ancient-medieval-modern" sequence" and also in that he too conceives Socialism but not as "the crown on it" - only as the crown of western culture but not his Socialism - or JLM's Socialism "in the highest sense" is no longer 'Socialism' as commonly understood, but simply primitive anarchism at work in an advanced society of the scientific-technological era. In this sense it would be worthwhile comparing his strategic anarchist goals with the strategic goals of Communism. This makes the difference, and therefore, the aim may be different, and so too the ideas ancient, medieval, and modern - plus their connotations. So that, the Faustian man of JLM may not be so Faustian if at the same time he has so much of the classical man and also of the Magian man as JLM's fiction proves.

But the story "D" would indicate that JLM disagrees with Spengler's

idea that Cultures are organic structures that develop in time until past their efflorescence they fade away at the end of their cycle which always starts with the Spring and ends with the advent of its Winter. And yet, the most famous and according to some, the best of LGG's essays - "The Land" - is structured in the sequence Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn. Obviously, the sense of JLM's essay (signed as LGG) is different from Spengler's idea of culture. To begin with, JLM has reversed the order of the seasons, if he intends to mean Spengler. But there is some ground to assume that he is saying something or other about Spengler's idea of History. JLM's sub-text for "Winter" is haunted by historical men from the Neolithic (from the Azilians, the Venriconian Picts, etc.) to modern man, and by the presence of that primitive pervasive relationship of men with the land. "Spring" in JLM's essay makes us

"balk from the thought of our strange, unthinking cruelties, the underpit of blood and suffering and intolerable horror on which the most innocent of us build our lives."(5)

"Summer" complains of the advent of agriculture and of the bondage to the land of that "kind of democracy of the land" which went round and round in a sort of

"perfect Spenglerian cycle. Yet it was waste effort, it was foolish as the plod of an ass in a treadmill, innumerable generations of asses."(6)

And then, "Autumn" is harvest, abundance, the beauty of the land. But for all that beauty, nature is meaningless without Man - there is only humankind. Autumn reminds JLM of the power of humankind, and hence, JLM reminds us of the Faustian man of Spengler who is ushered in as follows:

"Three million years hence our descendants out of some tremendous furrowing of the Galaxy, with the Great Bear yoked to The Plough and the wastes of space their fields, will remember this

little planet, if at all, for the men who conquered the land and wrung sustenance from it by stealth and shrewdness and a savage and surly endurance."(7)

It would be too ambitious to attempt to explain to what extent JLM contradicts or supports Spengler's views, but his direct allusion to a "perfect Spenglerian cycle" can be neither fortuitous nor independent from his idea of dividing the essay "The Land" into four parts one for each season of the year, no matter that in doing so he altered Spengler's order, or, actually reversed it. This, to my mind, is symbolical, for it is typical of JLM's method to reverse or to put straight the values, the views, or the ideas which in his opinion are wrong; especially when related to the theories of the origin of civilization, or its future. In relation to the passages quoted above, it can be argued that JLM's real intention is to put forward once more his Diffusionist ideas, etc. Of course, if it comes to that there is Diffusionism in the essay as there is Diffusionism in most of his literary work, including of course, the trilogy. But limiting JLM's meaning to Diffusionism alone would be even worse. In the particular case of the items under analysis here, apart from a direct allusion to Spengler's cyclic theory of History, there is also an indirect allusion to the motif of the seasons, which JLM reversed, etc. It should be pointed out that this last item is particularly important since Spengler has characterized each of the stages of his " 'Contemporary' Spiritual Epochs" in his Table I as follows (including column one only):

"SPRING

(... newly-awakened dream-heavy Soul. Super-personal unity and felness).

SUMMER

(Ripening consciousness. Earliest urban and critical stirrings).

AUTUMN

(Intelligence of the City. Zenith of strict intellectual creativeness).

WINTER

(Dawn of Megalopolitan Civilization. Extinction of spiritual creative force.

Life itself becomes problematical. Ethical-practical tendencies of an irreligious and unmetaphysical cosmopolitanism)."(8)

It should be observed that in reversing this JLM would have meant to reverse Spengler's meaning as well. Thus, I would imagine that in "The Land", having Spengler as his reference, he would have characterized the seasons as follows:

WINTER, as 'Beginning (9) of Civilization. Extinction of spirit-harmony. Life becomes problematical. Ethical-practical tendencies of a religious and metaphysical unearthly order.'

SPRING, as '... newly-stunned, dull-heavy soul. Disunity and collective disease.'

SUMMER, as "(Awakening humaneness. Earliest socialistic and free stages).'

AUTUMN, as 'Intelligence of Humanity. Zenith of strict collective creativeness.'

For the sake of contradicting Spengler, that would be acceptable. But even when JLM may not have intended to put it that way, he may have intended to mean something different from what Spengler had propounded. Thus, even if the hypothetical interpretation explained above were ill-founded in the sense that JLM never intended such a characterization of Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn, it would still be correct to ascribe it to JLM's line of thought since it harmonizes with his model. However, it would be more accurate to conclude instead, that in using Spengler's idea of the seasons, JLM envisaging no more no less than to disprove Spengler's theory in so far as the cycle of civilization must not necessarily follow the pattern of the cycles of nature, and therefore, JLM would hardly conceive the cycle of the seasons as illustrating the different phases of the development of Civilization.

The other item which should be emphasized here is the "three million years" anticipation-theme, which, as seen earlier on, is recurrent in JLM. But in the context of Spengler's pessimistic view of History, this anticipation is particularly important in so far as,

on the one hand, it provided a macrocosmic perspective from which to look at Spengler's theory of History, transforming his pessimism and his scientific prophecy into something gigantic so that as an error it would also be gigantic; and on the other, it puts forward a clear rejection of Spengler's cyclic theory, or more precisely, perhaps the rejection that

"Cultures are organisms, and world-history is their collective biography. Morphologically, the immense history of the Chinese or of the Classical Culture is the exact equivalent of the petty history of the individual man, or the animal, or the tree, or the flower ..."(10)

For, in my view, JLM's passage quoted above in (7) cannot be interpreted differently regarding Spengler's theory, especially when, as explained earlier on, JLM is not concerned with "organic cultures" or with the organic development of a section of civilization but with Humankind as a whole, and with the contradiction between Nature and Civilization, which having been engendered by humanity itself, in keeping with the same laws that brought it about, must now be resolved in its favour by humanity, not by Nature.

If further evidence were needed to support the view that JLM consciously alluded to Spengler, the best source is his trilogy where we find again the sequence Winter, Spring, Summer, and Autumn, under the slightly altered form of Ploughing, Drilling Seedtime, and Harvest in "S S"; whereas in "C H" the 'seasons' - leading to Winter - would be suggested by the quality of the clouds which darken from Cirrus to Cumulus, and from Stratus to Nimbus. The four phases do the reverse movement in "G G". If I were right in assuming that JLM's intention is to contradict Spengler, this would be confirmed by the fact that only in "C H" does he follow the order of the stages indicated by Spengler and ending thus in Winter; but this may have more to do with his allegory of Civilization and/or with the allegorical meaning of the trilogy, and in keeping with it what really matters is the three movements as indicated in chap. 1: the original Golden Age of

humankind, the period of Civilization or loss of the golden age, and the period of the new golden age as the ultimate triumph of humanity. So, in making use of materials derived from Spengler he may be using them to serve his own ends. If that were the case, it would not be the first time that JLM makes use of his opponents' contentions in order to combat them. As for the present case, this is reflected in Spengler's pessimism concerning humankind in History, and in his view of the future in particular, which is contrary to that of JLM. This seemingly irrelevant difference in mood might be but the symptom which hides the true cause of their divergent philosophies.

Concerning the anthropological dispute as to whether humans are by nature ferocious or kind and gentle, Spengler sides with the neo-Darwinians, describing thereby primitive man in exactly the opposite terms that JLM and the Diffusionists do:

"The soul of these strong solitaries is warlike through and through, mistrustful, jealous of its own power and booty. It knows the intoxication of feeling when the knife pieces the hostile body, and the smell of blood and the sense of amazement strike together upon the exultant soul. Every real "man," even in the cities of Late periods in the Cultures, feels in himself from time to time the sleeping fires of this primitive soul."(11)

This passage is clear enough to indicate that there cannot be any identity of views, especially regarding humanity and Civilization, when JLM and Spengler so strongly disagree on what to JLM is, so to speak, the corner-stone of his philosophy of Man and of History. It is not my intention, however, to attempt a brief resume of the extent and import of their discrepancies. Let it suffice, then, to point out some loose items that are, nevertheless, relevant to JLM's model.

Concerning the question of war and peace, JLM and Spengler stand at the very opposite extremes. Spengler explains that war sprang out of the combats of individual carnivores as what he calls an enterprise of tribe against tribe which entailed a whole organization, and that the

law that the victor imposed upon the vanquished became the law. It follows that human law is ever the law of the stronger to which the weaker must conform, etc. (12), which translated into human terms allows him to affirm that

"A people is only really such in relation to other peoples, and the substance of this actuality comes out in natural and ineradicable oppositions, in attack and defence, hostility and war. War is the creator of all great things. All that is meaningful in the stream of life has emerged through victory and defeat."(13)

It is not difficult to realize that JLM would have agreed with the premise in italics, but he would have strongly disagreed with all the rest. This is so not only because the concepts run counter to his own views but also because they constitute, in turn, premises on which other non-humanist concepts and undemocratic ideas can be based and justified. For example, the relationship between nobility and race which Spengler explains further on in relation to this theme is his attempt at proposing, at the same time, that war comes as the general result of the race relation, whereby war is the primary politics of everything that lives. Therefore, in Spengler's terms politics is but a substitution for the sword, and the next consequence that arises from this is that there is only personal history and hence only personal politics, etc. That is why, I think, Arthur Helps thought that according to Spengler

"It was not the Christian Gospel but the Christian martyr that conquered the world."(14)

Again, this would be another motive of disagreement with JLM since his admiration for Christianity arises in the main from his view that it incorporated primitive ethics, as suggested for instance in "Sp.". (We have already seen that according to Haeckel and others the ethics of Christianity had existed long before Christ.) But their disagreement is not limited to this aspect alone on the theme of

Christianity, it is much stronger when Spengler at his worst affirms:

"Who cannot hate is no Man, and history is made by Man."(15)

This piece of thought would suffice to mark by itself the broad gulf that separates JLM from Spengler (especially when Spengler was thus addressing the youth of Germany) in their social ethics.

In the scientific field Spengler drastically contradicts JLM's hopes that Archaeology is the science that can unearth scientific evidence concerning our distant past and that his reliable evidence would constitute a sound foundation for a truer philosophy of History. Spengler affirms that Archaeology is limited in so far as it may easily err. As an example he cites the case of the mass-graves of the War in northern France in which, he maintains, we know that men of all races lie together. But he doubts that the anthropologist of the future - theoretically at least - would be able to find out the truth, and therefore, concludes that

"immense dramas of race can pass over a land without the investigator of its grave-skeletons obtaining the least hint of the fact."(16)

These few examples may suffice to show the origin of Spengler's pessimism. On the other hand, they should help us to grasp the essence of Spengler's and JLM's divergent views on the future of humankind, their opposite outlook on the social science, and their antagonistic political positions. In short, they may help us to grasp the essence of their discordant and totally different models. But all this can be expressed in a very brief statement like the following:

"It goes without saying that Spengler hated materialistic Humanists, Utopians, 'World Betterers' and Pacifists. World Peace is always a one-sided resolve. 'Man is a beast of prey. I shall say it again and again'"(17)

And yet! - It seems that all their substantial differences did not prevent JLM from seeing some positive aspects in Spengler's model, as for example Spengler's idea that

"Primeval man is a ranging animal, a being whose waking-consciousness restlessly feels its way through life, all microcosm, under no servitude of place or home, keen and anxious in its senses, ever alert to drive off some element of hostile Nature. A deep transformation sets in first with agriculture - for that is something artificial, with which hunter and shepherd have no touch. He who digs and ploughs is seeking not to plunder, but to alter Nature. To plant implies, not to take something, but to produce something. But with this, man himself becomes plant - namely as peasant. He roots in the earth that he tends, the soul of man discovers a soul in the countryside, and a new earth-boundness of being, a new feeling, pronounces itself."(18)

Obviously, this is not exactly JLM's view of the issue, but at least, there is nothing major which can be regarded as opposite, on the contrary, JLM would see an essential truth in this, excepting perhaps the concept of man as plant (no matter how figurative in intention). But the general movement is there, and it is also in JLM's model in much the same way that JLM seems to agree with Spengler in conceiving the next movement as that from which the Faustian culture was to be born. For, as Spengler explains it, agriculture was not enough: Man had greater needs and thus robbed Nature's treasures of metal and stone, wood and yarn, managed her waters in canals and wells, broke her resistance with ships and roads, bridges and tunnels and dams. But he meant not only to plunder her of her materials, but also to enslave and harness her very forces so as to multiply his own strength, which according to Spengler leads

"To build a world oneself, to be oneself God - that is the Faustian inventor's dream, and from it has sprung all our designing and re-designing of machines to approximate as nearly as possible to the

unattainable limit of perpetual motion. The booty-idea of the beast of prey is thought out to its logical end. Not this or that bit of the world, as when Prometheus stole fire, but the world itself, complete with its secret force, is dragged away as spoil to be built into our Culture."(19)

Now, this sounds just like JLM's aim as the theme has been highlighted by stories such as "LDEC", "EIW", "VM", "C", and even by "F S"; also in essays like "The Land"; and also in novels such as "TGB" and "GH" (q.v.). It is the theme which Domina Riddoch put in a nutshell when explaining her "Jules Vernesque stuff" to M.M., her private romance of the Expedition which would no longer confine itself to the earth, an Expedition so different from those adventures of their Azilian ancestors that it would mean a leap into outer space, to the planets, to the fixed stars, to the Milky Way -

"Why, then, somewhere beyond the rim of the Galaxy and the rims of time, ten million years and a day away, men'll reach the palace of God and storm it, and capture the engine-room and power-house, and then - and then -"(20)

The coincidence is too complete to be entirely true, and in fact, it is at this point that JLM's optimism is in contradiction with Spengler's pessimism for the simple reason that the latter does not trust humaznity like JLM does. Spengler trusts only a tiny section of it, the leaders, since he like FWN believes that it is for the leaders to do the harder work, whereas JLM - acknowledging the leader's role in Civilization (not in the Golden Age) - shifts all the weight of his hopes on to the invincible spiritual power of humanity as a whole. Notwithstanding this, not having come across any scholarly study of the relationship between JLM's views and Spengler's philosophy is reason enough to add a question tag at the end of this conclusion. The other reason that justifies this question tag is the possibility that JLM himself had been uncertain in his assessment of Spengler, and had, therefore, adopted some of his views. But he may only have included some of them in order to expose them as errors or as tokens

of non-humanistic attitude although, in this particular case, I have already suggested his debt to Bebel (see chap. 14). "TGB" for example, might be interpreted as a case in point where humanity depended almost exclusively on leadership, not only to save their individual lives but in fact to save humanity from extinction. Contradiction? Probably not: only complexities of meaning. My impression is that to JLM the question of leadership - part and parcel of the cultural development may also be regarded as one of the mechanisms of diffusion - is crucial in crucial circumstances, even if alien to human nature in normal circumstances. But success in Phase IV depends on good leadership (see chap. 7). In any case, JLM seems to be on the side of Spengler on the question of leadership - although there seems to be some discrepancy. However, we had already seen how JLM had agreed with Bebel on the topic of leadership, and the same idea is to be found in Spengler now, at least in the sense in which Sorokin has interpreted Spengler's thought:

"In the early period of a High Culture the leadership belongs to the creative minority - the nobility and the priesthood, the castle and the cathedral."(21)

All JLM's literature is full of this, including his trilogy, and actually the leader is recognizable as the essential trait of his hero-characters. JLM's idea of leadership appears as associated with the idea of High Culture, and this may be the reason why his hero-characters in Spengler's terminology are either Apollinian, or Magian, when they are not Faustian - where these seem generally to be represented by either English or American in our time.

Whatever the implications, I would point out that according to JLM's model his great adventure begins here on earth with the fight for liberating humankind from the shackles and the dehumanizing effects of Civilization. In his model this is a crucial situation, perhaps the most crucial of all, and therefore, the role of leadership is essential. I would suggest, by way of hypothesis, the nature or the origin of leadership is confined to what in his model is

equivalent to 'the period of Civilization', but it will cease to be necessary as soon as humankind regains its ultimate freedom.

Nevertheless it is possible to recognize Spengler's ideas at work in JLM's model. But at least two questions must be answered before establishing the true relationship that connects Spengler's ideas with JLM's model. Firstly, whether all the Spenglerian content was actually derived from Spengler, and if so, whether it was all derived consciously. Secondly, whether the inclusion of Spengler's ideas denotes adoption or rejection of his views, or, whether the inclusion has a different purpose. For example, JLM might have intended to give a different turn to Spengler's ideas, or he might have sorted out Spengler's ideas in order to adopt some whilst rejecting or attacking others. My impression is that JLM did all these things in one single process, and as is usually the case, he did all this in order to contrive his own model.

Obviously, there is much more material, and at the same time much clearer evidence of their discrepancies as already shown. This can be corroborated and given the corresponding resonance by Spengler himself when anticipating that not even his Faustian civilization will survive since the tragedy of Man is that "Nature is the stronger of the two" and concludes quite firmly that

"Only dreamers believe that there is a way out. Optimism is cowardice."(22)

and JLM, like Morris, or like Kropotkin, was a dreamer, but the type of dreamer whose dreams run 'ahead of the natural march of events', or so it seems to me.

In conclusion whatever the possible and probable coincidences between JLM and Spengler, - once their deep differences have been detected - the fact remains that in the light of JLM/LGG's model, nature is based on Neo-Darwinism, but mainly because his social science is, and as a result, he ends up justifying class division, social violence, and war. Hence his pessimism. The author rejects

that pessimism because far from being founded on scientific fact as Spengler purports, it only arises from the perceptions of a class consciousness which tends to identify its own fate in history with the destiny of humankind.

CHAPTER 16 FRIEDRICH WILHELM NIETZSCHE (FWN) AND JLM/LGG

The analysis of "E" (in "CC") would reveal a strong attack on F.W. Nietzsche (FWN). In chapt. 6 we came across a more subtle allusion to FWN. The attack on his philosophy may not be less strong. And yet, as in the relation between JLM and Spengler, it is also possible to refer to something akin to a common language between JLM and FWN. It would be preposterous, within the scope of the present work, to attempt a comparison between them. All I can envisage here is to advance a few general comments on some aspects which have turned up as a result of my analysis of JLM's work as related to FWN's philosophy. Again, as in previous cases, the question is to establish the degree either of correspondence or divergence, either of intentionality on the part of JLM or coincidence, etc. between the two authors, although that seems hardly a condition sine qua non, for as it was pointed out earlier on, no matter what similarities of form - and even of content - the general impression is that JLM and FWN represent two opposite views concerning life, humankind, society, etc. However, before attempting an analysis of this kind, I shall deal with the topical questions related to FWN's philosophy and/or imagery which JLM raised first in "FTS" and then in "E", but in fact, including also other works in which JLM alluded to FWN.

The general opposition between FWN and JLM can be described as the clash between JLM's conceptions on democracy and an unrepentant aristocratic-minded FWN. His aristocratism is so deep that he even sees an enemy in Christ and Christianity, which was set up - he affirms - in opposition to the Church, being thus a revolt

"against the organized hierarchy - not against corruption of the hierarchy, but against caste, privilege, rank, and formalism. It was an expression of unbelief in the "elect", a denial of everything priestly and theological."(1)

Ironically then, a theme which should have united FWN and JLM, being both non-Christians, in fact separates them for reasons other than Christian matters. For if JLM may be defined as an atheist he may

also be defined as a pro-Christian in so far as his social ethics do not conflict in basic humanist concern with those of Christianity, where FWN is certainly anti-Christian because of the democratic element he sees in the doctrine, but being anti-Christian, he is at the same time pro-religious in mentality at least, in so far as his philosophical thought denotes deep theological roots. And it is probably this trait which JLM set out to expose and to combat in his story "FTS", for in this work the allusion to FWN is present despite the fact that there is no direct allusion nor any overt clue to it. However, the explicit allegorical intention of the story prompts us to analyze in broader terms and in the light of JLM's overall view of civilization. This method allowed us to make out his line of intention leading to FWN, something which might be difficult to imagine without having the text of the story before our eyes.

The plot of "F T S" contains both elements of content and of form which I interpret as incidental allusions to FWN. Among these external elements, the very setting described at the beginning with Richard Southcote on the top of the hill watching Mevr, the 'city of the plain', is already susceptible of interpretation as a pictorial representation of FWN's Zarathustra (see chapt. 6) for the opening of this story reminds the reader of Zarathustra, even if very faintly and in an ironical way. To the reader who is not familiar with JLM's literature, in particular with his 'romances' and as a result, has not come across other instances in which his allusions to FWN are recognizable, the interpretation pointed out here may appear as too far-fetched if not ill-founded or non-existent. However, the direct attack against FWN in "E" is neither an isolated item nor a fortuitous motif in the story. It is rather an overt clue to a trend of philosophical thought which JLM sees represented in its utmost degree (or in its more comprehensive form) in FWN's thought, for his philosophy embodies practically all the intellectual preoccupations which pervade JLM's literature. It is the task of the researcher to establish the exact relationship between FWN's philosophy and JLM's. The present work - as in the previous cases - envisages introducing the subject, or merely, drawing the attention of the reader to it.

As suggested above, the reader who is not familiar with the 'Mitchellian' themes, whatever his/her reaction when reading chapter I of "T D" headed "Suicide and the Horizon" (2), might not necessarily associate it with the theme of suicide in FWN even when he/she might associate it with other authors. To be more precise, I do not think that anyone would associate the theme of suicide with FWN specifically, not even when appearing alongside the Walls-of-the-World theme and within the context of the symbolic theme of the standing stones of the Neo-lithic represented by the Stane Muir in the novel. Yet, these elements are already pointing to a more important and much deeper meaning, not only because of the connotation suggested by the title but also because Book One is headed "Ante-Natal" and given as epigraph verses from Swinburne's "Marching Song". Besides, the subchapter introduces Malcolm Maudslay (MM) when he is only five years of age and therefore the

"companionable looking stone with which  
to batter in the Walls of the World"(3)

may appear as child play in an infantile mind, and yet we note the same stone theme, developed with different connotations to FWN's

"stone of wisdom, thou sling stone, thou  
star-destroyer."(4)

In other words, and in keeping with JLM's approach, I understand the stone motif as a symbol related to a theory of knowledge. FWN's intention is the same, but since it is his theory of knowledge that JLM is combatting, it might not be misleading to infer that FWN's stone as symbol conveys a meaning which is opposite to the meaning JLM attaches to his stone motif. The "companionable" stone turns up again, in the story "WLS" (5) related to the Atlantis theme (see chapt. 7). Here the stone may signify a superior culture, humankind's mastery over nature, and even, the difference between humankind and other species that did not survive in the process of evolution of anthropomorphic races. In actual fact, however, that stone is above all a token from an earlier civilization. JLM introduces thus the chronological element, or the historical perspective as a central

element in the acquisition of knowledge. In doing so, his own theory of knowledge appears as a collective achievement rather than as an individual one. That is, as a process of evolution rather than as an enlightening achievement of some privileged intellect. In other words, JLM is in fact combatting FWN's elitist conception of human knowledge. In this sense, the scene in "T D" is clear enough.

Among his novels "G H" must certainly be described as anti-Nietzschean in content. But JLM also provides some external clues, mentioning for example

"a sunset that might be the Twilight of the Gods itself"(6)

Even if accepting an allusion to Wagner (he is never mentioned by JLM and I do not remember having come across any recognizable indirect allusion to him apart from this, which may not be intended as Wagner, unless JLM wants to direct us to "We Antipodes" in FWN's book "Nietzsche contra Wagner"), according to the content of "G H", I would have thought that JLM might have directed us to the other twilight - FWN's "Twilight of the Idols", which he probably does as will be seen below. A more direct clue to FWN is provided in the chapter in which Gay Hunter, the main character, on recovering from the shock produced by the revelations concerning the horrific world which a Nietzschean civilization had created in the past (the past of the novel set some 20 thousand years ahead) and whose remains could still be seen in the ruins of a London destroyed so long ago, decides to march against the fascists who had made that London their head-quarters and their stronghold. This movement in the narrative reminds us of FWN's "going down", at least in formal terms, since Gay actually asks Rem,

"Sing for me, Rem, in case I've to go down again"(7)

which coupled with the following motif in the form of a rhyme, completes or makes clearer the allusion to FWN:

" 'Gay go up and Gay go down': That is

the way to London Town"(8)

since it directs the reader's attention to both "TSZ" and "The Twilight of the Idols". In the first work the motif of the going down appears, for example, in the following context concerning Zarathustra's 'mission':

"And when he had reached the top ... there lay the other sea spread before him: the night ... was cold at this height, and clear and starry ...

Ah, this sombre, sad sea, below me! ... To you I must go down!

Before my highest mountain do I stand, and before my longest wandering: therefore must I first go deeper down than I ever ascended:

Deeper down into pain than I ever ascended,"(9)

The passage in "The Twilight of the Idols" which I think is pertinent to the content of "GH" is the following:

"Progress as I understand it. - I also speak of a "return to nature," although it is not properly a going back, but a going up - up into high, free, and even frightful nature and naturalness, such as plays, or may play, with great tasks ... To express it in a simile, Napoleon was an instance of a "return to nature," as I understand it"(10)

It is possible to say that "GH" is a critique of FWN's concept of "progress", especially if FWN bases it on a "return to nature" concept which has nothing to do with JLM's. The first impression, however, is that there seems to be an identity of some kind between them when FWN defines his return to nature as "not properly a going back, but a going up - up into high, free" nature, etc. But the "frightful" character of the nature FWN refers to seems to convey one element of a qualitatively different approach to the concept nature which apparently is the corner stone of their respective philosophies. As will be seen below, FWN's concept of progress is based on the

neo-evolutionist principles which JLM combats, i.e. social darwinism, or the idea that the same laws of Nature apply also to Civilization. As it has been pointed out earlier on, social darwinism, far from condemning violence and war tends rather to provide scientific (or pseudo-scientific) justification for these and other social scourges. Because of this and of Napoleon's historical role, and because of JLM's concept of historical 'hero' - such as Hanno, Mungo Park, Liebknecht, Christ, etc. plus all the host presented in "NAU" - JLM loathes Napoleon. Therefore, the "great tasks" hinted by FWN in his simile can only be strongly rejected by JLM since, probably, the situation depicted in "G H" is but the historical implementation - at theoretical level at least - of such "great tasks" engendered by a concept of progres such as FWN's. According to JLM, of course Nietzsche's concept of progress has nothing to do with humanity and therefore it leads to the utmost dehumanization ever conceived as illustrated by "GH". In the course of this exposition there will be opportunities to refer to other similar instances, but the problem in hand now is the allusion to FWN's philosophy as shown in "FTS".

The personal history of old Richard Southcote, the main character in "FTS", can be simplified down to just three chief movements, i.e., from a healthy happy man doing research on earthquakes he deteriorates to insanity becoming a madman seeking fierce revenge in the utter extermination of a humankind he now hates. He finally moves on to a third stage in which his mental health is restored as a result of a fall which in turn crippled his body. These three movements correspond, in a minor degree, to the structure of his model, but at the same time they are apt as an allusion to FWN, not to his philosophy directly but to a crucial experience in life which is revealed when old Southcote's fictional experience is tacitly compared with FWN's own experience which haunted him from childhood as a result of his father's death. In fact,

"Nietzsche's father died following a fall...: he found his father lying unconscious. ... (he) was troubled by the idea that he might meet the same death as his father. (The idea seems to have assumed the nature of an obsession: its

origin probably lay in Nietzsche's fear of madness, which was strengthened by the fact that his father died insane. The insanity was caused by the fall, but Nietzsche was probably doubtful whether the fall did not merely bring to the surface an inherited weakness.)"(11)

So, apparently, JLM referred his scene in FTS to FWN's actual experience rather than to FWN's own allegory based on that experience which, we are told, is recognizable in "The Vision and the Enigma" in TSZ (12), although JLM may have also reversed FWN's meaning as will be seen below, but in relation to the snake motif only. For the time being I am dealing with the fall which can also be related to the scene of Prologue 6. Concerning the fall of FWN's father and its consequences, JLM reverses the terms. Whilst FWN's father died insane as a result of a fall, in JLM's version, the father (young Richard Southcote's father) recovers his mental health as a result of a fall. Whilst in FWN's life experience his father becomes insane because of an innate propensity to madness, in JLM's fictional creation the father recovers his mental health because of an innate tendency to good health, where good health is a synonym for Natural Man's humaneness. This is the basic theme of JLM's model. Moreover, whilst FWN's father's insanity brings about individual death (his own death) as a final outcome, Southcote's recovery in JLM's FTS brings about collective life, or salvation (qvi), as a final outcome: salvation for all humankind (for this is the sense of FTS), reversing thus the original intention of old Southcote's madness.

As pointed out above, the fall as symbol is also used by FWN in Prologue 6: the fall of the rope-dancer during his performance at the market-place, who falls as a result of the buffoon's antics. As a dying man the rope-dancer asks Z whether he can save him from hell

" 'there is no devil and no hell' "

answers Z

" 'Thy soul will be dead even sooner

than thy body: fear, therefore, nothing  
anymore!' "

The man's conclusion, then, is that he is no more than an animal -

" 'Thou has made danger thy calling ...  
Now thou perishest by thy calling' "(13)

Z comforts him; his own conclusion on this account is that

"Sombre is human life, and yet without  
meaning: a buffoon may be fateful to it.  
I want to teach men the sense of their  
existence, which is the Superman, the  
lighting out of the dark cloud -  
Man."(14)

It is impossible not to associate this scene in TSZ with the scene in Miriam's house after Southcote's fall in FTS. The allegory is, I think, basically the same although the sense is altogether different. Let us examine JLM's text of Southcote's fall.

Like in the preceding case JLM actually reversed the sense, and thus, the victim of the fall lying in Miriam's house is not primarily concerned with his 'salvation' - in contrast with the rope-dancer - but with the terrestrial salvation of those tending him (as part of the population of Mevr). Nevertheless, unlike the rope-dancer, it is not the after-life salvation that Southcote is concerned with, but the salvation from death (or in the sense suggested by the biblical passage that inspired the story FTS), a collective death which, in the terms of JLM's allegory may be identified with a symbolic extinction of all the human species (also part of JLM's model) in much the same way that the destruction of Sodom meant the total extinction of its 'sinful' population. An important difference with the rope-dancer is that Southcote, as the victim of the fall, is at the same time the possessor of the key to salvation (symbolically understood), so that no Z prophet is required by him although he needs an enlightenment. Now, those who were looking after him far from being anything like 'prophets' were in fact, in Southcote's opinion, not only the very

scum of Mevr but actually the vilest and wickedest and most hopeless people on earth - very much like those biblical people of Sodom and Gomorrah. FWN would have identified them with the "rabble" - or the Chandalas? - those who, presumably, form the heart of the "polluted stream" which he claimed Man to be. The only thing that both the rope-dancer and Southcote seem to have in common is that they both learn something crucially important. But even this operation is different in content since the former in fact unlearns, whereas the latter is enlightened. The nature of the unlearning and of the enlightenment makes all the difference. Whilst the rope-dancer - who has been led to conclude, contrary to his religious belief, or his theory of knowledge, that he was no more than an animal which had been taught to dance by blows and starvation - unlearns his own wrong concept of after-life salvation or damnation, he does not learn anything about human life on earth, except perhaps, that he is "something to be surpassed" since the only assurance that he is not just an animal, that Z can give him, is that he has made danger his calling and now

"you perish through your calling: so I will bury you with my own hands."

presumably because he as a human being is but a bridge between Man and the Superman. Southcote on the other hand unlearns his wrong concept of civilization and of humanity in quite a natural way - almost unwittingly on the part of his 'prophets'. What is revealed by the very "rabble" is the meaning of humaneness so concealed by civilization, and through this he also grasps the sense of life, the sense of Man's existence, i.e., exactly that which Z is seeking to teach. But here lies the essential difference: whilst the sense of existence for Z is the Superman, not only because

"Man is a rope stretched between the animal and the Superman - a rope over an abyss."(15)

but also, and fundamentally because

"The Superman is the meaning of the earth. Let your will say: The Superman shall be the meaning of the earth!"(16)

What Southcote learns amounts to exactly the opposite.

Southcote's enlightenment has the character of a revelation - intended to reverse the sense of Joanna Southcott's campaign based on Revelation 12 - but a revelation made by the common people, or at any rate, the lowest and the downtrodden. It is in this connection that the 'fall' is important as symbol, both because it is related to coincidence (for it did not have to happen) and because it is, in keeping with JLM's view, a 'fall' from civilization to the height of humanity, i.e.: not a fall but the reverse (incidentally, note the allusion to Spengler). From his former position in Civilization Southcote had never known about the people and yet, like an authoritarian and severe god, he had passed judgement on them and accordingly was going to destroy Mevr in order to punish the unworthy, the disobedient, the wicked, and the sinful. But Southcote was a madman, and as such, he had been deprived of his humaneness. The fall from civilization rid him of his madness and enabled him to recover his human condition. Only then could he see humanity underneath the rabble, or rather, how humankind still survived under the heavy weight of civilization. But above all, only then could Southcote realize the insuperable excellence of the human soul whose love, pity, and compassion appear as the indestructible elements on which the greatness of humanity sits so firmly that neither the forces of Nature nor those of Civilization can challenge it. In other words, the 'Superman' that FWN is looking for has always been here on earth. However there is another discrepancy with FWN in this respect: for Nietzsche also conceives his Superman as earthly, so that together with maintaining that the Superman is the meaning of the earth he adds:

I conjure you, my brethren, remain true to the earth, and believe not those who speak unto you of hopes beyond the compass of the earth!"(17)

For FWN, remaining true to the earth means, remaining true to hierarchy, caste, race, etc. in keeping with his view that the laws of Nature are valid also for men, i.e. in governing human affairs. Instead, remaining true to the earth for JLM means remaining true to the natural spiritual gifts of humankind which, as seen in the preceding section, are best represented by love, pity and compassion, which engender true comradeship among human beings based on a feeling of natural equality and selfless regard for the others and the group as a whole. This 'soul' of humanity is, in JLM's view, the true "meaning of the earth", and accordingly, this is the content of the 'revelation' that enlightened Southcote and which eventually 'redeemed' him, for the irony lies in that he who was bent on punishing the sinners turns out to be the true sinner and is therefore, redeemed by the virtuous soul of humanity.

The core of the problem is that JLM's view arises from his Rousseauian conception of the innate goodness of human nature, whilst FWN's ideas concerning the Superman are but the natural result of his adherence to neo-evolutionist science, so that here is one more evidence that social Darwinism is the vital question which provokes JLM's reaction. Social ethics is the crux of his philosophy, and hence, his social ethics become his paradigm from which he assesses other human philosophies, since from his point of view, every philosophy produces a theory of social organization which can be based either on equality or on inequality, and in the case of FWN's philosophy gives occasion for a social order based on race, caste, and privilege.

Let FWN himself explain his undemocratic and anti-Christian stance:

"Christianity springing out of a Jewish root, and only comprehensive as a growth of this soil, represents the movement counter to every morality of breeding, or race, and of privilege: it is anti-Aryan religion par excellence: Christianity, the transvaluation of all Aryan values, the triumph of Chandala values, the gospel preached to the poor and lowly,

the collective insurrection against "race" of all the down-trodden, the wretched, the ill-constituted, the misfortunate, - undying Chandala revenge as religion of love ..." (18)

which is why JLM combats FWN since he is not only sympathetic to the Chandal but also in favour of "the collective insurrection ..." as FTS suggests although the story can hardly be interpreted as biased in that direction at the outset.

The motif analyzed above may call for further correlations, especially in connection with "The Vision and the Enigma", FWN's allegory of the shepherd who bit the neck of the black serpent that was hanging out of his mouth, thus delivering himself from being choked and at the same time transforming himself,

"Far away did he spit the head of the serpent -: and sprang up. -

No longer shepherd, no longer man - a transfigured being, a light surrounded being, that laughed! Never on earth laughed a man as he laughed!

O my brethren, I heard a laughter which was no human laughter," (19)

If compared with the scene described by JLM in FTS, the first difference is that where FWN presents a human being biting a serpent JLM presents a serpent biting a human being. This difference has a bearing on the meaning of the allegory each writer conceived. The description in FTS is how the Turk Ozman - a grave robber - gave his life to save his comrade Abdul's from the bite of "a small green viper" by sucking at the bane in the wound as soon as he realized they would get no help from Richard Southcote.

"'Haste, effendi. My brother has been bit of the yellow scorpion!'

For a moment the old man, who had once been Richard Southcote, M.D., stared up at the gesticulating Turk. Then returned to his eyes the same light as had been there when he had risen and threatened Mevr. He laughed, laughed aloud,

ringingly, unemotionally, so that Osman dropped his arms and stared, and presently saw the hakim deliberately turn his back and walk down the hill towards Mevr. From the ground Abdul groaned.

'Give me the knife, Nameless.'

The bestial-faced Turk stared down at his fellow-scoundrel. His hands began to shake. Then, abruptly, he dropped by Abdul's side and tore away the stained djibbeh. His intention was evident. Abdul shank away.

'Fool! Not that! It is death!'

The turk's great hands gripped him. 'Peace! I drink worse poison every day in the Street of Ten!'

With that, he bent his trembling lips towards the little oozing incision on the brown hide of Abdul the grave-robber."

(20)

Note the allusion to FWN's "no human laughter" of this "transfigured being", and the contrast offered by the "bestial-faced Turk". To JLM the Nameless's selflessness is the faculty that marks the real superiority of humanity. Now, provided that JLM might have alluded to FWN's philosophical riddle, one can only imagine that he chose to oppose to FWN's 'transfiguration' his own version of a transfiguration in reverse, or rather, of a different kind in so far as his idea of 'superman' is totally different from that of FWN's for he is talking of Man as a species, not as a caste. Thus the Nameless's gesture reminds us by contrast of "voluntary Death" in TSZ.

There is here one more sharp contrast between JLM's almost Christian attitude concerning voluntary death on behalf of humankind as illustrated in FTS and FWN's idea:

"Thus to die is best; the next best however, is to die in battle, and sacrifice a great soul."(21)

For JLM seems to have related his scene of the viper to Shakespeare's "As You Like It" with the intention of opposing it to FWN's intention, seeking at the same time in his coincidence with Shakespeare, to give his symbolic scene a more authoritative support, as will be seen. FWN

begins his allegory like this:

"But there a man was lying! And there! The dog, leaping, bristling, whining, and then it saw me coming - then it howled again, then it cried out - had I ever heard a dog cry so for help?

And truly, I had never seen the like of what I then saw. I saw a young shepherd writhing, choking, convulsed, his face distorted; and a heavy, black snake was hanging out of his mouth.

.....  
The shepherd, however, bit as my cry had advised him; (...) He spat far away the snake's head - and sprang up.

No longer a shepherd, no longer a man - a transformed being, surrounded with light, laughing! Never yet on earth had a man laughed as he laughed!"(22)

Let us compare this description with Shakespeare's scene in which Oliver narrates to Rosalind and Celia the adventure of Orlando under an old oak where a wretched ragged man (Oliver himself)

"Lay sleeping on his back. About his neck  
A green and gilded snake had wreath'd itself,  
Who with her head nimble in threats approached  
The opening of his mouth; but suddenly,  
Seeing Orlando, it unlink'd itself,  
And with indented glides did slip away  
Into a bush; under which bush's shade  
A lioness, with udders all drawn dry,  
Lay couching, head on ground, with cat-like watch,  
When that the sleeping man should stir;  
for 'tis  
The royal disposition of the beast  
To prey on nothing that doth seem as dead.  
This seen, Orlando did approach the man,  
And found it was his brother, his elder brother."(23)

And when Rosalind asks whether Orlando had left the wretched ragged man there, food for the hungry lioness, Oliver proceeds:

"Twice did he turn his back and purpos's  
 so;  
 But kindness, nobler ever than revenge,  
 And nature, stronger than his just  
 occasion  
 Made him give battle to the lioness,  
 Who quickly fell before him; in which  
 hurtling  
 From miserable slumber I awak'd."(24)

To JLM the fundamental thing is the reason why Orlando gave battle to the lioness, which is no different from the reason why his own character, the Nameless, saved the grave-robber's life. It is worth noting, however, that JLM uses (in his own variation of the motif) Shakespeare's green instead of FWN's black colour for the snake. But if FWN used a dog instead of Shakespeare's lioness - presumably because the dog is associated with his father's fatal accident - JLM related the impending danger not to an animal but to Civilization that had influenced doctor Soutchote's mental health to the point of turning him into a madman who, for this reason, would refuse to succour the grave robber bit by the viper. If FWN was concerned with the question of the Superman in relation to the problem of eternity or of the eternal reoccurrence motif, JLM like Shakespeare, was concerned with the problem of human brotherhood and kindness among human beings in opposition to unkindness, enmity, rivalry, and even violence and hatred. We say in Part II chap. 8, how JLM had related the theme of "As You Like It" to the social problem of the means of subsistence and its unequal and unbrotherly distribution in social life as the cause of social inequality and injustice, and hence, of hatred and violence and of social strife. The symbol of the green viper seems to highlight the point again confirming his view of Shakespeare's play. Thus, JLM may have seen in the two similar metaphors by FWN and Shakespeare respectively, as quoted above, two different variations on the same human theme: the meaning of human life. In introducing his own variation JLM may be emphasizing his idea that nothing is supreme if it is not human in the first place. And, according to him, what is more human than kindness? - This human kindness is JLM's starting point and the reason of his battling against all those who think that humans are by nature anything but kind. Just as JLM could understand

why Orlando saved his wicked brother's life - he may have understood Lady Macbeth's fears in I.4. because she knew that Macbeth as a human being was "too full o' th' milk of human kindness" - and can therefore, agree with Shakespeare on the plausibility of these human reactions for the same reason that the wicked characters in "As You Like It" are not in fact wicked by nature, but the opposite as the play shows. Whereas Southcote, in his self-attributed role as 'prophet' in the course of time suffers the deprivation of his kindness and when he is no longer human, he is capable of an act which rendered him "the most unnatural / That liv'd amongst men" (25).

The present work is not intended as an attempt to draw a parallel between JLM and FWN, and yet, FTS imposes a further comment on the question of the "camel-drivers" which JLM introduces in the following context:

"A caravan - lines of laden, dusty camels and thirstily vociferous drivers - had newly arrived from Bokhara. The dust arose in clouds, babel of many tongues filled the air. From the nearby streets the vile things which had once been women were already flocking into the Suq. They mingled with the caravan drivers. One, a ragged harpy with a shrill voice, Southcote saw wheedling at a black-bearded camelier, already drunk and sitting, cup of arrack in hand. Suddenly, with an insane ferocity, the ruffian leapt to his feet and smote the woman a blow that cracked her jaw. She fell with a scream of pain, and wild guffaws of merriment broke out. Loudest of all laughed the two Persian gendarmes who patrolled the bazaar. The camelier stared vacuously down at the woman ... It was, set against its background of heat and dust, a scene that might have been filched from hell."(26)

This scene is related to the climax of the story that really begins when Southcote arrives at the Street of Ten and begins to count from amongst the rabble the ten righteous ones: the first "righteous" is Ahmed the scavenger who saved a child (also referred to as "the brown

mite") from being killed by the frightened donkey. The second one was the camelier:

"On the sidewalk a man and a woman moved lurchingly. (...) Yet, passing, it seemed to the mad hakim that somewhere, before, he had seen those two-. (...) The man was the black-bearded camelier (...) the woman, she whom Southcote had seen with him fell to the ground. Came the ruffian's shamed voice 'Courage little sister. I will not leave you', And again, within Southcote, spoke an unknown voice: 'Two!'"(27)

If it is true that a camel driver should not be a surprise in a place such as Mevr, it is also true that camel driver, and camels, are not a surprise in FWN's imagery either. From the point of view of both content and context, JLM's caravan, the "dusty camels and thirstily vociferous drivers" or cameliers, are related to FWN's "rabble" and to his "three metamorphoses" in TSZ, in so far as JLM's intention in FTS is precisely to present the rabble of Mevr, at the "great bazaar of the Suq es Iraq" (an equivalent, presumably, of FWN's market-place). The particular thing in JLM's rabble is that, apart from the camel-drivers, he presents the prostitutes - "the vile things which had once been women" - and the gendarmes, frequently present in JLM's short stories as symbol of authority (or the State), the inequality which characterizes Civilization, and the reign of authority and its aftermath: undemocratic rule, oppression and repression.

In relation to FWN's metamorphoses, JLM highlights the 'metamorphose' of the camelier, so that to FWN's

"three metamorphoses of the spirit: how the spirit shall become a camel, and the camel a lion, and the lion at last a child."(28)

JLM seems to oppose that the camlier who had once been a kind and decent creature (in his capacity as Natural Man) became a ruffian full of "insane ferocity", and how this same ruffian became again a man, or

at any rate showed that in spite of everything he still retained the essential qualities of the Natural Man. In other words, JLM's is a metamorphose in reverse.

In in relation to the "rabble", FWN wrote:

"Life is a fountain of delight; but where the rabble also drinks all wells are poisoned."(29)

This is perhaps one of the few instances in which JLM agrees with FWN, and possibly the only one in which the agreement goes to some depth - "Life is a fountain of delight" - but the agreement ceases right there. The rest of FWN's thought has been proved totally wrong by the meaning of FTS, and as pointed out earlier on, the outcome of JLM's story reverses FWN's assertions, for if Southcote is meant to impersonate one of those "many a one"

"who hath gone into the wilderness and suffered thirst with beasts of prey, disliked only to sit at the cistern with filthy camel-drivers".(30)

he has now learned his lesson and after his own metamorphose has begun, he not only can now, no doubt, "sit at the cistern with filthy camel-drivers", but also provide the solution for the question which "almost stifled" FWN:

"What, does life have need of the rabble, too?"(31)

This is the essential difference, for JLM's answer would be not only "Yes!", but in fact also: "it is the rabble who have need of Life, for human life is meaningless without their number". Because it is not the Superman, but man is: "Man is the meaning of the earth!", would JLM retort.

As for the "naked brown child", FWN wrote in TSZ:

"what can the child do that even the lion cannot? Why must the preying lion still become a child?

The child is innocence and forgetfulness, a new beginning, a sport, a self-propelling wheel, a first motion, a sacred Yes.

...: ... the spirit now wills its own will, the spirit sundered from the world now wins its own world."(32)

This is another instance of correspondence in thought concerning some of the content. Yet, provided that they agree on the general idea of a metamorphose of the spirit, and also perhaps, on the faculty to will; they are not talking of the same metamorphose, nor of the same will either - let alone of the same spirit.

The naked child of JLM is an obvious allusion to a Golden Age child - son of Natural Man. Nakedness, symbolizing that Man had been "a free and happy and undiseased animal wandering the world in the Golden Age of the poets (and reality)" (33), recurs throughout his literary work, including of course his trilogy - ASQ.

The "brown" child of JLM is, again, the child of Humanity, since in JLM/s symbolism brown represents the colour of the human race.

Concerning FWN's idea of the spirit's own will, in FTS there is a "naked child" saved by a genuine Chandala type, a representative of the rabble - Ahmed the scavenger, who must have "willed" his act: there is no evidence in the story that the child had willed his. But the incident, coupled with FWN's idea, reminds us of the child in TD (MM, the main character) who had "willed" his own death ("voluntary death"?), but is saved by the irresistible challenge of the Walls of the World which he sets off to conquer and picks up for that purpose a "large and companionable-looking stone with which to batter in the Wall of the World ..." (34). Now, if it is true that the metaphor of the Walls of the World means that "civilization has built up in the hearts of men walls which cut them off from each other and from their essential selves" (35), then, it is obvious that they are talking of quite a different spirit, and therefore, of a different will.

Besides, in the light of JLM's imagery, as explained in chap. 7, the task "to batter in the Walls of the World" is not related to knowledge for knowledge's sake but for the role it is called upon to play in the quest for freedom. Therefore, it is not meant as a task for just a section of humankind, let alone for individuals, in much the same way that the quest is valid, not just for a number no matter how big, but for all humanity. And this, the quest for freedom as understood by JLM in his model, is beyond any doubt willed by absolutely every human being.

And last but not least, the lion. Even if there is no lion in FTS, it must be pointed out here that JLM also uses the symbol, although, usually associated with Swinburne's idea in his poem:

"Through the great deserts beasts  
Howl at our backs by night"(36)

(JLM uses the verses as epigraph for "T D"), as seen in the short story "W L S", in "T G B", and definitely in the novel "I S", and then also in the final scene of TD. However, not even in TD is the lion a lion proper, only a puma - in most of his stories set in the Central American jungles, the beasts become jaguars (like in IS) or a similar animal. But in the Persian Dawns cycle, the lion is a lion, although mostly related to the Golden Age theme, like in FS. Perhaps "the cough of some distant lion" in the story D A may have a different meaning. So too, the lion of L O, but the relationship with FWN's lion is unclear, unless JLM's idea were to oppose, in order to contradict FWN, the spirit of the child - Amina, the girl who kills the lion is almost a child - to the power of the beast, but this is not probable. However, it would be unwise to discard that symbolism of the lion in a story that highlights the difference between humans, proto-humans, and the non-human beings, especially when in that story JLM apparently opposes the spirit of humanity to the "lust and blood and brutishness" of that "strange precursor of Man ... Neanderthal Man." (37). In any case, it would be interesting to compare JLM's symbolism of the lion with that of William Blake's in "Songs of Innocence and Experience", for there seems to be some close

correspondence between them. But it would be unwise to discard an allusion to FWN in the symbolism of "L O" since JLM seems to understand FWN's Superman not as a poetic figure but as actual aspiration based on the theory of evolution. Beyond any doubt L O is a story intended to combat religious conceptions concerning the nature of the human soul (Amina, the heroine's name is a slight alteration of the word anima - soul) and the origin of humanity. Whether he manages to contradict FWN's views at the same time can be revealed through analysis. Underneath their duel in imagery lies a duel in natural science which motivates another one in social science, and the whole is reflected in their respective social philosophy and views including the field of politics, for

"Nietzsche as a sociologist aims at an aristocratic arrangement of society. He would have us rear an ideal race. Honest and truthful in intellectual matters, he could not even think that men are equal."(38)

Practically all JLM's literature is a plea for democracy, since his ultimate goal is total freedom for the human being. All his condemnation of modern civilization is in fact part of his battle against the lack of freedom which he sees as the result of the lack of equality.

FWN on the other hand proposes an unequal society as the best type of social organization based on the assumption that

"A higher culture can only originate where there are two distinct castes of society: that of the working class, and that of the leisured class who are capable of true leisure; or, more strongly expressed, the caste of compulsory labour and the caste of free labour. The point of view of the division of happiness is not essential when it is a question of the production of a higher culture; in any case, however, the leisured caste is more susceptible to suffering and suffer more, their pleasure in existence is less and

their task is greater."(39)

Precisely, it is against all this that JLM fought unrelentlessly as a man and as a writer. This difference shows the magnitude of the gulf that separates these two men.

This is the reason why JLM highlighted this theme in his FTS, and if Southcote impersonates FWN, or at any rate his philosophy of humanity, the outcome of the story is designed to prove FWN's theory as wrong as Ptolomei's system turned out to be with respect of Copernicus's.

And yet, the reader is likely to recognize not only FWN's literature but also probably bits of his thought here and there in JLM's literature. A brief survey would suffice to reveal that this is a natural development derived from the fact that their common main concern is Humanity. This, and the extreme discrepancy in their views made JLM include FWN and not any other philosopher in his Proem - FTS, for in this way he illustrates how, by reversing the meaning intended by FWN, JLM seeks to make his own thought more explicit. This means that JLM sees in FWN the impersonation of a body of thought that antagonizes important aspects of humanism which become central in JLM's ideology. FWN is an antagonist of humanism.

Let us now compare a couple of instances of reversion. The first is what FWN called "The Forgetful" in D D:

"The forgetful. - In the outbursts of passion, and the wild fancies of dream and insanity, man recovers his own pre-history and that of humanity: the animal world with its savage grimaces. His memory, for once, reflects on the past; while his civilised state evolves from the oblivion of these primitive experiences, hence, from the failing of that memory. Whoever, as one exceedingly forgetful, has always kept aloof from all this, does not understand mankind, -(40)

As usual, JLM takes up the idea because there is one general premise

which he regards as true. But alongside it there is a subordinate idea which conveys the element of controversy. In the present case JLM seems to share FWN's view that "in the outburst of passion ... man recovers his own pre-history and that of humanity", but only as far as the "animal world" perhaps, for the concept "savage" JLM reverses and transforms into "love" - not the romantic passion probably, but just the opposite of hatred. So that what belongs to humanity's pre-history is in any case love, even if at animal level, since it corresponds with the epoch when humankind did not know of hatred, violence, or wars.

This reversal of the Nietzschean conception is well-illustrated by the content of the story L C (41) in which the hero (an allegorical character) Berkhu "still searched unavailingly for the golden grain." "And the Mongols drew nearer" and towards the climax of the story when this hero is getting ready for battle

"he glanced at the face of the woman, and dimly, hurriedly, tried to remember that aged rheumy face.

"I do not remember you," he said, snatching the scimitar from her hand.

She raised her head and looked at him, and strangely, halted, he stared back.

He remembered her then. He had thought her long dead. She was a Caucasian slave, the first woman he had ever possessed... Years before, in the dawn of time. How she had hated, how loved. That he recalled, and himself of those days, and suddenly, says Nerses, some sealed and secret chamber seemed to crumble within his heart.

"Do you remember those years, Saith? I -" he heard himself, an unwonted liar, with amazement - "have forgotten them never, not all the wonder you gave me then -" ...

... says Nerses, in that final melee some realization seemed to come upon him. He half-wheeled round, the old Lion of the River, ... as though some secret amazing were revealed to him at long last.

"O God, the lost constituent!". And then the charge ... And they took Baghdad and slaughtered therein for many

days."(42)

By putting the line that love, not savagery, belongs to the pre-history of humanity JLM is not only combatting FWN's ideas but also the neo-Darwinian tendency to ascribe to human society the same biological principles that set the laws of evolution in the jungle into motion. He is also confirming once more his defence of what I have called the corner stone of his model.

Now for the second example. FWN wrote:

"How we should turn to stone. - By slowly, very slowly growing hard like precious stones, and at last lie still: a joy to all eternity."(43)

No doubt, this is likely to bring to the reader's mind the last novel of the trilogy ASQ - GG. The question whether JLM - or, LGG in this case - took FWN's words literally may be better solved with the assistance of the geologist perhaps. But JLM seems to have believed in the need to become harder and harder, though in a different sense maybe and for different purposes. In any case, it is symptomatic that the four parts in which the novel was divided are headed Epidote, Spheue, Apatite, and Zircon respectively, and more symptomatic still that Zircon is the hardest of all. The obvious difference with FWN lies again in substituting the element that in FWN's model is an end for that which in JLM's is a means, i.e. "how we should turn to stone" but as a 'necessary evil' without which it would be impossible to effect the fundamental change in Civilization that Humanity may recover its own original identity.

If all this were essentially correct, then, my assumption that FTS contains in a nutshell JLM's model (or system) and that in it he combats philosophical ideas of the type propounded by FWN, would also be correct. In that case, and as a final remark, I would like to point out how interesting it would have been, provided it were possible and feasible, to establish what exactly H.G. Wells was thinking and what he meant when referring to FTS he wrote to JLM:

"very good story" (see chap. 6, Q. 1).

IN CONCLUSION

In the writings of JLM/LGG there is a second meaning which, in the words of Goldmann, is "the essential meaning". It is not self-evident as totality without analysis let alone in isolated pieces, since it forms part of a whole which is vertibrated in such a way that if its presence can be detected in every individual title, its line of intention can not. In effect, the imagery of his literary work follows a consistent pattern which is woven into a complete and integrated structure intended to serve the purpose pursued by the content of his writings. His subject-matter is the evolution of society, whereby his main preoccupation is culture and his paramount concern - Man. This large process embraces not only the whole of culture in its historical dimension but also, by extrapolation, its possible and probable outcome. His views on this large movement are articulated into a sequence whose coherence and dynamics are instrumental in shaping his model of society. In fact, the model connects the most distant past of humankind to the most distant future. To do so, he incorporates the empirical knowledge, including even legend, of pre-Christian cultures on the one hand, and on the other, the possible and probable knowledge and achievements to be attained in the future. These anticipations are based on scientific theory. Broadly speaking his object is culture since it concerns itself basically with both spiritual, social, and material values throughout history, and with the dynamics of their creation, transmission and use. The author makes it clear that the cultural achievements are directly dependent on the way in which human beings organize the process of material production in society. Such process in turn is dependent on the knowledge that the human being may have gained over nature as well as on the power and means at his disposal to act upon it. In other words, he is aware that cultural developments depend not only and fundamentally on the mode of production, which is why he advocates the need for political revolution as essential, but also on the scientific achievements that come with it. So that, when the author concentrates mainly on spiritual culture, he does it because he has also given scientific research its due; and this, not only in natural science but also in

social science, for he assigns scientific knowledge a crucial role in the process of creating a higher culture.

In his system, the beginning and the end, the "alpha and the omega" of existence is the human being, and consequently, he sees the interdependence between Man and culture in much the same way that he sees the relationship between culture and freedom. Thus culture is the quest for freedom and therefore, it is culture that gives human life its sense and its true fulfilment.

His starting point is the dialectical relationship between Man and nature. Humanity as part of nature inaugurates a new reality in the universe: seeking their own survival they started the process of transforming nature, and in doing so, set in motion a new process in Life which gave origin to humanity's own and unique creation - culture. In turn the latter has been transforming humanity in more ways than one and not always for the better, for movement in nature seems to consist of its overt expression and its implicit contrary. So that a development that can be termed positive creates at the same time something that can be termed negative. Thus, culture is at one and the same time an agent of negative developments in that the more cultured humanity have become - especially in progressing to higher modes of production - the less humane the culture has tended to be: the farther away from the natural way of life of the species, the less human the relationship amongst the members of the society. This tendency if taken to an extreme by the historical process - as in the author's view is currently happening in his time - puts in jeopardy not only the highest values of humanism but in point of fact, the very existence of humanity itself. And yet, it is thanks to this process that humanity have been ascending at the same time to new heights of freedom, i.e. to a more humane condition. There is something inspired by Rousseau here. But there is something more. For if Man has gained civilization at the cost of his own dehumanization, civilization has given him instead the possibility of attaining his own freedom even when the latter entails the acquisition of power over nature and over himself, entailing thus new dangers arising from civilization, some of them deadly. Again, civilization puts Man in a position where it is

up to his own ability to achieve his ultimate triumph or to run head-long into his own destruction. His triumph means regaining that which he had formerly lost, but supreme in quality, since that would come as the result of a highly conscious and sophisticated reorganization of human life by substituting planned and pre-determined results, for the spontaneous and blind ways of nature.

In general terms his model finds inspiration in the "negation of the negation" law of Marx's dialectics of History. But it also incorporates the Rousseauian idea that the process of progression engenders its opposite. Hence his adoption of the otherwise 'romantic' notion that Civilization (as understood by JLM) can be compared to a "city of dreadful night" which has fallen prey to all the evils from a new Pandora's coffer as it were. His 'faith' in the ultimate triumph of humanity might also be confused with mere romantic 'dreams' if his model did not emphasize two decisive elements, namely, the necessity of political revolution, and the need for scientific knowledge as the only means of gaining power over nature. These are the pre-conditions of that triumph. His model shows that his analysis of human history coincides in general terms, and possibly even more in methodology and attitude, with Engels' approach. This, far from contradicting the author's adoption of the Rousseauian tenets, gives a more consistent outlook to his own interpretation of culture because it thus establishes the necessary connection between the revolutionary thought of the French Enlightenment and the modern system of thought founded by Marx and Engels. The model also incorporates archaic forms of humanist conceptions - as generally reflected in ancient legend and myth - even when most of them had already been incorporated to the Christian social doctrine, especially the themes of love and peace. Hence his admiration of Christ. On a strictly intellectual plane, his point of departure is Greek materialist philosophy and, by and large, their general way of life, in the sense that he regards the slave problem in the historical context of that Greek democracy as not relevant to the essence of his model.

His view of culture brings us back to the contradiction between progression and retrogression and the impending obliteration of

humanity. These forces, in his model, have their current expression even in science. In politics, it is Fascism. What makes it feasible is precisely the progress of the productive forces, especially of science and technology, without the corresponding progress in the general mode of production. Since Capitalism can only lead to war given both its competitive nature and its class character, the progress of the productive forces within this mode of production can only serve to make wars more and more devastating. This warlike character of Capitalism fosters the dehumanizing process, so that whilst science and technology should be the best allies of human beings, they become instead their deadly enemies. In this the author's prophetic talent anticipates both the atom bomb, and worse than that, the danger of a fatal atomic war (he died 11 years before Hiroshima and Nagasaki). We see here echoes of what he called his "intrawellsian immersion". The important thing though is that his model is not only a call to arms against militarism and especially against fascism but also a plea for peace and disarmament. This helps by making his humanist views more explicit, and confirms his longings for freedom as going far beyond their political connotation and into the philosophical pursuit of making necessity not only known but also liable to control. As a humanist he is then a pacifist who fights against the agents of war and violence. On the political plane his humanism makes him a soldier fighting against Capitalism and its ultra expression - fascism; and it makes him also a crusader for peace and disarmament.

Nevertheless, in this crucial tangle, the author also anticipates its possible and probable positive outcome, which he sees as feasible thanks to humanism. As a result he sees the importance of ideology in that it is equally necessary to make war on that which is theological in character and to foster that which has material and scientific foundations. At the heart of this concern lies the question of social ethics which, naturally, leads on to the question of social revolution. It is therefore related to political leadership, although in a more general sense it is related to the question of culture, i.e. the cultural revolution.

Based on the overt content of his writings, it is freedom that appears as his paramount objective, which in any case, has to be preceded not only by social revolution in order to come into actual existence, but also by other developments that, according to historical necessity, must contribute to removing the internal contradiction between individualism and the full development of the individual. For in the society he is trying to change, there has existed - according to Goldmann's words - this internal contradiction between individualism as a universal value engendered by Capitalism, and the important and painful limitations that such a system itself imposes on the possibilities of individual development. Just as JLM criticises relevant aspects of English culture, or of Capitalism for that matter, he either clashes with or coincides with views expressed by previous or contemporary colleagues of his. But he takes his place amongst British writers whose inspiration, especially that of Morris, he not only acknowledged but also adopted: the revolutionary romantic poets like Shelley. This once more connects him with French socialism and the forerunners of scientific socialism, the basis of his universality as a humanist. But it is not difficult to detect Wells's influence in all this. Generally, if Morris contributed decisively in shaping his ideological outlook by introducing him to modern socialist ideas, it was Wells who provided the general outline for the new tasks that a new world set before writers, and JLM like his master, could only assess the present in terms of the future. The Bolshevik Revolution marks the beginning of that future, and accordingly, in following that light the pupil seeks not only to participate in that movement to the future but also to outdo his master. His effort, at any rate, brings him into the great tradition to which Wells belongs.

His term 'Civilization' even when applied to all social formations following the primitive communal way of life, acquires its more relevant meaning when applied to History since the Reformation. He was quite conscious that natural science had also taken its modern form in that revolutionary atmosphere. He thought himself a revolutionary, and few would question it, but in fact his true goal was the cultural revolution. His battling as suggested above, belongs to the ideological arena. And yet, or possibly as a result, some have

regarded him as a mere romantic. If aspects of form were to have more specific weight than the content in a world of art, then one would have to use the word romantic, but then, this should be characterized as revolutionary romanticism as different from romantic revolutionism. For, in my opinion, his model as work of art has succeeded in establishing such an interdependence between content and form that if either were to be taken in isolation, the whole fabric of his creation would be disjoined. In other words, the romantic element is part of the whole and as such it should not be made to predominate over it. In conclusion, the flaws of the model should be viewed from the vantage point of scientific socialism and not from that of romanticism. His socialism corresponds in actual fact to the higher stage of socialism, hence his description of a humanism that looks 'utopian' - and therefore romantic - in our age. But it is conceived as humanity's glorious achievement, the crowning of the long historical process in a society in which its members could no longer understand the idea of social class let alone see its meaning. This explains why he postulates that the revolution means both redemption and salvation. Redemption because even the members of the oppressors' class, taken as individuals, can be humanized by the revolution; and salvation for all the species that will neither lose essentially its humane nature nor will it be wiped out from the face of the earth. Some may regard it as ironic if not contradictory that such a revolutionist - advocating sharp violence against the oppressive class - should be at the same time such a staunch pacifist; and yet, there is only consistency in this in so far as he is also following Marxism in his theory of revolution, for very much in line with the "negation of the negation" law of dialectics that inspires his model, peace on earth will be a reality only once that negation has taken place in History. He is a revolutionary pacifist. And this is the way to understand his metaphor that revolution means 'salvation', and that in this connection, theology is only an "archaic science". It can be seen that his aim is to combat first of all the theological model. And yet, he still admires Christianity. Again, there is no inconsistency. Even when to him Christianity is part and parcel of Civilization, it is far from being an enemy. Christianity's social content is both a route companion and a potential ally. It is the

ethics of the social project which Christianity inherited from pre-Christian humanism that makes them different from Capitalism. Just as in the past humanism found its way into theology, and survived through the reign of Civilization, so too it has now found in Marxism its natural abode and its life in the future. In other words, it is thanks to scientific socialism that humanism completes its metamorphosis and reaches its adulthood fully equipped to start its glorious expedition to the future and to the stars. Thus Christian humanism will eventually merge with Marxist humanism, and the peace-loving Christian will turn into a revolutionary pacifist.

On the front of social science the author saw the need to combat Neo-Darwinism and all brands of "organic theories of society", and all brands of defeatist and nihilistic theories like those of Spengler and Nietzsche respectively. In singling out these two authors here, an attempt is made at pointing out those aspects of bourgeois ideology on which the author concentrated his attention in search of a two-fold pursuit. On the one hand, he set out to make war on a philosophy of life which purports to provide the current theories that will help humanity to make out the key questions of existence that reveal the road to freedom, which is simply preposterous given its unscientific foundations. And on the other hand, he set out to expose the anti-human nature of an ideology which far from providing leadership to humanity's quest for a higher culture can only help to beget such monstrous social models as fascism. For he saw an impending danger in the fact that their theories were currently finding their materialization in fascism, particularly in the type of nazi-fascism which by then threatened to overpower the German people.

All this finds expression through the different phases of the model described in Part One which his writings contain. As is evident, from the artistic point of view, the model is based on the conventions of the quest of the ancient world where legend and myth combined to record the collective empirical knowledge that spontaneous materialism had provided humanity with, long before theology took over. Even when much later Christianity adapted the old legend to suit its own purposes, the author succeeds in restoring to it its primaeval sense.

In effect, the tradition of the Holy Grail entails a retrogression from ancient materialism to theologism. And since the theological thought is bound to be superseded by scientific method, the author sees that the latter can in fact attain the goals pursued by the ancient quest.

Finally, it is worthwhile noting that as revolutionary, the author's goal is not democracy, in so far as he is concerned with the higher stage of socialism. His model is clear in criticizing even the very State that must be set up after the triumph of the revolution he advocates in order to consolidate it. He goes even further. His aim is for the society that has already done away with democracy. To him it is clear that even the most democratic of democratic models requires all the same a State, and to him it is clear that the state is essentially an instrument of coercion. This clashes with his concept of freedom, and his model is a quest for freedom.

His model is a quest, no doubt. But it is the quest in search of "the Kingdom of God on Earth". This kingdom lies beyond "the Passage of the Dawn", i.e., Revolution, and still further. Beyond in fact, the Cultural Revolution.

NOTESINTRODUCTION

1. WILLIAMS, Raymond "Culture and Society", p.137.
2. GOLDMANN, Lucien "Towards a Sociology of the Novel", pp.135-6.
3. LOTMAN, Yury "Analysis of the Poetic Text", p.6.
4. SASSO, Javier "Sobre la Sociologia de la Creacion Literaria: Examen de las tesis de Goldmann".
5. EAGLETON, Terry "Marxism and Literary Criticism", p.34.
6. KHRAPCHENKO, Mikhail B. "Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo, deistvitelnost, tchelovek", Maskva, Sovietyky Pisatel, 1976.
7. KHRAPCHENKO "The Writer's Creative Individuality and the Development of Literature", p.16.
8. KHRAPCHENKO Op. cit., p.245.

CHAPTER 1

1. SHUKMAN, Ann "Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Yuri M. Lotman", p.45.
2. GOLDMANN, Lucien IN; "Sociology of Literature and Drama" ed. by E. & T. Burns, p.116.
3. GOLDMANN In op.cit., p.312. See also "HG".
4. GOLDMANN "The Hidden God", p.19.
5. DUHRING, Eugen As quoted by Engels in "Anti-Duhring", p.179.
6. MARX, Karl "Capital", vol. I, pp.761-3
7. ENGELS, Frederick "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" pp.43-44.
8. ENGELS "Introduction to the Dialectics of Nature", In: Marx Engels' Selected Works, p.349.

9. ENGELS "The Origin of the Family Private Property and the State", p.237.
10. ENGELS "Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy" In: Marx Engels' "Selected Works", p.603.
11. JLM "TGB", p.185.
12. ENGELS "OFFPE", p.217.

## CHAPTER 2

1. ENGELS, Frederick "Anti-Duhring", pp.191-2.
2. ENGELS "The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man", In: Marx/Engels: "Selected Works", p.359-60.
3. JLM "The Lost Constituent", a short story in "PDEN".

## CHAPTER 3

1. MORRIS, William In: "W. Morris: Artist, Writer, Socialist", by May Morris, vol. II, pp.456-7.
2. MORRIS "Socialism and Anarchism", as quoted in "Political Writings of William Morris" by A.L. Morton, pp.210-11.
3. ENGELS "The Origin of the family ...", p.236..
4. ENGELS "Anti-Duhring", p.251,
5. ENGELS Op. cit., p.250.
6. ENGELS "The Part Played by Labour in ...", pp.361-2.
7. ENGELS "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of ...", p.606.
8. JLM T D, p.215.
9. JLM Op. cit., p.197.

10. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.
11. JLM "LDEC", in: CC, p.142.
12. JLM "C.M.", p.40.
13. JLM "H", p.11.
14. JLM "L O", in: PDEN, p.107.
15. JLM & LGG "N.A.U.", p.125.
16. JLM & LGG Op. cit., p.29.
17. JLM & LGG Op. cit., p.263.
18. JLM & LGG Op. cit., p.199.
19. JLM L.Tr., p.141.
20. FRY, Northrop "Anatomy of Criticism", p.192.
21. WESTON, Jessie "From Ritual to Romance", p.59.
22. JLM "H", p.84.
23. ENGELS, Frederick Socialism: Utopian and Scientific", p.56.
24. ENGELS "Anti-Duhring", p.192.

#### CHAPTER 4

1. JLM T D, p.99.
2. Op. cit., p.103.
3. Op. cit., p.125.
4. Op. cit., p.238.
5. YOUNG, D.F. B S, p.38.
6. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.
7. Op. cit., Ibid.
8. Op. cit., p.258.
9. DAICHES, David The Present Age, pp.10-11.
10. JLM T G B, p.16.

11. Op. cit., p.17.
12. Op. cit., p.16.
13. Op. cit., p.161
14. Op. cit., Ibid.
15. Op. cit., Ibid.
16. Op. cit., pp.160-1.
17. Op. cit., P.18.
18. Op. cit., p.89.
19. See Chap. 8: Analysis of "H W S".
20. DUNNE, J.W. An Experiment with Time, p.207.
21. JLM Op. cit., p.229.
22. Op. cit., Ibid.
23. Op. cit., p.230-1
24. Op. cit., p.231.
25. Op. cit., p.185.
26. Op. cit., p.212.
27. Op. cit., p.213.
28. Op. cit., p.252.
29. JLM C C, p.114. But the story "V M" had originally been published in The Cornhill Magazine, Oct. 1929.
30. JLM T D, p.85.
31. JLM T G B, p.321.
32. JLM G H, p.194.
33. JLM See Frontispiece of "G H".
34. JLM T G B, p.232.
35. YOUNG, D.F. Op. cit., p.76.
36. JLM G H, p.136.
37. NIETZSCHE, F.W. H-A-T-H., p.319.

- 38 JLM As in 33 above.
39. JLM G H, p.121.
- 40 NIETSCHE, F.W. T S Z, II, XXXIX.
41. DUNNE, J.W. Infinite Regress, p.vii.
42. JLM Op. cit., p.268.
43. JLM T G B, p.175.
44. JLM Op. cit., p.174.
45. JLM G H, p.286.
46. JLM Op. cit., p.48.
47. JLM Op. cit., p.266-7.
48. JLM Op. cit., p.135.
49. MARX, Karl Capital, Vol. I, Chap. XXXII.
50. ENGELS, Frederick Anti-Duhring, p.192.

#### CHAPTER 5

1. ENGELS, Frederick "Anti-Duhring", p.157.
2. ENGELS Op. cit., Ibid.

#### CHAPTER 6

1. WELLS, H.G. In: "C C" (by way of Introduction).
2. WELLS, H.G. In: Op. cit., Ibid., Id.
3. JLM "Vernal", a short story in "C C".

#### CHAPTER 7

1. JLM As quoted by Munro in: "LM:LGG", p.102.
2. MUNRO, Ian S. "LM:LGG", p.102.

3. LGG "The Antique Scene". In: "ASH", po.124.
4. SWINBURNE, A. Ch. "A Marching Song".
5. MUIR, Edwin "Lewis Grassie Gibbon (J. Leslie Mitchell): an Appreciation", In: "The Scottish Standard", March 1935, p.23.
6. PLOMER, William In: "The Spectator", Aug. 4, 1933, p.168.
7. JLM T D, p.33.
8. MORRIS, William "The Hopes of Civilization", in "Political Writings of William Morris", p.160.
9. JLM As quoted by Munro in "LM: LGG", p.107.
10. CARLYLE, Thomas "Past and Present", 1843, pp.6-7.
11. JLM T D, p.197.
- 12 "The Saturday Review, Sep.1, 1928, p.262.
13. TENNYSON, Alfred "Ulysses."
13. ROUSSEAU, J.J. "Deuxieme Discours", p.92.
15. PISARIEV, D.I. As quoted in "Lenin: on Literature and Art", Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967, pp.20-21.

#### CHAPTER 8

1. JLM Proem to "He Who Seeks", in: "The Cornhill Magazine", vol. LXVII, No. 397, July 1929, p.97.
2. TROTSKY, Leo "Terrorism and Communism", in: "The Basic Writings of Trotsky", Ed., and Introduced by Irving Howe, Secker and Warburg, London, 1964, p.145.
3. JLM Quoted by Munro in "LM:LGG", p.25.
4. JLM "The Passage of the Dawn" is the "last of the Saloney stories" as one reads in "The Cornhill Magazine", vol. LXVIII, No. 408, June 1930 in the "Polychromata" series. Also in "C C".

5. JLM/LGG gives the theme of the fall an anthropological sense. See Chap. 6.
6. JLM "Introduction" to "The Blue Angel", a novel by Heinrich Mann, London, n.d. p.5.
7. JLM Proem to LDEC in "C C", p.131.
8. YOUNG, D.F. "B S", p.154.
9. LGG "W L S" in: "M.Th.", p.193.
10. JLM Proem to "D" in "C C", p.73.
11. JLM Proem to "G R" in "C C", p.218.
12. JLM "F T S" in "C C", p.13.
13. JLM As in 11 above.
14. SHAKESPEARE "As You Like It", II, vii, lines 153-4/159.
15. SHAKESPEARE Op. cit., II, vi.
16. SHAKESPEARE Op. cit., II, i. This also harmonizes with Hesiod's subject matter in "Works and Days".
17. MORRIS, William "Signs of Change" in: C.W. XXIII, p.68.
18. MORRIS, William Op. cit., pp.69-70.
19. JLM Proem to "P D" in "C C", p.261.
20. MORRIS, William "The Hollow Land", C.W. vol. I, p.254.
21. MORRIS, William Op. cit., Ibid, p.280.
22. JLM Proem to LDEC in "C C", p.131.
23. WESTON, Jessie "F R R", p.59.
24. WESTON, Jessie Op. cit., p.119.
25. WESTON, Jessie Op. cit., p.128-9.
26. JLM "HWS", IV in: "C C", p.44.
27. WESTON, Jessie Op. cit., p.164.
28. WESTON, Jessie Op. cit., p.3.
29. JUNG, Emma &  
FRANZ, M. Louise "The Grail Legend", p.23.

30. MORRIS, William Op. cit., Ibid.
31. MORRIS, William Op. cit. p.276.
32. JLM HWS, in CC, p.46.
33. JUNG & FRANZ Op. cit., pp.119-120.
34. MORRIS, William Op. cit., Ibid.
35. MACDIARMID, Hugh "The Belly-grip", a poem.
36. JLM "The Diffusionist Heresy" in: The Twentieth Century, vol. i, No. 1, Mar. 1931, p.14.
37. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.
38. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.
39. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.
40. See lines 25-27 of Proem to HWS quoted in III - above.
41. WESTON, Jessie Op. cit., p.129.

#### CHAPTER 9

1. (Heinemann) (eds.) As quoted by Munro in "LM:LGG", p.163.
2. FADIMAN, Clifton Id. Op. cit., p.164.  
(Simon & Schuster)
3. MUNRO, Ian S. "LM:LGG", p.164.
4. MUNRO, Ian S. Op. cit., pp.200-201.
5. JLM T D, p.60.
6. MACDIARMID, Hugh "'Lewis Grassie Gibbon' - James Leslie Mitchell" in: "The Uncanny Scot", p.157.
7. LGG Ws' I", Left Review, vol. 1, No. 5, Feb. 1935, p.180.
8. JLM T D, p.61.
9. JLM Op. cit., pp.60-61.
10. JLM Op. cit., p.60.

11. JLM Op. cit., p.61.
12. TENNYSON, Alfred "Ulysses", a poem.
13. TENNYSON, Alfred Op. cit.
14. SWINBURNE, Algernon "A Marching Song", a poem.
15. THOMSON, James "Sunday at Hampstead", III, 5, 7-8.
16. SHELLEY, P.B. Preface to "Laon and Cythna".
17. JLM "I I W" in "C C", p.243.
18. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.
19. AVELING, E. and  
MARX AVELING, E. "Shelley's Socialism", p.7.
20. WITTIG, Kurt "The Scottish Tradition in Literature".
21. AVELING, E. and  
MARX AVELING, E. Op. cit., p.8
22. SHELLEY, P.B. Letter to Leight Hunt, May 1st 1820 (As  
quoted by Aveling & Marx in op. cit.  
pp.2-3)
23. SHELLEY, P.B. "Queen Mab", verses 104-107.
24. SHELLEY, P.B. As in 16 above.
25. NOYES, Alfred "William Morris", p.47.
26. MORTON, A.L. Introduction to "Political Writings of  
William Morris", p.13.
27. MORRIS, William May Morris's "William Morris: Artist  
Writer Socialist", vol I, p.148.
28. GARDNER, D.R. "An Idle Singer and His Audience", p.85.
29. GARDNER, D.R. Op. cit., p.86.
30. MORRIS, William "How I Became a Socialist", Justice, June  
16, 1894. Quoted in "William Morris:  
Romantic to Revolutionary", p.638.
31. MORRIS, William C. W. A letter in "Commonweal", May 5,  
1889, Reprinted in May Morris's "WM AWS",  
vol. II, p.313.
32. JLM In "G H", "singer" is both the poet, the  
historian, the scientist, etc.

34. THOMPSON, E.P. "W M R R", p.782.  
 33. MORTON, A.L. Op. cit., p.14.

CHAPTER 10

1. MARX, Karl "Selected Works", as quoted by Daniel Gasman in: "The Scientific Origins of National Socialism", p.110.  
 2. MARX, Karl Id. Op. cit. Ibid.  
 3. ROUSSEAU, J.J. As quoted by Frederika Macdonald in: "The Humane Philosophy of J J Rousseau", p.58.  
 4. LGG "The Land" in: "A S H", p.79.  
 5. LINDSEY, John "J. Leslie Mitchell: an appreciation". Reprinted from "The Twentieth Century" in: "T G B", p.255.  
 6. CRUICKSHANK, H.B. "Mearns Memory" in: "The Scots Magazine" Vol.30, No.5, Feb. 1939, p.353.  
 7. JLM "Sp.", p.284.  
 8. I'ANSON FAUSSET, Hugh "Manchester Guardian", 26 Apr. 1933, as quoted by Munro in "LM:LGG", p.108.  
 9. JLM Op. cit. p.287.  
 10. JLM Op. cit. Ibid.  
 11. ROUSSEAU, J.J. Deuxieme Discours, p.92.  
 12. LGG "Sim" in: "A S H", p.49.  
 13. JLM Op. cit. p.21.  
 14. JLM In: "C C", p.  
 15. JLM "Sp.", p.131.  
 16. ROUSSEAU, J.J. Op. cit., p.110  
 17. ROUSSEAU, J.J. Op. cit. Ibid.

CHAPTER 11

1. JLM T D, pp.222-223.
2. YOUNG, D.F. B S, p.9.
3. WAGNER, Geoffrey "The Greatest Since Galt", f.n. p.301.
4. JLM Op. cit. p.38.
5. See Bibliography.
6. KEITH, Arthur "Ancient Types of Man", p.102.
7. KING (Professor) According to Keith, Arthur in op. cit. p.131.
8. HUXLEY, Thomas Id. Ibid, p.130.
9. JLM T G B, p.212.
10. SMITH, G.E. "The Diffusion Controversy", p.10.
11. See MUNRO, "LM/LGG", p.64.
12. See Bibliography
13. JLM "T D", p.223.
14. YOUNG, D.F. Op. cit., p.38.
15. Such as "The end of the Maya Old Empire". See Bibliography.
16. JLM "C M", p.46.
17. SMITH, G.E. Foreword to "C M".
18. LGG "Ws. I".
19. LGG Ibid.
20. LGG Ibid.
21. JLM "William James Perry, A Revolutionary Anthropologist", p.323.
22. YOUNG, D.F. Op. cit., p.12.
23. DAVIDSON, Basil "Africa in History", pp.37-38.
24. ENGELS, Frederick "The Part Played by Labour ..." in: OFPPE, p.251.

CHAPTER 12

1. See "Monism as connecting Religion and Science. The Confession of Faith of a Man of Science" p.3. See also R U, p.340. Monism as a unifying conception of nature as a whole - which sees the "unity of inorganic and organic nature, as well as their genetic relation", etc.
2. JLM "T D", p.38.
3. JLM Op. cit. "A footnote on origins" by JLM.
4. HAECKEL, Ernst "Monism" (1894), p.79.
5. JLM "I S", p.37.
6. JLM Op. cit., p.38.
7. PLOMER, William "The Spectator", Aug. 4, 1933, p.168.
8. HAECKEL "W L", p.100.
9. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.101.
10. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.403. See also p.54 and also "R U", p.154-7.
11. HAECKEL Monism, p.40.
12. JLM "T D", p.137.
13. WITTIG, Kurt "The Scottish Tradition in Literature", p.332.
14. HAECKEL "R U", p.17.
15. HAECKEL Op. cit.. p.256-7.
16. LGG "Religion" in: "ASH", p.157.
17. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.270.
18. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.274-5.
19. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.275-6.
20. HAECKEL Op. cit., Ibid.
21. LGG In: "ASH", pp.52-62.
22. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.289.
23. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.292.
24. See "G H", p.219.

25. WAGNER, Geoffrey "G.s.G." in: "E.i.C", 1952, p.309.
26. HAECKEL "W L", p.88.
27. HAECKEL "Monism", p.64-5.
28. HAECKEL "W L", p.347.
29. HAECKEL "Monism", p.68.
30. GASMAN, Daniel "The Scientific Origins of National Socialism"
30. See "The Scientific Origins of National Socialism by Gasman, Daniel.
31. HAECKEL "Freedom in Science", p.91.
32. HAECKEL Op. cit., p.93.
33. BERNAL, J.D. "Science in History", p.780.
34. HAECKEL "The Pedigree of Man", p.16.

#### CHAPTER 13

1. JLM T D, p.83.
2. The theme recurs in TGB, LDEC, The Land, etc. See GH (The Voice of the Tower). See also TD, p.86.
3. JLM CCC (L"Allegro) in: PDEN, p.201.
4. JLM T D, p.86.
5. JLM Op. cit., p.85.
6. BALDWIN, Roger "Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets" p.29.
7. KROPOTKIN "Letter to the Workers of Western Europe", in Baldwin's op. cit. in 6, p,252.
8. KROPOTKIN "Expropriation: An Anarchist Essay", p.6-7.
9. KROPOTKIN "An Appeal to the Young", p.5.
10. KROPOTKIN "Ethics: Origin and Development", p.4.
11. KROPOTKIN "Law & Authority: an Anarchist Essay",

- p.5.
12. KROPOTKIN "Wars and Capitalism", p.7.
  13. KROPOTKIN See 10 above: in Herbert Reid's "Kropotkin: Selection from his Writings", p.127.
  14. KROPOTKIN "Ethics: Origin and Development", p.14.
  15. JLM See "The Diffusionist Heresy" (p.15).
  16. KROPOTKIN Op. cit., p.31.
  17. KROPOTKIN Op. cit., p.30.
  18. KROPOTKIN "Modern Science and Anarchism", p.38.
  19. KROPOTKIN "Ethics: Origin and Development", pp.5-6.
  20. KROPOTKIN "Modern Science and Anarchism", p.45.
  21. KROPOTKIN "Law and Authority: an Anarchist Essay", p.23.
  22. KROPOTKIN Op. cit., Ibid.
  23. JLM See "Vernal" in "C C".
  24. JLM Op. cit., p.184.
  25. JLM Op. cit., p.185.
  26. JLM Op. cit., Ibid.

#### CHAPTER 14

1. ENGELS, Frederick In" "On Literature and Art", p.57.
2. MARX, Karl "Capital", vol. I, p.574.
3. MARX Op. cit., vol. I: (i) p.576; (ii) p.631; and (iii) p.632.
4. FWN TSZ, Prologue 5.
5. SPENGLER, Oswald "D W", vol. II, p.327.
6. WAGNER, Geoffrey "The Other Grassic Gibbon" (TOGG), p.41.
7. BEBEL, August "WPPF", p.7.

8. BEBEL Op. cit., Ibid.
9. BEBEL Op. cit., p.1.
10. BEBEL Op. cit., kp.5.
11. REID, Alexander "The Voice of the Land" in: "Scotland's Magazine", May 1963, p.44.
12. BEBEL Op. cit., p.126.
13. BEBEL Op. cit., p.35.
14. BEBEL Op. cit., p.129.
15. BEBEL Op. cit., p.241.
16. BEBEL Op. cit., p.127.

#### CHAPTER 15

1. MITCHELL, J.L. "Daybreak", a short story in C C. Also in the Cornhill Magazine, April 1930.
2. MITCHELL, J.L. Op. cit. in CC, p.73.
3. MITCHELL/GIBBON Unpublished. See Munro, I.S. pp.163-5.
4. SPENGLER "The Decline of the West", Allen & Unwin, London, 1926, Vol. I, p.363.
5. GIBBON, L.G. "The Land" in "Sc.S", London 1934, p.299. Also in "ASH", London, 1974, p.73.
6. GIBBON, L.G. Op. cit., p.303 (ASH, p.77)
7. GIBBON, L.G. Op. cit., p.305 (ASH, p.80)
8. SPENGLER Table I. "Contemporary Spiritual Epochs." (A separate accompanying "DW").
9. Not "dawn", since this word belongs to his imagery (See chap. 7)
10. SPENGLER "DW", I, p.104.
11. SPENGLER "M & T", p.43.
12. SPENGLER op. cit., pp.66-7.
13. SPENGLER "DW", II, p.363.
14. HELPS, Arthur "Oswald Spengler" In "The Decline of the

- West:, an abridged edition by Helmut Werner. Prepared by Arthur Helps. Allen & Unwin, London, 1961, p.11.
15. SPENGLER "The Duties of German Youth", as quoted by Arthur Helps in op. cit. in 14. p.15.
16. SPENGLER "DW", II, p.124.
17. HELPS, Arthur Op. cit., p.12.
18. SPENGLER "DW", II, p.89.
19. SPENGLER "M & T", p.85.
20. MITCHELL, J.L. "T D", p.197.
21. SOROKIN, Pitrin "Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis" Adam Charles Black, London, 1952, p.109.
22. SPENGLER "M & T", p.104.

#### CHAPTER 16

1. FWN "The Antichrist", CW XXVII.
2. JLM "T D", p.13.
3. JLM Op. cit., p.14.
4. FWN TSZ, III, XLVI, in: CW, p.188.
5. LGG "W L S", in: "M Th".
6. JLM "G H", p.183.
7. JLM Op. cit. p.168.
8. JLM Op.cit., p.171.
9. FWN Op. cit., p.185.
10. FWN "T I", O.W.48, p.217.
11. HOLLINGDALE, R.J. Note 25 to his translation of TSZ, in: Penguin Classics, 2nd printing, 1976, p.341.
12. HOLLINGDALE, R.J. Op. cit. ibid.
13. FWN TSZ, Prologue 6.

14. FWN Op. cit., Prologue 7.
15. FWN Op. cit., Prologue 4.
16. FWN Op. cit., Prologue 3.
17. FWN Op. cit., ibid.
18. FWN "T I", C.W., p.152.
19. FWN TSZ, C.W., p.193.
20. JLM "FTS: In: "The Cornhill Magazine, vol. LXVI No. 391, Jan 1929, pp.39-40.
21. FWN Op. cit., p.82 (C.W.)
22. FWN As in 19 above.
23. SHAKESPEARE "As You Like It", IV, 3, lines 106-119 and 126-131.
24. SHAKESPEARE Op. cit., ibid, lines 127-131.
25. SHAKESPEARE Op. cit., ibid, lines 121-2.
26. JLM "FTS", ibid.
27. JLM Op. cit., ibid.
28. FWN Op. cit., CW, p.25.
29. FWN Op. cit., id., p.113.
30. FWN Op. cit., ibid.
31. FWN Op. cit., ibid.
32. FWN Op. cit., ibid.
33. LGG "The Antique Scene" In: "Sc.S", p.20. Also: ASH, p.124.
34. JLM As in 3 above.
35. YOUNG, D.F. "B S", p.52.
36. SWINBURNE, A.Ch. "A Marching Song".
37. JLM P D E N. p.110.
38. LUDOVICI, Anthony In: "TSZ", Appendix to C.W., p.411.
39. FWN "H.A.T.H", In: CW, No. 439, p.319.

40. FWN "Dawn of Day", no. 312, p.262 of G.W.
41. JLM "L C" In: PDEN.
42. JLM Op. cit., *ibid*, p.31-32.
43. FWN "Dawn of Day", p.360 (No.541), Fisher & Unwin, London, 10-3.
44. WELLS, H.G. See Note (1) of Chap. 6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. JAMES LESLIE MITCHELL/LEWIS GRASSIC GIBBON

The works published under his pseudonym are indicated (LGG):

I.1. SHORT STORIES, ARTICLES, INTRODUCTIONS, etc.

- 1924: IN: T.P.'s and CASSELL'S WEEKLY, "Siva Plays the Game", a story, Oct. 18.
- 1928: IN: "GRIM DEATH", a collection of stories by various hands, selected and arranged by Christine Campbell Thomson. Selwyn and Blount, London: "If You Sleep in the Moonlight".
- 1929: IN: THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE: Stories:  
 Vol. LXVI, Jan. "For Ten's Sake" p. 38  
           May. "One Man with a Dream" (1) p.589  
           LXVII, Jul. "He Who Seeks" p. 97  
           Aug. "The Epic" p.160  
           Sep. "The Road" (2) p.341  
           Oct. "A Volcana in the Moon" p.463  
           Nov. "The Life and Death of Elia Constantinides" p.513  
           Dec. "Cockrow" p.641
- 1930: LXVIII, Jan. "Gift of the River" p. 17  
           Feb. "East is West" p.129  
           Mar. "Vernal" p.257  
           Apr. "Daybreak" p.385  
           May "It Is Written" p.513  
           June "The Passage of the Dawn" p.641
- IN: ANTIQUITY; A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF ARCHAEOLOGY:  
 Articles:  
 Vol. IV, No.15, Sep. pp.285-302:  
           "The end of the Maya Old Empire"  
           16, "Yucatan: New Empire Tribes and Culture Waves".
- 1931: IN: THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: an article:  
 Vol. I. No. 1 Mar.: "The Diffusionist Hersey" p.195  
 IN: REYNOLDS ILLUSTRATED NEWS: a story:

- Jul. 12th.: "Near Farnboru" (3)
- IN: THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE: stories:
- Vol. LXXI, Aug. "A Footnote to History" (4) p.195
- Sep. "The Lost Constituent" p.355
- Nov. "The Floods of Spring" p.623
- Dec. "Thermopylae" (5) p.684
- 1931: IN: ANTIQUITY REVIEW OF ARCHAEOLOGY:  
an article:
- Vol. V. No. 18, June, p.172: "Inka and pre-Inka".
- 1932: IN: THE MILLGATE: an article:
- Vol XXVII, Part I., Mar. No. 318:
- "William James Perry, M.A., D.S.C.,  
A Revolutionary Anthropolgist", pp.323-326
- IN: THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE: stories:
- Vol. LXXII, May "The Buddha of America" p.595
- June "The Last Ogre" p.699
- Vol. LXXIII, Sept. "Cartaphilus" p.344
- IN: "Eskimo, a novel" by Peter Freuchen:  
"Introduction" Jarrolds Publishers  
(London) Ltd., June.
- IN: SCOTS MAGAZINE, Dec., "Greenenden", story (LGG) p.168
- 1933: IN: SCOTS MAGAZINE, Jan., "Smeddum", story (LGG) p.248
- Feb., "Clay", story (LGG) p.329
- IN: THE CORNHILL MAGAZINE: story:
- Vol. LXXIV, Feb., "Dawn in Alarlu"
- IN: THE FREE MAN, Sept. 9th "Grieve - Scotsman" p 7  
(article)
- 1934: IN: THE MEARN'S LEADER AND KINCARDINESHIRE MAIL,  
Feb. 8th p. 1
- "Canting Humbug!", a letter in reply to a  
speaker at the Stovehaven Burns Club (LGG)
- THE EVENING NEWS (Glasgow), No. 564, Feb. 24th,  
Saturday Supplement:
- "I Kent His Faither - A Scots Writer Reviews  
His Reviewers", (LGG) p. 1
- THE FREE MAN, Mar. 3rd: "New Novels" (LGG) p. 6
- Mar. 17th: "News of Battle" (LGG) p. 9

- 1935: IN: LEFT REVIEW, Vol. I, No. 5, Feb.: (LGG)  
 "Controversy: Writers' International", a letter p.179
- CINEMA QUARTERLY, Vol. III, No. 2, Winter (LGG)  
 "A Novelist Looks at the Cinema" (LGG), article. pp.81-5
- THE JOURNAL OF TRANSACTIONS OF THE SOCIETY  
 FOR PROMOTING THE STUDY OF RELIGIONS, No. 13,  
 Oct. "Religions of Ancient Mexico", an article pp.11-20
- n.d.: IN: MASTERPIECE OF THRILLS, a collection of 60 short stories  
 by various hands, edited by R. Huson, Daily Express, London,  
 193-?  
 By LGG:  
 "A Stele from Atlantis"  
 "The Woman of Leadenhall Street"  
 "First and Last Woman" (6)
- By JLM:  
 "Busman's Holiday"  
 "The Road to Freedom"  
 "Lost Tribes"
- By Mitchell, J. Leslie and Armstrong, Fytton:  
 "Kametis and Evelopis"
- n.d.: IN: "THE BLUE ANGEL", a novel by Heinrich Mann, Jarrolds  
 Publishers (London) Ltd., London:  
 "Introduction"
- (1) "Revolt" in PDEN.
  - (2) "The Lost Prophetess" in CC.
  - (3) "First and Last Woman" in M.Th.
  - (4) "The Lovers" in PDEN
  - (5) "Dienekes's Dream" in PDEN
  - (6) "Near Farnboru" in 1931 in Reynolds Illustrated News.

## I.2. NOVELS AND BOOKS:

- 1928: 1. "Hanno: or the Future of Exploration", Kegan Paul,  
 Trench, Trubner and Co., London (June), E.P. Dutton &  
 Co. Inc., New York.
- 1930: 2. \* "Stained Radiance: A Fictionist Prelude"
- 1931: 3. \* "The Thirtieth Disciple, being a Portrait and Saga of  
 Malcolm Maudslay in his Adventure Through the Dark  
 Corridor", January.
- 1932: 3. \* "Three Go Back", January.  
 The Bobbs-Merril Company, Indianapolis.
4. \* "The Lost Trumpet", July.
5. \* "Sunset Song", August. (Sep. in the E.C.B.) (LGG)  
 (Reprint, Sept. 1933) (Re-issued as No. 16 of  
 Jarrolds's "Jackdaw" library, Feb, 1937).

6. \* "Persian Dawns, Egyptian Nights", Nov.
- 1933: 7. \* "Image and Superscription: a novel", Mar.
8. \* "Cloud Howe", May. (Reprint, Oct. 1934) (Re-issued as No. 19 as 5. - above, 1937 June) (Serialised in the "Aberdeen Bon Accord and Northern Pictorial", Feb. 2, 1934 - Apr. 27, 1934, and in the "The Mearns Leader and Kincardineshire Mail", Feb. 8, 1934 - Apr. 26, 1934, both condensed versions)
9. \* "Spartacus", August. (Re-issued as No. 11, as 5. - and 8. - above, Jan. 1937)
- 1934: 10. "Niger: the Life of Mungo Park", The Porpoise Press, Feb. (London, Faber and Faber, on verso of title-page) Ryerson Press, New York. (LGG)
11. \* "The Conquest of the Maya", February.
12. "Gay Hunter", William Heinemann Ltd., May, London (Reprint, May, 1935).

BY LGG AND HUGH MACDIARMID:

12. \* "Scottish Scene, or the Intelligent Man's Guide to Albyn", June. (Reprint, Feb. 1937) (Reprints "Greenden", "Smeddum" and "Clay").

BY LGG AND JLM;

13. \* "Nine Against the Unknown: a Record of Geographical Exploration", November. (Subsequently outlisted by Simon and Schuster, New York as "Earth Conquerors: The Lives and Achievements of the Great Explorers", by Mitchell, J.L.)
14. \* "Grey Granite", November (LGG)
- 1935: "The Conquest of the Maya", E.P. Dutton and Co. Inc. New York.
- "Grey Granite", Doubleday Doran and Co. Inc., N. York.

\* means Published by Jarrolds Publishers (London) Ltd., London.

## II. GENERAL

1. AVELING, Edward and  
MARX AVELING, Eleanor "Shelley's Socialism", Printed for  
private circulation only, London 1888  
p.26.
2. BALDWIN, Roger "Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets"  
(KRP) A collection of Writings by Peter  
Kropotkin. Dover Publications Inc. N.  
York, 1970.
3. BEBEL, August "Woman in the Past, Present and Future",  
W. Reeves, London, 1893, p.264.
4. BERNAL, J.D. "Science in History", Watts & Co.,  
London, 1965.
5. BURNS, E. and T. "Sociology of Literature and Drama",  
Penguin Education, 1973.
6. CARLYLE, Thomas "Past and Present", Chapman and Hall,  
London 1843.
7. DAITCHES, David. "The Present Age: After 1920", The  
Crescent Press, London, 1958.
8. (DAILY EXPRESS) "Masterpiece of Thrills", edited by R.  
Huson, Daily Express, London 193-(?).
9. DAVINSON, Basil "Africa in History", Paladin, London,  
1978.
10. DUNNE, John W. "An Experiment with Time", A & A Black  
Ltd., London, 1927, p.208.
11. EAGLETON, Terry "Marxism and Literary Criticism", Methuen  
& Co. Ltd., London, 1976.
12. ENGELS, Frederick "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific",  
Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978.

- "Introduction to the Dialectics of Nature" In: MARX/ENGELS "Selected Works".
- Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy", In Selected Works as above.
- "Anti-Duhring", Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1959.
- "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1973.
- "The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man", In "Selected works as above.
13. FRY, Northop "Anatomy of Criticism".
14. GARDNER, Delbert A. "An Idle Singer and his Audience", Mouton, The Hague - Paris, 1975.
15. GASMAN, Daniel "The Scientific Origins of National Socialism", Macdonald, London (& America Elsevier Inc. N. York, 1971, p.208).
16. GOLDMANN, Lucien "Towards a Sociology of the Novel", Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1975, p.181.
17. HAECKEL, Ernst "Monism as Connecting Religion and Science: The Confession of Faith of a Man of Science". Adam & Charles Black, London, 1894, p.117.
18. HOLLINGDALE, R.J. "Introduction" to "Thus Spoke Zarathustra", Penguin Classics, 1976.
19. JUNG, Emma and FRANZ, M. Louise "The Grail Legend", Hodder and Soughton", London, 1971, p.452.
20. KEITH, Arthur "Ancient Types of Man", Harper & Brothers, London and N. York, 1911, p.151.
21. KHRAPCHENKO, M.B. "The Writer's Creative Individuality and the Development of Literature", Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977.
- "Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo, deistvitelnost, tchelovek", Maskva, Savietsky Pisatiel, 1976.
22. KROPOTKIN, Peter "Letter to the Workers of Western Europe", In: R. Baldwin's "Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets".

- "Expropriation: An Anarchist Essay", International Publishing Co., London, 1886.
- "An Appeal to the Young", New Edition, The Twentieth Century Press Ltd., London, 1904.
- "Ethics: Origin and Development", George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., London, Calcutta, Sydney, 1925.
- "Law and Authority: An Anarchist Essay", International Publishing Co., London, 1886.
- "Wars and Capitalism" (Reprinted from "Freedom"), Freedom Press, London, 1914.
- "KROPOTKIN: Selections from his Writings" Herbert Reid (ed.), Freedom Press, London, 1942.
- "Modern Science and Anarchism", Freedom Press, London, 1912.
23. L G G "A.S.H.: Essays and Short Stories". Edited by Ian S. Munro. Hutchinson of London, 1967. July 1974 4th impression).
24. LINDSAY, JACK "Decay and Renewal", Wild & Wooley, Sidney Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1976, p.447.
25. LOTMAN, Yury "Analysis of the Poetic Text:", Ardis/Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, 1976, p.309.
26. MACDIARMID, Hugh "The Uncanny Scot: a Selection of Prose". Edited by Kenneth Buthlay, MacGibbon & Kee, London 1968.
27. MARX, Karl "Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production". Transl. by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. Edited by Frederick Engels. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965 (3 Vols.).
28. MARX/ENGELS "Selected Works", Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1982 (6th printing), p.790.
29. MORRIS, May "William Morris: Artist Writer Socialist", 2 vols. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, MCMXXXVI.

30. MORRIS, William "The Collected Works of William Morris", ed. with an Introduction by his daughter May M. Longmans Green & Co., N. York, Bombay, Calcutta, MDCCCXIII.
- "Complete Works", Longmans Green & Co. London, 1915.
- "Political Writings of William Morris", ed. by A.L. Morton, Lawrence & Wishart Ltd., London, 1973 (with an Introd. by A.L. Morton).
31. MUNRO, Ian S. "Leslie Mitchell: Lewis Grassic Gibbon", Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh London, 1966.
32. NIETZSCHE, Friedrich "The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche", ed. by Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London, T.N. Foulis, 1909. (Transl. by Thomas Common).
- "The Case of Wagner: Nietzsche Contra Wagner"
- "The Twilight of the Idols"
- "The Antichrist"
- (Transl. by Thomas Common). T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1899, p.354.
- "The Dawn of Day", (Transl. by Johanna Volz). T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1903, p.387.
- "Thus Spoke Zarathustra", Transl. with an Introd. by R.J. Hollingdale, Penguin, 1976.
- "Human All Too Human", C.W., Vol. 7. Transl. by Helen Aimmern with Introd. by J.M. Kennedy. Edinburgh and London, 1909.
- vol. 4: "Thus Spoke Zarathustra",. transl. by Thomas Common.
33. NOYES, Alfred "William Morris" (Englishmen of Letters), MacMillan & Co., London, 1908.
34. ROUSSEAU, J.J. "Discours" (2eme Discours: sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inegalite parmi les hommes), S.L.B., Bordas, Paris, 1968.
35. SASSO, Javier "Sobre la Sociologia de la Creacion Literaria" Examen de las tesis de Goldmann", Cuaderno de Literature No. 22, Fundacion de Cultura Universitaria, Montevideo, Uruguay, 1972.

36. SHAKESPEARE, William :As You Like It" In: "William Shakespeare: The Complete Works" ed. by Peter Alexander. The Players Edition, Collins, London and Glasgow, 1959.
37. SHUKMAN, Ann "Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Yuri Lotman", North-Holland Publishing Co., 1977.
38. SMITH, Grafton E. "The Diffusionist Controversy" In: "Culture: The Diffusion Controversy", London, 1928.
39. SOROKIN, Pitrim "Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis", Adam Charles Black, London, 1952, p.345.
40. SPENGLER, Oswald "The Decline of the West", Allen & Unwin, London, 1926 (in 2 vols.).  
  
- An Abridged edition (by Helmut Werner and Arthur Helps), Allen & Unwin, London, 1961.  
  
"Man and Technics: A Contribution to a Philosophy of Life". Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1932, pp.104.
41. THOMPSON, E.P. "William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary", Lawrence & Wishart Ltd., London, 1955.
42. WESTON, Jessie "From Ritual to Romance", Cambridge, 1920.
43. WILLIAMS, Raymond "Culture and Society: 1780-1950", Penguin Books Chatto & Windus, 1962.
44. WITTIG, Kurt "The Scottish Tradition in Literature", Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1958.
45. WAGNER, Geoffrey IN: "Tribune" No. 741, Oct. 1951, p.12: "A Great Scot".  
  
"The Greatest Since Galt" In: Essays in Criticism, Vol. II, No. 3, July 1952, pp.295-310.  
  
"The Other Grassic Gibbon" In: The Saltire Review: Vol. II, No. 5, Autumn 1955, pp.39-40.
46. YOUNG, Douglas F. "Beyond the Sunset", Impulse Books, Aberdeen, 1973.

