



The South Central Modern Language Association

Dehumanized or Inhuman: Doubles in Edward Bond

Author(s): Debra A. Castillo

Source: *South Central Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Summer, 1986), pp. 78-89

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press on behalf of The South Central Modern Language Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3189368>

Accessed: 12/08/2010 11:13

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jhup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The South Central Modern Language Association and The Johns Hopkins University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to South Central Review.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Dehumanized or Inhuman: Doubles in Edward Bond

DEBRA A. CASTILLO
Cornell University

Much recent Bond criticism has been concerned with the difficult question of how the playwright's stated purpose of developing a "rational" theater is realized in a body of work that seems more nearly mythic than realistic. Even a superficial review of article titles confirms the centrality of this interest in reconciling the political and the poetic aspects of Bond's work.¹ Again and again, the critics return to a set of ideas and themes that are, as Jenny S. Spencer notes, quite direct and uncomplicated.² Their concern is not unwarranted. Bond's theater *is* political, and his focus of investigation is nothing less than the survival of all the human, humane qualities of the political animal, the dweller in a contemporary polis. Yet the discussion of these relatively simple (in abstract formulation) ideas is rarely simple and seldom uncomplicated. Spencer herself characterizes Bond's work as an attempt "to present representations of reality (mediated by theatrical convention in the same way ideology mediates perception) which are both recognizable as our own world, and yet untenable (in need of change)."³ The convolutions of syntax in Spencer's discussion represent difficult convolutions of thought, from the doubly metaphorical "present representations"—of reality, of convention, of ideology as filtered by perception—to the paradox of an impossibility which is immediately recognizable, her parenthetical style reflecting the difficulty of writing about rational drama in an irrational world. To use a currently fashionable term, Bond's poetic dramas "deconstruct" dominant myths of perceptions, of conventions, and of ideologies in the controlled application of a few carefully chosen images.

Ruby Cohn is quite correct in her characterization of Bond's theater as "fabulous;"⁴ indeed, Bond's work develops a reasoning man's fable of our times. Where the traditional fables of Aesop use animals to demonstrate human foibles, Bond's modern fables utilize a similar, if more subtle, version of this technique by surrounding characters with images of dehumanization or metaphors connecting them to animals.

Michel Foucault's discussion of "the Other that is not only a brother but a twin, born, not of man, nor in man, but beside him and at the same time, in an identical newness, in an unavoidable duality"⁵ is singularly apt in application to Bond's dramas, which are deeply involved in the examination of the self and its dehumanized other, the alienated, estranged self, an Other which is outside him (an antagonistic member of the "irrational" society), within him (a Dostoevskian dramatic projection), and beside him (a detached yet identical entity). As with Foucault, for Bond unseen power relationships determine the specific configuration of this Other (friend, enemy, alternative self) at any given moment in a complex interplay of fluid, ambiguous social forces. Bond's preface to *Lear* returns almost compulsively to this issue in his contrast of the innocent aggressiveness of the free animal to the unnatural violence of the caged one and the comparison of both free and caged animals to the panicked aggressivity of the human race.⁶ Animal imagery has, in Bond, no simple identification, no simple purpose. The pure, unsocialized animal that is the double and secret self of man is thrust outside him, is perverted into beastliness, and at its limit point the "animality [that] has escaped domestication by human symbols and values . . . reveals the dark rage, the sterile madness that lie in men's hearts."⁷ In his dehumanized characters, then, Bond gives voice to a painful silence and provides a fabulous, or fantastic, presence to elements which are recognized and repressed in "civilized" society:

The polis is polished
civilization is polite
 is policed.⁸

In Bond's society, the polished veneer of polite society is in unremitting tension with the raging beast, a tension which is intensified by images and metaphors that call up man's relationship to the repressed animal in both its positive and negative associations. To discuss this dehumanization in Bond's work as a whole is a project far beyond the scope of this study. Instead, I have chosen three representative early plays: *Lear*, which examines mythic and literary Britain; *Saved*, which offers Bond's metaphor of present urban society; and *Early Morning*, which simultaneously recreates the recent past and projects the future such a tradition may entail.

One of Bond's typical ploys has been to contrast the humane and the dehumanized aspects of a single personality as split into two opposing and juxtaposed dramatic characters. These characters represent real antitheses, but the difference is also, at the same time, illusory in the way a Dostoevskian double is both a real physical presence and a psychological projection. In *Lear*, the building tension and the creation of the double takes place within the play as part of its action. Before his defeat

by his daughters, Lear believed himself and his country secure. The wall he was building would insure the continuance of polite society, of civilization, of a polished and perfect state that would be peaceful even if governed by fools (3). With his defeat however, the dream begins to disintegrate and the king's character splits into its human and its dehumanized halves. The king withdraws from polite society into a nostalgic green world of peace and tranquility as a pig-keeper with the Gravedigger's Boy and his wife. The assassination of the Boy and his transformation into the Ghost that accompanies Lear in his later peregrinations signals the creation of a dehumanized double, a double that is, moreover, neither ontologically stable nor complete. Katharine Worth has pointed out the fairy-tale quality of the Ghost which neatly balances the traditional uncanniness of a ghostly presence with the comforting reassurances of a familiar fable.⁹ The figure of a ghost, who exists in a shadow world between life and death, is the perfect image for a double which operates on the border between reality and hallucination, partaking of both and neither. Partly an imaginative construct of Lear's nostalgic desire for a Golden Age and partly an independent being, the Ghost reflects Lear's own lack of a critical evaluation of reality. As Dostoevsky's Schedrovdarov notes in a passage that seems equally applicable to Bond's king, "before you do anything you have to make yourselves something, to assume you own shape, to become yourselves. . . . But you are abstractions, you are shadows, you are nothing. And nothing can come from nothing. You are foreign ideas. You are a mirage. You do not stand on soil but on air. The light shines right under you. . . ." ¹⁰

The Ghost, a dehumanized extraction of Lear's psychological immaturity, is only the first, though by far the most notable, of a series of "Others" evolved by the play. In Bond's world, even the Ghost is torn apart by new categories of opposition. Sometimes almost sinister, sometimes pathetic, the Ghost decays in death as Lear gains in wisdom and maturity in his dealings with the world. Scharine observes that "the Boy's moral maturity travels a path parallel to Lear's but in the opposite direction. By the time Lear reaches a state of only desiring to live humanely, the position of the Boy when we first met him, the Ghost of the Boy wishes only to be hidden and protected."¹¹ As Lear achieves insight and understanding, he returns to the world to die a politically significant death. His double, the Ghost, evolves in the opposite direction until, gored by his own pigs, he dies, ignominiously, a second time. Ultimately, the Ghost represents a regressive force that is both unfeasible and immoral in a political age, and he is quite rightly rejected even by pigs. Lear learns that human beings, who may be pig-like in many respects, are not malicious by nature, and that only through political action can his sufferings and those of his people be alleviated.

The phantasmagorical nature of the Ghost is critical to Bond's vision, since the Ghost stands for the uncanny reality/fantasy of the social pres-

tures that give it existence. Each human being undergoes a similar dehumanizing experience under the pressures of socialization, an experience which is all the more terrifying because of its effective invisibility. The Ghost, then, not only dramatically represents a self divided, but also demonstrates an innate propensity of culture to fracture the psyche into impotent partial identities reflected in successive social masks. The Ghost of the Gravedigger's Boy, crying in fear and gored by his pigs, is one such pitiful mask, an invisible shield for the naked ego. However, as Bond notes, "the whole of civilisation is in a sense a self-mask, a self-justification,"¹² and *Early Morning's* Arthur, who carries with him his own uncanny double in the form of his brother's disintegrating skeleton, reveals the unhappiness of the double's lot: "Who came first, the man or his shadow? The shadow, of course. I undressed a shadow once: it was white underneath and cried: it was cold" (60). Arthur's vision is deadly, for eventually the illusory comes to precede the real, the mask is perceived to be prior to the face, and, indeed, the mask is no less real in this social world than the hypothetical naked face behind it. Ironically, man thus becomes socialized by the death of all human characteristics, by his transformation into a social function, a cipher, or a shadow. "Bodies are supposed to die and souls go on living," says Arthur in a later passage: "That's not true. Souls die first and bodies live. They wander round like ghosts, they bump into each other, tread on each other, haunt each other" (101). Life in an irrational society approximates the ghostly afterlife of Bond's cannibalistic shades.

These soul-killing propensities are what make the system so devastating and so dehumanizing. The trial of Len by the lynching mob is terrifying precisely because within the dream structure of the play it retains the lineaments of realistic presentation; a trial of dehumanized puppets, of shivering shadows covered by rigid social masks. Gladstone restrains the crowd by a reference to "the book": "Yer 'ave t' 'ave yer trial t' make it legal. Yer don't wan' a act like common criminals. Trial first death after. . ." (43). Irrational man rules by the book, by the trappings of official authority divested of substance.

More frightening and more comic is Arthur's heavenly trial, where, with complete blindness to human issues, the accusers set criminal acts alongside floutings of convention as anti-social behavior of equal indefensibility. On the one hand, they accuse Arthur of serious crimes: "He rapes little girls," "He gives babies syphilis," and "He kills." But to these grave criminal acts are juxtaposed such apparently trivial accusations as "He wastes electricity," "He's a nose-picker," and "He eats dirt" (45-48). Bond's dream society carries to its logical conclusion the relative unconcern of human beings with physical violence and their overriding preoccupation with points of etiquette.

Len, the dehumanized working man kicked to death by his peers in *Early Morning*, appears in *Saved* split into his passive (Len) and active

(Fred) poles. Whereas in *Early Morning* Len precipitates the first case of cannibalism by his murder of the man who broke into the queue, in *Saved* it is Fred who commits murder while Len jealously looks on from his hidden vantage point. Pam, who sleeps with both men, significantly recalls at the end of the play the earlier joke of the woman with quads (98); the submerged reference to doubles ("That'll teach 'er t'sleep with siamese twins," [p. 17]) delicately suggests a warning ignored.

As in *Early Morning*, the characters in *Saved* are almost completely dehumanized by their environment, and their possibilities for independent action are strictly limited by their implicit acceptance of what seems to them the inalterable conditions of their existence. However, where *Early Morning* emphasizes the role of social and political tradition, *Saved* stresses the function of technology and the deification of the object over the people who produce it, what Octavio Paz calls the triumph of the sign over the signified and the thing over the image.¹³ A mechanical universe is substituted for a human reality in a circular process in which technology requires the negation of human values, and the disappearance of these values (Paz's "images") is a necessary precondition for the development of a technological society.

For the workers in *Saved*, their jobs are a disagreeable, inevitable part of their lives, and they would prefer to forget about their work as soon as they leave the shop:

Fred: 'Lo Len, 'Ow's life:
 Len: Usual. 'Ow's the job?
 Fred: Don't talk about it. (33)

Later in the play, Len asks Harry a similar question: "'Ow d'yer get on at work?" and Harry replies briefly, "It's a job" (61). The reader knows very little about the specific nature of the work engaged in by these men, but the presence of the assembly line is an important underlying motif in the play. In his preface to *Lear*, Bond explains: "It does not matter how much a man doing routine work in, say, a factory or office is paid: he will still be deprived. . . . Because he is behaving in a way for which he is not designed, he is alienated from his natural self, and this will have physical and emotional consequences for him" (vi). The alienated worker evokes, in effect, the masked shadows described by Arthur.

As significance is drained from their work, and the workers are alienated from the products of their labor, a parallel drain of signification occurs in other levels of their lives. Moral institutions are as corrupt as the factory, and thus in *Saved* the church is merely the "best place for'n easy pick up" (48). By its complicity with the social order, the church becomes as impersonal as the assembly line, and inside its walls men no longer search for the meaning of life but conduct calculated, impersonal hunts for sexual gratification.

This spiritual cannibalism is made literal in the dream world of *Early Morning* for a shocking effect. Psychic, cultural, and moral hungers are intensified under the irritation and pressure of the queue, and the suppressed aggression of the socialized beast combines with these other pressures to find explosive release in Len and Joyce's murder and cannibalization of an anonymous bystander. The act of killing and eating a fellow human being parallels the more extensive rationalized murder practiced in the play's political arena. Bond makes us see that in following their instincts, Len and Joyce are acting in a manner perfectly consonant with their upbringing and that their act is no more indefensible than the equally macabre, though socially rationalized, murders committed by the ruling powers. Perhaps the most amusing aspect of this macabre scene is that although the frustrated couple murders and consumes a fellow being, they maintain to the end a perverse sense of propriety which reflects once again the absurd concern of civilized beings with etiquette; they "kep' 'is knickers on" since they "don't 'old with this rudery yer get" (23). The pornography of violence is accompanied by incongruous Victorian conventions of outward social morality. As in the post-industrial world of *Saved*, psychological unrest at the excessive rationalization of life is not turned against cultural and religious institutions, and resistance no longer takes place between labor and capital. Instead, the dehumanized object-man vents his aggression on other similarly afflicted beings.

While the nature of aggression and its amplification by the restrictions of an industrialized society are clear, the reader still echoes Arthur's question, "Why did you kill him?" (26). The apparent lack of motive is confusing, as is the sudden focusing of generalized aggressivity on this specific object. Yet while the choice of a specific object may be puzzling, for Bond the general impulse is clear. Len and Joyce's cannibalism, Fred's murder of the baby, Lear's execution, and even the Ghost's goring by his pigs respond to a common instinct; the roots of such unreasoning violence can be located in the social system that provokes it. On the one hand, the assembly-line mode of production dehumanizes man by convincing him that he is a machine and that his exertions are in no way unique. He is completely interchangeable with any other worker. At the same time, paradoxically, the loss of a sense of the sacredness of individual life derives from the Christian impulse itself. If industrialization has taught man that he has no soul, it is Christianity that teaches him to despise the body, since the body is, after all, destined for corruption. Aggression builds against the institutions which continue to aggravate man but are invulnerable to his violence. In such cases, the random murder of a scapegoat causes but little surprise: "When unappeased, violence seeks and always finds a surrogate victim. The creature that excited its fury is replaced by another, chosen only because it is vulnerable and close at hand."¹⁴ In Bond's plays, murder is

frequently, pointedly, an act of violence done to a mere body, a soul-less post-industrial entity.

The corporeal masked shadow has, in Bond's image system, its own metaphorical double, and the frightened, cowed Ghost is paired with images of healthy animals, which, when prodded, become the cornered beasts lashing out in sterile, uncomprehending rage. The animal, then, is a more ambitious, more ambiguous metaphor than the masked shadow: beautiful in its innocence; when warped by societal pressures man-animal reveals the traits we associate with "beastliness."

It is the beastliness which is most apparent in *Saved* where animal images consistently have an alienating effect. Harry is a "nosey ol' gander" (18) who lives in a "sty" (21). Women are called "birds" (34), "pigs" (117), or, most frequently, "cows" (23, 43, 83). Barry recalls with great relish the murder of "yellow-niggers" who were dismembered with a "pig-sticker" (29). Len and Fred's mutual courtship of Pam is discussed in a fishing boat, punctuated with graphic descriptions of how to properly bait a hook (48-49). The ultimate victim of the worker's pent-up violence, Pam's baby, is never given a human identity. His cries are confused with those of a cat stuck up a chimney (38), Pam distantly refers to him as "that" (58), and Barry sings a chilling version of a lullaby in which the baby's brains are used for bait (63). Significantly, the child is seen as an animal that can't be hurt because it is too young to have feelings (67); he "looks like a yeller-nigger," says Colin (68), and as they begin to stone the child Mike mockingly suggests calling the R.S.P.C.A. (71).

The murder of Pam's baby signals the crisis point as the enraged beastliness of the workers breaks forth in an act of violence, violence that is, as Eagleton notes, "natural because human beings are cultural."¹⁵ Girard locates the roots of culture in an act of violence. He finds that "the primordial event must be . . . the murder of a random victim which must appear as the embodiment of the whole crisis, the sum total of all monstrous undifferentiation through a process of collective transfer made possible by the mimetic undifferentiation of the *doubles*."¹⁶ Pam's child, engendered by the Siamese twins Len and Fred (or Colin, or Mike, or Barry, or Pete—in the cycle of violence distinctions of biological paternity are irrelevant), comes to represent, in his lack of a clear identity, the monstrous interchangeability they support as factory workers. The child's death eases the pressure, and the images of animality and violence decrease and become less intense in the rest of the play, but Pam's unconscious recall of the story of the Siamese twins points towards another cycle of violence waiting to commence.

The recognition that the mob will be temporarily appeased by a scapegoat does not escape *Early Morning's* Arthur. While the doctor expresses concern during the attack on Windsor castle, Arthur realizes that "they'll be all right once they've lynched someone" (42). The public

hangings advocated by the Chamberlain and carried out by Victoria and Florence demonstrate a similar principle. The anger of the people is directed away from the government and focussed on relatively minor offenders. Hanging is, after all, no more than the socially approved mode of lynching, and the doctor's response to Arthur's insight is typical of the conventions he represents: "If they're lynching they'll need death certificates" (42). Even arbitrary, unmotivated violent actions can be co-opted into the social institutions, and conventions of behavior remain unshaken by the murder of a *pharmakos*.

Thus, the availability of victims does nothing to alleviate the aggression itself. Like the heavenly cannibals who must periodically appease their hunger by eating each other, so the execution of a scapegoat only temporarily appeases the hunger for freedom from society's cage. As long as man does not realize that his real enemy is the social institution that fuels his aggressivity, the cycle of violence will continue. As Chizhevsky observes, "the main trait of the ethical world is its uniformity and monotony."¹⁷ It is no fluke that the representatives of the social system are also representatives of an eternally recurrent order. Thus, *Saved* ends with a chilling reminder of the cycle of violence; at the end of *Lear*, Cordelia takes the old king's place as a wall builder; and at the end of *Early Morning* Victoria works out her eternal roster of the order in which the inhabitants of Heaven will eat and be eaten by each other. Chizhevsky continues, "in the theory of 'eternal recurrence'—at which (in one way or another) ethical rationalism must inevitably arrive—was concentrated the whole fierceness with which the meaning of the individual concrete being was rejected."¹⁸

This eternal recurrence is most strikingly envisioned in *Early Morning* in Arthur's nightmare of the mill which epitomizes the blindness and futility of society's pursuit of its illusory goals. "D'you dream?" Arthur asks his Siamese twin George, now reduced to a skeleton:

D'you dream about the mill? There are men and women and children and cattle and birds and horses pushing a mill. They're grinding other cattle and people and children: they push each other in. Some fall in. It grinds their bones, you see. The ones pushing the wheel, even the animals, look at the horizon. They stumble. Their feet get caught up in the rags and dressings that slip down from their wounds. They go round and round. At the end they go very fast. They shout. Half of them run in their sleep. Some are trampled on. They're sure they're reaching the horizon. (68)

The mill grinds and grinds, remorselessly grinding the people and animals, destroying their hopes, poisoning their dreams, negating the value of their very existences, blinding them to the approaching storm, forcing them to ignore everything but the tantalizing and inexplicably distant horizon.

The apocalyptic dust storm envisioned by Arthur is similarly foreseen by Lear, who recognizes, more clearly than *Early Morning's* prince, that the freeing of the animal at the treadmill or the animal in the cage offers the only hope of forestalling the onrushing doom: "There's an animal in a cage. I must let it out or the earth will be destroyed. There'll be great fires and the water will dry up. All the people will be burned and the wind will blow their ashes into huge columns of dust and they'll go round and round the earth forever! We must let it out!" (37). The caged animal is, of course, a figure for Lear himself as well as his people, and by fettering his instinctual self with artificial social and moral imperatives, Lear has goaded the animal into a violent backlash. Arthur's dream reveals the unconscious brutality and indifference to suffering of the animal who is unaware of the bars of its cage. In *Lear*, the pressures of imprisonment turn the animal into a monster that consciously and aggressively seeks to mutilate and destroy others out of a frustrated hatred of its own life. *Lear* as a whole is exceptionally rich in animal images, as many critics have noted,¹⁹ and the animal is used in metaphor and parable as the primary representative of those natural impulses entrapped by social convention. Ruby Cohn makes this point most concisely:

As king, Bond's Lear calls his people sheep and his enemies wolves. When mad, he sees himself as a dog and a mouse. The program for the Royal Court production pictures a monkey in a cage, but Lear's plea is wider, reaching out to horse and bird, and crying: "Let that animal out of the cage!" Lear's dead daughter is to him a blend of lion, lamb, and child. He compares the subservient farmer's family unfavorably to wolf, fox, and horse, and he accuses men of behaving like jackals and wolves. Sane and admired as a saint, Lear narrates a fable of a man's voice in a bird's body. His last fantasy wish is to be as cunning as a fox. These diverse images accumulate into a powerful illustration of Shakespeare's great line: "Unaccommodated man is no more but such a poor bare forked animal as thou art."²⁰

This "poor bare forked animal," especially as depicted in Lear's metaphor of an animal in a cage, effectively describes the condition of the individual in society; however, the metaphor must be extended if it is to serve as a description of the relationship of men to each other. Clearly, each individual is divided in himself between the social mask he assumes and the remnants of instinctive life which feed his aggressivity. As each man lacks a unique center, so too does society. The conventions of social interaction are mere words covering a "moral bankruptcy" (*Saved*, 7) that becomes more and more complete since language is itself tainted by the irrational impulses of civilization. Eagleton, in his discussion of Bond's prefaces, suggests that such alienation is inevitable: "the human animal is the animal whose nature it is to overreach itself; its

most distinctive mark—language—is precisely such a ceaseless distancing, transgression and transformation of the instinctual.”²¹ Thus, social life also rotates around an absent center, and repressed aggressivity is channelled towards the exterior, socialized masks of other humans. The superficial mask of social conventions fools the animals into a belief that something is behind it; the terrible and ironic reality is that the mask, once engendered, propagates other masks that prohibit the discovery of the lack of substance behind them.

Foucault elegantly makes a similar point. In his “Preface to Transgression,” he discusses the “denatured” language of modern sexuality which has been “cast into an empty zone where it achieves whatever meager form is bestowed upon it by the establishment of its limits.”²² Just as Bond intuits the conflict between healthy animality and the masked shadow, so too Foucault distinguishes between healthy sexuality and its distancing through language. The denatured *language* of sexuality does nothing to reveal the secret of man’s being. Instead, “it is that which offers itself in the superficial discourse of a solid and natural animality while obscurely addressing itself to Absence. . . .”²³ For Foucault, the circularity of sex is ineluctably bound up in the linguistic interrogation: “the universe of language has absorbed our sexuality, denatured it, placed it in a void where it established its sovereignty and where it incessantly sets up as the Law the limits it transgresses.”²⁴ Bond would agree. Fred’s sexuality is a weapon for the victimization of female bodies; his penis and the stone he throws at the child are parallel mechanisms for revenge on society. His rupture of moral conventions (seducing women in church) and his defiance of Law (the murder of the child) are equivalent gestures demonstrating the intolerable limits on human behavior and the grotesque actions that result when speech fails to voice its outrage. The sexual and industrial modes of exploitation have a common result—the reduction of man from a complex being, a healthy animal, to an interchangeable sign. Pam’s house, like the factory, represents for Fred the repetition of the same, while in the churches and laundromats await the multiplicity of other bodies in which he searches for something to release himself from the eternal recurrence of the same frustrations. The irony of his erotic search and inevitable frustration is evident; even in his rebellion he cannot get off the treadmill and merely substitutes one assembly line for another. The language he hears is the repetition of the same words, the women’s bodies are blank repetitions of the same body, like masks reflected in an infinite series of mirrors.

Bond recognizes the primal necessity of destroying the cage so the human animal can once again “lie in the fields, and run by the river, and groom itself in the sun, and sleep in its hole from night to morning” (*Lear*, 40), but he understands that this re-identification of man and his environment cannot occur in the context of a return to a Golden Age.

Lear's withdrawal and Arthur's apotheosis essentially do nothing to change the structure of society—in their absence, the Cordelias and Victorias of the world continue their repressive reigns. The cure, like the disease, must take place on the three levels originally infected: the personal, the social, and the linguistic.

In order to cure himself, man must recognize the nature and the source of the forces that motivate him. On the personal level, he must reunite the fragmented portions of the self and re-establish the equilibrium between his desires and the socialized tendencies that impel him towards repression. On the social and political levels, Bond envisions the creation of a democratic socialist society. He considers violence inefficient, and hopes to reach a more humane society "by rational means; that means writing plays, that means teaching, that means discussion, that means persuading, that means caring."²⁵ Finally, on the linguistic level, in Todorov's words, "we must break down the automatism which makes us take the word for the thing, makes us consider one as the natural product of the other."²⁶ Bond's plays point to the necessity, as well as the extreme difficulty, of making this revolutionary gesture, but only in this way can the dust storm be averted; only through such gestures can the animal at last enjoy the sun uncaged.

NOTES

¹Important studies concerned with this issue include the following: Ruby Cohn, "The Fabulous Theater of Edward Bond," in *Essays on Contemporary British Drama* (Munich: Max Huber Verlag, 1981); Robert L. Tener, "Edward Bond's Dialectic: Irony and Dramatic Metaphors," *Modern Drama*, 25 (1982), 423-434; Cristopher Innes, "Edward Bond's Political Spectrum: From Rationalism to Rhapsody," *Modern Drama*, 25 (1982), 189-206; Philip Roberts, "The Search for Epic Drama: Edward Bond's Recent Work," *Modern Drama*, 24 (1981), 458-478; Jenny S. Spencer, "Edward Bond's Dramatic Strategies," in *Contemporary English Drama*, ed. C. W. E. Bigsby (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1981); and Daniel R. Jones, "Edward Bond's 'Rational Theatre,'" *Theatre Journal*, 32 (1980), 505-517.

²Spencer, p. 124.

³Spencer, p. 125.

⁴Cohn, p. 185

⁵Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 326.

⁶Edward Bond, *Lear* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972). See especially pages v, xi and passim throughout the preface to the play. All further references to this text and other Bond dramas will be found in the text of this paper. Editions used are as follows: *Early Morning* (London: Calder and Boyars, 1968); and *Saved* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1965).

⁷Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 21.

⁸Norman O. Brown, *Closing Time* (New York: Random House, 1973), p. 23.

⁹Katharine J. Worth, *Revolutions in Modern English Drama* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1972), p. 183.

¹⁰Dimitri Chizhevsky, "The Theme of the Double in Dostoevsky," in *Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. René Wellek (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1962), p. 124.

¹¹Richard Scharine, *The Plays of Edward Bond* (Cransbury, N.J.: Assoc. Univ. Press, 1976), p. 211.

¹²"Discussion with Edward Bond," *Gambit*, 3.17 (1970), 15.

¹³Octavio Paz, *Los signos en rotación y otros ensayos* (Madrid: Alianza, 1971), p. 317: "The constructions of technology are absolutely real, but they are not presences; they do not represent; they are signs of action and not images of the world. . . . The apparatuses and mechanisms of technology become insignificant as soon as they cease to function: they say nothing except that they no longer serve. Thus technology is not really a language, a system of permanent signifieds based on a vision of the world. It is a repertory of signs endowed with temporary and variable signifieds" (my translation).

¹⁴René Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1977), p. 2.

¹⁵Terry Eagleton, "Nature and Violence: The Prefaces of Edward Bond," *Critical Quarterly*, 26 (1984), 132.

¹⁶Girard, pp. 78-79.

¹⁷Chizhevsky, p. 125.

¹⁸Chizhevsky, p. 126.

¹⁹ See for example the excellent discussions of the use of animal imagery in Bond's *Lear* in Tony Coult, *The Plays of Edward Bond* (London: Methuen, 1979), pp. 43-45; Leslie Smith, "Edward Bond's *Lear*," *Comparative Drama*, 13 (1979), pp. 65-85 passim; and Horst Oppel and Sandra Christenson, *Edward Bond's "Lear" and Shakespeare's "Lear"* (Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1974).

²⁰Cohn, p. 194.

²¹Eagleton, p. 133.

²²Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), pp. 29-30.

²³Foucault, *Language*, p. 31.

²⁴Foucault, *Language*, p. 50.

²⁵Karl-Heinz Stoll, "Interviews with Edward Bond and Arnold Wesker," *Twentieth Century Literature*, 22 (1976), 417.

²⁶Tzvetan Todorov, *The Poetics of Prose* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), p. 213.