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INTRODUCTION

James Jones is one of the foremost living American authors, but he does not command the critical attention he deserves. Very few scholarly essays have been written about him and even fewer surveys of twentieth-century American literature have bothered to include him. Moreover, up to now no one has published a book-length study of his works. His last two books, a detective novel and an account of a trip to Vietnam, received only a handful of reviews, and the novel that preceded them was approached more as a piece of journalism than as a work of fiction. In addition, his second novel, Some Came Running, was universally denounced, and his fifth novel, Go to the Widowmaker, inspired no more than two or three favorable reviews.

For a long time, many critics have considered him a one-shot novelist who unloaded his meagre supply of talent and experience in From Here to Eternity. Others, like John Aldridge (in his essay on The Merry Month of May, "James Jones: Puberty in Paris") and Seymour Krim (in his piece on Some Came Running, "A Comment on Our Lunacy in America"), more kindly regard Jones as a has-been or as a
throwback to a school of writing that has become old-fashioned and irrelevant to contemporary conditions. These kinder critics contend that his basic problem is ignorance of all the modern "advances" in writing technique that would enable him to piece together more accurately the crazy-quilt patterns of our time. In their eyes, "realism" is outdated; it no longer touches reality. If Jones could just turn himself into a Joyce or a Kafka-roach, they would gladly flock back to his works. Of course, they shake their heads sadly as they say this, because they believe that Jones cannot even master standard English, let alone rise to the level of language sophistication achieved by Joyce. The standard Form A review of Jones's fiction includes a half-column enumeration of his latest grammatical sins. These Form A reviewers, including various anonymous Time men and Geoffrey Wolff of Newsweek, all lament that Jones's English teachers and editors did not rap him across the knuckles enough to make him learn how to outline a sentence. Then, if he had just tried to think about girls with his brain instead of his groin and spent a little less time with the boys, maybe—-

Unquestionably Jones's style has sparked more hostility than any other aspect of his work and, yes, it does matter that he is much too fond of redundancies and other space-consuming verbal monstrosities, but critics have
blown this issue out of all proportion. Certainly the awkwardness and gracelessness of much of his language in the earlier novels can be offensive and irritating, but even in these works Jones is far from being a "tongueless" man like the thief in John Fowles' short story "Poor Koko." Moreover, it would be considerably harder to level such charges against his language in *A Touch of Danger* and *Viet Journal*. In addition, with the typically querulous exceptions of Leslie Fiedler and Chandler Brossard, most of the contemporary reviewers deemed the style of *From Here to Eternity* appropriate to its subject and even heaped praise on the authenticity and imaginativeness of the dialogue. True, the puritans, such as Harold Gardiner, S.J., and the anonymous reviewer in *America*, cried out against the obscenities, but they mainly felt that it was a shame that soldiers talked that way.

Unfortunately, however, the publication of *Some Came Running* convinced reviewers that they had heard the death-knell of all decent, civilized behavior and speech. At the same time that Edmund Fuller (in "In Praise of the Yahoo") was striving mightily to defend civilization against the advent of the Yahoo as social arbiter and Granville Hicks (in "James Jones's *Some Came Running*: A Study in Arrogant Primitivism") was establishing the pattern of lengthy citation of Jones's offenses against the
American language, their fellow critics, such as Warren Bovée, Harvey Swados, J. Donald Adams, and J.H.D. in *House and Garden*, decided that the time had come to Stand Up for Literacy. This universal outrage proved a bonanza for lazy reviewers of Jones's subsequent efforts since they no longer had to probe his books for meaning but could get by with hunting up a few choice specimens of his grammatical errors. After all, the entire fate of Culture was at stake every time he said "aint," wasn't it? Moreover, how could literature ever survive his refusal to use the apostrophe properly?

Well, civilization is and is not at stake over this issue, and Jones deliberately provoked at least some of the abuse he received. In his view, *Some Came Running* was—among a lot of other things, of course—an experiment, an experiment in the use of colloquial forms in expository and narrative writing. I think that a classic style in writing tends to remove the reader one level from the immediacy of the experience. For any normal reader, I think a colloquial style makes him feel more as though he is within the action, instead of just reading about it."¹ The problem with this position is that the reader who has been conditioned to accept the "classic style" as

natural might be distracted by the "colloquial style" and
might therefore find it easier to put himself into the ac­
tion of a work written in the style he is used to.

Anyway,

who is this "normal reader" and where does he hang out?
Also, whose colloquialisms are we talking about?

As Jones

himself knows better than any of his detractors, Hick Mid­
western aint the same as Kaintuck Hillbilly or Poolshooter
Brooklynese or Mississippi Goodolboy or Army Private Ob­
scenity grumble.

In New York City alone, one man's easy-

to-read colloquial style may seem almost incomprehensible
to someone five blocks away.

Thus, there is considerable

danger in a thoroughly colloquial approach to style.

How­

ever, most critics would concede that Jones's own collo­
quial style does not lean heavily on esoteric slang and
(except for the theoretical discussions of Bob and Gwen
French) is rarely obscure or confusing!
formal English form is all.

it just dont fit

In addition, his past posi­

tions on the best-seller lists support his contention that
he can reach a large number of people through his version
of colloquialism.

Therefore, allowing for the above qual­

ifications, Jones’s stylistic credo does have some justi­
fication.
Unfortunately, Jones's second line of defense is less
satisfactory in the terms in which it is expressed:


Naturally these cats [intellectuals and critics] also object to my writing style. You think I don't know that it's not elegant? But there's a certain method in that. In my view, a well-turned phrase communicates itself as such and not the thought it contains. It becomes an end in itself. I prefer an inelegant sentence with meaning to an elegant one at the price of meaning.

I'm the common man's novelist. I'm not writing for Ph.D.'s at Harvard. I'd like to be read and understood by the rank and file of the United States, by the private in the Army and not just by some professor of English. I'm the last of the proletarian novelists.2

This theory about the virtue of inelegant expression underlies the contrast in *From Here to Eternity* between Pete Karelsen's and Mazzioli's desire to impress each other with witty mots and Prewitt's deeply felt need to express his half-conscious version of the truth about Army life and human isolation in "The Re-enlistment Blues." The trouble here is that although this theory starts with a valid insight about the dangers of too great an emphasis on beautiful or witty phrasing, it ends up positing a false situation since it assumes that a sentence must be either elegant or meaningful. Worse than that, it overlooks the obvious point that an "inelegant" sentence can also call attention to itself as inelegant and may therefore distract as many readers from its meaning as any elegant one ever did. It would be painful to count the number of Jones's

critics who got turned away from his meanings for this very reason.

On the other hand, Jones's claim to be the common man's novelist does point to a more valid defense of his style. Sentences do convey more than the single basic idea or set of ideas they are intended to contain; they also imply an attitude toward language itself and toward the society which created and formed the language that is being manipulated. Hence, operating from this vantage point, Jones's language is deliberately shaped to suggest his sympathy with the underdog level of our own society as represented by Prewitt and Warden. This sympathy becomes a bit strained in *Go to the Widow-maker* when he champions the classiness of Lucky Videndi over the lower class vulgarity of Mo Orloffski and Wanda Lou, but it undergoes a suitable resurgence in *A Touch of Danger* which employs the typically "proletarian" form of the hardboiled detective novel. Jones's private dick, like his predecessors Spade, Marlowe, and Archer, prefers the poor to the moneymen, while freely condemning both predators and pat-sies among the poor. Neither Jones nor his detective spokesman intends his sympathy for the poor as a blanket approval.

Jones's style is consciously counter to the tradition of the early nineteenth-century American and British
novel in which the narrative was written with a leisurely wordiness that seems stilted to us now and in which characters from all levels of society spoke in an elaborate formal diction. This was one of Twain's complaints against Cooper, and he could also have leveled this charge against Poe or Hawthorne. Of course, a whole host of realistic writers from Twain to Salinger has intervened since then and has considerably altered the traditional form of the novel. Along this line, a large number of writers, such as Bellow, Ellison, and Baldwin, have learned how to blend the colloquial with the formal in style, and some of the followers of Hemingway have even simplified their style to the Dick and Jane level. However, most writers have confined their use of a fully colloquial style to first person narratives and interior monologues. As Terry Southern remarks in his discussion of *The Thin Red Line*, Jones's special achievement is to apply his knowledge of the speech patterns of lower class Midwesterners and Army enlistedmen in a seemingly less personal context:

There is behind the work a new kind of narrative; it is the "omniscient author" taken toward a logical extreme, where the narration itself, although faceless, without personality, expresses feelings, both of individuals and collectively, in their own terms. For a mild, printable, example, the narration will not say "Welsh was still angry about it" but "Welsh was still pissed-off about it." Narration which uses four-letter idiom traditionally requires that the narrator emerge as a personality. Jones has ignored this requirement and has given
Thus, one major reason why *The Thin Red Line* succeeds as thoroughly as it does is that Jones's style of narration is so well suited to the social level of his characters. There is no discrepancy between thought, form, character, and situation.

Jones has a very fine ear for lower class American accents and, according to a British critic, can even "manage Jamaican better than many British authors, who tend to confuse this dialect with Hollywood-Alabama." However, he has difficulties with the speech and thought patterns of supposed college intellectuals like Bob and Gwen French in *Some Came Running* and, to a lesser extent, of upper middle class figures like Jack Hartley and Harry Gallagher in *The Merry Month of May.* Such difficulties damage the

---

3 Terry Southern, "Recent Fiction, Part I: 'When Film Gets Good . . .',' Nation, 17 November 1962, p. 331. Southern also comments that *The Thin Red Line* "is surely one of the strongest and most effective war novels ever written; even its immense length and Jones's habit, or method, if it is that, of redundancy ('Some were simply watchers, standing and looking.') work to advantage, suggesting the insane confusion, tedium and the endlessness of war" (p. 331).


5 Although some critics might disagree, this stricture does not apply to *Go to the Widow-maker*. As John Thompson remarks in "The Professionals" (New York Review
credibility of these characters. The failure to provide the Frenches with an appropriate manner of speech is especially harmful since it undercuts the effectiveness of Jones's entire experiment in colloquial narration in that book. There are several passages in which the narration purports to view a situation through Gwen's eyes, but during much of these times the voice is not hers. Yet it would be a mistake to assume that because Jones finds it hard to portray the speech mannerisms of college intellectuals and upper and middle class people that he has nothing of value to tell us about these groups. Contrary to what many critics may believe, Jones is an intellectual who has had some college training, and his financial success has provided him with an increasing social mobility, though he remains more responsive to the speech patterns that surrounded him during his formative years.

of Books, 15 June 1967, p. 16), "Most of the people in James Jones's Go to the Widow-Maker belong to a new and nameless class that has not been much noticed in books. They are proletarians who have become rich since the war, but they have not changed their tastes nor their manners nor their speech. . . . They speak the dialect that nearly every man who has grown up in America knows, and often speaks to other men, a dialect seldom used more than briefly in writing. It expresses a peculiar attitude of masculine aggression and sexuality and solidarity, largely through its obsessive obscenity. Jones uses it to explore the complexities of this attitude, of its ability to get into its speech contradictions of rivalry and affection, Oedipal passion, homosexuality, and its many contrary concerns about women."
To the extent that Jones's style is a class-conscious instrument, it is directed against the standards and values of literary critics and book reviewers, exactly as they had feared it was. If my own interpretation of *The Princess Casamassima* is correct, Henry James, anticipating the position of most of the critics of Jones's style, argued that the cultural achievements of the Western world have been founded on social inequality and that the social leveling necessary to bring a fair deal to our poor would probably destroy or at least diminish civilization as we know it. In my view (which closely resembles that of Clinton F. Oliver, who wrote the introduction to the Harper Torchbook edition), James's basic premise was that art has been the product of a leisure class and would inevitably suffer a reduction in sensibility, sensuousness, and subtlety in the clumsy and tasteless hands of the masses, though he, like his main character, Hyacinth Robinson, found himself torn between his love of artistic beauty and his desire to alleviate the unjustifiable wretchedness of the poor. His mistake was in failing to envision any middle ground between his two rigidly defined goals of art and social equality. Even though Jones would probably agree with James's analysis of the basis of the type of art which Jones opposes, he has never intended his style to promote a new barbarism in thought, feeling, or behavior.
Again and again, Jones points out that a man with little education and no social background may be more genuinely sensitive than a man who has had both these advantages, though neither education nor the lack of it guarantee the development of intelligence and responsiveness to life and other people. As Henry James himself did, Jones always favors sensitivity over callousness in its various guises of practicality, masculine toughness, authoritarianism, religious zealousness, etc.; it is only the artificial sensitivity of the snob or would-be aesthete that he attacks. Moreover, he is ultimately less interested in using his style to express a class allegiance (or even an allegiance to underdogs of any class) than in making it a tool for exploring the thoughts and actions of soldiers and of people from lower to middle class backgrounds. His inelegant language seems particularly well-adapted to the psychological probing of certain types of rough-hewn "masculine" attitudes. As John Thompson notes in his review of Go to the Widow-maker:

[Jones's] use of the proletarian dialect of obscenity allows him an entirely new accuracy of fact and of valuation in speaking of sexual experience. No other writer has ever done this so well. It is more than a matter of using obscenities, as we call them; it is a profound honesty, a willingness to connect physical experience with feeling that neither pornographers nor those who speak only of the feelings and obscure the physical can hope to manage. As he manages this about sex, so he does about
aggression. Jones uses the language of masculine aggression, knows how to assess its undertones of sexuality, and in the action he presents, he shows the consequences of these feelings. Those who imagine he is simply praising the male world do not understand him at all.  

In this respect, Jones's apparent flouting of established modes of expressing sensibility in literature has actually led to a gain in intricacy and delicacy in the examination of important areas of contemporary experience.

Far too many critics have let their obsession with Jones's grammar hinder them from gauging his complexity and making an appropriate effort to understand his fiction. In spite of his desire to be comprehended by the rank and file of American society, Jones demands the same kind of imaginative and disciplined study which critics have eagerly bestowed on other major writers. He is a highly conscious artist who pays close attention to the smallest details of his works. A good example of this is the way the theme of the unexpectedness of life permeates virtually every action in *From Here to Eternity*. This theme, of course, is highly appropriate to a novel climaxing with the Japanese sneak

---

6 Thompson, p. 17. Thompson also argues that "in telling this story, Jones has all his famous difficulties with English syntax. Still, although the most interesting things are not those he presents in his version of standard English, but rather in his vernacular of obscenity, he can do quite brilliant set pieces when they are called for. His descriptions of the sea, of diving recall and sometimes surpass in their figures and their visual imagery those of Lawrence Durrell, for instance" (p. 16).
attack on Pearl Harbor, but it is also displayed in little touches throughout, such as Prewitt's discovery that the delightfully named Lorene is really Alma Schmidt and Bloom's justifiable astonishment that his attempt to thank Prewitt for helping his dog immediately provokes a fight with him. Even Warden's small attempt to outmaneuver fate by avoiding the hotel where he first took Karen is promptly repaid by Stark's observation of the two of them at the new hotel which in turn leads to Stark's surprising drunken confrontation with Warden during the field problem. Surely an author who can consistently weave such tiny incidents as these into durable well-designed webs scarcely deserves to be treated as a perennial amateur, yet so many critics blindly brush aside these webs to grab a handful of threads.

Jones amply reveals his concern with the construction of The Thin Red Line as a tightly knit entity in a letter he wrote me on September 24, 1973:

In connection with LINE you may be interested to know that—technically—it was also a deliberate experiment in the use of mass viewpoint. This was the only form in which I found I could work the material into the proper mold that would give the effect I wanted of "a single animal", i.e., the company. You will note that the viewpoint not only changes from paragraph to paragraph and sentence to sentence, but that also sometimes within the same sentence the viewpoint will move from man to man to man. This also was an excellent way of showing the incredibly different, the appallingly different, reaction of different men to the same stimuli.
In this passage, Jones has unfolded a complicated strategy for dealing with the difficult structural problem of portraying a group simultaneously as both a single personality and a collection of individuals. Moreover, he confirms Terry Southern's impression of his sophisticated awareness of the role which style can play in developing a form which truly reflects the psychology of this particular kind of group. Why then have so many critics accused Jones of being a sloppy and superficial craftsman?

The chief problem with nearly all of the criticism about Jones is that it has failed to examine his basic philosophy. For example, few critics have noted his belief in reincarnation and none have remarked that it forms the center of all his literary webs. Even Richard Adams, who made an otherwise excellent analysis of Jones's theory of spiritual growth in his essay "A Second Look at From Here to Eternity," neglected to point out that Jones views all such growth in the context of an ongoing process of reincarnation. For this reason, Adams was unable to observe that Prewitt's death was not presented as a tragic ending but rather as a significant stage in Prewitt's spiritual development. Since Jones's conception of spiritual evolution through reincarnation provides the foundation for structure and characterization in his novels as well as for his ideas about life and morality, it is im-
possible to gauge the full extent of his artistic accomplishments without an understanding of this conception. This means that no critic to date (with the partial exception of Richard Adams) has been in a position to make a just evaluation of the totality of Jones's fiction.

Judging from the few reviews by Fiedler and the one or two other critics who made a passing mention of Jones's interest in reincarnation (and from recent reviews of the last volume of Yukio Mishima's *Seas of Fertility* tetralogy), there is a strong tendency among critics to mock the idea of reincarnation. One of Mishima's reviewers even questioned whether a work which took reincarnation seriously could hold the intellectual interest of a Western reader, and asked "who really cared whether Isao, the young rightwing fanatic in the second novel, was the reincarnation of Kiyoaki, the sensitive lover in the first?"7 The assumptions here are that reincarnation is both a childish notion which adults should try to outgrow and a typical piece of Eastern irrationalism which Westerners should dismiss because of our superior knowledge of logic. But isn't such an offhanded rejection of an idea dangerous for a critic? Should Joyce's *Ulysses* be casually tossed aside because of Molly Bloom's interest in *MET-HIM-PIKE-HOSES*?

---

Or should we politely refrain from commenting on the reincarnationist beliefs of Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, Hesse, Salinger, and Jack London? Do we have to believe in orthodox Catholic doctrine to appreciate Dante, Chaucer, Chesterton, and Graham Greene? Or become atheistic existentialists to discuss the writings of Sartre and Camus? We should remember Henry James's critical principle of granting the artist his donnée and then examining what he does with it. A critic ought to strive to hold his preconceptions and personal values in check when approaching a work of some literary value in order to gain a deeper insight into it.

The one task a critic dare not evade is that of reaching the most incisive and sympathetic interpretation he can. Unless he is willing to cast aside his prejudices and meet an author on his own ground, he will remain in his own subjective world and merely record his reasons for not responding to that author. One of the greatest benefits which literature affords is the chance to extend our imaginative horizons, so that we can learn what it feels like to perceive the world as a priest or a sadist, or a whaling captain or a prostitute—or a man who is convinced that death is absolute or a man who believes that his soul will be continually reborn in other forms throughout eternity. The critic can, of course, assert his own value
judgments after achieving his primary goal of interpretation, but he should do so very cautiously or he may find that he has thrown away the special gifts which the author alone had to give him. Let us now put aside as many of our own preconceptions as we can and attempt to reconceive the world through Jones's vision. There are greater riches in Jones's fictional universe than most critics have imagined.
CHAPTER I

THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY:

EVERYONE COMES RUNNING

In spite of its abusive reception by the critics and its later oblivion, Some Came Running remains the fundamental testament of Jones's philosophy. His one previous novel, From Here to Eternity, had outlined his views on God, reincarnation, and spiritual growth; Some Came Running not only expands these views but also discusses his ideas concerning Karmic relationships, Glamours (illusions), spiritual discipleship, the subjectivity of everyone's "Image-picture" of the world, and the involution-evolution process (involving the falling away and eventual reunion of each soul with God). Even though he never explicitly refers to these ideas again in his fiction, Jones continues to use them as the basis for his characterization, plotting, symbolization, and overall meaning. Thus, Some Came Running serves as a key to all his other works. As Jones wrote me on July 8, 1973:

all my subsequent novels are founded structurally on this same "system" of "subjective realities"--"Image-pictures"--and the resulting "Karma-seeds"
of responsibility that grow out of their collisions. Actually, they are. The solid "abstract morality" that all my books stand on is a pedestal provided by this concept of the evolution-involution of the Universe, which is the only "system" I've ever found that provides a reasonable explanation of paradox. Of how everything turns into its own opposite. A quote pops to mind: "Shun not the cloak of evil, lest it be yours to wear."

Actually, during the writing of ETERNITY and also of RUNNING I was embarked on a, for me, profound soul-search. I've later learned--I guess I even knew it then--that just about everybody goes through this same process at about the same age. I mean, in a sense in which it occupies almost all of the mind, soul, one has. Anyone of any true moral sensibility. At that time, for quite a few years, I was on an enormous study-kick of mysticism, and even occultism. The Indian philosophies. The Christian. Theosophy. Reincarnation particularly fascinated me. It stood to reason that if the law of the conservation of energy applied throughout the physical Universe, it ought also to apply in the spiritual Universe. I wanted to make a book that, on one level, would show all the "subjective realities" functioning and colliding and still at the same time allow all of the paradoxes to apply, be shown, also. Bob French of course was the spokesman, the mouthpiece, for it.

Ultimately--paradox, again--when I had done it, I found that nothing had changed. I had made a book, was all. And, paradoxically, I was still victim--or participant--to my own "Karma seeds", already established, as if I hadn't written it, or understood and recreated--or created--the system. I had proved nothing. I had presented a hypothesis, was all. To be accepted or rejected by every other "subjective reality", my own included. I had presented the possibility of a belief, but not enforced it. I was no freer than before. I could choose to believe it, or not to. I don't know whether I believe it now today. I choose to, but I don't know.

I have never had any "occult" experiences. I have never had any "signs" or personal "revela-
tions", about it. If I have any religion, this is pretty much it, but I am still subject--just as subject--to my own Karma seeds as if I had not worked it out. The only thing I gained is perhaps a minimal tranquility in the face of world events, and personal, that allows me to look them in the face. Had I ever had any visionary proofs, I might be a Knower, or I might be--a Nut.

I watched this woman Lowney Handy slowly go on to become a psychotic, after a heavy dose of all this matter. She literally became insane in her last years. Part of that story is told in WIDOWMAKER. I couldn't do more with it, since for me at least, there is no way to write a nut from the inside and make it digestible, let alone truly symbolic of the "human condition".

But all my later work is based on these few principles. On this "system". I still can't prove it's the right one. It fits all the "phenomena". That's all I can show.

Jones's letter indirectly raises a serious question about his work; is it legitimate for a novelist to structure a fictional world which purports to be "real" on a scheme which he "chooses" to believe? This question will probably seem more important to Americans than to Europeans accustomed to idea-centered novels like Mann's The Magic Mountain, Sartre's Nausea and the Roads to Freedom trilogy, and Camus's The Plague. It will also stimulate more interest among philosophers and literary critics than among those theologians who both recognize and countenance the fact that all religions require a leap beyond reason and experience to faith. Yet the question remains a disturbing one and should not be lightly dismissed.
Even though Jones's philosophy tries to account for all the "phenomena" he has observed in individuals, societies, and the universe, he has had to make several enormous uncheckable assumptions about the nature of God and of reality. In basing his fictional world on these assumptions, is he conning the reader into accepting something which he personally is unsure about? (How much emphasis should be placed on the words "choose to believe," a phrase which modestly and honorably expresses Jones's doubts about the validity of his beliefs?) Are Jones's philosophical views incompatible with his artistic aims?

Jones has never argued that the physical world does not exist. Neither does he deny the existence of other people, nor of national, religious, and social customs. Like many other writers, he uses his observations of both the physical world and other people as the foundation for the realistic surface of his fiction.

On the other hand, he does assert that people hold widely differing views of the world and that ultimately they cannot make any meaningful or lasting contact with each other until they are reunited with God at the end of time. He has also posited an invisible world of bodyless souls which exists alongside the visible human world. Both of these ideas challenge the conventions and rationales of the realistic novel. Most writers create a real-
istic surface to persuade their readers that their stories are true to life. They want their readers to assume that they share a common vision of reality. But Jones prefers not to assure his readers that he sees the same world they do. His form says, "This is the way the world is"; his content says, "Our egos won't let us see the world as it is."

Given the terms of Jones's philosophy, the conflict between his form and his content is probably both irreconcilable and unavoidable. If, as Jones argues, all men are blinded to some extent by their egos, then they will encounter each other in the midst of a world they mistakenly believe they understand. Moreover, they will be convinced that others experience the world in the same way they do. Yet gradually, through their conflicts with others, they will lose this assurance about their knowledge of the world and about their perception of themselves. At this point, their belief that they share a common view of reality with others will give way to a recognition that everyone places a filter between himself and the "real" world.

Similarly, Jones's readers begin with the assumption that he is describing the world they are familiar with, but then are given the opportunity to see that their "mutual" version of reality may be highly subjective. The difficulty with this approach is that many readers may be
so misled by the realistic surface that they never comprehend the philosophical vision underneath. Their incomprehension could be a product of their own subjectivity, but it could also be partially the result of the inherently deceptive quality of this kind of surface.

Since Jones does choose to believe in his philosophy, he would be dishonest if he failed to give his readers some indication of his choice of it, either directly or indirectly. Any writer ought to present his fullest vision of life, and this vision necessarily includes his speculations as well as his observations. On the other hand, since Jones feels that he can't prove even to himself that his view of life is accurate, he would be dishonest if he tried to propagandize in its favor. Balancing these demands is an exceedingly hard task, and Jones's herculean efforts to do so have not always been successful.

A philosophical novelist like Jones faces a special danger; he may be tempted to fit his characters into the procrustean bed of his ideas. Jones is aware of this danger and usually tries to avoid it:

instead of laying out the abstract idea--if A is put against B then C will result--I take the people, one of whom will more or less represent A (but who has the right to not represent A, if he so chooses), and one of whom will more or less represent B. Then when I set A against B, maybe Z or X will result, instead of C. Because by allowing that unknown to exist in there, I won't actually be able to know what will happen until it writes its own answer. Because after all,
this problem, whatever it is, is a question which I haven't answered, and a question which I don't feel qualified to answer, wouldn't presume to answer, for myself or anybody else. And by doing it that way I'm letting the people write their own story themselves.1

As an example of how he leaves room for the unexpected in his works, Jones mentions that:

in Running, I guess I worked on that book for three years before I knew whether Dave Hirsh would actually marry that slob, Ginnie Moorehead, and then it was another year before I was able to find out whether he would leave her or not after he did marry her.2

Most of the time Jones employs his philosophy to interpret the behavior of his characters rather than to dictate what their behavior will be. Although he has sharply defined ideas about what constitutes spiritual growth in his characters, he usually stresses that there are a multiplicity of means for attaining this growth. Yet sometimes he has taken a much less flexible approach. For example, he lends too much support to Gwen French's rigid, simplistic theory that an exact, graphable relationship exists between an author's involvement in an unrequited love affair and his desire—and ability—to write. According to this theory, a writer can do productive work

---


2Aldrich, p. 242.
only while he is striving to win a woman who seems unresponsive to him. Jones backs up this theory by fitting both Dave Hirsh and Wally Dennis into the pattern which Gwen describes. Moreover, in this novel, he fails to indicate that a writer could develop in any other way. However, in his later novel Go to the Widow-maker, he implicitly rejects much of this theory by portraying an author who becomes able to combine requited love, increasing maturity, and artistic progress.

Occasionally, Jones runs into the quite different problem of endangering the expression of his philosophy by sympathizing with the "wrong" characters. Even though he makes Bob French the spokesman for his own ideas in Some Came Running, Jones pays more attention to Bama Dillert who emerges as a powerful counter-spokesman. Worse still, Jones seems more interested in Bama whom he superficially objects to than in Bob whom he presents as a near-guru. Bama fascinates the reader by his sneering, confident pose; his ability to dominate his male and female acquaintances; his competence in a large variety of practical skills; and his romantic, easygoing lifestyle. In contrast, Bob is a lackluster character who spends most of his time dodging conflicts. Bama speaks in a forceful, colloquial style which is suited to his character and background; Bob, at least when he is theorizing, speaks in a
clumsy, jargonistic style which has probably put off many readers. Bama creates a far more vivid impression on readers than Bob does.

Jones has reasons for making Bama colorful and Bob wraith-like. He wants to build up Bama's outward strength as a prelude to demonstrating his inner weakness; when serious misfortune strikes Bama, the formerly cool Southerner is unable to cope with it, and his facade of unshakability collapses. Jones also seeks to expose the fallacy of Bob's attempt to withdraw from society and to avoid the responsibility of giving advice to others; Bob's flight from others involves a flight from pain and from the further knowledge he might gain through humiliating and humanizing conflicts with others.

Nevertheless, a large portion of the book focuses so heavily on Bama's apparent strengths and Bob's shadowy non-involvement with others that inattentive readers might easily jump to the conclusion that Jones prefers Bama's worldly viewpoint to Bob's spiritual wisdom. This emotional contrast in Bama's favor may even be a major reason why Some Came Running has been consistently misunderstood by the critics. Judging the characters in Jones's own terms, we can say that Bama has a life of his own and that Bob is mainly a combination of spokesman and symbol. Jones knows Bama's upbringing and his turf, and he can make Bama
"real"; he is not as familiar with Bob's social and intellectual environment, and he doesn't make him as credible. Again, the horns of Jones's dilemma are clear. Even though he believes that everyone encounters and interprets the world in basically subjective ways, he needs to create his characters on the basis of his encounters with people whose customs he understands, and he must make these characters convincing in terms of his readers' common experiences.

Fortunately, Jones does not leave the last word with either Bama or Bob, but rather with Dave Hirsh, a highly complex and satisfying character. Dave begins by longing to emulate Bama's worldly success, but he eventually learns to recognize the superior value of Bob's philosophy of spiritual progress. Although his actions are sometimes too openly manipulated to illustrate Jones's ideas, his overall development does not seem forced or reductive. He is by far the most important figure in *Some Came Running*, and the novel rightly centers on his evolution from—to use Bob French's terms—"animal man" to "mental man" to "spiritual man."³

When Dave first arrives in Parkman, he is functioning almost exclusively on the animal level. His emotions and

³James Jones, *Some Came Running* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957), p. 811. Subsequent references to this edition will be made in the text under the designation SCR.
actions are about as primitive as they can be. In addition, he fits Jones's definition of "a slob as someone who has an inordinate ego which makes him close his mind down around his small beliefs and prejudices." He had made his decision to visit his home town while drunk with some other recently discharged soldiers, and he relishes "the furor [his return] was going to create" and "the malices he would activate" (SCR, 4). Moreover, his initial action in town of pointedly rejecting the bank in which his brother Frank has part interest is a petty revenge for the way Frank had treated him nineteen years before when Dave had "disgraced" his family by getting a country girl pregnant. Even though he is now thirty-six, Dave continues to resent the injury which Frank inflicted on his ego then. What could exhibit his present childishness more clearly than this long treasured grudge?

As Jones wrote in his letter of July 8, 1973:

It's perhaps important to note that when Dave arrives in Parkman as "slob" and "animal man", it is because he had deliberately made himself so. This is the self-destructive part--the self-immolation, one could say--of the artist which, when used fruitfully, gives him the tendency and need to "destroy" himself in public.

In spite of the war's embittering influence on Dave, the most probable reason for his turning himself into a drunken, lustful, spiteful clown and for his abandoning

\[4\] Aldrich, p. 245.
the writing he had once valued is that his former unre­quited love, Harriet Bowman, married someone else. As a result, when he meets Gwen French, his first thoughts are not about the possibility of loving her but only about his desire to have sex with her and to gain the ego satisfac­tion of having her love him. Nevertheless, he may have unconsciously guessed that his ill-fated attempt to seduce the unyielding Gwen will push him out of this animal exis­tence toward intellectual and spiritual development. Bob French theorizes that the only way an individual can de­velop is through experiencing pain—"Physical pain, mental anguish, spiritual suffering" (SCR, 819). However, since no man would consciously seek pain, it has to come to him in the form of something that he would seek, and the most common type of pain that we all run after is love. Hence, in pursuing unrequited loves like Harriet and Gwen, Dave is really opening himself to enormous pain, especially since he strongly fears rejection, and, through that pain, to sensitization toward the longings and feelings of other people and toward the revelation of his own inadequacies. As Bob also contends, love on the animal level means only the desire for sex, love on the mental level the desire to be loved by someone else to gain outside confirmation and justification for selflove, and love on the spiritual level the need to move beyond yourself toward God Who is also in
motion and Who therefore cannot be pinned down, limited, or understood. It is Dave's love for Gwen on the mental level that turns him into a writer again for the same reason he had previously become a writer when he was in "love" with Harriet Bowman. However, just as he is more powerfully entangled with Gwen than he had been with Harriet, his writing under Gwen's influence is more painful, sensitive, and honest than anything he had created when he was chasing after Harriet.

Dave is, of course, the prime example of Gwen's own theory that writing is not an end in itself, but only a "by-product of the near psychotic love-hunger of the individual; . . . A by-product that the individual willingly gave up himself, when he reached the Love climax and either got or did not get the Love-object" (SCR, 568). Gwen also speculates that there is an "almost mathematical clinical progression from the beginning sense of un-love up through the height (according to the individual) of talent to the Love climax . . . thence almost immediately into the decline of talent and on down to the inevitable destruction of talent, or the individual, one" (SCR, 567) and Dave's involvement with Gwen unfortunately bears this out.

Gwen's poorly phrased and needlessly obscure theory provides the weakest link in Jones's philosophy. She may legitimately suggest, as Edmund Wilson and others did,
that writers gain their artistic impulse as a response to suffering, but she goes too far when she argues that their creativity is exclusively and inextricably bound to a "love-hunger" which can be traced on a graph. Yet Jones obviously supports her theory here by letting Dave's life serve as evidence for it.

Dave begins writing again as a means of keeping Gwen interested in him while he is trying to seduce her and he constantly expresses his hope that Gwen will be pleased with what he has done. Moreover, he obviously wants her to transfer her admiration for his fiction to his person. Nevertheless, even though his basic purpose in writing is to make Gwen love him, he doesn't try to idealize his own life or romanticize other people in his work. As Bob would explain it, using his concept of love on the mental level, Dave can't justify his love for himself if he gets Gwen to love a false image of himself, so he has to reveal all the flaws he sees in himself.

According to Gwen, the artist is also driven toward self-exposure by his combination of a "desire for unbridled license" coupled with "this higher-than-normal, stronger-than-was-customary-in-humans sense of high integrity and great morality, forming that perpetually balanced and forever insoluble conflict within that made you the artist" (SCR, 566). This motive ties in with the previous one
because both are based on the powerful nature of the artist's ego and its equally powerful vulnerability. Dave acts again and again on the basis of the needs of his ego only to find that his actions seem designed to puncture his pride and to force him to look more closely into himself. For example, when he returns from the trip he has made to Florida because he was outraged at not having been invited by the Frenches for Christmas, he discovers that Gwen and Bob had simply been expecting him to come over, and he has to admit to himself that he had acted childishly. His trip has been productive both because he had written "The Confederate" during that time and because he had been able to expand his sympathy by learning to understand the way of life of the southerners, a group whom he had formerly feared and regarded as alien to him. However, he has risked the thing he wanted most, Gwen's love, out of a petty affront which didn't even exist.

This incident is typical of him and suggests the way in which his ego and his desires are simultaneously valuable and damaging. Gwen states this idea explicitly when she remembers the "drinking and sexing" of the writers she has known and reflects that "they were all like runners" (thus giving one interpretation to the title) "runners with huge enormous feet. They were dependent upon their feet to run, and needed them. But those same
feet were always tangling them up and tripping them. And if they ever did win a race it was both because of their feet and in spite of them, simultaneously" (SCR, 305). Dave's own writing can be viewed both as a result of his imperfections, that is, of his captivity to his desires and illusions, and as a means to free himself from them. He couldn't have become a writer without his ego and his desires, but he can't move on to the next stage of discipleship until he is ready to leave them behind. Only when he has fulfilled himself at the artist stage will he perceive the need to serve as a Disciple "working consciously and specifically with some Great Master" (SCR, 820). This is why the artist stage at its peak is merely the preliminary step to the lowliest Disciple stage. Nevertheless, if the artist can carry his attempt at self-exposure out to the fullest limit, he can then move beyond that self toward God. Bob French implies both the way in which art is founded on imperfection and the way in which the Disciples--and, above all, the Leaders and Lords and Masters and Teachers--supersede the artist when he tells Dave that:

the way of the artist . . . is never to know.

. . . If he knew what God was, he would be too sure. And the very nature of an artist, a great artist, is that he must never know; must never be sure. That is why he works so hard, and so painfully, and hungers so hard and painfully. If he knew . . . Well, I don't suppose he would ever produce anything, would he? He wouldn't need to (SCR, 1182-1183).
Even though Dave's head is filled with ideas for future novels after the moment of revelation in which he frees himself from most of his illusions, he senses that he is approaching his death and that he will never be able to write about any of them. However, the reason he dies at this point is that he has learned all that he needs to "know" to become a Disciple and is now ready to begin—literally—a new life, either in the "world of bodyless souls, spirits, complete with its own body politic, its own hierarchy of Leaders and Lords and Masters and Teachers . . . surrounding the material world we inhabit" (SCR, 816) or in a new body on earth.5

5In his letter of July 8, 1973, Jones also wrote: "where you say 'He dies at this point . . . . because he has finally learned all he was supposed to learn in this particular incarnation and is ready' etc. I underlined this, and wrote in the margin: 'Important point! I can go no further.' And indeed, I have never been able to, artistically. Any attempts I have ever made, and I've made two or three, have always failed as art and become preachments. I simply have not the facilities to take it any further than this point: 'He dies at this point.' And, finally, first and last I am a novelist; and I cannot write about a 'Master' perhaps because I have never known one. Oh, I could fake it, as Maugham did in The Razor's Edge (Maugham is supposed to have drawn the 'Master' in this book from a man named Paul Brunton whom I used to read. I could never believe Brunton's Mastership.) (Either.) This is why, of course, the Spiritual Master-and-Disciple conception has never reappeared in my work. I've met some so-called Gurus but found them all suspect, finally. Or naive. But the conception, the basis, has figured in all my work since. In fact, on lower levels than the 'spiritual', I have used the Master-Disciple relationship several times. Actually, it exists equally on lower levels of sensitivity, right on down, into the
One of the most significant changes in Dave's writing during the time that he is still bound by his love for Gwen is his shift from "unconscious writing" which depends on the author's emotions to "fully conscious writing" which has a "preconceived effect" toward which the author is working (SCR, 695). This kind of art is a far cry from the type practiced by the Wisconsin lumberjack who tried to put "everything he ever felt about life and beauty and frustration" into his making of the copper skillets hanging in Gwen French's kitchen (SCR, 270) and the form of folk art practiced by Prewitt and his friends in composing "The Re-enlistment Blues"—not to mention the kind of art which most critics think Jones advocates as well as practices. However, this "fully conscious writing" is presented as an advance over the more spontaneous writing Dave had done in the past. Gwen points out that in fully conscious writing:

"It's no longer enough to just feel something and then write it. You have to construct. And then you have a tendency to lose all the fresh originality of your emotions, which came out of your innocent unconsciousness of them, because now you know what they are (SCR, 695-696).

Probably the most important implication here is that Dave has grown in his awareness of his emotions, though he

animal world. But to try to create it in a 'spiritual' sense is to strain belief on the part of the reader beyond the point I care to go, artistically."
still has a long way to go before he will reach the understanding necessary to free himself from them. The book which Gwen views as an example of fully conscious writing is Dave's "comic combat novel" in which he attempts to show that the life of men in combat is "no more brave or fine, or possessed of any other human virtue, than their life at home would have been" and in which he recognizes that each one of the "laughable (but unpitiable) fools" he is writing about is "DAVID HERSCHMIDT, who could look back on one of the most foolish lives of any of them, but who would no more admit it than they would, if accused of it" (SCR, 650). His movement toward self-knowledge, self-acceptance, and self-transcendence is further confirmed by his only slightly earlier decision to change his writing name from the pretentious "D. Hirsh" to the more legitimate "David Herschmidt."

Dave is almost finished with his combat novel when the crisis comes in his relationship with Gwen and, true to Gwen's theory, he is unable to write at all for some time afterwards. Moreover, when he does return to work the quality of his writing is distinctly inferior to what he has done before. In addition, during the period after he has given up Gwen and become attached to Ginnie, the best he can do is a sentimental love story, which nearly destroys the overall effect of his combat novel, followed
by a vicious but equally unsuccessful depiction of his deteriorating relationship with Ginnie. At the end, even though he seems eager to write again, his writing is no longer a matter of importance since he is beyond the attachment to the world that had necessitated his fiction.

Dave's entanglement with Ginnie provides an appropriate conclusion to his development in this incarnation because it forces him to confront his strongest illusions, and these illusions significantly form the basis for his decision to marry Ginnie. First, he feels that he needs a woman and that he is "too old" and "too fat and ugly and too broke" to get a chance at any woman other than Ginnie (SCR, 1187). This point is dubious since, as Bama points out, Dave's fortunes could change at any moment and a sufficient monetary gain from the sale of his book (or from any other source, such as the defense job which he takes after marrying Ginnie) would greatly improve Dave's chances with other women. More importantly, though, Dave is ensnaring himself in the trap of self-pity which Gwen futilely warned Wally Dennis against when he decided to enlist in the Army as a means of running away from his suffering over Dawn's marriage. Gwen made clear the dangers of any form of pity when she told Wally:

all the chains, and limitations, and prisons we build around ourselves resolve themselves into that one word Pity. Pity reduces everything to futility. Pity involves us in the problem,
whatever it is, Pity holds us caught by the thoughts our Pity builds in our minds. . . . Its the opposite way from Freedom. Just as much as Ego, and Vanity. And it doesn't matter a damn whether you Pity yourself or Pity someone else. Pity always binds you closer to the imperfection you see—that you hunger after—and that has caught your emotions (SCR, 1022).

The imperfection which Dave's self-pity binds him to is his sense of his body and its "needs." Yet when he marries Ginnie to obtain a continuous source of sexual pleasure, he finds that she no longer wants to have sex with him because she believes that respectable married women don't like sex. Worse still, Dave's sexual desire and longing for companionship make him dependent on someone else when he should be seeking his own salvation. At the time when Dave was tormented by Gwen's abandoning him, Bob had cautioned him that "every man must find his own salvation" and that "it's not to be found outside. In another person. Not in friendship; but most particularly not in love" (SCR, 1084). However, Dave had considered this advice useless then and had refused to guide himself by it. As a result, he became caught by the "married man's settled panic at the thought of being without his wife" (SCR, 1207). Nevertheless, Dave finally has to admit that he and Ginnie can never make contact with each other because "each of them had in them a sort of superimposed picture, like a celluloid overlay on a map, of life—and of what life was, or was not, and also what it should be;
or, rather, what they wanted it to be" and these separate pictures "could not be made to coincide" (SCR, 1229). Fortunately, though, this realization frees Dave from his dependence on Ginnie and enables him to accept the knowledge that he, like all other human beings whether they recognize it or not, must be forever alone. This knowledge also liberates him from the demands of his body so that he may now be able to "make the crossover" from the material world to the world of bodyless souls (SCR, 820).

Dave's second reason for marrying Ginnie, his pity for her and desire to offer her the opportunity to make a better life for herself, resembles his first reason and contains similar flaws. For example, in trying to help her change her life, he is actually binding himself to her imperfections. Dave soon becomes Ginnie's subject because he can understand much of her point of view and is aware of his own failure to provide what she had expected from him, whereas she comprehends neither his outlook on life nor his expectations. He is therefore caught in a vicious circle: his sensitivity, originally acquired through his involvement with Gwen, makes him weak in relation to Ginnie and his weakness with Ginnie renders him even more sensitive. This situation fits in with Bob French's poem The King is Helpless in which Bob argues that the power given to the Queen in chess is an "astonishing foresight"--of the
power women would someday come to wield in modern society and over their men in all of our Western civilization" (SCR, 561) and that this new power of women is "a definite evolutionary development: with a definite evolutionary purpose: namely, to make the men more sensitive" (SCR, 933).

Dave's sensitivity is a flaw as long as it remains tied to pity, but it prepares the way for his final compassionate understanding which allows him to lament the suffering of others without permitting himself the illusory comfort of believing that he can do something to eliminate that suffering or that it would benefit any individual to be spared a single moment of pain. At the end, he can even feel compassion for the man who fires the bullet which will terminate this life for him. He also feels a sad but unpitying compassion for Ginnie, his fellow countrymen, and all the men involved in the Korean war. He realizes that he has caused Ginnie pain just as she has caused him pain, but he finally learns that we are not "responsible for the pain we cause in others" but only "for the pain that others cause in us" (SCR, 1231). Even though he regrets the suffering he has brought to Ginnie, he recognizes that since, as Bob had said, "each man must find his salvation in himself alone" and since "nothing anyone did to you, or for you, made one damn bit of difference, in the end. It was the one alone," what Ginnie did was really "her problem," not his (SCR, 1231).
Dave's realization about his inability to "help" anyone on the personal level also applies to the social, political, and military levels. Before his final revelation about individual salvation and responsibility for oneself above all, Dave held democratic ideals which were similar to Prewitt's:

If he had ever believed in anything, Dave Hirsh believed fervently in the rights of the free individual. . . . Every human being had the right to be treated like a human being, and not like some kind of animal or a member of some particular herd or other. Every human being had the right to some measure of dignity—no matter how unbeautiful that human being might be physically, or how low and undeveloped mentally. That human being still had the right to be treated optimistically and believingly, instead of pessimistically and cynically. . . . Everybody ought to be given their chance (SCR, 1168).

Because Dave held this viewpoint and observed daily violations of the individual's rights by governments, groups, and other individuals, he began to see decadence everywhere and to notice parallels between his own country and the Roman Empire on the brink of its decline and fall. From his limited, provincial perspective, such an event seemed a disaster on the scale of Armageddon. However, he develops doubts about this idea too just before his death:

Was it really the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, after all? Being enacted over again? Perhaps not. Perhaps that was only another of his illusions. God, he had so many. Anyway, he hoped it wasn't. He loved this country—and this town, too—loved them deeply. . . . But perhaps that was an illusion, too? Why should a man love one country—or one town—or one person—
more than he loved another? Well, he certainly hoped, sincerely and devoutly hoped, we weren't living in the beginning of the Decline and Fall (SCR, 1233-1234).

These reflections indicate an extension of Dave's sympathies—he had hated Parkman and only came to appreciate it and feel part of it when he returned from Florida—and suggest that his compassion is on the verge of embracing all of suffering mankind. They also imply that he is close to believing that every soul on earth is of equal importance since all were put here to learn and all have eternity in which to complete this spiritual education. This would mean that everyone already has his chance, though it is not the chance Dave has in mind when he is asserting his views about the rights of the free individual. Flagrant injustices, such as murder, corruption, sadism, colonialism, and war, should therefore be regarded not as horrible anomalies that reasonable men ought to eliminate in their quest for a sane and comfortable utopia, but rather as distressing yet ultimately beneficial instruments for helping each soul evolve to a higher state of being.

This revelation about the necessary and beneficial nature of suffering underlines the mistake implicit in Dave's third reason for marrying Ginnie, his desire for a happy and contented relationship modeled on the principles Bama enunciated for his marriage to Ruth. Since
Dave is running away from the pain of his failure with Gwen, a happy relationship with Ginnie would negate all the spiritual growth he has attained so far. Bob French points out the dangers of a happy love relationship when he asks Dave, "Did you ever notice how disgusting, how really idiotic--how dumb--requited lovers are?" (SCR, 1085) and if Dave could have witnessed his niece Dawnie's interview with the representative of Weight magazine he would have had to agree. (Since he does not witness Dawnie's interview, her situation provides a lesson only for the reader and hangs as a loose end in the structure of the novel.) However, Dave runs no risk of falling prey to a stultifying happiness since he has made some serious miscalculations both about Bama's principles and about Ginnie's ability to fit them. For example, Bama's requirements for marriage had been aimed at getting sufficient control over the woman and the situation to gain him the benefits of wife and family while leaving him free to live as he chose when apart from them, whereas Dave plans to enjoy such a marriage by itself without living freely outside of it.

Moreover, Dave is incapable of Bama's insensitive, uncaring treatment of women and Bama's unsentimental recognition that Ruth wants only money, a home, a farm to run, and children. Dave refuses to face the implications of
Bama's question, "What if I was to sell that farm and move her up here, to live the kind of life you and me live? . . . She'd take off and leave me so goddamned quick it'd make your head swim, that's what" (SCR, 1188-1189). Bama also argues that Dave doesn't understand that what Ginnie wants most is to be respectable, and that he will therefore be unprepared to handle her as Bama himself would.

Dave has always hero-worshipped Bama for the worst of reasons, namely his growth-impeding ability to dominate women and the conditions of his life, yet the folly of such hero-worship has never been more evident than in Dave's combination here of following Bama's example without listening to Bama's own advice or comprehending the causes behind Bama's apparent "success."

However, Dave's worst misjudgment is his assumption that Ginnie could become like Ruth. The wifely attributes which Bama had sought and found in Ruth were:

First, they got to be dumb. . . . And second, they got to be very very respectable; and it's better if they're real religious too. Then there's another third thing: They got to be used to takin' orders from the menfolks, so that they believe that's the right way of things and the way they ought to be (SCR, 772).

When Bob French warns Dave that one must then "be quite sure that they are dumb; and that they are goodnatured," Dave replies that "those are two things I am sure of," but he is wrong on both counts (SCR, 1182). Ginnie's cunning,
insensitivity, and self-centered viciousness are demonstrated both by her visit to Gwen French, in which she deliberately arouses Gwen's disgust to turn her away from Dave, and by her decision to tell her angry, gun-toting ex-husband that Dave is visiting the Frenches in order to get Rick away from the house in which she and Dave are living. Dave's misreading of Ginnie's character at this time is one of the main reasons why he is so vulnerable to her manipulation, though this vulnerability will also lead him to his later understanding of her and will eventually guide him to his salvation.

Dave's fourth and final reason for marrying Ginnie, his belief that a stable, peaceful, unpassionate relationship with her will be more productive for his writing than his tormented relationship with Gwen has been, is not only based on the same misreading of Ginnie's character as his previous reasons but also on a misconception—or, more probably, a convenient overlooking—of the nature of the writing process. The result is that the work he does accomplish is greatly inferior to what he did while suffering the agony of unrequited love and that he eventually agrees to abandon his unremunerative writing for a job that will enable him to support both Ginnie and himself. Appropriately, the end of their relationship comes when Ginnie hits Dave's typewriter with a flying saucepan during their last argument.
Considering the number of illusions and blunders involved in each of Dave's reasons for marrying Ginnie, it is amazing that the final results are so fruitful for Dave's spiritual development, yet this is the heart of the vital paradoxes in the book: pain brings growth; "evil" brings "good"; the clash of powerfully held illusions brings the end of those illusions; the worst possible worldly choices bring the best possible spiritual results. Dave's final meditation reveals not only how such paradoxes operate but also how they apply to nations as well as to individuals:

undoubtedly no two humans on earth ever lived in identical worlds. . . . Because each had his own private world, and what was more wanted to if possible impose it upon everyone else that he possibly could, in order to prove to himself that it did in fact exist. And that was always where the trouble came. Because the other man— or woman— or nation, for that matter— was doing the same identical thing. Consequently, only clash resulted— and with the clash, trouble.

And from the trouble came the pain: the pain of defeat, the pain of victory and the hate it brought, but most of all the pain of being forced to relinquish part or all of that illusory world each has built up for himself (SCR, 1229).

And along with the pain and loss of one's illusory world come selflessness and sensitivity and sad unpitying compassion and freedom not only from illusion but also from desire and vanity and possessiveness and dependence on others, etc. This means that the state of war with which Some Came Running begins and ends is not a special visita-
tion of evil designed to bring about the doom of the human race, but simply an intensification—and maybe not even that—of the basic human condition with the same conflicts between the illusory worlds of each individual as in "ci-vilian" life, the same opportunities for experiencing pain, and the same possibilities for individual growth and salvation. Earlier, Dave summed this up in relation to his writing, though he was not yet prepared to accept it in relation to his life, when he reflected:

the upshot, the lump, of what he wanted to get said was that each man was a Sacred Universe in himself and at the same time, inextricably, a noisome garbage pail whose bottom had rotted out and was poisoning the garden air and needed to be got rid of posthaste, forthwith and forsooth. That these two were not only inextricable, but were actually one and the same. And that therefore there was no Evil; and probably no Good; only Growth;—or if there were, they were so inextricably involved, like man himself, that no man-brain or -system, no Philosophy of Meaning, would ever separate them without automatically perverting both. And that therefore there was only growth, only change, and the pain of change, and the ecstasies of that pain, to embrace; because that was all there was, to embrace (SCR, 756).

The only viable attitude which an individual holding such a viewpoint can take toward life, struggle, injustice, and anguish is one of acceptance rather than of rebellion or judgment. Yet paradoxically, like everything else in this book, such acceptance frees the individual from the very things he is accepting and moves him toward a more spiritually advanced way of life and thought.
The many paradoxes are of crucial importance since the religious "system" developed here is founded on the greatest paradox of all, the concept of felix culpa or the "fortunate fall." Since this concept is also crucial in Hawthorne's "My Kinsman, Major Molineux" and The Marble Faun, it is appropriate that Gwen decides to study Hawthorne (and Whitman too, for obvious reasons) when she returns from the desert after having tried to burn out the pain of her former relationship with Dave. It is even more appropriate at the end when Bob remarks to Gwen about Dave's death that "we all are guilty. You, me, that girl, everyone. And yet at the same time we all are also unguilty. We suffer, and we learn; and then we grow.—Though growth may often seem like 'Sin' to others; to the ignorant. Do you remember the end of Hawthorne's Marble Faun?" (SCR, 1256). However, the most significant elaboration of the theory of the fortunate fall as it applies to the related concepts of growth and the nonexistence of evil can be found in Bob French's discussion of the "involution-evolution" process:

before there could be evolution, of necessity there had to be involution— the going outward from God; which, unfortunately, has become the supposedly Evil, and totally erroneous, symbol of Satan and his Dark Angels being kicked out of Heaven. In fact, the involution can no more be Evil than the evolution; since without the one the other would be impossible. Now, if you take the whole process and look at it in the shape of the letter V, with God at both ends
at the top and man here on Earth at the bottom, the point, you have the whole situation. We souls here on Earth, which actually involved down from God to meet our gross—and by gross I only mean dense; no derogatory connotations—material bodies as they evolved up to meet us and be used by us, are actually right now at the very lowest point of the V and preparing, and only just now beginning in fact, to evolve back upward whence we came (SCR, 818).

Given the assumption that men on earth are at the lowest point on the V, it is not surprising that spiritual evolution, as experienced by Dave (and Edith Barclay and Bob and Gwen French), involves the act of leaving behind virtually everything that you started out with. That is why the epigraph from Mark, 10, about the man who came running to Christ to ask how to gain eternal life is especially apt since it asserts that spiritual advancement requires abandoning your possessions. Accordingly, Dave's illusions are not the only things he leaves behind during his final moments of life. Almost as a preparation for abandoning his material body, Dave sets out to leave his home (both the house and the town), nearly all of his material goods except for his typewriter, and the wife he had become so dependent on. In doing this, he resembles Christian in Pilgrim's Progress who also has to leave behind wife, friends, and material possessions in order to venture on his spiritual journey. Dave "packed only one bag—and, after looking at all his clothes in the closet, wondered why he even packed that much" (SCR, 1232).
However, the most important "possession" Dave leaves behind is his ego. He is finally able to escape from his desire to seem important to other people because he has learned that his view of the world is an illusion and that there is no way for him to make anyone else see the world from his perspective. Thus, he no longer regards writing as a way to compel other people to look at him, but rather as a means of making "other people's illusory world more real—to [him]" (SCR, 1230), an idea which probably offers the best defense for Jones's own attempt to create a realistic surface for his novels. However, this realization frees Dave both from his previous reason for writing, which was founded on the needs of his ego, and from the prison of his ego itself, the figurative prison that resembles the "Federal prison" which "always disturbed" Dave whenever he looked at it from the shell factory where he worked (SCR, 1201).

One last thing which Dave leaves behind as he moves out of this life is his legacy to others. This legacy not

6In his introduction to "The Ice-Cream Headache" in Rust Hills's anthology Writer's Choice (New York: David MacKay Co., 1974), Jones argued that "if there is any one comment about life which is not disputable, it is that life is not teachable. We can't even teach our children not to make a mistake we made. But life is certainly re-creatable, in fiction. And that is how fiction, if it is good enough, serves us. We can each of us become another, see through his eyes, live through his life. If only enough good fiction were written, we could each of us become all men" (p. 225).
only includes his material bequest of his property to Gin­
nie and his manuscript to Bob and Gwen but also his spiri­
tual bequest of the Karma he had made "with and also in
everyone he had come in contact with since he first came
back to Parkman," the Karma which he recognized "would
stay with all of them, himself and them too, until the day
they died. And perhaps, as Bob maintained, would stay
with them afterwards, too" (SCR, 1231). As usual, Bob
provides the explanation:

whenever we meet people and create desires in them;
whenever we cause them to love us or to hate us,— or perhaps both, which are the very strongest of
desires; in so doing we are making Karmic attach­
ments between them and us, all of which must be
worked out in future lives, the power of the Karma
depending of course upon how strong the desire we
create in them. Of course, its vastly more compli­
cated than that. Their original desires toward us
come into it too; and almost always our meetings
with people in our lives are holdovers and in one
way or another the working out of meetings in past
lives. And that doesn't even halfway explain it.
The purpose always being, of course, to eventually
free ourselves of all Karma—both good and bad—
which we must first do before we can move on to an­
other plane of existence (SCR, 932).

Bob also tells Dave that "anyway I, personally, am con­
vinced you and Gwen have that type of a Karmic attachment;
and a very powerful one" (SCR, 933) and there is little
doubt about the truth of that statement.

Gwen's attachment to Dave is fully as strong as his
to her, even though the special demands of her ego won't
allow her to confess this to him and thus alter their re-
relationship. She has imprisoned herself by her combination of pride in her virginity and pride in the image of herself as an experienced worldly woman grown weary of sex, an image which she had created to protect her virginity. Even when she realizes she loves Dave and wants him to see through her lies and overcome her resistance, she can't break through the crust of her ego and the false image of herself, which she both hates and loves, to give any indication to him that she might be willing to have sex. This pride is again in the forefront during the visit from Ginnie Moorehead in which Gwen is violently agitated by the idea that Dave's desire for her has placed her on the same level as fat, disgusting Ginnie. Only after Dave's death can Gwen admit to herself that in the midst of "all her champings and cageshakings and miseries and wild outcries, she had nevertheless been proud of [her virginity]" (SCR, 1256).

Ironically, Gwen has always wanted to avoid being "a silly, lying, vain, preening woman: playing spiritual, playing at being the Pedestal: the universal 'Conscience' --and all the time being sly and deceitful underneath the thin veneer of sweet and soulful respectability" (SCR, 1248). Yet she has become exactly like this despised image of woman by trying to be the opposite. Part of the reason she chose the role of the woman of the world who
once had numerous lovers was that she didn't want to seem respectable and spiritual. However, her misleading counter-image of the sophisticated woman provides her with a more eminent position among the people who matter most to her than the rejected image of the innocent virgin would have given her and lends added authority to her role of spiritual advisor to her creative writing students. Moreover, her willingness to advise her students about personal matters is reminiscent of the scorned role of universal Conscience and is equally based on a lie. This is why she was so struck by the phrase from the occult book Light on the Path which warned, "Shun not the cloak of evil, for if you do it will be yours to wear. . . . And if you turn with horror from it, when it is flung upon your shoulders, it will cling the more closely to you" (SCR, 1249). She has done everything she hadn't wanted to and become what she condemned, but out of this experience she has supposedly learned how to free herself—by becoming what she has only pretended to be and by opening herself to the pain that comes from the sexual relationships she has feared so much.

Dave's Karmic legacy to Gwen is the guilt which leads her first to reveal her inexperience and past lies to her sympathetic father and then to have her hymen punctured both as an act of penance and an act of intended self-lib-
eration which will enable her to have an affair in the future without fear of being exposed as a virgin and a liar. Through Gwen's response to her guilt, Jones implies that such Karmic legacies force people to face something about themselves which they had been trying to hide and compels them to move beyond the obsessions and mistakes which had been trapping them. However, Gwen's decision about her hymen affords little proof of her growth since she is building her future on a new lie. In addition, she still feels that "physical contact . . . was just too--too intimate a thing to do--without love" (SCR, 1255) and that a man would have to be "sensitive, and kind, and gentle, and intelligent . . . and be all of those things, and be them damned plainly and clearly" before she would consider a relationship with him (SCR, 1258). These thoughts reveal the large amount of pride which she has retained. Even though she seems to follow in Dave's footsteps by choosing to forsake Bob, her home, her virginity, her sheltered existence, and her previous false image of herself, she has obviously not evolved to his level. She shows too many external signs of growth which are not matched by a believable depiction of inward progress. Her continued lying, self-enclosure, and pride make the rest of her projected spiritual development appear contrived and unconvincing.
The problem here probably stems from the conflict between Jones's desire to assert that Gwen is now fit to carry on Dave's projected novel "about Francine and the group in Hollywood" (SCR, 1232; also SCR, 1256-1257) and his realization that she is still far from ready for such a task. Jones is torn between an idea which he wishes to convey about Dave's spiritual legacy to Gwen and a characterization which can't be altered quickly enough to support this idea. In this instance, he tries to serve opposing demands of philosophical exposition and artistic creation and ends up undermining both his philosophy and his art.

Jones is much more successful in his portrayal of the Karmic relationship between Edith Barclay and her grandmother Old Jane Staley, possibly because he is again dealing with characters whose background he thoroughly understands and possibly because he is less thesis-ridden. Edith's motivations ring true throughout; her conflicts with Janie and her guilt over them seem natural and unforced. Like Gwen's response to Dave's Karmic legacy, though, Edith works out her Karmic bond with Janie through guilt, self-exposure, penance, and self-liberation.

When Edith called her grandmother an old whore, she was shunning the cloak of Janie's open, publicly witnessed sexuality which meant that she herself would have to wear
it more tightly later on. Edith comes to regret her insult to Janie when she realizes that she made her grandmother feel too ashamed to seek treatment for her severe illness because Janie feared that she had a venereal disease. The stages in Edith's expiation of this guilt are explicitly outlined in the text:

It was all, of course, old Jane, really. Old Jane and her diverticulitis and her discharge she had so desperately tried to hide. That was, really, what had made [Edith] take the house [that her lover Frank Hirsh had bought her] in the first place. It was, in a way, a sort of penance to old Janie. Well, she had paid the penance, and so it had served its purpose. . . . She had been Frank Hirsh's "mistress"; Frank Hirsh's kept whore; and that was what she had wanted to be--because of Janie. Now it was over. Maybe in some private secret way that was partly why she had taken the house; just in order to bring this end about that much sooner.

Certainly, anyone who thought they could fool Agnes Hirsh indefinitely were only kidding themselves. And now with the humiliation of being kicked out forcibly by her lover's wife, she had in some obscure way, she felt, paid her debt to Janie (SCR, 1158-1159).

As Bob points out to Gwen at the end, no one is "ever really responsible for another's death" except the person himself (SCR, 1252). Guilt in the context of this novel means accepting responsibility for something you will later discover you are not truly responsible for. Nevertheless, you need to experience this guilt in order to evolve to the level of the higher understanding that genuine responsibility resides only in yourself and your own actions. Thus,
Edith's acceptance of guilt for Janie's death is, in a sense, a mistake, but it is an error which is more fruitful from a spiritual standpoint than an accurate judgment of her responsibility would have been at this time.

Edith had started out as an intelligent, but puritanical, possessive, and self-enclosed girl. Her ability and independence are shown in her handling of the secretarial work at Frank's jewelry store where she had had to "create for herself out of whole cloth a practical system . . . to replace the theoretically perfect . . . system the School had drilled into its pupils well enough but which would not work because its precision left no room for the mistakes of bosses or salesclerks, or of office girls" (SCR, 77). She regarded her establishment of her own system as a "triumph" in "a battle fought and won against not only order and system but against herself and her own misgivings, and of which, she thought, she was just as proud as if it were something important" (SCR, 77). As a result of this sense of triumph, she liked to stay late by herself in the store savoring her past struggle and accomplishment. In addition, she enjoyed being alone in the store because she felt "it was her store then. It belonged to her" (SCR, 76). Her possessiveness is further illustrated by her anger at Janie for having dared to try on Edith's jewelry in front of the mirror. Edith's inces-
sant desire for privacy makes it evident how self-confined she was, and her horror at her second lover's attempt "to teach her some of the more unusual ways of making love" (SCR, 83)—her later sexual education by Frank implies that the wounded veteran was trying to teach her fellatio and cunnilingus—reveals how conventional she was in her sexual outlook.

The first important changes in Edith occur as a result of her affair with Frank. She becomes sufficiently involved with him to break through her self-enclosure and to make herself vulnerable. However, a large portion of her love for Frank is really "pity for him and his childish ways" (SCR, 1053), and this pity binds her to him long after she has realized that he is "about as petty, and jealous, and totally self-centered a man as probably existed anywhere" (SCR, 1052). She also chains herself to him by her womanly pride, which makes her, once she has "given herself and her love to a man, almost totally unable to let go of him, unable to admit that she had been wrong" (SCR, 1052). This same pride leads her to refuse to accept any of the presents Frank offers her out of his guilt and desire for greater control over her. Her later decision to accept the house from Frank therefore indicates a diminishment in her pride.

In addition to accepting the house which will pry her free from Frank as well as publicly brand her a "whore"
so that she can pay her guilt-debt to Janie, Edith places on Janie's corpse the jewels that she had tried to keep away from Janie during her lifetime. Moreover, she begins to acquire many of Janie's personality traits, such as the "native" psychological acuteness that enables her to see, as Janie did, that "Frank and Agnes Hirsh owed their 'second honeymoon', their new closeness and warmth, to her: Edith Barclay" and also "Jane's old harsh raucous gravelly laugh [Edith] had used to hear so much" (SCR, 1054). She then decides to reveal her affair to her father, as Gwen will choose to confess her past lies to Bob out of a similar sense of guilt. Afterwards, Edith completes the pattern of surrendering her possessions, which include her job, her reputation, her pride, her aloofness (both personal and sexual), her dependence on Frank, her past images of herself, her property (both the jewelry and the house) and her security. She also follows the related pattern of leaving everything and everyone she has known up to now. Her final reflections about her situation bear out the concept of growth and the way such learning operates:

She had no regrets at all, and no fears. She had no sense of loss. If she had it all to do over again, probably she would not have done it—knowing what she knew now. But then, how could she know now what she knew, if she had not done it? There was a kind of fatality and inevitability about all of it (SCR, 1160).
Significantly, her last thought before leaving is one of compassion for both Frank and Agnes.

The similarity in the patterns of growth followed by Dave, Gwen, and Edith reveals one of the ways in which Jones tries to unify this gigantic novel. All of the characters in the novel resemble the man who came running to Christ to ask how to attain eternal life since all of them grow or fail to grow according to their willingness to give up their possessions. The characters who make the largest spiritual advances are Dave, Gwen, Edith, and Bob French (who abandons his confidence in his own wisdom, his air of being above all human squabbles, and his close daily contact with his daughter). Some of the characters who hold themselves back are: Frank Hirsh, who clings to his wealth, his status, and his imaginary control over women through peeping-tomism; Agnes Hirsh, who prefers sacrificing her gall-bladder to sacrificing her partial control over Frank; Bama Dillert, who would rather be shot than surrender his macho vanity; and Wally Dennis, who clings to his pride in his virility and to the false security of his Randall #1 combat knife which a North Korean soldier uses to cut Wally's throat. As Jones wrote me on July 8, 1973:

I guess we are all seeking "eternal life". Whether in "reincarnation", or "Christian heaven", or whatever. And I meant the title to have all those meanings. In one sense [my novel] is almost an exegesis of the passage in Mark [about the man with too many possessions]. Certainly it's an extrapolation of it.
Jones treats his mythical town of Parkman as a microcosm and implies that the activities of its inhabitants represent the human condition. He attempts to create the impression of a microcosm by including characters from all levels of society: beginning with the lower class servant Jane Staley, factory worker Ginnie Moorehead, and small time gambler Bama Dillert; moving on to the middle class intellectuals Bob and Gwen French; glancing briefly at the established upper class figure Anton Wernz III; and rounding things off with the rise to the wealthy elite by Frank and Agnes Hirsh. However, he also seeks to demonstrate that the surface divisions of society conceal the isolation of each soul and the harsh reality that salvation comes only to individuals, never to groups. As Christ did, Jones argues simultaneously that the class structure is spiritually valueless and that the rich take an especially rough path to their salvation. Above all, Jones wants us to see that people from every kind of background face the same choices between egotism and selflessness, ruthlessness and sensitivity, rebellion and acceptance, pity and compassion, and temporary escapism and growth. In his eyes, the basic human condition of spiritual evolution toward reunion with God supersedes all social views and all material aims.

Yet Jones's efforts to develop this microcosm nearly break down due to his opposing goals of portraying a multi-
level society and of picturing the individual human condition. Jones realizes that any form of society, including that of a small town, is founded on the concept of the interrelatedness of its members, and he does indicate various ways in which his characters are affected by the social and economic structure of Parkman. For example, he shows how Old Janie earns her small income by working as a maid for Frank Hirsh and others like him; how the promiscuous lowlife Ginnie absorbs middle class notions about respectability; and how the seemingly independent Bama resents and envies Frank, a VIP whom he has never met. However, Jones also wishes to demonstrate that these social connections are illusory and that the unillusioned individual will find that he has no need for society. The small town which Jones has constructed so laboriously therefore splinters into a loose assortment of individual souls working out their individual salvation in semi-isolation from each other.

Jones's spiritualistic vision of life comes dangerously close to being anti-social and anti-literary. He has to kill Dave when he does because Dave is on the point of ceasing to exist both as a social being and as a novelistic creation. Without his ego and his illusions (including his imaginary social connections with other souls), Dave can no longer be identified and analyzed as
as an individual. Jones can write about characters only on the levels of animal man and of mental man; that is, he can describe only characters who still believe that their subjective "Image-pictures" of the world are real.

The one part of Jones's philosophical system that provides a basis for drama is the theory of Karma, and Some Came Running appropriately centers around the Karmic relationships formed by Dave and Frank Hirsh. Dave develops intricate Karmic links with Gwen, Bob, Bama, and Ginnie and her ex-husband Rick; Frank makes Karma in his wife Agnes, his daughter Dawnie, his adopted son Walter, his mistress Edith, and Old Janie. In addition, numerous minor characters cluster around either Dave or Frank. However, few of these characters forge equally strong links with both of the Hirsh brothers. As a result, the novel almost splits into two separate sets of plots and subplots. Even though the cluster of characters around Dave occasionally overlaps with the cluster around Frank, the ties between the two clusters don't hold them together very tightly. For example, Dave has little contact with Agnes and Edith and none at all with little Walter, Frank's business partners, and Frank's other mistress Geneve Lowe. Similarly, Frank has a minimal, unlikely relationship with Bob and Gwen and no direct contact with Dave's friends Dewey and Raymond Cole. Moreover, Edith's Karma with Janie
and Frank would probably have worked out the same way if Dave had never returned to Parkman, and Dave's Karma with Gwen and Ginnie owes little to Frank, though Frank did introduce Dave to Gwen.

However, *Some Came Running* would probably not have been improved if Jones had divided his work into two separate novels. After all, Dave's story explicitly contrasts with Frank's since Dave follows the swifter path to spiritual salvation by coming to terms with his pain, whereas Frank delays his progress by striving to hold on to his pride and his possessions at any cost. Moreover, all of the characters in both clusters work out their fates in terms of the philosophy which Bob and Gwen describe so that each of their stories casts light on the others. Certainly Dave, Bob, Gwen, and Edith learn similar lessons about humility and compassion; Wally, Bama, Frank, Agnes, and Dawn are similarly trapped by self-pity; etc.

The chief difficulty with *Some Came Running* is that it is too ambitious. Jones has created too many characters, described too many parallel and contrasting situations, and worked too hard at expressing his ideas in as many ways as he could think of. As his letter of July 8, 1973, suggests, Jones was still in the process of forming his philosophy when he began to write this book, and he is clearly using the novel as a means of piecing his philos-
ophy together for himself as well as for others. His later works are all less ambitious and less idea-centered; they are also better constructed. Yet Some Came Running will remain more important than such highly limited works as The Pistol and A Touch of Danger because it contains many traces of Jones's fervor in discovering and recording his philosophical system.

No matter whether Jones's system is valid or not, it is an interesting one since it posits a complex cosmic drama. It emphasizes a learning process in which each soul is forced to discern both its similarity to all the other souls on earth and its isolation from them. This isolation is the reflection of the distance which each soul has fallen away from God and become immersed in self. Self is therefore the enemy in Jones's view of the world, and it must be defeated so that each soul can be reunited with God. As long as a soul remains subject to the desires and illusions of its ego, it functions on the animal level. However, in the course of spiritual evolution, everyone is pried out of the animal level by being put through a series of distressing and humiliating experiences designed to break down his ego and to make him realize that everyone else is being treated in the same way so that nobody's pride will be left intact. At a certain point in its education, each soul should reach a state of
compassionate understanding in which it feels sorry about the pain in everyone's life without wishing to change or eliminate that pain. This recognition of the necessary role of suffering can come at different times for different souls since it occurs within the context of a process of reincarnation which spans eternity. Eventually, though, compassionate understanding will come to all souls, and they will all become One with God at the end of time. But first they must grow enough to perceive the means of salvation that is within themselves.
CHAPTER II
INDIVIDUAL SALVATION AND GROWTH

Growth, in Jones's eyes, entails a movement from selfishness to selfless compassion. At the same time, it implies a movement from a life bound by illusions and desires to a life marked by inner freedom and an acceptance of the world as it is. The individual stops questioning the injustice of life in general and assumes full responsibility for his own life. In addition, he learns that he cannot find his salvation in other people or in any outside source, but only in himself and his own inner resources. His chief source of education is experience, but in order to profit from it he must face his experience honestly and unflinchingly; flight from pain results in backsliding. The hardest lesson of all is that love solves nothing and throws each individual back on himself. Once he recognizes the inevitability of his own and everybody else's isolation, he goes off by himself, yet with a sorrowful awareness of the suffering of others.

Jones believes that there are two significant paradoxes involved in the process of growth. The first is that
every one comes to resemble what he despises. Although
Gwen French in *Some Came Running* and Karen Holmes in *From
Here to Eternity* are explicitly told not to shun the cloak
of Evil when it is flung upon their shoulders, the warning
could also have been issued to Big Un Cash in *The Thin Red
Line*, Harry, Hill, and Louisa Gallagher in *The Merry Month
of May*, Sonny Duval and Chuck in *A Touch of Danger*, and
quite a few others. The purpose of such transformations
is to compel individuals to walk in another's shoes and
thus to learn directly how it feels to be "evil." For ex­
ample, if you consider whores evil, then you must have
some experiences which will teach you the inner reality of
a life of sexual promiscuity. Note, however, that you
don't have to become precisely what you loathe; Edith Bar­
clay learns all that she needs to know about "whores" from
a single affair. The upshot of such experiences is that
you will transcend the state of mind which you believed to
be evil by passing through it since becoming what you hate
is merely a stage in your development rather than a goal
or a destination.

The related paradox is that you can discover the
meaning of your errors only through having made them. Even
estrangement from God and involvement with your own ego is
not "wrong" in any final sense since this condition is the
starting point of the spiritual evolution process which
will lead you to selflessness and reunion with God. Isaac Nathan Bloom in *From Here to Eternity* learns to value life while committing suicide, and Richard Mast in *The Pistol* discerns the necessity of looking for salvation within himself as a result of having sought salvation in an external object. Since everyone is subject to the "Original Sin" of beginning evolution at the animal level, there is no disgrace in making mistakes. The point of these mistakes, however, is to teach you ways to master the areas of life that have been causing you difficulty and to move you toward a more spiritual level.

Jones's first novel, *From Here to Eternity*, introduces nearly all of his main ideas about growth. For example, through his spokesman Jack Malloy, Jones links his views on man's growth to his conception of a God Who is also evolving. As Malloy's term "God of Acceptance" suggests, the growth of man and God takes the form of an increasing empathy and affinity between them. Jones also stresses the reduction in ego and development of compassion of his principal characters. Both Warden and Karen Holmes come to recognize the role that pride has played in their love, and both learn how to express this love without being possessive or making personal demands. At the same time, Karen discovers that self-contempt can be
as much of a hindrance to growth as vanity. When both she
and Warden have reached a high level of self-acceptance
and unpitying concern for others, they find the strength
to separate and to face the prospect of ultimate aloneness,
even though they will both form temporary associations
with others in the future. The third major character,
Prewitt, learns that his fight against the unjust decisions
of Army authorities is motivated by pride and that he must
acquiesce to these local injustices because they aid the
spiritual education of everyone involved in them.

Jones's primary emphasis, however, is on the discon­
certing unpredictability of life and on the need to adjust
rapidly and flexibly to change. He has structured his
novel around two protagonists who are subjected to lengthy
series of unexpected events and who respond quite differ­
ently to unanticipated crises. Warden bends wherever he
can without betraying his integrity and regards each set­
back as a goad to a newer, more devious pursuit of his
goals; Prewitt always refuses to compromise and prefers
death to dishonor. Both men move far beyond the animal
level and both gain considerable insight into themselves
and life, yet only Warden manages to combine material sur­
vival with spiritual advancement. Prewitt will probably
take at least another lifetime to attain Warden's endur­
ance and adaptability.
Both Warden and Prewitt, as well as many of the other characters in *From Here to Eternity*, are idealized, larger than life figures. Jones regards this idealization as a flaw and has sought to avoid it in his subsequent novels. In an interview about *The Thin Red Line*, he remarked:

> You see, now, I look back at "Eternity" and I think it was a very romantic book, in a way. The same people—the same kind of people—are in the new novel, but I try to show them behaving more the way they would, and did, in real life than as I romanticized them before.¹

The romanticizing does interfere with Jones's presentation of his spiritual evolution theme since it has led many people to regard Prewitt as a tragic hero rather than as an overly proud man who needs to learn humility and compassion. Moreover, Ben W. Griffith, Jr., has amply demonstrated that Jones himself built up Prewitt as "a folk hero circumscribed within the limits of a vocation or profession."² Certainly Prewitt's proficiency in soldierly skills and in bugling is as extraordinary as John Henry's in steel-driving. In addition, he seems so clearly superior to the forces leagued against him that it would be easy to consider him the "good guy" and Capt. Holmes, Ike Galovitch, Maj. Thompson, and Fatso Judson the "baddies."


Also, the injustices which Prewitt is fighting are such blatant ones that most readers can't help feeling that he is right and that his defeat is undeserved, even though this emotional judgment runs counter to the ideas Jones wants to convey. Thus, Jones has reason to be disturbed about the effect of his mythicizing of Prewitt.

Yet the romantic elements of the plot and characterization may be the main source of the book's strong appeal. Unlike Some Came Running, which probably reflects more accurately both life and Jones's philosophy as a whole, From Here to Eternity is packed with many tense and thrilling incidents, such as Prewitt's struggle against the Treatment, Maggio's violent arrest, the queer investigation, Bloom's suicide, the beatings in the stockade, Fatso's murder of Berry, Prewitt's murder of Fatso, and the attack on Pearl Harbor. The characters too are exciting: an idealistic Army private who is constantly at odds with his superiors, a top sergeant who maneuvers behind the scenes for control of his company, a captain's wife who has an affair with one of her husband's subordinates, a prostitute who falls in love with one of her customers and who offers him shelter when he is fleeing from the law, a general who vows to rule his men by making them fear him, and a stockade prisoner who may be a new messiah. Even though this kind of excitement often veers toward the
melodramatic, it is usually well controlled and gives the novel considerable power.

More significantly, Jones's creation of an obviously romantic myth undercuts the realistic surface of his novel and enables him to convey directly some highly mystical conceptions. In all of Jones's writings up to *Viet Journal*, Prewitt is the only character who remembers any of his past incarnations, undergoes astral projection, and recognizes at the moment of his death that he is merely moving on to a new incarnation. (In Jones's work in progress, *Whistle*, a clerk named Landers goes through a bout of astral projection which resembles Prewitt's.) Jones's later mystical scenes, such as John Bell's vision of the universe through the eyes of the dead soldier Kral and Ron Grant's experience in the underwater cavern, are more muted and more limited; they do not possess the extravagance of Prewitt's experiences. Yet Prewitt's memory of his past lives and his vision of the soul's existence outside the body do depict the idea of reincarnation which forms the basis for Jones's beliefs about spiritual evolution. Since such experiences lie well outside the range of normal daily life, perhaps they are represented better in a clearly romantic setting than in a realistic one.

Jones's viewpoint is also served better by the idealized Jack Malloy than by the drab Bob French. In the ear-
lier novel, Jones has adequately prepared the reader to listen to his spokesman by showing Maggio's idolization of Malloy and Prewitt's grudging discovery that this idolization is deserved. Moreover, Prewitt's initiation into astral projection through following Malloy's advice about how to control his mind during solitary confinement amply confirms Malloy's role as a man of spiritual wisdom. In addition, Malloy's unfailing compassion, his ability to endure any amount of pain without wanting to inflict it on others, and his calm, nonegotistical refusal to barter his soul proclaim him to be a saint. Even the inability to feel possessive love, which Malloy considers a flaw in himself, may be a sign that he exists on a higher plane than the other characters since he has passed beyond the stage where such love might have had anything further to teach him. Although he wrongly stresses the need to apply passive resistance to open the eyes of others to their mistaken ways of life, he does recognize that the ultimate purpose of saintly behavior is personal spiritual advancement, not social revolution. Judged on this basis, Malloy merits Prewitt's description of him as "the new Messiah of the new faith Malloy had also prophesied. A Messiah who refused a following and preferred to work alone."³

³James Jones, From Here to Eternity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 665. The other novel I will deal with in this chapter is: The Pistol (New
The most complex and fascinating spokesman for Jones in *From Here to Eternity*, however, is not Jack Malloy, but rather the wily manipulator Milt Warden. Warden establishes his role as spokesman during his first visit to Karen Holmes when he claims that he has been "forced by irrefutable logic to accept the weird outlandish idea of reincarnation" and that he has "decided to not believe in mortal sin, since obviously no Creator who was Just would condemn His creations to eternal hellfire and brimstone for possessing hungers He created in them. He might penalize them fifteen yards for clipping, but He wouldn't stop the ball game" (*FHTE*, 118). Warden has grasped the concept that the "punishment" meted out for "mistakes" is a part of each soul's education rather than a harsh and permanent condemnation for wrong-doing. However, he admits that this is as far as he has been able to develop his views on God and salvation at this time; he has not yet seen the role of ego-reduction in the process of reincarnation or considered some of the directions his own spiritual growth might take.

Warden's chief characteristics are flexibility and a strong bent toward deviousness. Unlike Prewitt, Warden maintains his integrity not by hurling it against all

York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959). Subsequent references will be to these editions; the works will be identified by the following abbreviations: *FHTE*, P.
available objects but by easing it gently around these objects. Although he is contemptuous of brownnosing, he sees nothing to be gained by provocation or insult. Like the First Sergeant in "Greater Love" and Welsh in The Thin Red Line, Warden views life as a game in which he sets many of the goals and rules. If an officer plans to do something Warden resents or despises, he will not defy that officer, but will strive indirectly to change the officer's mind. Moreover, Warden usually regards the obstacles which officers place in the way of his goals as a challenge to his ingenuity, and sometimes he will even add a few obstacles of his own to increase the difficulty of his self-appointed task.

On the other hand, Warden does place what he considers to be the good of his company above his personal desires. He employs his manipulative techniques less for his own benefit than that of the company as a whole and of various individuals within that company, though he places the company before any individual. Moreover, he would welcome the presence of strong, efficient individuals capable of making their own decisions so that the functioning of the company would not depend entirely on him. For example, he is relieved when he realizes that Holmes's new appointee Stark is able to run the kitchen without assistance. In addition, he is delighted by Lt.
Ross's recognition of Calovitch's incompetence and the consequent promotion of Chief Choate. All in all, Warden displays little longing for the authoritarian control that Gen. Slater considers both essential and desirable.

Nevertheless, Warden does retain a belief in discipline, and he is occasionally willing to mete out punishment, although most of the time he strives to circumvent punishments which officers intend to order. This belief in discipline is shown when he tells Prewitt what to expect if he returns to the company after having been awol for so long because of the wound he incurred while fighting Fatso. Although he has covered for Prewitt until company maneuvers and has spoken to Lt. Ross to make him amenable to giving Prewitt a break, Warden feels Prewitt has stayed away too long to be able to avoid a court martial. He can limit Prewitt's punishment to one or two months in the stockade, but he can't do better than that, and when Prewitt responds that he won't submit to any time in the stockade, Warden replies, "I don't know what you expected. My Christ, you've been gone six weeks" (FHTE, 735).

An earlier example of Warden's attitude toward punishment is his readiness to place Prewitt on the worst details when he gets in the front half of the work detail line, coupled with his bestowal of sanctuary to Prewitt when he chooses to stand in the second half of the line.
Warden's aim in this and in other actions toward Prewitt is to teach him how to take care of himself. Here, Warden is acting as Master to an unwilling—or unready—Disciple. When Pete Karelsen asks him why he doesn't place Prewitt in Pete's platoon where he would have a chance to get ahead, Warden answers, "Maybe I don't want him to have a rating yet. Maybe I'm trying to educate him first" (FHTE, 163). The main thing that Warden is trying to help Prewitt learn is how to be flexible and how to react toward obstacles as Warden does. He would like to see Prewitt reach the same general view of life which he has, but he knows that Prewitt will have to discover this view for himself.

Considering Warden's deviousness and ability to get along under any conditions, we must ask why it would damage his integrity to become an officer. What makes the maneuvering he would have to do as an officer so different from the maneuvering he does under Holmes to keep his outfit functioning? One explanation for Warden's attitude is the natural hostility of the enlisted man toward officers, but Warden's feeling has to be based on something more solid than that or it undermines the reader's faith in his integrity. A slightly more satisfying explanation is that Warden, like Prewitt, views officers as top dogs who (willfully or not) must treat their "inferiors" as underdogs and realizes that he too might take on some of
the corrupting traits of the top dog if he becomes an officer. Prewitt had reflected that "it must be a great temptation . . . being top dog. . . . All you have to do [to imagine this temptation] is imagine you are an officer" (FHTE, 276).

In addition to his fear of this temptation, Warden is disturbed by several events which occur just prior to his decision not to accept his commission and which add a measure of dignity and justification to this decision. First, he is confronted by the death of Prewitt and by his inheritance of The Re-enlistment Blues and Prewitt's list of books to read. The fact that he has read most of the books on Prewitt's list reminds Warden of the intellectual, moral, and philosophical links between them and the grudging respect he has always felt toward Prewitt. At the same time, his renewed sense of affinity with Prewitt makes him resent the MP Lt. Colonel who is interested only in erasing any black mark against his men for shooting down Prewitt. It is fitting that Warden receives the final version of The Re-enlistment Blues since he is the only character with authority who has shown any understanding of the ordinary soldier.

The second event which affects Warden at the time of his decision is the announcement of the compulsory withdrawal to safe duty stateside of enlisted men around Pete
Karelsen's age who are below the rank of M/Sgt. Warden feels outraged at this official demand because of his awareness of the physical and mental decay which this semi-retirement will bring to Pete. Stagnation is, of course, the greatest threat to growth, and Warden sees this clearly enough to be justifiably alarmed about what will happen to Pete. Warden then witnesses Lt. Ross's fear-inspired reluctance to speak to his superior about keeping Pete on and Col. Delbert's refusal to consider such a proposal.

The third significant event is Warden's observation of the way the officers around him behave when he receives the notice of his impending commission. Their air of welcoming him into a closed society, or young gentlemen's club, makes him realize that he too will be expected to cultivate a snobbish attitude. Fourth, in telling Stark about Capt. Holmes's infection of his own wife Karen with a venereal disease, Warden has noted anew the devastating effect of the casual corruption that seems almost bred into officers. On top of all this, he sees how much he is needed by his men during the Japanese attack, whereas if he had been an officer on this occasion, he might have been too far away to help in time. It is possible that his sense of responsibility and his concern for the men would have been enough in themselves to make him continue to prefer his present rank to a commission.
The most difficult aspect of Warden's decision is that he must choose between—as Jones phrased it to me in conversation—"the man's world and the woman's world." This choice resembles the one which will confront Ron Grant in Go to the Widow-maker, but the terms of the decision aren't precisely the same. Grant does not risk separation from his work and from his sense of responsibility by his decision to stick to his woman, whereas Warden would be forced to surrender both to attain a "lasting" union with Karen. Moreover, if Warden did make such a sacrifice, he would lose not only his self-respect but also Karen's respect for him and thus would have gained nothing.

Yet even though he "loses" her, Warden's relationship with Karen has considerably aided his spiritual growth. He began the affair with Karen as a means of getting revenge on Capt. Holmes for the numerous petty humiliations which Holmes had inflicted on him in his role as commanding officer. However, Warden's motives change when Karen tells him what her husband has done to her and he is moved by compassion. Nevertheless, his sexual feelings remain "savage" and self-centered so that he is prepared to sacrifice the possibility of a long-range relationship for the short-term delights of a few afternoons with her. It is only during their final time together after Warden has learned that Karen knew about his turning down the commis-
sion and still wanted to be with him that he overcomes the selfish part of his love for her and becomes genuinely concerned about her feelings. Instead of making love to her for his own gratification, he touches her tenderly without trying to bring on the usual consummation and finds that he is making more potent love than before. In addition, Warden's chief aim during this final meeting is to protect Karen by preventing her from realizing that this is probably the last time they will see each other (just as she is trying to shield him from knowledge of the finality of their meeting). Even though afterwards he adds Karen to the list of women he has loved and wonders how many women the future may bring him, while he is with her Warden's concern is strictly for her, not for himself.

The equally selfless concern which he displays toward Pete Karelsen at this time indicates the extent of this change in his character. Earlier, he had used Pete as "his punching bag" (FHTE, 159) to relieve his frustrations, though he always became friendly with Pete after he had goaded him to anger. However, Warden gains a profound respect for Pete during the Japanese attack because of Pete's ability to make decisions and to handle himself well in combat, and this respect provides the base for Warden's outrage over the decision to send Pete stateside. In addition, he is troubled enough by his own advancing age to
worry that Pete's fate may foreshadow his own. But whatever his reasons for anger at the Army's treatment of Pete, he does show a greater sympathy and affection for Pete here than ever before.

Another sign of the change in Warden is the tenderness which he displays while telling Stark the truth about the source of Karen's venereal infection and how it led to her affair with Stark, though this incident is ambiguous since Warden realizes that this information will hurt Stark and has been looking forward to this moment with relish. Nevertheless, Warden's gentleness with Stark on this occasion is stressed again and again, and Warden does manage to save Stark from the consequences of the cleaver-swinging rampage he goes on after hearing this story. Moreover, Stark is the last person we see in Warden's company, and the two of them seem well on their way to becoming friends again.

The last sequence involving Warden and Stark gives some indication of Warden's difficulty in adjusting to the loss of Karen, though it also conveys his ability to cope with this loss. When he and Stark go to town together, Warden deliberately provokes a fight in order to release his various pent-up frustrations. He is drunk at the time of the fight and afterwards laughs "witlessly" and "brainlessly happily" while fleeing from the MPs who come to
arrest the combatants. During the course of their escape, he and Stark observe the ship carrying Karen away from Hawaii slide on "silently and pitilessly, as resistless and impossible to stop as a birthday or a moving clock" (FHTE, 845). When Stark tries to speak to him a minute later, Warden swings around and looks "at him, his eyes wide and violent, as if he had not known he was there" (FHTE, 845). However, Warden quickly recovers from his distressing reverie and leads the way in the back entrance to Mrs. Kipfer's where he treats Stark and himself to a pleasant afternoon with two of the women. Since an earlier conflict with Karen had led Warden to stay away from the New Congress out of fear of "ruining his reputation with a fiasco" (FHTE, 710), his presence here now implies that he has come to terms with his suffering and will be able to face the future with confidence.

Karen Holmes also gains strength from her affair with Warden. She too finds that inner freedom comes through moving beyond self-centered desires. Once she learns how to care for Warden without needing anything in return from him, she discovers that she has simultaneously attained compassion and self-liberation. Both she and Warden evolve to a higher spiritual level through their often painful and sympathetic responses to each other.

Like Warden, Karen enters the affair out of a desire to strike back at her husband and to assert her indepen-
dence from the ostensible lord and master whom she remains with for security. At this time, both she and Warden are filled by the kind of self-pity which later traps Dave Hirsh and Wally Dennis in Some Came Running, George and Sandy Thomas in "Two Legs for the Two of Us," Mona and Larry Patterson in "Secondhand Man," Hill Gallagher in The Merry Month of May, Sonny Duval in A Touch of Danger, and quite a few others. However, she has an additional motive that sets her apart from Warden and that involves her even further in self-pity. The venereal disease which made her sterile has led her to regard her body as evil and sex as ugly. Shortly after her return from the hospital, she had attempted to use Stark as an "instrument" to "clean" herself (FHTE, 334), but she still considers herself dirty at the time Warden makes his pass. Warden must therefore seem another "instrument" to be "used" before she unexpectedly falls in love with him.

Later, Karen admits to Warden that the quality which attracted her to him was his honesty with her. "You were honest, and if you thought it by god you said it, and to hell with the consequences. I admired that" (FHTE, 619). Warden himself had been looking for a woman who could respond honestly to a straightforward sexual declaration, instead of demanding that he play the traditional courtship game before she would go to bed with him. The first
time Warden asks Karen to have sex with him, she promptly and matter-of-factly agrees, though she pretends no enthusiasm at the prospect. However, her mood alters when her son comes home while she is preparing to climb into bed with Warden and they are faced with the danger of discovery. Although she is most concerned about the threat to her, she can't help realizing that Warden is running the greater risk since he could be severely punished under military law whereas she would only suffer a social reprimand. Moreover, after her son has departed, she is compelled to meet Warden on a more human level by his infectious amusement at having been forced to hide in a closet for the first time, even though he had been a travelling salesman prior to enlisting in the Army. Her own laughter and the tears that follow it then prompt Warden to meet her on a more human level and to show her "the great gentleness that was in him, that he was always wanting to bring forward but never could" (FHTE, 126). It is her appreciation of this gentleness that leads her to respond, "I never knew it could be like this" (FHTE, 126).

Karen's main problem is that she is guided by fear and self-distrust. She has been spiritually and emotionally estranged from her husband since he gave her gonorrhea, but she is alarmed by the thought of having to earn her own living since she has never trained for anything
except being a wife and sees no other man around to take care of her. Thus, when she gets involved with Warden, she prods him to become an officer like her husband so that she can hold on to all her benefits when she transfers her loyalty from Holmes to Warden. However, she also recognizes that if she divorces Holmes and marries Warden while he is still an enlisted man, she would create a scandal that could ruin Warden’s career and might even put him in the stockade. Therefore she insists on taking elaborate precautions so that she and Warden run as little risk as possible of being discovered before Warden can get his commission. She is willing to “cheat” on her husband, but not to abandon him before she can establish a new life apart from him. In addition to her concern about her own future, she is bound by a sense of responsibility to her son, even though Dana Junior already seems a copy of Dana Senior. Like Warden, though, she discovers the futility of planning.

The conflict between security and salvation is one of Jones’s most important themes, and it takes many forms throughout his work. In "The King," for example, the comeback of the jazzman Willy Jefferson from a life of poverty and misery and his subsequent loss of talent in the midst of wealth and fame imply that suffering develops expressiveness and that security breeds mediocrity. Correspond-
ingly, in "The Valentine," John Slade's spiritual education is increased by his loss of all his defences against torment and humiliation. As a further example, in "The Ice-Cream Headache," the worldly decline of a family over three generations is accompanied by an increasing humility and perceptiveness about life. The grandfather's combination of self-assurance and self-righteousness is ultimately replaced by the grandson's self-questioning and sympathy for others. In Jones's work, pain is always the chief instrument of growth, and it pierces through everyone's feebly-erected security in the service of salvation.

Like Dave Hirsh, Gwen French, and Edith Barclay, however, Karen voluntarily casts away her last holds on security. After she learns about Warden's rejection of the commission that was to provide the base for their life together, she could have chosen to continue to rely on her husband. Instead, when Warden asks her to meet him one more time, she openly defies her husband to go to him, even though she knows that it is no longer possible for Warden to marry her or to help her out if Dana should decide to divorce her. She tells Warden that the greatest gift he has given her is her "freedom. Dana can never touch me any more. You've made me loved" (FHTE, 825). She had suspected for a long time that "there must be another reason, above, beyond, somewhere another Equation beside this
virgin + marriage + motherhood + grandmotherhood = honor, justification, death" and that "there must be another language, forgotten unheard unspoken, than the owning of an American's Homey Kitchen complete with dinette, breakfast nook, and fluorescent lighting" (FHTE, 66). However, she has never found the strength to discard these goals until her final meeting with Warden. Paradoxically, the love which has led her to look outside herself and to become concerned about the feelings of another person has also made her self-directed and self-reliant. She has accomplished the difficult task of ridding her love of selfishness and possessiveness, and this accomplishment has given her the vision to face her past mistakes in loving and to communicate her awareness of them to Warden:

I've hated you bitterly, at times. All love has hate in it. Because you are tied to anyone you love, and it takes away part of your freedom and you resent it, you can't help it. And while you are resenting the loss of your own freedom, you are trying to force the other to give up to you every last little bit of his own... Love will always have hate in it. Maybe that's the reason we're on this earth, to learn to love without hating (FHTE, 824).

As a result of this new vision of love, Karen is able to give herself freely to Warden that night and to return to her husband the next day without remorse or fear. The prospect of having to fend for herself no longer intimidates her, and she admits to Dana that she has spent the night with another man, though she refuses to name the
man since she still wants to protect Warden. She is willing to let her husband divorce her or remain tied to her, but makes it clear that she intends to live as she chooses no matter what he decides to do. Significantly, after her conversation with Dana, she goes off for a walk by herself and finds that she enjoys being alone. Stein and Fife in The Thin Red Line, Jack Hartley in The Merry Month of May, Lobo in A Touch of Danger, and several other high level characters will make a similar discovery. Karen then meditates on Stendhal's philosophy of happiness and reflects that "the good thing about that Stendhal, he understood the very important place that misery and tragedy played in the making of a full happiness" (FHTE, 835). Earlier, she had replied to Warden's question about why the world has to be as cruel as it is:

I don't know either. . . . And I used to be very bitter about it. But now I know it has to be that way. There's no other way for it to be. Whenever a menace is conquered, a new more subtle menace arises. There is no other way it could be (FHTE, 825).

On the ship taking her away from Hawaii, Karen almost succumbs to a longing for her old pattern of existence when she sees a girl whose appearance of "flawless simplicity" reminds her of the "painstaking hours of hard work" she used to spend in making herself attractive and convinces her that "a woman with a small child could not compete in the league this girl played in" (FHTE, 854). In addition,
she develops a sense of inferiority in the face of the
girl's bravery over the heroic death of the fighter pilot
she was engaged to until the girl mentions that her fian­
ce's name was Robert E. Lee Prewitt and Karen realizes that
she must be the prostitute Lorene whom Warden had told her
about. This is Karen's last lesson about the social at­
titudes she once held, and it frees her to act in the fu­
ture without regard to social restrictions or any other
pressures to conform. Even though she has asserted to her­
self that love is over for her, it is obvious that she is
attracted to the young Air Force Lt. Colonel who has sought
her company on the ship and that she will eventually have
an affair with him.

One of the most important advances which Karen has
made at the end is that she has overcome her abhorrence of
her body and her life. Like Gwen French, she was warned
that it is impossible to avoid the "cloak" of "evil" (FHTE, 60). However, in spite of this warning, she has condemned
her husband for his sexual appetite and herself for the
adultery she committed in revenge. After bidding Warden
farewell, though, she can sit down with Stark's new mis­
tress and talk to her as one "happily adulterous" wife to
another, discussing with her "in a warm friendly intimacy
the fine traits of character in their lovers" (FHTE, 830).
She can also tell her husband honestly that she feels no
shame over the affair she has just concluded. She is even able to respond sardonically to her son's question about whether he can get into this war, "You may miss this one, but you'll be just the right age for the next one" (FHTE, 858). She knows now that nothing is truly or irrevocably evil, including war, and that her son will have to learn about life through his own experiences and mistakes.

Like Karen, the third major character, Prewitt, discovers that he cannot thrust aside "evil" through an act of will. His promise to his dying mother not to hurt anyone unless he absolutely has to leads him through a series of unforeseen events to murder a man. In between, he has directly and indirectly damaged a number of lives, including his own, by his rigid adherence to a set of absolute ideals. At the same time, he has gained insight into the process of spiritual evolution via reincarnation and into the ultimate meaning of love. He has made the same spiritual journey from selfishness to fellow feeling that Warden and Karen have, but by the end he has had a more explicit view of the process than they have.

Prewitt has a dim memory of past incarnations in his "wild visions . . . of having once played a herald's trumpet for the coronations and of having called the legions to bed down around the smoking campfires in the long blue evenings of old Palestine" (FHTE, 14). Thus, it is not
surprising that he feels a "call" to play the bugle in this incarnation. In his early boyhood, he feels drawn to music because he discovers that the songs he listens to then give "him something, an understanding, a first hint that pain might not be pointless if you could only turn it into something" (FHTE, 13). Now, he finds that even a simple lament like Sal Clark's version of Truckdriver's Blues can conjure up a meaningful vision for him, such as a half-glimpsed image of each soul's separation and return to God:

In the simple meaningless words he saw himself, and Chief Choate, and Pop Karelsen, and Clark, and Anderson, and Warden, each struggling with a different medium, each man's path running by its own secret route from the same source to the same inevitable end. And each man knowing as the long line moved as skirmishers through the night woodsey jungle down the hill that all the others were there with him, each hearing the faint rustlings and straining to communicate, each wanting to reach out and share, each wanting to be known, but each unable, as Clark's whining nasal was unable, to make known that he was there, and so each forced to face alone whatever it was up ahead, in the unmapped alien enemy's land, in the darkness (FHTE, 130).

Hence, Prewitt uses his bugle as his medium to attempt communication with those souls whose isolated paths come close to his own. The night when he takes Andy's place as Company bugler and plays Taps, which he regards as "the song of the Great Loneliness," he forges a bond with his fellow soldiers which could not exist otherwise. He touches their souls by communicating his sorrowful awareness of their
common situation. However, he is unable to sustain this vision either for himself or for his briefly shaken listeners.

Prewitt's worst fault, like Witt's in *The Thin Red Line*, is a pride so strongly developed that he is willing to make many sacrifices rather than surrender the minutest particle of it. Appropriately, it is this pride which drives him out of the Bugle Corps and which therefore increases his own isolation by removing his chief means of communication. His pride is allied to a powerful idealism, but both the pride and the idealism are aimed at holding on to a mental status quo which proves to be impossible to maintain. In addition, he is too keenly aware of what he feels is due him, but only intermittently aware of what is due others from him. This may be overstating the case, but he displays little concern about what would happen to Violet Ogure if she gave in to his demand that she forsake her parents and community to live openly as his mistress until he is transferred from Hawaii and leaves her behind. Similarly, he scarcely pays attention to Alma (Lorene) once he has made up his mind to return to his unit. Moreover, his own refusal to accept any kind of compromise often drives others out of the deals they've made with life into a dangerous and self-destructive realm from which there is no return. Thus, Prewitt realizes too late that
it was his contemptuous presence on the "date" with Hal and Tommy that made Maggio run wild with guilt. Prewitt's cold-bloodedness is then shown in his milking Hal for money before pursuing Maggio (though he intends to split this money with Maggio) and in his subsequent decision to employ the money for a calculated, passionless seduction of Lorene. Even though Hal and Lorene seem legitimate targets and though Prewitt later displays an affection for Lorene which interferes with the seduction, these actions do indicate a certain selfishness and brutality in Prewitt.

It is only during his last moment in this incarnation when he is confronted with the choice between killing once more or letting himself be killed without fighting back that Prewitt demonstrates the growth that has gradually resulted from all his experiences, but particularly from his contact with the teachings of Jack Malloy, his awareness of the futility of his murder of Fatso, and his reading of books by Jack London and others while in forced confinement at Lorene-Alma's. The fact that Prewitt took a gun with him implies that he had contemplated killing in self-defense when he started out, but he makes a conscious decision not to "become a Disciple of the Word" Kill when faced with the actual choice (PHTE, 789) and his thoughts at this moment reflect both a comprehension of the fear that his attackers feel and an appreciation of
the way they are handling the threat that they think he represents.

When Prewitt's mother died while he was still a little boy and a traditional Christian, he expected to see angels hovering over her bed or some other sign of her approaching encounter with God and immortality. However, he discovered that the single spiritually uplifting aspect of her death was "the fact that in this last great period of fear her thought had been upon his future, rather than her own... He only hoped that he would meet [death] with the same magnificent indifference with which she who had been his mother met it. Because it was there, he felt, that the immortality he had not seen was hidden" (FHTE, 17). Now he learns that neither the Christian conception of death with its emphasis on an eternity of joy or torment earned during an absurdly brief span of time nor the atheistic view of death as an absolute cessation of life fits his own circumstances. His last reflections before moving on to his next incarnation are on the process he is going through:

as if in a way he was seeing double, he realized it wasn't really going to end after all, that it would never end. There wasn't even that consolation, he thought sweatily. What he had thought once a long time ago, he thought, that day in Choy's with old Red. Now that there was always an endless chain of new deciding. It was right after all. That made him feel good, the being right (FHTE, 791).
One of the things which Malloy tries hardest to teach Prewitt is the doctrine of passive resistance. As Malloy recognizes, passive resistance is not merely opposing injustice without physically striking back, but also without mentally attacking the perpetrators of the injustice. Such resistance is aimed at change, not destruction, and is based on a feeling of love which demands nothing in return. As Malloy explained it:

A guy named Spinoza wrote a sentence once. He said: *Because a man loves God he must not expect God to love him in return.* There's a lot in that, in lots of ways. I don't use passive resistance for what I expect it will get me. I don't expect it to pay me back any more than it ever has. That isn't the point. If that was the point, I'd of given it up years ago as a flop (FHTE, 659-660).

This statement applies equally well to Prewitt's love for the Army, and it is significant that Prewitt can reflect that the men who shot him "were the Army too," and that "it was not true that all men killed the things they loved. What was true was that all things killed the men who loved them. Which, after all, was as it should be" (FHTE, 789).

A minute or two later, he can see the impact of his approaching death on the man who fired the Thompson gun at him. When Harry says to his fellow MPs, "You know I didn't mean to shoot him... He just stopped. It makes you feel pretty shitty," Prewitt remarks to himself, "That's what they call passive resistance, soldier. Aint that right, Jack?" (FHTE, 790).
Another lesson which Prewitt learns is that you should not be unbending when pressured by the unpredictability of life. This is a lesson which Mazzioli in "The Way It Is," Norma Fry in "None Sing So Wildly," Louisa Gallagher in The Merry Month of May, and many other Jonesian characters should have noted. Even though Prewitt long anticipated being sent to the stockade, he could not have guessed the sequence of events that finally put him there. Like everyone else, he assumed that he would be court-martialed for resisting the Treatment, but instead he initiates his own downfall by rejecting Bloom's expression of gratitude for rescuing his dog. Then, when Ike Galovitch attacks him because of his fight with Bloom, Prewitt believes he has found the "common enemy," but the moment he has knocked out this enemy he realizes that Ike is only a drunken old Slav who needed a hero to worship and mistakenly thought he had found one in Capt. Holmes. On top of all this, Prewitt could defend himself against imprisonment by pointing out the location of a fragment of Galovitch's knife that remained at the scene of the action, but he chooses to accept the situation and to let himself be railroaded into the stockade.

Once Prewitt is imprisoned, he is again confronted by the unexpected. He is astonished both by Maggio's change from a naively cynical boy to a tough, anguished
wild man and by Maggio's plan of escape. However, once Prewitt becomes outraged by Fatso's savagery toward Maggio and Berry, even though he realizes that both of his friends invited their beatings, he puts himself into a rigid state of mind from which all thoughts are excluded except those relating to Fatso's destruction. Thus, when Prewitt returns to active duty, his clamped-down mind prevents him from adjusting to the radically-altered circumstances in the company or responding to the friendly gestures made by all his fellow soldiers except Galovitch. His only reality is still the stockade, rather than the company. Prewitt's reaction here is one of Jones's clearest depictions of how a man forms a subjective image-picture of the world which cuts him off from other people.

Since Warden is unexpectedly away on his re-enlistment furlough, Prewitt has no one he can talk to about his intention of killing Fatso. However, since he had already refused to listen to Malloy, who had acted as his Master in the stockade, it is unlikely that he would now let himself be guided by Warden who has served as his Master in the company. Still, Prewitt's own planning of Fatso's execution is faulty since he fails to consider the possibility that an experienced knife fighter like Judson might be able to wound him or even kill him if allowed to fight back. Afterwards, when Prewitt finally talks to Warden
about the slaying and his wish to return to the company, Warden strains his mind for the most unlikely possibility and then tells Prewitt that the only way he can come back without penalty is if the Japanese attack Pearl Harbor and the Army releases the prisoners from the stockade to fight. When this improbable situation does occur, Prewitt attempts to get back to his unit and is caught by the MPs because they surprise him by parking their patrol car on the road with their lights turned off.

Apart from the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, the most astonishing of all these events is Prewitt's murder of Fatso. Since Prewitt's deathbed promise to his mother not to hurt anyone has been compounded by his regret over blinding Dixie Wells, he should be horrified at the thought of killing a fellow enlisted man. However, he has been prepared for the action by the combination of the atmosphere of the stockade with his simplistic picture of the world as divided into absolutes to be won and absolutes to be lost with no conceivable ground in between. The Number Two barracks of rebels and "fuckups" has served as a womb for him since it temporarily freed him from questioning the presence of "injustice" in the universe by narrowing his focus to a local injustice that seems more readily comprehensible (though even this impression is eventually proved false to him by Fatso's failure to understand why
Prewitt wants to kill him). Although Prewitt's view of life has frequently been too self-confined to allow him to cope adequately with the world he lives in, his fate does hint at the true complexity of the world and leads Prewitt himself to recognize that complexity during his last minutes in this life.

While Prewitt was in solitary confinement, he tried Malloy's system of mind control which brought about a separation between his soul and the body it is currently lodged in. This separation made him feel "as if there were two of him, and one of him went out of and away from the other of him" (FHTE, 579). He noticed then that the only connection between these two images of himself was "a kind of cord that looked like it was made out of jism . . . and he knew from somewhere, but unconcernedly this time, that if that cord ever got broken he was dead" (FHTE, 579). His experience at the end of this cord "was as if for the first time he had gone off the world like a spaceship and could really see all of it, and grasp the reason for all of it, and realize . . . that more than anything else it was like a small boy going to school every day, maybe he did not want to go but he had to go anyway, and if he does not learn one lesson one day it still isn't wasted because the wasted day helps him learn it that much quicker the next day" (FHTE, 579). Now, as Prewitt lies
in the sandtrap awaiting his death, he can "feel himself beginning to go clear out of himself" and encounters again "the cord he had seen that time in the Stockade that looked like it was made of come" (FHTE, 790). The return of this experience at such a time naturally brings back memories of the vision of the complexity and meaningfulness of the world which he had had on that previous occasion, and since he moves on to his next incarnation in the midst of this renewed lesson, he can carry it along with him into his new life.

One of the best of Prewitt's earlier perceptions—and one which does accord with the view of the world as highly complex—is that a person or a group may be an underdog in one place or in one situation and an oppressor some place else or under different conditions. For example, in Go to the Widow-maker, Letta Bonham is long the victim of her husband's Victorian attitude about the desirability of a sexless "purity" in wives, but when she learns about his affair with Cathie Finer she victimizes him by having him arrested and by taking away his control of the schooner company. In From Here to Eternity, the most obvious example of a single individual being both underdog and oppressor is Isaac Nathan Bloom. Bloom's consciousness has been shaped by his sense that Jews are despised and that since he is a Jew there is nothing he can
do to prevent his being despised all his life. To this extent, he has become a victim of the general attitude toward Jews, though he is also personally responsible for much of his alienation since his defensiveness about being a Jew has made him act in ways that are offensive to many of the men who would not have been put off by his religion. Jimmy Kaliponi's remark about "Jewboys" lacking the "heart" to be fighters (FHTE, 497, 498) reveals the validity of Bloom's impression of the injustice directed against his race (as well as implying the relativity of prejudice through Kaliponi's own case). Yet Bloom, like Prewitt, does have a choice regarding how he responds to that injustice. Just as Stark's example of waiting until he has a good job lined up before quitting his outfit points up how Prewitt could have safely escaped from the corps where the "punk" bugler was appointed over him, Sussman's example of ingratiating himself while retaining an awareness of his Jewishness points out what Bloom could accomplish (though this matter is complicated by our awareness of the waste involved in the limits set on—and accepted by—Chief Choate as a result of prejudice against Indians). Thus Bloom, like Prewitt, is both a victim of circumstances and a self-made victim.

However, Bloom is as much victimizer as victim, and it is fascinating to watch him swing back and forth between
these roles in the time preceding his suicide. One minute he is lamenting that his rise to corporalcy and his victories as a fighter can never overcome the prejudice against him, and the next he is asserting his new authority in a way calculated to hurt Sal Clark whom Bloom absurdly denounces as one of the "Wop Fascisti" (FHTE, 567). Next he reflects on the injustice of the reputation he thinks he has acquired for homosexuality (a reputation which he fears may be justified) and follows this up by remembering how he had made the report against Prewitt which had launched the queer investigation that had brought about his own embarrassment. Here is as manifest a mixture of "good" and "evil" as you are ever likely to find in such short compass and yet Bloom has to be considered as a whole rather than be judged by splitting him into two sets of actions without an active agent between them. Remember that one of Bloom's own errors was trying to deny parts of himself (his Jewishness, involvement with homosexuals, etc.) and this is a major reason for the attempt at suicide which he seeks to call off too late.

This entire sequence with Bloom supports the philosophy of Jack Malloy about the need to replace the Old Testament "God of perpetual punishment and vengeance" and even the New Testament "God of perpetual love and forgiveness that only punished evil when He absolutely had to"
(FHTE, 645-646) with the Malloy-conceived "God of Love-That-Surpasseth-Forgiveness, the God who saw heard and spoke no evil simply because there was none" (FHTE, 647).

The past forms of God with their fixed rules and their desire for men to follow certain well-defined paths have here been superseded by the "God of Growth and Evolution" whose only demand is that men profit from their mistakes. Hence, if Bloom is to be judged at all, it must be on the grounds that he failed to develop beyond his sense of the limitations placed upon him and that he sought to avoid the chance to learn from his errors. However, Bloom, like the small boy going to school in Prewitt's vision, is forced to work out his lesson whether he wishes to or not.

Although Bloom's suicide is a blunder, it teaches him to place a higher value on life. He foolishly believed he would be committing an act with irreversibly-bad consequences, but given Jones's theory of reincarnation no act has eternally-"bad" results. Malloy argues that the ability to commit suicide is the only genuine freedom which any man has, but that it is a cowardly action. Any death operates as a safety valve in the evolutionary process since it provides a break between one incarnation and the next. Yet the man who kills himself to get released from his pain in a particular incarnation will learn that he has been mistaken in believing he can gain more than a
temporary escape from pain and in placing his distress at slights to his ego above his opportunity to glean knowledge from life. He will then carry his awareness of the mistakes into his next incarnation. Suicide functions only as a pause rather than as a halt in the evolutionary process, and, like any other part of life, it advances the education of the man who makes use of it.

Although *From Here to Eternity* has often been considered the product of an angry young man, its ultimate vision is a peaceful one. Jones is saying that large-scale injustices, such as the often horrifying mistreatment of prisoners and the widespread prejudice against Jews, are part of a universal pattern of spiritual growth which will eventually benefit everyone. At the end of our growth, all our insecurities and discontents will be replaced by a perfect harmony with the universe. Given Jones's viewpoint, we might as well accept the world as it is since it operates in our favor.

Jones's third novel, *The Pistol*, appears to be as fully centered around the twin themes of the unpredictability of material life and the total absence of material security occasioned by it as *From Here to Eternity* was. After all, both novels stress the impact of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor which was one of the biggest shocks
this nation has ever experienced. At the same time, both novels emphasize that spiritual salvation works through insecurity and uncertainty.

In spite of their similarity in themes, however, The Pistol is a much narrower work than its predecessor. In this novel, Jones deliberately set out to create a short, tightly focused piece of symbolic writing. Because of the emphasis on symbolism, the characterizations are noticeably thin; Mast is the brainy one, O'Brien the brawny one, Winstock the misuser of authority, etc. Although they are supposed to represent different aspects of human personality rather than fully rounded human beings, they are too limited to attract more than momentary interest. We can be haunted by Prewitt or Maggio, but we give at most a passing thought to Mast or O'Brien once we have finished the book in which they appear. Jones himself, who is often his own best critic, has noted that:

[The Pistol is] okay, for an easy job, an easy out. But human beings themselves are never that easy to symbolize; they're never all black or all white like that; they aren't really any longer human at all. That's why it's so easy to kill real people in the name of some damned ideology or other; once the killer can abstract them in his own mind into being symbols, then he needn't feel guilty for killing them since they're no longer real human beings. And symbolizing characters like that is just as easy, an out for the writer as for the ideological killer.^[4]

---

In making things "easy" for himself in this novel, Jones has not only restricted his characters but also his plot and his dialog. He has confined his plot largely to the attempts which several characters make to get Mast's pistol and the dialog to their similarly-worded justifications for these attempts. He does hold our attention by introducing a variety of threats to Mast's possession of the pistol, such as trickery, bribery, and physical force. He also provides a mildly interesting commentary on the lengths people will go to in order to obtain a means of security against disaster in the material world. But he has sacrificed too many vital elements of fiction for the sake of his ideas, and as a result *The Pistol* is the least important work he has done.

In one respect, however, this novel does afford a useful contrast to *From Here to Eternity*. As a balance to Prewitt's realization of the folly of constantly bucking authority, Richard Mast discovers that it is a mistake to bow to authority on all occasions. Although Mast cannot resist the impersonal operations of the Authority who snatches away his security and leaves him defenceless in the wake of the spiritual evolution process, he can dispute the claims of many individuals who declare they have a right to dominate him. Moreover, he is taught to rely on the knowledge that he gleans from experience rather
than on the projections of his imagination or on the impressions of other people.

In a sense, The Pistol begins where From Here to Eternity left off since it opens with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. The terrifying unexpectedness of this event is stressed by the picture of Mast tranquilly having breakfast when the bombing starts. Significantly, the contrast to peaceful activities and the unexpectedness recur in the attempts to take away the pistol which Mast and all the other characters regard as the only protection against such unforeseeable and frightening events. For example, O'Brien takes the pistol when Mast is feeling a warm closeness toward him based on their having mutually challenged and survived an apparent danger. Similarly, it is when Mast feels most secure in his possession of the pistol that the supply clerk arrives to take it back. Ironically, Mast managed to retain the pistol for so long only because of the confusion caused by the attack on Pearl Harbor, which was also the reason he had wanted the gun in the first place.

The link between Mast's view of the pistol as a means of insuring his safety in battle and Wally Dennis's belief in the protective qualities of his Randall #1 Combat Knife implies that Mast's reliance on a weapon may be as foolish as Wally's. The sole evidence that supports Mast's convic-
tion about the saving properties of the weapon is Sgt. Pender's statement that his own pistol had saved his life twice. However, the fact that Pender had stolen his weapon from a dead American soldier indicates that the pistol is no guarantee of survival.

Mast's folly in depending on an external means of salvation is further demonstrated by the way he has to structure his life around protecting the pistol. The need for constant vigilance and distrust converts the pistol into a perilous burden in much the same way that the barbed wire around the Makapuu Point position makes the soldiers feel as if they have sealed themselves in rather than the Japanese out. Mast's need for vigilance can also be compared to the American demolition trap which becomes potentially useful to the Japanese so that a steadily increasing number of measures have to be undertaken to prevent them from having any chance to reach it. Mast is compelled to stay alert every waking and sleeping moment to keep anyone from lying, cheating, stealing, or otherwise tricking him out of the pistol. Moreover, Mast's fight with Grace on a steep mountainous incline means that he is risking his life to protect the object which is supposed to safeguard his life.

The self-delusion in Mast's continued belief in his weapon as a means of salvation is matched by his self-
deception about the way he obtained it. When he first invented the story of purchasing the hand gun from a man in the 8th Field Artillery to conceal the truth from others who might be driven by envy to turn his name in to the supply room, he knew the reality of his situation. However, he gradually reaches the point where he half-recalls being issued the pistol for guard duty and half-believes he bought it. Then, after Sgt. Pender allows him to keep it, he successfully blinds himself to the truth until Musso reclaim the missing weapon. At this point, Musso's action is the only thing that could free Mast from his illusion about being the true owner of the pistol.

Mast's combination of self-delusion with disguised self-interest paves the way for his destructive sense of righteousness. The most vicious act in the novel is Mast's kick in Grace's face and this kick is explicitly made out of Mast's bitterness at the supposed violations of morality committed not only by Grace but also by everyone else who tried to get his pistol. Even though Grace brings this injury on himself both by taking precautions against being kicked at a time when Mast would never have thought of doing this and by trying to kick Mast first, it is specifically Mast's accumulated feeling of outraged righteousness that makes him kick with such force. Mast's cruelty in this situation points up the way his quest for an ex-
ternal means of salvation has temporarily impeded his inner growth.

Mast has also obstructed his growth by his self-imposed ideal of masculine "toughness." Part of the reason Mast wants the pistol is that it enables him to appear more like his conception of what a soldier ought to be, a conception based on the Wild West Cavalryman of the past. Like Prewitt and Maggio, he greatly admires cowboys. It is this vision of himself as one tough hombre with a pistol on his hip that leads him to take the risk of walking slowly across an open square when the Japanese are attacking the area. Furthermore, he is willing to put his life in jeopardy again while on guard duty with O'Brien because he is flattered that "big, tough O'Brien whom he had seen engaged in so many heroic-sized fistfights" asked him what to do about a noise and he therefore wants to show off how tough he can be in front of O'Brien (P, 38). His satisfaction at the relatively safe and easy establishment of his toughness is the main reason why he feels so warm toward O'Brien on his return and why he is then so vulnerable to O'Brien's ruse. However, when he regains the pistol from O'Brien, he slaps it into his holster "toughly, confidently" (P, 48), thus indicating that he has still learned nothing about the absurd and destructive effects of acting tough.
When Mast finally loses the pistol for good, he asks himself whether it had "all been for nothing? all the worries? all the effort? ... really all for nothing?" (P, 157). The answer to this query can only be negative if his experiences have helped him to evolve beyond his former illusions and the self-love that prompted his desire for a means of personal protection. It is unclear whether he will be able to make this self-transformation, but he has taken two steps toward it by admitting his self-love to Sgt. Pender and by recognizing that his self-delusion about the way he acquired the pistol was "silly" (P, 157). In contrast, O'Brien, who never had even Mast's illusory claim to the pistol, is filled with anger at both impersonal Army Authority and God for taking away something which he could obtain only at someone else's expense. His railing at the weapons carrier bearing Musso away with the pistol and "upward at the sky" (P, 158) illustrates the self-pity that could trap Mast as well if he hasn't gained sufficient wisdom from all he has gone through to accept the fact that the world will never offer a simple and certain means to salvation.

The one thing Mast never seems to acknowledge is the extent to which his ordeal has been self-chosen. As everyone points out to him, he could attain a position of relative safety any time he wanted to by agreeing to become a
clerk and to work in the rear echelon. The Army is not forcing him to serve as an infantry rifleman, and he would probably be more useful to the war effort as a clerk. It is his own decision to take part in combat and to risk facing the Japanese officer that he fears so greatly. Thus, all of his striving to secure a personal shield against disaster or death is just hedging his bet. He wants the "glory" of having proven his manhood in battle without having seriously risked anything. His walk across the square during the attack is trifling; he doesn't really believe he can be hit since the presence of the pistol on his hip makes him feel invulnerable. On the other hand, he does believe he can be killed by a Japanese major with a Samurai saber if he doesn't have a pistol to protect him, so perhaps his loss of the gun coupled with his continued fear of the Japanese officer will make his risk real to him. However, one of the results of any growth stemming from this fear will be to move him beyond such fears to a stronger and less self-concerned state of mind.

A similar change that has already occurred in Mast is the way he has learned to handle his fear of authority. The only reason Mast tries to turn in his guard duty pistol after the Japanese attack is "some essential of Mast's childhood training, some inherent nervousness at the idea of going against authority" (P, 21). Later, Mast turns
the pistol over to Winstock out of this same fear of authority in spite of his powerful impulse to hold on to it. However, when he discovers that Winstock was employing his authority for personal benefit, he is ready to challenge him as an individual, though he plans to fight Winstock outside of anyone else's sight because he doesn't wish to be court-martialed for striking a superior. Thus, it is no wonder he rejoices over the absence of Authority during the Marconi Pass detail. Mast's feelings change again, though, after the fight with Grace that occurs because Cpl. Fondriere refuses to exert his authority to control the situation, and Mast returns to Makapuu Point with a sense of relief that "there, there was Authority. And with Authority there were rules" (P, 139). It is ironic that the first attempt that is made against his pistol after he has acquired this more favorable attitude toward Authority comes from a representative of that Authority.

The change in Mast between the way he acted toward Winstock's order and the way he responds to Sgt. Paoli is obvious. Now he refuses to obey the direct command of a superior even though he is warned that Paoli is prepared to have him court-martialed for disobedience. Moreover, he is willing to continue to stand up to Paoli and to defend his own point of view in front of Sgt. Pender. He is not totally defiant, though, since he does obey Paoli's
order to accompany him to Pender and he does place the
final decision about the pistol in Pender's hands. In
getting Pender to bend the rules to allow him to keep the
pistol until a superior orders Pender to take it from him,
Mast not only wins a victory over the "Book says" morality
of Paoli, but also makes a Wardenlike compromise with au-
thority which will enable him to act with some measure of
free will within the confines of a determined situation.
Even though he surrenders the pistol to the same Authority
that had let him make it his own during a time when an un-
usual set of circumstances had brought about a temporary
disruption of the rules, Mast can still hold on to the
confidence and skill he gained while defending the pistol
and to whatever amount of wisdom and self-transcendence
his experiences have taught him. That isn't a bad trade
for one little weapon.

The patterns of growth established in these two early
works continue with little variation throughout the later
works. The spiritually-educated characters nearly always
replace their pride with a selfless compassion, their self-
righteousness with sensitivity, their desire for others
with an acknowledgment of their isolation, and their long-
ing to change the world with an acceptance of the world as
it is. In addition, they usually shed their strongest
illusions and go off by themselves. In spite of their sympathy with the plight of others, they realize that they cannot and should not try to help people out of their troubles since everyone has to be permitted to grow through suffering.

The only significant modifications in these patterns occur in *Go to the Widow-maker* and *The Merry Month of May*. In the former, Ron Grant's growth toward compassion and selflessness takes the form of dishonesty toward himself and others. He consciously suppresses his worries about Lucky's fidelity to him and falsely informs her that he is convinced she is innocent of any wrongdoing with Jim Grointon. Considering the emphasis in the earlier books on the importance of being honest with yourself, this is a striking change in attitude. Moreover, this altered attitude toward the value of absolute honesty is reiterated in *The Merry Month of May* when Jack Hartley reflects that there are other values more important than honesty. Jack tries to decide whether Hill Gallagher will be helped more by the truth about the affair between his father and Samantha or by a lie designed to give Hill time to adjust to a highly unpleasant situation. In the end, Jack tells Hill the truth, but he has to wonder whether he should have lied since Hill is so deeply hurt by the information Jack has given him. It should be noted, though, that even in these
two works, Jones is not dismissing the value of honesty; he is simply questioning its worth as an absolute virtue.

The other modification of these patterns in *Go to the Widow-maker* is Grant and Lucky's achievement of a single subjective viewpoint. Prior to this novel, it had seemed impossible for two people to merge their individual views of the world. At the end, though, Grant and Lucky go off together instead of separating like Warden and Karen or Dave Hirsh and Gwen French. On the other hand, the two of them form a single unit which is separated from all other individuals. However, except for the special limited case of the two women in "Sunday Allergy," no other couple arrives at a single viewpoint in the rest of Jones's fiction.

The chief modification which *The Merry Month of May* introduces lies in the realm of responsibility. Although Jack Hartley too discovers that he can't be responsible for the lives of others, he also learns that human beings can help each other in very small ways. For example, he is touched by his brief spiritual contact with Ferenc Hofmann-Beck during a crisis concerning Louisa Gallagher, even though Ferenc is unable to offer him any concrete assistance with his problem. Jack is also impressed with the compassionate, would-be healing activities of the little French doctor who tries to save Louisa's life, even though he suspects that the doctor's actions are both
futile and foolish. Moreover, there is a strong suggestion in the novel that people concerned about their responsibility to others are functioning on a higher spiritual level than people concerned only about themselves. Furthermore, this suggestion is made with full awareness that these people who care about others will eventually find out that they can only be truly responsible for themselves. This suggestion is carried over into the subsequent novel, *A Touch of Danger*. One of the main themes of this detective novel is the importance of exercising responsibility, even though such responsibility is rightly doomed to failure. Here again, the characters who worry about their obligations to others are clearly more advanced spiritually than the characters who are bound by their personal desires. Thus, a person's growth becomes measured to some extent by the way he chooses to treat other people.

One final problem relating to growth is the question of sexual stereotypes. This problem is raised by Angelo Maggio's desire to be a cowboy and by Richard Mast's desire to be brave in a conventional manner, as well as by Karen Holmes's wish to live according to the traditional image of woman as exclusively wife, mother, and homemaker. Both Mast and Karen come to realize that the popular views on manhood and womanhood are hindrances to their growth rather than guidelines for it. Other characters in the following chapter will make the same discovery.
CHAPTER III
BRAVERY AND THE CIRCLE OF THE SEXES

From the beginning, Jones has opposed the American popular notions of he-man masculinity and ultrafemininity. According to the traditional stereotypes, men should be strong, silent, cool, aggressive, and efficient, and women should be passive, dependent, virtuous, emotional, and appearance-conscious. However, as Jones sees it, this polarized set of stereotypes has its roots in the animal level and forms men into callous egotists and women into childish parasites. He believes that the attempt to use such stereotypes as ideals blocks the spiritual development of both men and women. In contrast, his concept of growth emphasizes a movement toward a recognition of the mutual spiritual goals of men and women and toward a broader and more sensitive view of the multitude of possible combinations of personality traits inherent in both manhood and womanhood.

For Jones, the worst dangers of the he-man form of masculinity are exemplified in warfare. Here, men are systematically reduced to the animal level so that they will
kill, maim, and torture in order to insure their own survival. In Jones's view, the bravest soldiers are usually also the most brutish and self-centered ones. They equate hardness and viciousness with manhood and regard gentleness and sympathy as womanly weaknesses. Fortunately, however, the process of evolution continues even in the midst of battle, since men at war are also sensitized upward through suffering and humiliation after their "combat numbness" wears off.

In contrast to the he-man's excessive hardness, the chief danger of ultrafemininity is an exaggerated softness stemming from a sense of dependency which hinders a woman from thinking and acting on her own. Jones has portrayed this danger most clearly through Karen Holmes's fear of leaving a husband whom she despised and of seeking something beyond the limiting social roles of wife and mother. Jones also believes that the ultrafeminine woman, like Karen Holmes, further handicaps herself by failing to prepare to earn her own livelihood and by neglecting to learn other important survival techniques which would prove useful if she were suddenly forced to take care of herself. Still, life itself instructs women as well as men in the art of survival, and women too are made aware of their isolation and of their need to act independently.

The greatest threat to everyone lies in an extreme polarization between men and women. When men strive to
abolish all their "womanish" qualities and women seek to destroy their "männish" personality traits, they not only wreck their basis for communication with members of the opposite sex but also lose contact with a significant part of themselves. Moreover, getting rid of these personality traits is an impossible task since the unwanted qualities will inevitably reappear in other forms. As Lucky Videndi argues in *Go to the Widow-maker*, there is a Circle of the Sexes which closely resembles the Circle of Politique in political science. Like the "Clock Face of Politics" in which "the rabid extreme Right became Leftist" and "the rabid extreme Left became Rightist," the Circle of the Sexes operates in such a way that "when you became more Masculine than Masculine, you could only become, move toward Feminine. You simply couldn't go on becoming more and more Masculine than before."¹

The Circle of the Sexes is also strongly reminiscent of the ancient Chinese symbol of the yin-yang. The yin-yang too is a circle divided between the masculine princi-

¹James Jones, *Go to the Widow-maker* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1967), p. 263. The other works of fiction which I will deal with in this chapter are, in order of publication: *Some Came Running* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957); *The Thin Red Line* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962); *The Ice-Cream Headache* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968); *Viet Journal* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1974). Subsequent references will be to these editions; the works will be identified by the following abbreviations: GTTW, SCR, TRL, ICH, VJ.
ple (yang) and the feminine principle (yin), but inside the yang section there is a dot of yin and inside the yin half there is a dot of yang. The presence of these two dots is intended to show that the yin and the yang are neither totally different nor totally separate from each other. In addition, the circle around them signifies their ultimate unity as well as the Oneness of the universe. To attain the harmony represented by the yin-yang circle, both men and women must accept themselves as they are and the world as it is. Only by acceptance can they gain a sense of their own wholeness.

Jones's fourth novel, The Thin Red Line, provides a devastating commentary on the "toughness" of men in combat. For example, the names of several major characters, such as Big Un, Big Queen, Fife, Doll, "Carrie" Arbre, and "Milly" Beck, underline the pretentiousness and absurdity of their pursuit of he-man masculinity. Moreover, the toughminded acts which various men do perform in this novel reflect a primitive callousness. A typical example is Fife's assertion of his new status of combat-tested veteran by pulling the beard of a Japanese corpse and engaging in fistfights. In Jones's view, such acts are bestial rather than manly and indicate the arrogance, folly, and indifference of the individual who performed them. He
argues that the surest sign of an individual's spiritual growth is his willingness to acknowledge both his frailty and his lack of importance to others.

The main problem with *The Thin Red Line* is that it is built around a philosophy which Jones no longer mentions directly. The reader has to go outside the novel for a full understanding of it since he could not reconstruct Jones's philosophy from the information he provides. For example, if one is acquainted with the views on reincarnation which Jones outlined in his first two novels, he can detect a reference to them in Fife's remark that he doesn't know whether there is an afterlife or not, but that if there is, it isn't "like all the churches say" (*TRL*, 480). Yet the reader could not infer Jones's beliefs about reincarnation from this single remark which is the only semi-explicit reference to them in the book. Similarly, one may note that Stein, Fife, Storm, and several other characters become humbled by their experiences, lose many of their illusions, and go off by themselves, but he would not be able to surmise that these actions form part of a process of spiritual evolution which stretches from here to eternity. The reader can only scratch the surface of Jones's ideas by reading this book alone.

On the other hand, one can easily probe the full implications of *The Thin Red Line* by applying what he has
learned from an attentive study of the first two novels. He doesn't have to go to any outside source other than Jones's own writings for the further explanation that he needs to understand this book as a whole. The plotting and characterizations are founded on the same set of beliefs that were spelled out in detail in *From Here to Eternity* and *Some Came Running*. Once this fact is established, everything becomes clear.

Since Jones has already discussed his philosophy at length on two occasions, why should he have to describe it again in book after book? By abandoning his attempt to present his philosophy directly, Jones attains a greater artistic scope in relation to characters and subject since he no longer has to provide an all-knowing spokesman or devise plots that will depict every facet of his beliefs. Moreover, by narrowing his themes, he can achieve a sharper focus and a tighter organization. In addition, he can still hint at the larger ideas which he has relegated to the background of his work. All in all, he gains more than he loses by his decision to stop talking about his system.

One of Jones's most outstanding accomplishments in *The Thin Red Line* is the organization which is simultaneously less ambitious and more successful than that of *Some Came Running*. Because he is primarily interested in
analyzing the effects of combat rather than in expounding a world-view, he can keep a much tighter rein over his material than he did in his second novel. Moreover, the material itself is more manageable since men in an Army combat unit have more in common than people living in different sectors of a small town. In battle, men in the same company are forced to fight together and to keep their eyes on what the enemy is doing, whereas people in a small town can engage in a much wider range of activities. Jones is well aware of the amount of unity which can exist in an Army company and often treats Charlie Company itself as a character, even though he never forgets for a moment that it is composed of individuals. He deliberately alternates between those intense occasions on which all the men in the company react alike, such as the aerial bombings which shatter everyone's nerves, and those incidents in which they respond differently, such as the dangerous run under enemy gunfire in which Bell concentrates exclusively on getting across safely while Dale is concerned more with showing off his fearlessness and with gaining the attention of his superiors.

Jones's other large achievement in *The Thin Red Line* is his ability to maintain our interest in a set of consciously de-glamorized characters. Although he provides as much action as he did in *From Here to Eternity*, he care-
fully removes the romantic aura which he had placed around such characters as Warden and Prewitt. Moreover, he manages to have his cake and eat it too by describing heroics performed by anti-heroes. A good example of this is Bead's hysterical victory over the Japanese soldier who attacks Bead while he is defecating. We are excited by the fight and concerned about Bead's safety, yet we can't help observing the ludicrousness of the circumstances in which the fight takes place and Bead's excessive viciousness in killing his enemy. Hence, even though the incident satisfies our thirst for adventure in fiction, it also compels us to take a complex, unidealized view of the victor.

Clearly *The Thin Red Line* is the kind of combat novel which Dave Hirsh was writing in *Some Came Running*. It fulfills Dave's conception of a comic combat novel as one "in which death, and mutilation and war itself are comic; instead of horrible" (SCR, 290) and in which men at war are shown to be guided by the same vain, petty, malicious, grasping, narrowminded motives that dominate their actions in civilian life so that the human race will be forced "to take an unvarnished unsugarcoated look at itself for a change" (SCR, 145). In addition, it utilizes the same general form that Dave had employed of following "a typical infantry company" composed of "typical green men" who are "as well trained as any men can be who have never been in
combat yet" from the onset of a campaign to its conclusion (SCR, 649). Even though The Thin Red Line does not adhere strictly to Dave's outline since it is set in Guadalcanal rather than in Europe and since it excludes several of the scenes Dave had envisioned, it comes close enough to Dave's plan to compel a comparison between the visions of the projected book and the completed one.

The heart of both Dave's book and The Thin Red Line is the view of death as comic, especially in the sense that, like the classic pratfall, it is a means of deflating the human ego. Dave's theory was that previous writers focusing on the experience of modern warfare had emphasized the "horrible horrible horrors of war . . . because their egos could not support this hated indignity of personal death, any kind of death, which they feared they might have to suffer and were so vain they could not stand the thought of" (SCR, 145). Furthermore, he had argued that "if you could divorce yourself from imagining it was you, there was nothing funnier in the world than the way a man who's been shot tumbles loosely and falls down. Unless it's watching someone slip on a banana peel and break their arm" (SCR, 145). This Three Stooges quality of death which Dave described is the reason why in The Thin Red Line "Bell had felt laughter burbling up in his chest" when Kline had fallen with a startled look on his face (TRL,
189-190) and "Stein could not help laughing" at the movement of the "widened eyes" of the surrendering Japanese soldier "slowly crossing themselves in despair as they focused on the advancing muzzle" of Big Queen's rifle which Queen then fired in the Japanese soldier's face (TRL, 317).

The classical epic-tragic view of warfare would assert that each man's death in combat (or at least each hero's death) is meaningful and noble, thus enshrining the ego of the individual dead man and of mankind in general. However, the Jonesian comic view depicts each man's death as pointless, stupid, and laughable in order to shatter men's illusions about the world and their own importance to it. At the same time, though, this comic view takes issue with the modern tragi-comic attitude which similarly rejects the epic-tragic conception. Paradoxically, whereas the modern attitude regards the individual's death in combat as truly meaningless and cries out against it, the Jonesian comic view sees it as a meaningful part of the spiritual evolution process. Moreover, the comic view ultimately leads to an attitude of acceptance and compassionate understanding, even exemplified by the dead themselves as shown the the look of "vastly wise and tolerant amusement" on the face of the dead myopic Graeco-Turkish draftee Kral who hadn't realized until he was shot that the profession of first scout which he had volunteered for "was a
thing of the past and belonged in the Indian Wars, not to the massed divisions, superior firepower, and tighter social control of today" (TRL, 187). Furthermore, Kral's dead look provides a link between this attitude toward death and Jones's theory of reincarnation through Bell's impression that the more he stared at the eyes of Kral's corpse "the more he felt them to be holes into the center of the universe and that he might fall in through them to go drifting down through starry space amongst galaxies and spiral nebulae and island universes" (TRL, 187). Although Bell is not ready for the message revealed by Kral's eyes and is terror-stricken by Kral's waggish look when he tries to tell himself "HERE LIES FOUR-EYES KRAL, DIED FOR SOMETHING" (TRL, 188), it is a lesson he will eventually learn from his own experiences.

Coupled with the comic view of death is the comic view of mutilation and war. Since both mutilation and warfare have an enormous potential for lowering men's pride as well as for tormenting men to make them grow, they can be considered comic in the same terms as death. However, they are also comic in the spectacle they offer of men pursuing trivial, selfcentered concerns under extreme conditions. Examples of this are the way Big Queen's desire to maintain his image as a supremely powerful, cowboy-heroic male forces him to pull a corpse from the mucky
ooze and to take the lead through a jungle where he is in constant fear of snakes, the way the Nebraska farmer Marl responds to the loss of his right hand by asking over and over how he is going to be able to work in the future, and the way Don Doll's accidental lodging in Carrie Arbre's buttocks when they jump off the road to escape enemy fire makes Doll think about committing sodomy with Arbre while the attack is still going on. Even the cynically wise Welsh can be caught up in an absurd enterprise like trying to stop Tella from yowling because he feels such screaming isn't "dignified" (TRL, 241). However, the most revealing action is Dale's collection of the gold teeth of dead Japanese soldiers which confirms Welsh's observation that war is fought for the sake of property. Greedy, small-minded, and frequently bestial, these men are supposedly the bravest of the brave and in fact actually do perform extraordinary feats in the most dangerous circumstances. But bravery too must be regarded as comic in the midst of a ludicrous activity like war.

In an essay on "Phony War Films," Jones argues that the "really superior combat soldier" is the Man who has "become an Animal, a vicious, cruel, shrewdly functioning Animal who saves the outfit time and again."\(^2\) Certainly

this is true of the most courageous and capable soldier in *The Thin Red Line*, the ambitious Charlie Dale. Although Dale has some initial fear of combat, he is sheltered not only by the combat numbness that affects everyone but even more by his wall of selfishness. He can walk through a field of fire without worrying because he doesn't believe anything can hurt him personally and because he is more concerned with making a good impression on the officer in charge so that he can get out of the kitchen and move up in rank. In addition, he finds it easy to kill Japanese because he can't imagine himself in their place or have any concern with their feelings. It is not surprising that he is outwardly successful since those with the strongest egos have the best chance of thriving materially in either peace or war.

In *Viet Journal*, his recently published nonfiction account of a trip to South Vietnam, Jones again stresses the animalistic nature of warfare through a device which he calls the Simian Figure. This figure "visits" Jones on such occasions as the night before Jones goes to the embattled base at Dak Pek and the night in Kontum when he hears the South Vietnamese firing at shadows. Even though he is unwilling to delineate the meaning of the Simian Figure too closely, he does make a connection between this ridiculous apelike creature and man's incessant pursuit of
danger. Moreover, he asks himself:

Could [the Simian Figure] be a symbol of the race, and our needs for fury and danger and fear and their excitements? Maybe he was a mirror image of myself? Myself before I shaved all over and put on airs and clothes, and pretended to be different? (VJ, 221).

In addition, Jones's disturbance by the Simian Figure may be related to his frequent attacks of guilt over "the backwardness of humanity. Of the cruelty, the indifference, the Kantian solipsism humanity mostly consisted of. It made a terrible despair" (VJ, 140-141). Certainly the Simian Figure suggests the theory of evolution which Robert Ardrey developed in African Genesis (and which Jones has discussed with me) and this theory in turn implies that man will continue to be backward if he remains at the emotional level of the "killer ape" where he began.

An even better example than Dale of the killer-apelike callousness that constitutes much of the bravery in warfare is the personal vendetta against the Japanese conducted by Big Un Cash. Cash sees all Japanese as evil because some Japanese soldiers tortured and killed two American prisoners, and he becomes so enraged by this incident that he kills two Japanese prisoners by cracking their heads together. Moreover, he has no sense of personal danger when confronted with the Japanese because all he considers is the chance this gives him to slaughter these evil creatures. (In Go to the Widow-maker, Al Bonham ex-
periences the same exhilarating recklessness when destroy-ing "evil" sharks.) Not surprisingly, Cash appears to regard himself as a kind of Old West Hero, complete with shotgun. His dying request that his wife be told he died "manly" reveals not only the image he has of himself but also how little he has learned from his experiences since his deathwound has come from a "light Nambu" fired from ambush by one of five suicidal starving Japanese soldiers who might as easily have hit someone else instead; Cash was merely the biggest target and ten yards in front of anyone else on the trail (TRL, 434).

Many of the other examples of bravery in battle stem from the soldier's fear and would not be considered heroic if the motive were known. For example, Bead's response to the presence of the enemy soldier in the woods is hysterical, triggered not only be fear but also by his embarrassment at being seen while having a bowel movement. It is therefore appropriate that the guilt he feels after killing the soldier resembles that which he experienced when his "mother had caught and whipped him for masturbating" (TRL, 168). Similarly, Don Doll's daring feat of charging a Japanese emplacement is provoked by his feeling of being unable to endure a stressful situation any longer, and he even cries "Mother! Mother!" all the time he is running toward the enemy whom he doesn't want to encounter (TRL,
Afterwards, he too feels ashamed of what he has done, but his shame lasts only until other men begin to praise his deed.

It is no accident that both Bead and Doll think of their mothers in connection with these incidents. In Jones's letter of July 14, 1973 concerning my original aim of organizing my study of his work around the sociological theory of a contemporary "masculinity crisis," Jones suggested:

I think in your exploration you should look into this thing of American mothers, and the historical continuity of the establishment of sexual guilt in the male by the religious and "social respectability" factors as personified in the American female over the generations. All tied in of course with the internal power-fight within the family in America, in which the female while always seeming to lose, almost always won in secret by use of the "sexual-guilt weapon". This shows up in all sorts of ways in my work. Most obviously, in stories like JUST LIKE THE GIRL; but less obviously in things like Frank Hirsh's window-peeking, etc. . . . The worship of Mother and her sanctity (for this also see JUST LIKE THE GIRL), depending upon its impact and intensity, can make (a) homosexuals, (b) incredibly brave fighting soldiers, driven mainly by masochism, afraid of homosexuality, and (c) weakling males who seek dominant wives (italics mine).

The one thing which offers all soldiers the chance to be brave—and vicious—is the phenomenon which Jones calls "combat numbness." This numbness operates in the same fashion as the curtain in Dawn Hirsh's mind which separates part of her personality from the rest to safeguard her against unpleasant realities. It is also comparable
to the mind-numbing exhaustion in combat of Quentin Thatcher in "Greater Love." While it lasts, it seals off the sensitive, fearful, vulnerable side of each man's character and allows the brutal, selfish, survival-at-any-cost side to function on its own. Combat numbness is the thin red line which not merely marks but makes the difference between sanity and madness, "heroes" and learners, and involution and evolution. The chief danger of combat numbness is its effect on men's characters since it reduces men to the animal level and thereby places them back at the starting point of spiritual growth. It is only when the combat numbness wears off that men are free to experience pain again and hence resume their development.

In spite of the handicap which combat numbness places on them, many of the characters in *The Thin Red Line* do grow spiritually as a result of their combat experiences. Since their growth comes in a variety of ways and takes a variety of forms, each of them gains a slightly different perspective on war. However, their growth always involves a movement away from "masculine" hardness, savagery, and aggressiveness.

The first character who steps beyond the animal level of the combat soldier is Capt. James Stein. Since Stein had wanted to emulate his idealized image of his father who was a major in World War I, his recognition of the
falsity of this image signifies a profound change. Although his image of his father had led him to regard military activity and the role of command in wartime as noble endeavors, his experiences make him see that his most cherished beliefs about himself, his father, and warfare are illusions. The first of these experiences is the wounding of Pvt. Jacques which occurs in front of him. This incident disturbs Stein not only because it confronts him with the cruelty of war but also because it contradicts his vision of himself as a benevolent leader. He had deemed himself a protective father to his men, yet he is now compelled to realize what he has brought them to face.

Stein is also shocked when Fife is hit a short distance away from him since this incident makes him aware of the enormous role which chance plays in warfare and of the consequent futility of logic and tactics. In addition, he is confronted immediately afterwards by a situation in which chance mocks the wisdom of one of his own decisions by altering the circumstances on which it is based. He may be correct in his general estimate of the situation and his proposal to Col. Tall that a patrol reconnaissance be made to the right. If, as he believes, the Japanese force is reduced there, an attack on the right might preserve many lives that would be lost through a direct attack. However, the unexpected advance of Milly Beck's men
leaves him without an argument when Tall, whose decision to descend from the command post Stein also fails to anticipate, arrives to take over. Although the success of his patrol the next day appears to confirm the accuracy of Stein's judgment, he can never be sure whether the Japanese had maintained only a small, weak force in the area on the right at the time he had suggested the patrol or whether they had waited until that night to move a much larger force from there, just as he can never be sure whether his decision was motivated by concern for his men or fear for his own life.

The final experience which clashes with Stein's image-picture of the world is the slaughter by his own beloved men of a small group of exhausted, ineffectual Japanese soldiers, several of them unarmed and attempting to surrender. The "victory" which this slaughter brings appears bloodthirsty and chaotic to him rather than the shining, heroic spectacle his father had led him to expect. As a result of this last revelation, he is well on his way to being freed from his illusions when Col. Tall announces that he is dismissing Stein from his command. Stein's sudden weeping awareness that "he could no longer even dislike Tall" with its half-stated corollary "And if you couldn't dislike even Tall" makes it evident that he has attained an understanding of the way everyone, including
Tall and himself, remains trapped by his illusions until his experiences reveal their inadequacy (TRL, 327). His momentary impulse to weep also signifies how far he has moved beyond the traditional image of the stalwart, shatterproof male.

The former officer John Bell also grows, though his development takes a somewhat different course from Stein's. Bell's growth stems chiefly from his sexual problems, and his special perceptions about combat relate to its sexual overtones. Although Bell's biggest flaw has been his dependence on his wife Marty, this dependence is also the source of his sensitivity. Moreover, his continual fear of losing Marty torments him and keeps him alert to the knowledge that comes through pain even when he is under the influence of combat numbness. This is why he can perceive the threat to humane qualities in Skinny Culn's "philosophy of not feeling except for feeling pay" (TRL, 400). In addition, Bell believes that the lack of feeling that comes from combat numbness turns soldiers into near-automatons guided by a distorted sexual excitement derived from the opportunity to penetrate the enemy through death. In Viet Journal, Jones makes a related observation in his own voice when he notes that there is "an odd conspiratorial physiological alliance between fear and the sense of sex" (VJ, 219) and that "if all the factors were right, fear
could be terribly exciting. So exciting you could get hooked on it like a drug. And want to do it again. Like sex" (VJ, 218).

Not surprisingly, Bell feels trapped by the Modern State with its highly organized warfare which has taken him away from the genuine sexual excitement of contact with his wife. It is only when Marty writes him a "Dear John" letter that he becomes resigned to his isolation and chooses to continue his life in the Army on the ground that "he would probably do as little harm there as anywhere else" (TRL, 492). Even though this is the most distressing incident in Bell's life, he responds to it with a sad but sympathetic comprehension of his wife's feelings (though he concedes that his belief that he has always understood her may be an illusion), rather than a wish to hurt her in a way that the traditionally masculine Capt. Bosche would have approved.

A third learner, Welsh, displays less compassion than either Stein or Bell do, but he also shows a keener awareness of the absurdity of warfare and of his own role in it. Welsh had started out with a big advantage over the other two since he had been able to guess what his own combat experience would be like. He even feels triumphant because everything turns out "exactly as he had expected and anticipated, thus leaving him with no real shock or
... trauma: men got killed mostly for statistical reasons, as he had anticipated: men fought well or badly about like they would have fought for women or other Property, as he had expected" (TRL, 375). Although Welsh rages as much as Fife at his situation of fighting for the sake of some "property" that is meaningless to him, he knows that he could have avoided joining the Army in 1930 since he had anticipated then that there would be a war within ten years. Moreover, this awareness of his own responsibility for his circumstances grants him a measure of sardonic aloofness that would have proved useful to Fife.

Welsh's major accomplishment, like that of his precursor Warden, is to recognize that war is a childish game which differs from cowboys and indians only in the greater complexity of the Army machinery operating it. He also shares Warden's conviction that he can maintain his integrity within this organized madness by playing his own countergames with the rules arbitrarily made up but rigidly adhered to by himself. Although he outwardly conforms enough to avoid friction with his superiors, he inwardly goes his own way and bends the Army's rules in the directions that please him most at the moment. Instead of simply distributing grenades like any other noncom, he must toss them to his men like footballs to mock the rah-rah atmosphere of the approaching battle and must make his
mockery sly enough that the generals watching him will miss it and admire his spirit. Moreover, he has secretly and cynically asserted his individuality by carrying gin in his canteens; by giving two false first names for the Army records so that the Army won't be able to notify his parents if he dies and will be forced to take care of him if he is injured; by making his slit trench a half inch shorter than regulations require; and by imagining himself in a sixteenth century bathtub when he is actually in a slit trench.

Welsh recognizes that the reason he is in his country's Army at war "from choice, not necessity," in spite of his lack of respect for "home, family, country, flag, freedom, democracy, the honor of the President," is that part of him "liked all this shit. He liked being shot at, liked being frightened, liked lying in holes scared to death and digging his fingernails into the ground, liked shooting at strangers and seeing them fall hurt, liked his stickywet feet in his stickywet socks. Part of him did" (TRL, 410). The part of him that seeks out such experiences is related to the "penancemaking, selfdestructive thing in his nature which had made him go after Tella" and which "would almost certainly make him liable to other such acts in the future" (TRL, 375). It is also the source of Welsh's jeering at Storm's attempt to help the men in his
company by force-feeding them atabrine pills to prevent the malaria that might make them sick enough to get shipped out to safety and of Welsh's concealing his own case of malaria both for the sake of holding on to the disease itself and of avoiding his release from combat.

Paradoxically, although Welsh is aware of the educating value of pain and chooses to remain in the Army as the most obvious and available source of pain, he advises everyone else to seize any chance to escape from combat and hopes that if he can only pursue combat numbness "long enough and often enough, it might really become a permanent and mercifully blissful state" (TRL, 495). The peace that Welsh seeks, however, is not a mind-drugging flight from reality but rather that which comes at the end of the educational process when he will finally have learned all that experience can teach him and is ready to move on to a higher spiritual state where pain will no longer be necessary. Although he may be wrong in his calculations about this course of action and may actually be approaching the thin red line between sanity and madness, he has already learned enough to make accurate predictions about many (though not all) of the experiences facing him so that he may indeed be following the surest path for his own salvation. Moreover, if Welsh's calculations should prove to be right, then the thin red line is the thinnest line of
all since even combat numbness could lead to spiritual evolution which is the only meaningful form of sanity or manhood.

The most equivocal figure is Witt, as clearly the descendant of Prewitt as Welsh is of Warden. Witt has more than one opportunity to observe the absurdity of his romantic notions of the role of individual skill and wild west heroism in battle, but it is doubtful whether he ever examines or casts off his illusions. He is much too fond of his image of himself as a Davy Crockett-like savior who can single-handedly rescue numerous friends in his company except for those times when the officers on his own side issue such foolhardy orders that it becomes impossible for anyone to prevent disaster. The problem is that his officers seem perpetually to issue such orders and Witt seldom has a chance to save anybody. The one incident that should have opened Witt's eyes is the Ding-Dong Trail roadblock massacre in which he not only was unable to help any of the others but was barely saved himself by having a friend shot beside him in time to give him a chance to jump out of the way of the attack in blind panic. However, instead of re-examining his view of either himself or his skills, he finds it convenient to protest against the officer who ordered the roadblock in the same way as he has protested against so many officers in the past; he must protest
against circumstances, superiors, and the nature of the universe to avoid recognizing his own inadequacies.

Nevertheless, Witt's freedom of movement and ability to assert his individuality do provide a balance to John Bell's vision of himself and the others as automatons, and the juxtaposition of Witt's and Bell's opposing pictures of reality implies a subjective element in each of them. Although Bell's picture fits in better than Witt's with the description of the behavior of their fellow soldiers under the influence of combat numbness, it fails to take into consideration the different responses of the men in his company both to what is happening to them on the battlefield and to what they do while experiencing combat numbness. Moreover, it ignores the enormous difference between the ways in which all of their characters develop afterwards. Thus, even though Bell's viewpoint reveals a major "truth" about combat, his is not the only truth. It therefore seems appropriate that the book ends with the statement that "one day one of their number would write a book about all this, but none of them would believe it because none of them would remember it that way" (TRL, 495).

Although there are moments in The Thin Red Line when an experience is strong enough to affect everybody in the same way so that it becomes possible to talk about a group vision, most of the time each of them is bound inside his
own subjective world which must inevitably conflict with those of the other soldiers. As always, the purpose of such conflicts is to disturb the illusions of one or both of the colliding consciousnesses. For example, George Band's illusions of the respect inspired by his leadership and of the joyous camaraderie of men in battle are shaken by Mazzi who is really more concerned about Till's observation of Mazzi's subjective terror during the attack on Boola-Boola Village than about the faults he is denouncing in Band. Similarly, both Doll and Carrie Arbre are upset by their discovery that each considers the other a homosexual while regarding his own readiness to perform certain homoerotic acts as normal. Other examples of such confrontations are: 1. Fife's irritated assertion of his educational superiority at a time when Witt is wrapped up in self-pity over his self-maintained exile from Charlie Company; 2. Doll's attempt to assume "paternal responsibility" for the lower-ranking Fife by offering him a position in his own squad which leads to his subsequent feeling of having been conned because of Fife's grateful acceptance of his offer; and 3. Bosche's reluctance to live up to his announced willingness to back up his men when Beck, speaking for all the men, asks him to protest the Division Commander's order to remove their beards.

As was the case in Some Came Running, all these clashes between subjective worlds create Karmic bonds
which will probably have to be worked out in future lives, yet all of them serve to further the movement across the thin red line from involution to evolution and to prove that even modern warfare cannot damage human character enough to halt this progression. The presence of the man eating the apple at the end therefore suggests not only the loss of innocence which Paulette Michel-Michot emphasizes in the title of her essay "Jones's The Thin Red Line: The End of Innocence," but also the Fortunate Fall in which man's separation from God is merely the starting point for his gradual development and reunion with God. Nevertheless, the men who will cross that last thin red line between man and God are not the proud, brave, super-masculine animals who fight wars, but the sensitive human beings who emerge out of the suffering of combat.

Jones's fifth novel, Go to the Widow-maker, throws new light on the author's various earlier insights about bravery and manhood by placing them in the context of the Circle of the Sexes. According to Lucky's theory about the Circle of the Sexes, when men seek to become super-masculine and to eliminate every trace of the feminine in themselves, they inevitably begin to take on more and more feminine traits. This paradox of the pursuit of an extreme form of masculinity leading to an increasing feminization
is one more fulfillment of the warning that when you shun the cloak of evil it will embrace you even more tightly. The same warning holds true for women who try to be ultrafeminine and for both men and women who attempt to deny their own sexual identity. When Gwen French sought to avoid the feminine characteristics which she despised she found that she began to acquire more of those characteristics than she had had before.

*Go to the Widow-maker* also stresses key resemblances between women and men. Even though Ron Grant strives hard to attain the he-man's aggressiveness, he has an equally strong desire to become a slave to some woman. Similarly, although Lucky Videndi emulates the ultrafeminine woman's passiveness, she also has a powerful urge to assert her own independence and to dominate the men who care for her. As a result of these mixed attitudes, both Grant and Lucky have to overcome penchants for risk-taking and for excessive dependency before they can hope to build a lasting marriage. Moreover, their union is only made possible by the essential similarities in their characters and ideas.

Like most stories of requited love, *Go to the Widow-maker* does become sentimental at times, though this sentimentality is limited almost exclusively to the early part of the novel. There is an exaggerated glow over those scenes in which Grant first meets Lucky, notes the way her
friends adore her, and introduces her to his own awestruck friends. Lucky seems a little too charming, a little too perfect, and the early stage of their love seems a little too glamorous and idealized. In short, the atmosphere of these scenes is too reminiscent of the forties and fifties Hollywood depiction of love in high society.

Fortunately, this sentimentality virtually disappears once Grant and Lucky begin to fight since the conflicts between them are credible and compelling and since both of them then emerge as complex, fascinating characters. Jones's overall concern with growth here takes a more secular turn and enables him to accomplish something which only a few novelists have done well, to show in detail the gradual development of a mature, durable love. He makes a probing psychological study of the two lovers' slow but discernible movement toward acceptance of the responsibilities stemming from their love. As Jones carefully points out, mature love can only be attained after both partners detect and overcome a number of childish components in their own personalities. We can believe in the union of Grant and Lucky at the end because we have observed their difficulties in achieving it; Jones has made us see the many painful steps which each of them has taken in gaining self-awareness and in adapting to the other.

As in The Thin Red Line, Jones displays considerable skill in structuring. All of his subplots blend in well
with his main romantic plot. He never loses sight of the developing relationship between Grant and Lucky; even when both of them are off-stage, the characters in the forefront are talking about them and providing information about the problems they are facing. Moreover, Jones constantly makes a correlation between Grant's encounters with women and his experiences underwater. Whenever Grant has troubles with either Lucky or Carol Abernathy, he invariably tries to re-establish his "manhood" through confronting dangerous situations while skindiving. This pattern is also followed by Al Bonham who compensates for the deterioration of his marriage by hunting sharks. In addition, Jones links the romantic episodes to the skindiving ones by focusing on the same cast of characters in relation to each of them. For example, Carol Abernathy encourages Grant's interest in skindiving because she thinks this will enable her to maintain her own hold over him, and Jim Grointon persuades the Grants to go on a lengthy diving expedition because he hopes it will give him the chance to seduce Lucky.

One major improvement which Jones has made here over what he did in Some Came Running is his increased economy in plotting. In the earlier novel, he connected his many subplots to the main plot chiefly by focusing on parallel and contrasting situations. For example, Wally Dennis's affair with Dawn Hirsh closely resembles Dave Hirsh's
involvement with Gwen, and Wally's flight from his pain over losing Dawn serves as a contrast to point up the superiority of Dave's final willingness to face his agony and accept his isolation. However, Wally's escapist decision to join the Army makes little impact on Dave, and Dave's death has no obvious effect on Wally. In *Go to the Widow-maker*, though, Jones frequently interweaves parallel and contrasting situations into the same actions so that they directly influence each other. The best example of this is the way Jones meshes the subplot involving Al Bonham and Cathie Finer with the story of Grant and Lucky. The recklessness displayed by Cathie and Bonham not only contrasts with Ron's and Lucky's growth toward maturity but also reinforces the Grants' decision to shoulder their obligations toward each other and to live in a more responsible manner. When Bonham calls Grant for help after the police find him with Cathie Finer, Grant gets the opportunity to witness the disastrous results of Bonham's and Cathie's risk-taking and can report them to Lucky for her edification as well. In addition, Bonham's downfall leads to the failure of the schooner company which Grant had invested in and therefore teaches Grant another lesson about the need for avoiding senseless and unnecessary risks. Clearly, Bonham and Cathie are much more personally involved in the fates of Grant and Lucky than Wally and Dawn had been in the fates of Dave and Gwen.
The central problem in *Go to the Widow-maker* is Ron Grant's obsessive concern with his masculinity. Grant is tormented throughout by his fear that his fourteen-year relationship with the domineering Carol Abernathy has weakened his character and by his need to do something spectacular to establish that he is still a man. However, he finds that no act of his can be sufficiently daring to convince him of his courage and virility since he always discovers some small flaw which leads him to regard his bravest and most skillful actions as pointless and unmanly. It is never enough for him to perform coolly and competently underwater; he is perpetually disturbed by his nervousness prior to entering the water. Neither is it meaningful that he quickly learns to freedive as deep as Jim Grointon since he considers this accomplishment negated by the heaving of his chest as he returns to the surface, even though Al Bonham assures him that such heavings are normal. Even his reckless attack on a twenty foot shark proves nothing to him except that he is a little tougher than he has been in the past. Only at the end does he realize that he can never succeed in his quest to establish his masculinity by external means and also that he has badly mistaken the nature of manhood. He learns then not only that his quest for an exclusively masculine way of life leads to a denial of valuable "feminine" components
in his personality but also that the continual pursuit of this impossible goal would lower him to the animal level. As a result of these revelations, he frees himself from his hero-worship of men like Bonham and Grointon and returns to his more appropriate task of writing sensitive, uncompromisingly realistic plays.

In Viet Journal, Jones indirectly points out the childishness of urges like Grant's to prove masculinity through experiences with danger and to assert superiority through endless bouts of competition by linking such impulses to a "fifth-grader" mentality. He introduces the metaphor of the fifth-grader during the scene in which the North and South Viets try to outdo each other in raising the highest and biggest flags at the site of a prisoner release, thus prompting an American colonel to comment that "somebody has said that Vietnam is the biggest fifth grade in the world" (VJ, 101). Shortly afterwards, Jones notes the destructive side of this kind of behavior by describing the fighting at the largely worthless area of Quang Tri and then remarking: "I could not imagine any soldier wanting to stay in a place like that and fight for it. But both sides did. Stubborn fifth-graders" (VJ, 102). Finally, when discussing his reactions to the "high-making, hilarity-inducing condition" of going low level in a helicopter, Jones makes it clear that he considers this impulse
Wasn't this supposed to be dangerous? I could feel a silly, happy grin on my face, as I asked. It was dangerous, the colonel nodded, with a grin back; but it was fun. . . . What a weird race we were. There was some of the fifth-grader in all of us (VJ, 103-104).

To a large extent, Grant's similar fifth-grader impulses spring from his need to compensate for his constant humiliation by Carol Abernathy. Again and again, Grant is shaken by his vision of Carol as "the old mantilla-ed witch-mother image standing on the church steps pointing" (GTTW, 25) and by his belief that she "had been taking over small pieces of his soul bit by bit" so that finally she "had taken all moral force, all will out of him" (GTTW, 266). Her chief hold is the guilt which she has instilled in him for having once offered her to a friend during the early days of their relationship. This had happened shortly after he had returned from the war and "was fucking everything he could get his hands on then" because "he had been too near dead too long, and he wanted everything he could get" (GTTW, 105). At this time, sex for him was nothing more than an animal need so that he was surprised to discover that Carol didn't regard sex as casually as he did. However, he has come to accept her view that he injured her by his unfeeling attempt to trade her off. In addition, he has taken half-seriously the role of foster son to Carol which the two of them had acted out in front
of a *Life* reporter to preserve Carol's and her husband's reputations, and this view of her as foster mother has complicated his feelings toward her. Moreover, he has allowed her to become the moral arbiter of his writing and has endured many tongue lashings from her for misdirecting his energy to sex and other "trivial" pursuits instead of concentrating exclusively on his work. He also retains a sense of obligation to her because she had acknowledged and assisted his creative talent when nobody else believed in his ability. As a result of all these demands on his conscience, he has become bound by a string of guilts in regard to her: "guilt as unfaithful lover, guilt as ungrateful son, guilt as commercially successful artist, guilt as a man who kept cuckolding his friend. My God, talk about Oedipus!" (*GTTW*, 45).

However, strong as the pull of all these guilts is on him, Grant is held even more firmly by his unwillingness to be left alone without Carol. He is obsessed by a "fear that every girl in his life from now on would only be a liaison and that kind of bone-cold loneliness he could not face. . . . He preferred to run back to a little love which if it did not keep you really warm, at least did not let you quite freeze" (*GTTW*, 47). If he hadn't met Lucky, who offered him another alternative to this dreaded loneliness, he would probably have lived up to the title of
his play about Carol called *I'll Never Leave Her*. However, his refreshing new love for Lucky is a similar source of concern for him since he resents his belief "that he literally could not live without her . . . because he felt it was unmanly" and since he is convinced that "a man should be able to live without any damned woman" (*GTTW*, 343).

Grant's feelings about women have long been complicated by his latent masochism and by his realization that "what he really wanted was to enslave himself to some woman and become her creature, her groveling possession, contemptible, and contemptuously treated by her" (*GTTW*, 225). This has provided a large part of the basis for his relationship with Carol who shows little reluctance to shower Grant with belittling remarks and limited physical abuse. However, his conscious mind has retained sufficient control for Grant to reflect that his awareness of this desire is the reason "why all these years he had had to be so careful in picking himself a wife. He must not pick a bad master. . . . But, of course, he would have to be the boss in the family, too" (*GTTW*, 225). He longs simultaneously to submit himself to Lucky's will and to force her to obey him. This dual attitude and the masochistic impulse associated with it lie in back of his wish to have Lucky display herself naked at the nude swimming party instigated by Sir John Brace. Later, he is both sexually
excited and upset when Lucky performs her nude ballet in the water and cannot discern which emotion is paramount in him. His dual attitude is also responsible for his willingness to fantasize a scene in which he witnesses his wife having sex with another man and for his distress at the thought that she might actually have betrayed him with Jim Grointon.

Grant's insecurity about his manhood and his semiconscious belief that he deserves to be treated with contempt can be traced even further back to "his terrible and lifelong inferiority complex" (GTW, 79). Not much information is provided about the origin of this complex, but some hints are offered through Grant's response to his real first name. His dislike of being called Decameron was so great in his childhood that he tried to enroll under a false name at Summer Camp, and he remained hostile enough toward his name when he was older that he had it legally changed to Ron. Evidently he had had to endure a lot of teasing as a result of his name, and he resented his father for giving it to him. Moreover, the name originated in his father's half-concealed anger at his wife's frigidity and indicates his father's irresponsible selfishness in ignoring the possible repercussions of this private joke on his son. In addition, Mrs. Grant's frigidity implies that she is the same kind of puritanical,
overly respectable mother as Mrs. Slade in "The Tennis Game" and Elvira Hirsh who both instilled a strong bent toward masochism in their sons.

One result of Grant's inferiority complex is the "'rejection syndrome' built into his psyche that could be triggered by the slightest and often most inoffensive thing" (GTTW, 459). Because Grant views himself as deserving to be outcast, he constantly expects to be rejected and yet resents any action that he interprets as rejection. His natural response to Lucky's refusal to go to bed with him on their first date, like Dave Hirsh's to Gwen's rejection of his advances, is to ask what's wrong with him. He is always ready to believe the worst about himself, even though he is frequently moved to attack the person who pointed out his flaws.

Grant's foremost worry is that he is a coward. This is a problem he has experienced throughout his life, but it has been exacerbated by his participation in World War II. During the war, he had made himself perform dangerous tasks "just to prove to himself that he wasn't as much of a coward as he already knew he was" (GTTW, 289). However, he believes that the performance of courageous actions is less important than the possession of an attitude of courage, and he is convinced that he still lacks this attitude. Moreover, Grant has decided that "in the
war there were so many who had done so much more than he had" (GTTW, 289). This impression that he did too little in the war disturbs him enough that it renders him somewhat self-destructive. At the least, it adds to his inferiority complex by making him see himself as less active and worthy than his fellow soldiers.

The worst side effect of his dissatisfaction with his wartime efforts, though, is that it leads him to idolize hard, irresponsible men whom he mistakenly regards as more courageous than himself because they can perform the same actions he does without displaying any insecurity about them. In Grant's view, Grointon is a superior being because of the things he "could do in or on or above the sea, diving, sailing, flying, even the camping, all the romantic, and real, things that the bourgeois, small town, and now pseudo-intellectual, types like himself could not do and only dreamed about and sometimes, if they became pseudo-intellectual, wrote about" (GTTW, 490). At this time, Grant would undoubtedly agree with Doug Ismaileh's remark that "just about every American—every man—who ever lived" would prefer to be a great athlete than a great writer (GTTW, 271). Since he is distressed by his own small stature which prevents him from becoming an outstanding athlete and admires Bonham for his huge size, Grant is obviously obsessed by something he lacks and can never gain.
Grant's confidence in himself is further undermined by his cuckolding of Hunt Abernathy. He is afraid that by "unmanning" Hunt through his affair with Carol, he has also unmanned himself. Moreover, he feels especially guilty because he let Hunt support him during the years before he achieved commercial success with his plays and because he and Hunt have been friends. He has come to look upon Hunt as a foster father to the same extent that he regards Carol as his foster mother, and this has naturally increased his regret and shame over what he has done to Hunt.

Grant once accused Doug Ismaileh of trying to use him as a father figure he could destroy, yet Grant too is searching for a substitute father. He views not only Hunt in the role of father, but also Bonham and, to a limited extent, Grointon. When Grant first goes skindiving in the sea with Bonham, he feels "very much the son to Bonham's massive paternalism" and finds that this "gave him reassurance" (GTTW, 14). In addition to Bonham's competence in the water, his massive size may also make Grant feel like a little boy next to him. Later, on the trip to Marants Cay, Grant notices that Grointon "usurped a sort of parental superiority" (GTTW, 488), but this time he is displeased because he is aware that Grointon is performing for Lucky's benefit and is striving to place Grant in the
role of child so that he as father figure will be more appealing to Lucky. As strongly as Grant has admired Grointon, he is not prepared to surrender his wife to him, and he develops a semi-Oedipal jealousy toward Jim.

One additional reason Grant is drawn to men like Bonham and Grointon as heroes, friends, and fathers is that he regards them as the last individualists in an overly-organized world. He and his novelist friend Frank Aldane are convinced that "given the expectable increase in government's control of the social body's functions and its mental attitudes, in order for it to perform efficiently in an ever increasingly complex industrial society, men of their type would be squeezed out of existence in a very short time, maybe fifty years" (*GTTW*, 74). Because he considers the organization of modern societies a universally emasculating though necessary force, Grant longs for a way of life in which a man can still experience freedom. He believes that the way Bonham and Grointon live offers such freedom, and he argues to Aldane that "this skindiving stuff and underwater archeology and all that is the last frontier left to an individual to do individual work" (*GTTW*, 75). He is sure that individualism, adventurousness, and toughness form a better trinity than organization, security, and sensitivity, though he will later question this judgment.
In Kipling's "Harp Song of the Dane Women" which serves as the epigraph for Go to the Widow-maker, a contrast is made between the women's world of "the hearthfire and the home-acre" and the man's world of the sea as "the old grey Widow-maker," or between the pursuit of security and the pursuit of danger. This contrast represents the conflict within Grant. The women in the poem question why men should forsake them for a life that offers self-destruction as its goal, and Lucky Grant might well ask the same. There is a connection between Grant's difficulties with women and his desire to assert his manhood in the sea. Just as his impetus to learn skindiving came from his rebellion against Carol's castrating domination, his later quest for more and more dangerous experiences underwater is derived from his increasing alienation from Lucky. Once Grant decides that Lucky has slept with Grointon and turns himself into a "self-convinced, self-convicted cuckold," he tells Lucky, "I find now that I'm much braver underwater, much more courageous now, since we've become 'estranged'" (GTTW, 581). In reality, he has become willing to take foolhardy risks because he no longer cares much whether he lives or dies. He is also propelled by a powerful aggressiveness to seek out and destroy any fish near him, no matter how vicious or inoffensive it might be. However, he is forced to re-examine his behavior
when the unimaginative Orloffski informs Grant that his assault on a twenty foot shark was the craziest thing Orloffski had ever seen. Later, when Grant helps Orloffski and Bonham steal five cases of whiskey, justifying his involvement in the scheme on the ground that he is taking the whiskey from an organization, he suddenly realizes the folly of what he is doing and, by extension, the misguidedness of so many of his past attitudes and actions.

Grant's subsequent fight with Orloffski which he knows in advance he can't win is the last stage in Grant's education. It teaches him the futility of courting trouble for its own sake since the beating he accepts from Orloffski is both pointless and stupid. Moreover, he finally sees that the end product of the course toward manhood which he has been following is not the partially sensitive Bonham but rather the foul-mouthed thief Orloffski. Orloffski is the total individualist since he has no respect for law or society or even the police and has no concern about the feelings or property of other people. Hence, once Grant realizes he is starting to resemble Orloffski, he understands that he must change his direction. One of Grant's reflections at the end of the book is that he and Lucky need to stick together because "alone, they didn't either one of them have even that much of a chance. . . . In these Orloffski and Bonham woods" (GTTW, 617). Grant
has at last recognized the callousness and destructiveness inherent in the anarchic lives of the men he had once regarded as mentors.

Grant's speech to Lucky after he has returned from his fight with Orloffski reveals the extent to which he has come to terms with his insecurities about his masculinity. His image of the boy who becomes obsessed by a fixed picture of the great difference in size between his father's penis and his own and who carries this picture within him applies to Grant's own case. For example, his idea that the "boy" can never grow up because his memory of this disproportion between his father and himself remains a mental reality to him even though his own physical size will change depicts Grant's inferiority complex and the discrepancy between the way he views himself and the way others see him. Although Grant himself is less concerned about his past achievements as a playwright than about the possible failure of each new work, these achievements loom large in the eyes of both friends and acquaintances. Moreover, time after time he believes he has acted like a coward when others applaud him as cool and courageous. Both Bonham and Grointon profess as deep an admiration for his boldness and prowess as he has for theirs. Furthermore, the multitude of activities Grant can do with ease and grace would be satisfying to anyone else. It is
only Grant's attitude that prevents him from being pleased by them. The lesson he needs to learn most is that of self-acceptance, and this is what the beating from Orloffski teaches him.

Grant believes that others too have made the mistake of continuing to see themselves as boys when they are really men and that this misconception hinders them from acting maturely. Boys don't know how to handle sex or how to act tenderly and responsively with a woman. Neither do they comprehend how to interpret and diminish international and local conflicts or how to deal with social and moral issues. Hence, the men who regard themselves as boys "take refuge in bravery. . . . Only by being brave can they be what they think--hope--is manly, a man. No other way. . . . So they make up games. The harder the game, the braver the man. Politics, war, football, polo, explorers. Skindiving. Shark-shooting. . . . All to grow up to Daddy's great huge cock they remember but can never match" (GTTW, 608).

Grant's assertion to Lucky that "I'd like to think, I think I maybe am, growing up to my father's cock" (GTTW, 608) implies that he is abandoning his belief in bravery as the criterion of manhood and is now willing to see himself as maturing in other respects. He has just put aside his masculine pride and assured Lucky that he has become
convinced that she didn't have sex with Grointon, even though he still harbors suspicions about the incident that provoked his belief in her guilt. Her possible infidelity places a severe test on his manhood since he has always regarded cuckolds as the unmanliest of men, and it requires considerable self-control plus self-acceptance for him to overcome his outrage and humiliation over what he thinks she has done. It also requires an ability to perceive another person's concerns as equal in importance to his own.

Grant further shows his willingness to consider Lucky his equal through his appreciation of the single viewpoint which they had temporarily attained. In the first few days after his marriage to Lucky, Grant had found that "some occult alchemy of close warm wet sexuality" had enabled the two of them to relate to each other as if they "had actually become one personality, the two separate eyes in one head as it were, so that each knew at any given second what the other felt or was thinking" (GTTW, 375). This sense of fusion vanished after their argument about Grant's affair with Carol, but it re-emerges at the end when Grant reflects that "maybe, if he hung on, if they hung on, they might someday again achieve that sort of strange wonderful Single Viewpoint they had once had" and then believes he can see in Lucky's "eyes that she had been
thinking the same thing" (GTTW, 617-618). The possibility that Grant and Lucky may be able to attain a durable merging of their separate subjective views indicates the strength and meaning of their love.

In "Secondhand Man," Mona Patterson had argued that weakness might be a virtue since "to be strong you have to be—dogmatic" (ICH, 61) and since weakness forces men to depend on each other more. Yet she was only half-right in her appraisal of the value of weakness, and this left her unprepared for the relapse which came from her husband's desire to please other men by living up to their image of a real man as a heavy drinker and an ever-ready seducer. She made sense when she pointed to the arrogance in Wyatt Earp's brand of independence which rode roughshod over the lives of others, but she failed to see that the opposite extreme of letting others determine your values is equally mistaken. In contrast to her ideas, Ron and Lucky learn that you do not have to surrender your individual judgment when you relinquish your pride. They achieve their yin-yang fusion because they both find out how to curb and blend their simultaneous longings for domination and submission. Their union is securely based on their mutual growth rather than on their mutual weakness.

In many respects, Lucky acts as Grant's Master, though in other respects he acts as hers. From the
beginning, she recognizes the importance of his writing and encourages him to concentrate on it rather than on skin-diving and similar pursuits. She values the emotional perceptiveness revealed in his plays and his passionate yet gentle lovemaking, not his brutalizing quest of danger. For this reason, she wants to turn him away from his more aggressively "masculine" activities and put him back in touch with the sensitive side of his character. However, it is not only her direct influence on Ron that helps to sensitize him, but also her indirect effect through the suffering she arouses in him. Because of this suffering, when Grant thinks about his own apparent cuckolding, he also thinks, "Good God! . . . Poor Hunt Abernathy!" (GTTW, 530), thus truly sympathizing with Hunt for the first time.

Lucky's beneficial impact on Grant even extends to his lovemaking which she had found so pleasing in the early stages of their relationship. The first time Grant meets Lucky, he is bent exclusively on satisfying his sexual desire as soon as possible so that he becomes furious at her for not granting him immediate access to her bed. However, after he marries Lucky, he discovers that their sexual closeness is responsible for the more general closeness that culminates in their achievement of a single viewpoint and thus learns that sex on this level is akin to spiritual union. Later, when they become estranged, Grant makes the
equivalent realization that the "fucking privileges" which Lucky is willing to extend to him are unsatisfying because what he wants to do is make love to her. He had agreed with Lucky's pronouncement that "the reason there is so much divorce in America today is because sex is not dirty enough in the home" (GTTW, 33), but what they both meant by this statement is that sex should be uninhibited, not that it should be impersonal or vicious. For example, they both regard oral-genital sex as pleasurable and resent puritanical injunctions against it or other natural forms of sexual expression. By the end, both Grant and Lucky have learned that the best lovemaking comes when each partner has some concern about the other's pleasure and that the form in which love is expressed is less important than the feeling directing it.

Grant's final willingness to accept Lucky even if she did "fuck" Jim Grointon demonstrates not only his increased movement toward the unselfishness he had begun to display in his sexual relationship with her but also a greater flexibility in outlook. Much of his difficulty in accepting his masculinity can be traced to his rigid, stereotyped notion of what a man should be. Once he gets beyond the conventional image of a Man as someone who is strong, silent, self-contained, and unthinkingly brave, he is free not only to assess his own virtues more accurately
but also to adopt a more personal set of values. However, his acceptance of Lucky's possible unfaithfulness also compels him to modify a personal value which was derived from his own experience. Since he had believed that infidelity by either partner in a relationship automatically kills something vital which can never be regained, he has to acknowledge that he is acting counter to his convictions in deciding to continue his involvement with her.

On the other hand, Grant has remained true to Lucky (except for the two occasions when he slept with Carol to avoid humiliating her), and he has reason to hope that Lucky will be faithful to him in the future. Ben Spicehandler, the psychiatrist who befriended Grant and Lucky in Kingston, had argued to him that even if she did have sex with Grointon "maybe she's sorry. Maybe she's learned something. Something about where the real importance lies" (GTPTW, 593). Ben can speak on this subject because he had left Irma during the first year of their marriage out of fear of responsibility, but had returned to her when he had matured enough to realize that marriage to her was what he wanted and that he had the emotional strength to cope with it. He had never inquired how many men she slept with while he was gone, but since that time both of them have been faithful to each other. The knowledge which Ben had gained then places him in the role of Master in regard to
this kind of situation. Functioning as Master, Ben asks Grant:

> do you expect everything in life to come to you without paying for it. You're too big, too important, too much, not to know better than that. Are you too big and too important to even be willing to indulge in a little education? You refuse even to educate, teach a little? Of all you claim you know about life? (GTTW, 592-593).

Just as Ben has been taught a lot by his temporary abandonment of Irma, he expects that Lucky too may have gained a greater insight into herself and life from whatever mistakes she has made. This principle of growth also applies to Ron.

Grant too quickly dismisses Ben's point that his troubles with Lucky may stem from a fear of responsibility similar to Ben's toward Irma. He naturally remembers the difficulties he faced because of his overlarge sense of obligation to Carol and all the hoops she made him jump through in the name of moral responsibility. Moreover, Grant's sense of responsibility is one of the qualities that sets him apart from the "accident-prone" Bonham, the untrustworthy Grointon, the crude Orloffski, and the pugnacious Finer. Nevertheless, Grant had been reluctant to abandon the known problems of dealing with Carol for the unknown problems of living with Lucky and had played a passive role in their decision to get married. He even gave the appearance of letting Lucky and her friend Lisa Halder
push him into the marriage, although he would not have allowed the marriage to occur if he had been opposed to it. Later, when Lucky turned hostile, he took refuge in a pursuit of danger instead of facing his problems and making decisions about them. Only at the end does he seem willing to take on the responsibility of living with a woman and to place her desires, emotions, and welfare alongside his own.

Although Grant realizes that it is impossible to achieve a lasting security, he does turn his back on risk-taking as a way of life and begin to see value in establishing the tiny measure of security that is possible in this world. His Master in this area is Rene Halder, the Frenchman who had built up the Grand Hotel Crount from a barely profitable business into the most thriving celebrity attraction in the Caribbean. Up to this time, Grant had been accustomed to letting Carol direct his major financial decisions and this had left him vulnerable to such manipulations as the purchase of an expensive house across from hers which would put him in the embarrassing position of having to bring a bride into constant contact with Carol. His slipshod handling of finances is further demonstrated by his willingness to give Bonham money for repairing the ship without making any reciprocal demand on him. Rene’s reaction to this is to insist that Ron ask for some form
of security from Bonham and to offer to take care of this matter himself. Although Grant still has little concern for security at this point, he is unwilling to oppose Rene's desire to help him. Both he and Bonham readily agree to Rene's request that Ron be given first mortgage on the schooner because neither of them foresees any circumstances in which Bonham's new company might go broke. However, when Bonham's involvement with Cathie Finer leads to the dissolution of the company, Grant's mortgage on the ship is the first debt to be paid. Significantly, Rene's achievement of this small amount of security for Ron in the midst of self-destructive acts by the Bonhams, the Finers, and Orloffski is the last thing mentioned in the book and it implies that Grant should have looked up to Rene and Ben Spicehandler as his models for manhood instead of to the callous and irresponsible skindivers and their associates. However, it should be noted that Rene's wisdom does not extend to his handling of women since his wife legitimately complains that he demanded "purity" of her when they married but now seeks affairs with younger women, whereas Ben's lack of foresight on finances is shown by his failure to inquire about the daily charges on the cruise, thus giving Bonham the chance to ask exorbitant prices at the end of the voyage.

Apart from his involvement with Lucky, the only experience which seems worth the risk Grant has taken is his
mystical excitement in the cave during his first dive at sea. On the way down, Grant feels that "everything, all problems, all plans, all worries, 'mistress', her husband, new girl, the new play, sometimes even consciousness of Self itself, seemed to have been swept from his mind by the intensity of the tasting of this new experience, and new world" (GTTW, 12). This escape from the confinement of Self prepares him for the "strange spiritual excitement" he develops in the cave (GTTW, 16) and for his feeling that the "seventy-eyed monster, all head and almost no body, resting on the sand floor" might be "the Great Being Himself" (GTTW, 17). Moreover, Grant feels "himself beginning to get an erection in the dim stillness" as he always did "when he found himself alone in an empty church" and he asks himself, "Was it the privacy? . . . Or was it maybe the nearness of God? the nearness of Unknowable? (GTTW, 17). He vows to return so that he can "masturbate, come like a fury, and watch his milky semen swirl and mingle with the green water which itself swirled about his body with every tinest movement" (GTTW, 17), but when he does go back, he finds that he doesn't want to masturbate and instead swims "back and forth across the cavern delighting in the movement of the water against his naked crotch" (GTTW, 205). Furthermore, immediately after he leaves the cave, he "quietly" and "mysteriously" loses his erection (GTTW, 205).
Clearly, the scenes in the cave show Grant the awe-inspiring yet friendly and beneficial aspect of the sea. However, he also observes the darker side of the sea when he dives to retrieve the car containing the dead Jamaican businessman and Anna Bottomley. Although the businessman and the girl have brought about their own destruction through reckless sexual play while driving, the sea is the instrument which kills them. When Grant accompanies Bonham to recover the bodies, though, he is confronted by an image of birth with the density of the sea reminiscent of amniotic fluid and the anchorchain stretched from the ship to the car like an umbilical cord. In addition, this hint of the indivisibility of birth and death is compounded by Grant's impression that the lifting of the businessman's body looks "for all the world like some dead soul rising to some skim-milk heaven" (GTTW, 294). The sea embraces everything in the same way that the process of evolution does so that self-destruction blends into the movement toward oneness with God.

Since Lucky is unable to share these underwater experiences with Ron, she sees only the cruelty of the attacks which he and the other men make on the fish and the dangerousness of the situations he faces down there. She has recently lost her South American lover Raoul because he had insisted on taking part in the revolution in his
country and had been killed in this effort. Hence, what she wants now is a man who can assume the role of her father and protect her from every hazard and hardship in life. She has become the victim of a feminine variation of Ron's obsession with his childhood memory of his father as a man of immense stature and power.

Lucky too regards herself as a child, but unlike Ron she feels no compulsion to try to measure up to an adult world that seems beyond her reach. Instead, she longs for a man who will guide her firmly and yet cater to her childish whims. However, her father looms so large in her mind that it will be hard for her to consider any man, including Grant, on the same level as her father. For example, on one occasion when she recollects several of her worst experiences with men, she thinks to herself that "the only really honorable man with real honor she had ever met was her Daddy" (GTTW, 252). She long continues to feel that if her father had remained alive throughout her girlhood, she might not have become so promiscuous or she might, at least, have formed a different opinion of herself. At any rate, she would then have had somebody to lean on who would have relieved her of the burden of self-responsibility. What she is seeking now through personal relationships is a man who will accept this kind of responsibility for her life and who can then be blamed for everything she finds wrong with herself.
Lucky's attempts to find a man who will take control of her life indicate that she is succumbing to the ultra-feminine woman's wish for dependence. Like Karen Holmes and Dawn Hirsh, she fears that she can't gain security through her own efforts and yearns to have a man provide it for her. She wants a man to make her feel safe and protected.

However, no matter how much Lucky longs for a man who can dominate her, she also wants to be free to make her own decisions and to live as she pleases. Thus, she has mixed emotions about authority in any form. Her mingled wish to be both dominant and subservient to a man is similar to Grant's longing to be simultaneously master and slave to a woman. On the one hand, she likes to have Ron lie with his arm over her belly because she appreciates "that feeling of being held down like that, by a man, by a real man. Authority" (GTTW, 93), but on the other hand, she enjoys the sense that when men "came, came in you, you owned them then" (GTTW, 261). In this latter response, she resembles Dawn Hirsh not only in her pleasure at the thought of gaining a hold over the man during sexual intercourse, but also in her discovery that this hold does not extend beyond the sex act.

Lucky's combined desires for submission and for dominance are embodied in her relationships with two of her
past lovers, Raoul and Forbes Morgan. With Raoul she was compelled to play a secondary role, letting him make the major decisions about both of their lives for as long as she chose to remain with him. The one time she rebelled by taking a lover when Raoul temporarily left her alone in Kingston, she allowed Raoul to hustle her off to New York the moment he returned and heard that she had been playing around. Furthermore, she admired Raoul for taking such a firm, possessive measure with her, although she also felt bitter about what she had done. Later, she expects Ron to be equally hard and quick in responding to her flirting with Grointon, though his interference would only enflame the resentment she already feels against him. However, when Grant's pride makes him refuse to acknowledge this provocation as Raoul had, she considers his response not only a sign of weakness but also a semi-invitation to let Jim make love to her. She begins to wonder then if Grant isn't another version of Forbes, the lover whom she had completely under her thumb. Lucky can dominate Forbes as fully as Carol has dominated Grant in the past, and she feels as complacent about this power as Carol has felt. Unlike Carol, however, Lucky is also sickened by this power. Even though Forbes could now provide Lucky with the security she is looking for, she rejects him because he can't give her the strength and authoritativeness that
she wants in a man. On the other hand, Raoul could have offered her only aggressiveness and adventurousness, and he died in the pursuit of aims which had no connection with her. Grant comes closest to satisfying her opposing desires, yet full satisfaction of them is an impossible task and she will eventually have to reach a compromise between them. She has a good chance of attaining this compromise because she stands somewhere (though not midway) between the overly demanding types, like Agnes Hirsh and Carol Abernathy, and the overly dependent types, like Mona Patterson and Louisa Gallagher.

Nevertheless, Lucky will have some difficulty making the compromise because she leans toward the extreme of ultrafeminine passiveness. When Grant invites her to Indianapolis, her roommate is the one who must arrange for the tickets and locate a ride to the airport because Lucky feels incapable of performing these tasks. Moreover, Lucky’s form of coping with her separation from Grant is to lie in bed until he contacts her again. Naturally, she is passive in sex as well. As an extension of this sexual passivity:

It turned out that Lucky, either because of the way she was built or maybe it was psychological she admitted shyly, could have a real orgasm in only one way. And Grant, whose first play about a sailor’s love affair with a Honolulu whore was more autobiographical than generally supposed and who had learned his lovemaking in one of the toughest schools in the world, was her boy. He was oral-oriented if he was anything (GTW, 56).
This penchant for cunnilingus increases her exertion of power over men in sex at the same time that it lessens her active involvement, thus forming a temporary union of her drives for dominance and submission and of Grant's similar drives as well. However, the passiveness of her role in cunnilingus is fundamental to it and also a source of delight to her. Hence, it is a sign of growth when she takes a more active part in the sex act with Ron after the night of her temptation by Grointon. Significantly, although there is a question in Grant's mind about whether her behavior is motivated by guilt, her active participation in sex pleases him more than the passive surrender that had previously delighted him.

Lucky's invitation to Grant to make love to her after he returns from his fight with Orloffski further demonstrates her new aggressiveness and concern. When Ron points out to her that he can't do it her way because of his broken nose, she quickly replies that "fucking's fine" (GTWO, 609), thus indicating that she is less interested in her own pleasure than in expressing her affection and sympathy for him. Like Grant, she had allowed herself to drift into the marriage by letting Lisa handle the arrangements for it, but she too finally has to accept her share of responsibility for the marriage in order to make it continue.
Even before she met Grant, though, Lucky's propensities toward passivity and admiration for the forceful, athletic male had been tempered by her realization that the super-virile man often had something awry in his character. For example, her college affair with Tad Falker, the captain of the football team at Cornell, had taught her that such men generally "preferred the company of men to being with a woman" (GTTW, 262). Moreover, she had then developed a theory of the Circle of the Sexes out of the combination of her experience with Falker and her study of the Circle of Politique in her Political Science courses. Just as the Circle of Politique posits that "you could only go so far Right without becoming Left; and you could only go so far Left without becoming Right," Lucky's Circle of the Sexes argues that "when you became more Masculine than normal, than 9 o'clock, you automatically came closer and closer to the Feminine" (GTTW, 263). When she examines the loutish brute Orloffski in the light of this theory, Lucky can spot certain feminine traits in his personality, such as "his physical vanity, his preoccupation with his own beauty (beauty?!), his posing," and "his preening" (GTTW, 263). Moreover, these analyses of Orloffski and the Circle of the Sexes not only fit in well with her conclusion that the super pro-males "were all fags together, in a totally non-fag non-sexual way" (GTTW, 263), but also
place her at a psychological distance from such men. However, the analyses should also have warned her against the dangers of trying to be more Feminine than Feminine and of letting herself become too passive, yet it takes her a lot longer to apply this part of the theory.

The main thing which clouds Lucky's judgment of men is her sense of having been deceived by them so many times. In recollecting the men she has been involved with, she feels that there was "not one of them but who had lied to her about something" (GTTW, 262). However, the act of treachery that upsets her most in retrospect is Buddy Landsbaum's attempt to give her to the writer Clint Upton in return for his assistance on one of Buddy's films. This offer parallels Grant's attempt to share Carol with a Navy buddy. Like Carol in the previous situation, Lucky feels degraded by her past lover's lack of respect for her as a woman and as an independent agent who has the right to choose her sexual partners.

Even though Lucky has never stopped wanting to find a man she can trust, she feels less and less able to put her faith in any man after each successive deception. This is why she is so disturbed when she learns that Grant lied to her about his involvement with Carol. She begins to think that he is like all the other men she has known and worries that his ability to lie to her so successfully then means that he can deceive her again in the future. Hence,
she is confronted with the problem of how to live with such distrust toward Grant in the same way that Grant must cope with his suspicions about her. Both Lucky and Grant have to ask themselves whether it is worthwhile to continue a relationship in which trust has been violated, and they must overcome a bitter struggle within themselves before they can accept each other.

One of the worst effects of Buddy's effort to trade off Lucky was that it made her feel like a whore. This was the first time she had been forced to look at herself in this way, and the whole affair infused her with an anguished sense of guilt. Moreover, she continues to feel the impact of her "horrible convent childhood" which had only been partially mitigated by her Catholic father's advice "to listen to what they said, but believe what [she] wanted" and by his explanation that the Catholics "were in business like everybody else. Like every ideology" (GTTW, 99). She still carries the seeds of strict Catholic morality within her, and this leads her to view herself as sinful and possibly Evil. In her eyes, the fact that Grant had intercourse with Carol after leaving Lucky in New York means that he had regarded the relationship they had begun then as a casual one and had considered her "a two-week party-girl whore" (GTTW, 424). However, she has established such a sophisticated veneer that it takes Grant
a long time to pierce through it and discover that "she was ashamed! . . . She thought of herself as a whore secretly, apparently, but could not face or bear admitting that about herself to herself. So she turned it around and made it look as though Grant (or someone) thought of her that way—and then hated him (them) for it. . . . And it was probably all as automatic and uncontrollable as Grant's own 'rejection syndrome'" (GTTW, 460). Therefore, just as Grant has to achieve a large measure of self-acceptance in order to free himself to love her, Lucky has to conquer much of her guilt and self-hatred to become able to express her love for him.

Lucky's excessive shame over her lack of sexual virtue prior to marriage points up another flaw in the concept of ultrafemininity. Although Lucky has made no effort to live in accordance with the traditional image of the "good girl," she despises herself because she doesn't fit this image. Her guilt over her sexual indulgences resembles that of Karen Holmes and Louisa Gallagher. All three come to hate themselves because they feel that they shouldn't have as strong a sexual appetite as they do. In addition, all three are ashamed of their bodies. Louisa is the most extreme case, since she continually pulls her skirt down and draws men's eyes to her legs, but Karen and Lucky are also affected by such impulses. Karen often stares with
disgust at the reflection of her body in the mirror and Lucky feels intense remorse over her nude ballet in the water.

Nevertheless, in spite of her shame over her past and her longing to escape from the empty and rugged pattern of life she had established in New York, Lucky wants to hold on to the freedom and irresponsibility she had enjoyed before joining her life to Ron's. She has been accustomed to having her own way and to indulging her sexual desire with any man who attracted her. However, since Ron has made it clear that he regards marriage as a monogamous institution, she is now compelled either to accept this limitation on her sexual life or to abandon this marriage. Unfortunately, this demand for a monogamous sex life is made more and more difficult for her by the increasing estrangement between Grant and herself. Even before their marriage, Lucky had resented the inhibitions she imposed on herself as a result of her attachment to Ron and had felt a need to get even with him for having taken away her independence. Therefore, when the incident at the nude swimming party teaches her that Ron is vulnerable, she decides to make him "pay for everything. For leaving her in New York like that, for making her pull that silly nude bathing stunt and embarrassing her this afternoon, for bringing her down her into this stupid
drunken weekend with that bunch of creepy sick drunks. Make him pay, most of all, for having made her fall in love with him” (GTTW, 248). Her objection to the loss of freedom brought about by love is even stronger than Karen Holmes's had been. She also feels as powerful an urge to make a man pay for hurting her as Agnes Hirsh had felt toward Frank. With the additional motive provided by Grant's deception about Carol, Lucky's ideal form of making him pay would be to commit adultery with Grointon. However, this form of revenge involves the risk of exacerbating her whore complex as well as destroying her marriage. Moreover, her desire to strike back at Grant for undermining her independence has always been accompanied by a fear that she would be punished for her past life by being deprived of Grant. Hence, even if she did have sex with Grointon, she discovered that the renewed excitement wasn't worth the risk of destroying her future with Grant.

The special temptation which Grointon holds out to Lucky is the possibility of fulfilling two of her fantasies. He is linked in her mind with "a cocky, dirty, arrogant young fellow" whom she had seen standing in front of "a rag-tag motordrome" and whom she had imagined herself taking on "as a one-or-two-night-stand stud and then gently but firmly" dismissing to see how he would react (GTTW, 361). However, "sticking to her theory that fantasy
indulged is not only fantasy lost but might also be ac-

tively dangerous, she had declined" to become involved

with this man (GTTW, 362). Nevertheless, the image of

her seduction of the man at the motordrome and the urge
to fulfill it remain with her and are brought to the sur-
face again when she meets Grointon. In addition, going
to bed with Grointon would satisfy her "played-out-in-
full-imaginative sexual fantasy of her screwing another
man in front of Ron" (GTTW, 235). Yet, as Ron himself
warns her, "fantasy isn't reality" and ultimately she must
choose between the two (GTTW, 353).

The main obstacle to Lucky's choice of reality is
her belief that she herself is not real, a belief which
is comparable to Grant's impression that he is still a
little boy. As a result of such beliefs, Grant and Lucky
place little value on their decisions. Lucky feels that
"whatever she said or did didn't really count. . . . Take
her feeling about telling him about the $10,000 wedding
present her mother was going to give them. . . . When she
said it she knew it wasn't true, but that didn't matter
because it would never come home to roost, because she
wasn't real, and none of this was real, and so it didn't
count" (GTTW, 254).

Lucky's sense of her own unreality is clearly tied
to her ultrafeminine desire to be charming. When she
remembers her lie about the wedding present from her mother, she also reflects that "the only way she could describe it was that a sort of 'evil spirit' of 'Charm', a naughty devil of charm, had possessed her" (GTTW, 254). The chief danger in being charming is that it involves a large amount of role-playing. For example, when Grant introduced Lucky to his friends, she decided to charm all of them by trying to live up to their expectations of what a woman should be rather than by attempting to act naturally. The problem is that when a woman—or a man—plays too many roles, she may lose contact with her inner self and begin to wonder who she is. She may also separate herself from her individual observations about life and her personal values.

Having sex with Grointon might also have seemed unreal to Lucky, but it could have had devastatingly real consequences for both Ron and herself; she came very close to trading a potentially rewarding reality for the brief satisfaction of a daydream. Still, either by reasoning it out in time to resist temptation or by succumbing to Grointon and rediscovering the emptiness of such seductions, Lucky learns the importance of making meaningful choices and of substituting responsibility for risk. This discovery parallels Grant's realization that manhood demands maturity of judgment rather than childish confrontations with danger. As a result of this lesson, Lucky finally
accepts her own reality and assumes the burden of accountability for her decisions. However, because she makes her commitment to this form of responsibility first, she is subjected to a severe test of her new convictions by Grant's suspiciousness and anger. It is only at the end when both Lucky and Grant have matured enough to shoulder their reciprocal obligations toward each other that their marriage has a chance of survival.

Jones's penchant for creating and examining parallel situations and personality traits has paid enormous dividends in his treatment of Ron and Lucky. He has more than amply reinforced his theme of the Circle of the Sexes by his careful and convincing analysis of the Grants' large similarities amid obvious differences. For example, he has demonstrated in elaborate and telling detail how they both come to accept the fact that they have a mixture of "masculine" and "feminine" traits in their characters, even though Grant retains his full share of aggressiveness and Lucky continues to lean heavily toward passiveness. In addition, he has presented a credible picture of their progression to the point where they can place maturity and responsibility above risk-taking as future goals. Above all, Jones has shown us how Grant and Lucky, like the more perceptive members of Charlie Company, learn that a humane masculinity and a humane femininity are not intimidated by
the popular preconceptions about what a man or woman should be and lean toward neither sadism nor masochism. This is one of the sanest and most adult depictions of the relations between men and women in American literature.

Jones's two most recently published novels also stress the need for men and women to refrain from guiding their lives by the popular notions about manhood and womanhood and to find a way of expressing their sexual identity which would lead toward neither sadism nor masochism. In The Merry Month of May, the narrator Jack Hartley has attained a fairly high level of maturity and sensitivity through his awareness of his failure to accomplish the major goals he had set for himself. In addition, he has wisely accepted a toughminded yet sensitive woman as his Master in several important survival techniques. Moreover, Jack's compassion and understanding contrast favorably with the aggressive selfishness of the more traditional male figure Harry Gallagher. In spite of a few remaining illusions which he loses in the course of the novel, Jack displays the best approach to attaining a truly humane manhood.

Although Frank "Lobo" Davies, the narrator of A Touch of Danger, starts out at a lower level than did Jack Hartley, he too undergoes a process of spiritual evolution.
Like Jack, Lobo has had his ego reduced through his sense of having failed in both his work and his marriage. Moreover, even though Lobo has always been overly aggressive and overly combative, he has at least learned to limit the injuries he inflicts on others and to accept his inability to secure any form of absolute justice. In addition, he has advanced enough spiritually to serve as Master to a girl called Sweet Marie who has let herself be abused by others. Like all true Masters, Lobo tries to teach Marie how to take care of herself and how to move toward his own level of insight and sensitivity. He finds Marie an apt pupil since she also has acquired humility through consciousness of her mistakes and since she has begun to come to terms with her isolation in the world. He is further impressed by her combination of courage and ability in the "masculine" activity of skindiving. Thus, Lobo and Marie provide another example of the similarity between men and women who have reached a certain level of spiritual progress.

Both Jack Hartley and Lobo Davies place a heavy emphasis on the need to act responsibly. In this way, they carry forward Ron Grant's final call for the replacement of risk-taking by responsibility as the criterion for judging men and women. The question which this raises about the wisdom or folly of acting in a "responsible" manner is the topic of the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

INDIVIDUAL, SOCIAL AND KARMIC RESPONSIBILITY

Even though the responsible man is clearly superior to the irresponsible man, he has not yet attained the highest level. The responsible man has learned that the greatest danger of irresponsible behavior lies in its close association with animal selfishness, but he has not discerned that his own efforts to help other people are also prompted by vanity. His own vanity is probably a function of the mental level, and it has its origin in the belief that one person can arrange another person's life for him better than he could arrange it for himself. Hence, before the responsible man can move on to the level of the spiritual man, he must find out how to display his compassion without seeking to alter the object of this compassion. At the same time, enough, he must be careful not to elevate this conception of noninterfering compassion into an invariable ideal since, as Bob French discovered to his sorrow, you cannot avoid the burdens of interfering and of assuming responsibility for other people's decisions when someone thrusts these burdens upon you. In addition, the responsible man should keep in mind that a person who has
mastered some area of experience can offer limited assistance to a Disciple who has already learned enough to be able to comprehend and to act on the basis of this guidance; however, he should never forget that a Master cannot teach a Disciple anything that he is not prepared to learn.

The most important thing the responsible man has yet to apprehend is that he cannot control the thoughts and actions of other people; he can only control his own. The only true responsibility is individual, not social. A man must shoulder full accountability for the way he has conducted his life and not try to lay this burden on anyone else. At the same time, he must come to regard even his worst mistakes with neither horror nor guilt but instead must learn to accept them as an essential part of his spiritual education. Once a man has evolved to this level of perception, he will be freed from any longing to change the world.

Like the responsible man's desire to help others, both the radical's dream of transforming society and the conservative's need to keep it unchanged spring from pride. Both the radical and the conservative believe that they alone know the best way for everyone else to live. They too must be taught to surrender their pride and to develop a form of compassion which will not lead them to interfere in the lives of others. The way in which the radical and
conservative are educated is through the conflict between them. When each tries to force his subjective vision of the world on the other, he makes the ego-reducing discoveries that he is not as competent as he had thought that he was and that the vision which he had prized so highly is an illusion. This means that the relationship between the radical and the conservative is a Karmic one.

In a Karmic relationship, each person involved arouses a strong feeling of love or hate in the others and brings about a collision between his subjective view of reality and that of the others. The result of this collision is that each person loses part of his illusions and becomes aware of the inevitability of his own and everyone else's isolation in the world. Hence, even though a Karmic relationship is a painful binding force, a person can and should free himself from it by abandoning the pride and the illusions that have been holding him captive. In obtaining his release from this Karmic attachment, a person will stop blaming his misfortunes on the others in the relationship and will acknowledge his own role in shaping the circumstances of his life. At this moment, the person gains his first real chance of moving beyond the suffering caused by the desires of his ego and of eventually becoming the Master of his own progress toward reunion with God.
As was the case in *Some Came Running*, *The Thin Red Line*, and other previously discussed works, problems relating to matters of individual responsibility and Karmic relationships play an important role in *The Merry Month of May*. In this novel, Jones examines the 1968 Paris student rebellion which began in an impulse of social concern and ended in an expression of self-destructive irresponsibility. Jones compares this social conflict to the Karmic father-son battle between Harry and Hill Gallagher and implies that both conflicts have their origin in the pride and the illusions of each of the participants. Yet the result of these two conflicts is ultimately beneficial since the comfort and complacency of everyone involved is shaken in a way that will lead them further along the painful road to self-discovery, self-responsibility, noninterfering compassion, and spiritual insight.

*The Merry Month of May* is clearly Jones's most ambitious attempt to probe the social implications of his spiritual philosophy. He has employed a lengthy series of actual events as the background for this novel and indicated some ways in which the behavior of recent historical figures like Charles de Gaulle and Dany Cohn-Bendit fits the basic pattern of the spiritual evolution process. Most of the critics have commented on the accuracy of Jones's observation of these events, though they might not have
agreed with his philosophical overview if they had understood it in its entirety. Jones has demonstrated, however, that his philosophy can be applied to actions which occurred in the "real" world and not merely to behavior which took place in his own fictional universe.

_The Merry Month of May_ also differs from Jones's five previous novels in two other respects; it deals with social conflict in terms of social comedy and it employs extensive symbolism in far less obtrusive ways than _The Pistol_ did. Jones maintains an ironic tone throughout which casts all the characters, including the narrator, in a comic light and which prevents the reader from becoming emotionally involved in the many political and personal clashes in the novel. This lack of involvement should leave the reader free to contemplate the various symbolic meanings of the book.

The distance which Jones places between us and the characters is a mixed achievement, however. It works well in various scenes involving Jack Hartley, such as his half-ludicrous, half-serious temptations by Samantha Everton and Louisa Gallagher, and in the whole account of the students' revolutionary activities and the government's counter-stratagems. Yet the distancing is never quite right in relation to the three Gallaghers who are the central figures in the book. We are simultaneously too far
removed from the Gallaghers to care what happens to them and too close to view them primarily as objects of satire. The Merry Month of May was potentially Jones's finest work, but it is seriously flawed by his failure to make the Gallaghers either vital and sympathetic figures of tragedy or sharply defined caricatures.

Although Jones has apparently sought to develop the three Gallaghers into a cross between individual characters and representative types, he has not succeeded in either direction. He does not give the Gallaghers the same complex, particularized attention which he lavished on Ron and Lucky Grant; neither does he perceive in them the kind of basic, resonant qualities that he found in Welsh and Witt. Instead, he has made them vehicles for his social commentary and turned them into symbols in much the same way that he did the "characters" in The Pistol. Even though Jones's ability to use characters as symbols is far more sophisticated here than it was in his earlier novel, he makes the same mistake of treating these characters as lifeless puppets. He is mainly concerned with showing us the social effects of the temporary nationwide abandonment of responsibility that was provoked by the Paris student rebellion, and he wants us to see the Gallaghers as a small-scale reflection of this national event and the powerful social forces that shaped it. However, Jones has
manipulated the downfall of the Gallaghers too openly to make it seem either convincing or disturbing. Moreover, the patterns which he has chosen for the Gallaghers are virtually cliches of our time, and he has added few new insights about the personality changes involved in these patterns. Harry is simply the old-time radical whose relinquishment of social responsibility leads him into a life of callous hedonism; Hill takes the typical plunge from extreme political activism to extreme mystical passiveness; and Louisa is the fanatical idealist whose one moment of irresponsibility shatters her.

The main problem with Jones's depiction of the Gallaghers is that he has not fleshed out the positive traits which they supposedly possessed before their downfall. We are told in a single paragraph about the sacrifices which Harry made in the past for the sake of his social concern, but we find it hard to believe in this concern because it fits in so little with his present character. Jones concentrates so much on Harry's latent selfishness and his swift descent into irresponsibility and viciousness that we think of Harry as a bastard from beginning to end. Similarly, Jones makes us see Hill's desire to expose the hypocrisy behind his father's claim to radicalism and to hurt his father far more clearly than his wish to improve the plight of the downtrodden. Furthermore, Louisa's
idealism seems too far out of touch with reality to be meaningful. Yet if we can't believe that there is a positive side to the Gallaghers' expressed sense of social responsibility, then we can't regard their flight into irresponsibility as destructive in any way or feel that they have lost anything valuable by it. Moreover, if we can't believe that they will eventually discover that they have lost something valuable through their temporary folly, then we can't perceive the basis for their future spiritual evolution. We can never share Jack Hartley's sadness over their fate because we have never been allowed to share his illusion that the Gallaghers are the "happy American family" which has everything, including a sense of social concern.

Jones has, however, accomplished many things in *The Merry Month of May*. Jack Hartley, Samantha-Marie Everton, and minor characters like Dave Weintraub, Anne-Marie, Ferenc Hofmann-Beck, and Martine are strong creations and display the kind of vitality that is missing in the Gallaghers. In addition, Jones has portrayed the various activities and ramifications of the student revolution in complex and fascinating detail. Moreover, his use of symbols, such as the river, the barricades, the laying of the paving stones, and the historical background of several famous buildings in Paris, appears to be simultaneously
natural and carefully worked out. Thus, this book could have been extremely good if Jones's depiction of the Gal­laghers had been more satisfactory. Instead, it is only moderately good: splendid in conception, but half-successful in execution.

Throughout The Merry Month of May, Jones sharply focuses our attention on matters relating to responsibility. His narrator, Jack Hartley, constantly stresses the importance of acting in a responsible manner and, as the novel progresses, begins frequently denouncing the irresponsible behavior of the French government, the student rebels, the Gallagher family (except for McKenna), Samantha-Marie Everton, Sirhan Sirhan, and himself. Moreover, Jones implies that there is a connection between the havoc wrought by the collective decision of the students, citizens, and government of France to take a holiday from responsibility, and the disruption of the Gallagher family caused by their own and Samantha's decision to place their personal desires above their commitments for a while. As always in Jones's fiction, though, such irresponsibility has value since it leads individuals to experience the woe that induces in­sight. Although Jack Hartley argues that the aim of civilized education is to teach the individual self-control and that "the whole point of civilization is to help each
other make life less cruel, "1 he too discovers that the only way anyone learns anything is through the agony of having erred. After all, Jack's own enlightenment is the product of his recognition that he is "a failed poet, a failed novelist," and "a drop-out of a husband" (MMM, 11).

In Jones's letter of November 7, 1972, he wrote that "Jack Hartley, though occasionally weak and falling far short of his own ideals, is the modern 'Man of Honor' ... caught and held in a society where honor has no place, spiritually emasculated even more by the society he dwells in than by his personal withdrawal by choice." This role may not be apparent at first since Jack often seems a comic character because of his concern over the sanctity of his morning toilet ritual, his devotion to his favorite pissoir, his employment of an umbrella on even the sunniest days as a talisman against rain and other disasters, and his fumbling with the umbrella to disguise his shock at finding Samantha nude in her hotel room. However, he gradually gains the reader's respect by the favorable contrast between his behavior and that of almost

1 James Jones, The Merry Month of May (New York: Delacorte Press, 1971), p. 272. The other works of fiction which I will deal with in this chapter are, in order of publication: The Ice-Cream Headache (New York: Delacorte Press, 1968); A Touch of Danger (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1973). Subsequent references will be to these editions; the works will be identified by the following abbreviations: MMM, ICH, TOD.
everyone else. Jack always strives to do the right thing, though forces outside and inside himself conspire to defeat his intentions. He does have illusions which lead him to inflict as well as to receive sorrow. His most persistent illusion is his belief that decent actions can influence events in a directly beneficial way and that humane intervention can bring careless or bitter people to their senses.

Jack's first major intervention is based not only on his illusion that he knows what is good for other people and can get them to do it, but also on his misconception of the Gallaghers as the "perfect happy-American family" (MMM, 13). He wants to believe in the strength of the ties between the Gallaghers because of his distress over the failure of his own marriage. However, he must later admit that perhaps it was foolish to talk Louisa into confronting Harry about his other women, even though Jack can never regret the birth of his goddaughter McKenna which resulted from this confrontation. Jack takes his role as Godfather almost literally, yet his failure to bring about a second reconciliation when he gets Harry to confront Louisa about Sam suggests that he was not as responsible for the first reconciliation--or for McKenna's birth--as he had imagined. To the extent that he is responsible for the first reconciliation, he has no cause for self-congratulation since the subsequent breakup of the family leaves
all of its members more badly scarred than they would have been if Jack had let Louisa return to America with Hill as she had intended.

Jack's decision to tell Hill about his guess that Samantha has gone to Cannes with his father is equally unsuccessful. Although Jack takes time to reflect what he should do in this case and tries to consider what would be best for Hill on a long-range basis, he only manages to tell Hill a truth which Hill is not prepared to face.

Jack's subsequent effort to reach Hill when Hill is on the point of departing for his spiritual hide-out in the Spanish caves is also a failure. When Jack tries to tell Hill about his own vague comprehension of the purifying function of suffering, an idea which he has gleaned from the way his hand was healed through contact—and union—with the blood of the deer he shot with an arrow, all Hill channels through to his mind is Jack's statement that this incident made him decide to stop killing. Since Hill only listens to those comments which reinforce his own beliefs, Jack never has a chance of convincing him to stay or of provoking him to reconsider his newfound approach to life.

Jack's efforts to get Harry to place his family obligations above his fantasy and to get Samantha to abandon all contact with the Gallaghers fare no better than his pleas to Hill. Harry sneers at his concern and Samantha
mocks his manhood. The most Jack can get Harry to do is
to pause in Rome to find out whether his wife's suicide
attempt will turn her into a vegetable or not before con­tinuing on his trip to Israel in pursuit of Sam. Jack's
session with Samantha is even less fruitful and more em­barrassing since Sam takes advantage of the occasion to
subject Jack to a temptation that both shocks and allures
him. However, Jack's resistance to Sam's wiles points up
the way Harry could have resisted as well—if he had
chosen to.

The difficulty of making the right choice becomes
clear when Louisa asks Jack to make love to her to reassure
her of her womanhood after Harry has accused her of being
a lesbian and to even things up for Harry's affair with
Sam. This time Jack refuses to interfere in the family
quarrel and takes the honorable course of refusing to sleep
with his best friend's wife, even though he has now become
soured on this "friendship." Yet afterwards he has to
question whether it wouldn't have been better for everyone
if he had done as she wished. Certainly it would have been
the only form of consolation that Louisa was ready to ac­cept then. Still, there is no guarantee that such an af­fair might have made any difference since Louisa had tried
to kill herself more than once in the past. Even if Jack
had taken Louisa sexually--on his Second Empire couch or
elsewhere—she might have been comforted only temporarily or she might even have come to regard Jack as another betrayer out to take advantage of her. After all, her mentally deranged view that everyone in the hospital is conspiring against her is merely an extension of her habitual feeling that every man is a sexual predator with designs on her body. Thus, an affair with Jack would surely have confirmed her distrust of men.

Finally, Jack's endeavors to help Louisa in the hospital also prove to be useless. His attempt to loosen one of Louisa's straps to ease her physical discomfort almost enables her to free herself from the apparatus which is keeping her body alive, and this particular failure seems symbolic of all Jack's efforts to act responsibly. Moreover, Jack's struggle to talk Louisa into saving herself seems equally symbolic—and equally futile. Edith de Chambrolet's speech to Louisa to quit all her nonsense and start getting well is no more than a slight parody of Jack's one-sided conversations with Louisa. Jack's score as a do-gooder is a strike-out.

Jack's personal effectiveness has long been hindered by his inability to respond quickly in an emotional situation. This flaw is first revealed when Louisa attacks him for not having joined forces with Hill and the other students in their rebellion. Jack becomes "upset" at being
"placed suddenly in the position of the villain" (MMM, 85). Later, when Jack finds Sam naked in her hotel room, he is "so taken aback that whatever [he] had meant to say to her completely fled [his] mind" (MMM, 268). In addition, Jack feels that the reason he was unable to offer any real assistance to Hill may be that "that sudden mysticism routine of his threw me" (MMM, 297). Furthermore, his inability to respond to Louisa's request that he have an affair with her comes partly because she sprang this plea on him too swiftly and partly because he "just never had thought of her that way" (MMM, 322).

Jack's biggest flaw, however, is his overprotectiveness. The special objects of his concern are Louisa and McKenna, but at times he also wants to take Hill, Harry, Ferenc Hofmann-Beck, and the student body of the Sorbonne under his wing. He refuses to consider taking Louisa into potential riot areas and tries to prevent her from obtaining knowledge of any situation that might be disturbing to her. Later, he threatens Weintraub with some undefined reprisal if Weintraub tells Louisa about Harry's affair with Sam. Jack's protectiveness continues even near the end when he is concerned with keeping McKenna from learning about her father's flight to Israel and her mother's attempt at suicide. The danger in such overprotectiveness, as Hill had pointed out earlier in relation to
McKenna, is that it "spoils" the person who is protected and leaves him little prepared to cope with life's difficulties.

Yet in spite of all Jack's failures and flaws, he retains our sympathy and respect because of his humility and concern for others. When he tells Weintraub that he knew in advance that de Gaulle is about to release enough gasoline to the people for the Pentecost weekend, thus ending the thrust of the student rebellion, Jack immediately admits that his ego had prompted him to mention his information, and he reflects to himself afterwards, "I didn't much like myself. Damned ego" (MMM, 262). Moreover, although much of his reason for trying to help the Gallaghers is his desire to preserve his illusion that happy, close-knit family life is possible and desirable, he persists in offering assistance to them long after they have lost all pretence of remaining a family unit.

Like the barowner in "A Bottle of Cream" who "would like to be able to say Chet Poore and the episode of the bottle changed [his] life in some way or another" but who does "not honestly think it did" (ICH, 182), Jack comes to recognize the small effect which anyone has on anyone else's life. In addition, he wisely concludes that he can't alter the Gallaghers' mistakes or their misery and that he must accept things as they are. However, he also
feels that this need not mean that he should abandon his sense of responsibility or isolate himself. During the time when he had contemplated driving Louisa and McKenna to Holland to get them out of danger from the student rebellion as well as away from news of the affair between Harry and Sam, Jack turned to Ferenc Hofmann-Beck because he needed someone to confide in. Even though Ferenc could make no useful suggestion for improving matters, Jack felt "somehow relieved" and "suddenly, for no apparent reason, [he] liked [Ferenc] very much" (MMM, 253). From this experience, Jack learned that while such contacts change nothing, it is still valuable and comforting to touch and be touched by somebody else's spirit in this way—if only briefly.

The chief index of Jack's development toward acceptance and compassionate understanding is his response to the river which represents life itself and, more specifically, the path of evolution. After Weintraub's visit on the day that the police take over the Sorbonne, Jack looks out of his window and reflects that "it was always there, that sadness of the river, of the flowing of the river" (MMM, 28). Later, at a time shortly before Martine calls him, Jack thinks to himself:

It was one of those lag periods, one of those spells that come, when a bachelor's life doesn't seem all that good after all and you are inclined to start asking yourself what the hell
it all means, and what the hell is it really worth? That was no kind of mood to have living alongside the dark, flowing river Seine twinkle-oily under the tall quai streetlights. And yet I knew I would be drawn helplessly to my windows, to stare at it, and its dark, masked, massive indifference to my death (MMM, 161).

Most of the other references also associate the river with darkness and sorrow.

In spite of these qualities, or rather because he eventually recognizes their meaning and value, Jack starts to turn to the river for comfort. For example, when Harry tells Jack about his confrontation with Louisa and his decision to leave her for Sam, Jack looks "away, out the window at the river," as he listens since he thinks "that might help" (MMM, 312). Moreover, as the disasters involving the Gallaghers and those closely associated with them add up, Jack increasingly stares at the river (MMM, 316, 317, 328, 332, 353, 354, and 355). What he begins to see there is that all these incidents are part of the flow of history and the flow of the spiritual evolution process.

Jack's final significant encounter with the river occurs after the student rebellion has run its course and the Gallagher family has divided into separate suffering tributaries. At this time, Jack is attracted by the music of two young students who presumably took part in the rebellion and who are now reduced to playing for money on a public thoroughfare. They are playing traditional British
and Scottish marching songs and ballads, thus suggesting the students' links with the past and with the flow of history. Furthermore, the place they have chosen to perform these songs is a bridge which is scheduled to be replaced soon by a modern, super-highway bridge, just as the bridge the students had attempted to build with the workers and their fellow citizens had been torn down in favor of the government's smoother, anti-individual one. As Jack listens, the "thin, brave, piping music" spreads "upriver in the breeze," thus reflecting the courageous continuance of each soul in the evolutionary process and the strong, brave beginning each soul makes in each new incarnation (MMM, 360). It heartens Jack to see that the students have the determination to persist in facing life in spite of the inevitable further pain that awaits them, and he becomes aware of the "lengthening sunlight" as he walks home (MMM, 361).

In contrast to Jack, Harry Gallagher increasingly pursues the path of irresponsibility. Eventually, Jack notices that Harry has developed "a very cruel mouth . . . like the mouth of an Arab pasha as the Victorians used to draw them" (MMM, 276). This mouth has appropriately been fitted to Sam's "street Arab grin" (MMM, 132 and 140). Thus, both of them are clearly linked to the "silly little Arab immigrant boy" Sirhan Sirhan (MMM, 300). By the time
Harry joins Sam in Israel, he has betrayed virtually everyone and everything that had any meaning for him.

First, Harry becomes as much of an enemy to his son as de Gaulle has been to the students. He resents Hill's revolutionary activities because they edge Harry out of the limelight among his family and friends. Although Harry felt he had established himself as a fighting radical on the basis of past risks and sacrifices, Hill has no interest in this past and regards Harry's present life as an ease-filled, money-protected sham. Harry therefore decides that he has to re-establish his self-image through present actions and to prove that he is a better man than his son. Even though he has long been tempted by Sam, he doesn't go after her until he sees her with Hill and deduces that they have been sleeping together. It gives an added dimension to his relationship with Sam to know that he has taken her away from his son and thereby asserted his superiority as a stud. He is also pleased to be invited by Hill's Cinema Committee to write and direct the film they are making of the revolution for propaganda purposes because this affords him another chance to crow over Hill. When Hill angrily resigns from the committee, Harry carries on the project long enough to show how much greater his experience and skill are than that of the students and then he loses interest because Hill is no longer around to compete with
him. Harry's abandonment of this project is a multiple betrayal, since he not only violates the trust placed in him by the students, but also his own radical ideals and his son's revolutionary cause. Earlier, he had upheld these same ideals at the expense of his old friend Allen Steinerwein by leading a strike against the film whose script he had written and which Steinerwein was directing. On the other hand, his main reason for leading the strike was that it enabled him to demonstrate that he was still a dedicated radical.

Even though Harry's selfishness and indifference toward others have always been latent in his character, the key to his renunciation of all his commitments and concern for others is his involvement with Sam. As their affair progresses, Harry comes to resemble her in his disavowal of responsibility, duty, love, sympathy, and tenderness. The source of Harry's absorption with Sam is purely his "Fantasy" and the male masochistic impulses behind the fantasy. The concept of male masochism as Harry defines it from his own experience is that the man places the woman's pleasure above his own in the sex act and that through his stimulating her to experience an orgasm he obliterates her awareness of himself as the instigator of her ecstasy. Thus, the sex act as Harry desires it becomes a mixture of delight in the physical activities themselves and pain in
the thought that the woman at the point of her greatest excitement has lost all interest in him as an individual. This masochism which lies behind Harry's preoccupation with cunnilingus and which motivates his sexual proclivities with any one woman naturally becomes intensified when two women are involved, especially if they are more interested in each other than they are in him. Harry implies this need for the two women to have an interest in each other when he tells Jack that he didn't experience the same sensation when the girl who had taught him to enjoy playing with two women simultaneously teamed up with a girl who didn't get excited by touching her. This suggests that the main reason Harry is attracted to Sam and to the brand of fun she provides is that she offers him pain sugar-coated with pleasure and thus summons him to abandon comfort and complacency for the sake of the evolutionary form of education.

Harry's son Hill is also called by Sam to begin his true education, but the source of her appeal to him is different from the lure that proved so successful with his father. Apart from the probability that Sam is the first highly skilled sexual partner that Hill has had, he is drawn to her by motives similar to those which drew Dave Hirsh to Ginnie Moorehead. Jack implies that Hill may share Dave's goal of helping a socially disadvantaged girl
overcome the influence of her terrible environment when he questions Hill about why he fell in love with Sam: "Is it because she's a black girl? And you feel that's part of your Revolution? You were going to save her from something?" (MMM, 198). Although Sam's mother is a wealthy and renowned Haitian singer who has sent her daughter to the ritziest schools in Switzerland, it is likely that Hill sees her only in terms of her black skin and his doctrinaire liberal attitudes toward blacks. Just as Dave never saw the cunning side of Ginnie, Hill never sees the cunning side of Sam; he, like Dave, is the dupe of the "helpless" woman he loves. Then, like Wally Dennis over Dawn Hirsh, he goes into a tailspin because Sam left him first and because he doesn't want anyone else to do the things he had enjoyed doing with her. In short, he finds that in spite of his philosophy of sexual noninvolvement, he has become possessive.

Hill's reasons for denouncing the monogamistic approach to love and marriage are that it is unrealistic, hypocritical, and emotionally harmful. He has resented the way his parents tried to stay together in spite of extreme dissatisfaction with each other and has decided that this is an unrewarding form of existence. In place of that, he would like himself and McKenna to enter into sexual relationships without feeling concern for their
partners so that they can walk away from each relationship undamaged any time they conclude it is no longer fun. However, Hill discovers through his involvement with Sam that the evolutionary process continues in the same patterns it has operated through in the past in spite of the "ideas" anyone like himself develops to bypass or defeat it.

The problem which now arises is that Hill, again like Wally Dennis, chooses to run away from his suffering rather than to work his way through it. He has become soft because he sheltered himself by seeking out girls who were willing to serve on his own terms. Hence, he is unprepared for Sam's indifference to him after their sexual attachment. Naturally, he is doubly upset because she prefers his father, the man with whom he feels the deepest rivalry. (As Jack points out, Hill resembles his father both in his beliefs and in his actions, though his subjective vision of the world won't let him admit the similarity.) Hill has not yet realized that adherence to his philosophy of sexual indulgence devoid of personal care or risk would mean functioning on the animal level and would therefore involve greater self-betrayal than sticking to a bad marriage like that of his parents. Neither has he learned that there is more pride enmeshed in his desire to withhold himself in his sexual relationships than there would have been in the monogamistic commitment he had scorned. It is appropriate
that the worst misery he has to endure comes from a woman who both practices his philosophy and exposes his illusions about it.

The change which Hill now undergoes is ironic because it entails a total reversal of character. Before he met Sam, he was an activist who believed that his views on political and social anarchism were worthless unless he and his friends tried to put them into practice. Afterwards, he seeks a life of passivity through drugs (particularly LSD) and semi-isolated meditation in remote Spanish caves. Moreover, although he had previously struggled to assert his own convictions, he now defers to the I Ching and lets this overly general, confusing book do his thinking for him. Also, whereas he had once claimed to be working in the interest of others, he is now devoted to self-contemplation and individual salvation, though the means he has chosen are the ones least likely to assist him to his goal. The two "buddies" whom he takes with him to Spain are striving to keep him so entangled in drugs and mysticism that he won't notice how much money they are extracting from him. Moreover, Jack's impression that Hill might have considered returning to Paris if Harry hadn't followed Sam and if Louisa hadn't attempted suicide suggests that Hill will long continue to use mysticism and drugs as a shield against sorrow. However, just as his earlier effort to
protect himself through a casual approach to sex had failed, it is likely that his present attempt to gain tranquility will break down and he will be led back upward on the true path to individual salvation.

Hill's effort to evade awareness of his responsibility for his own misery is a fairly typical Jonesian pattern. For example, the three characters in "Two Legs for the Two of Us" and Sidney Greene in "Sunday Allergy" do this as well. Yet one day all of them will have to stop blaming external forces for their inner turmoil and to face the truth about their psychological and spiritual cowardice. Only when they admit this truth about themselves will they become strong enough to break off the dependent relationships they have formed with others.

Like all of these characters, Louisa Gallagher too strives to evade suffering, and, like her son, she undergoes a startling transformation of character in the process. Samantha is again the catalyst for the transformation, and the allure which Sam holds for Louisa is related to that which she held for Hill. Louisa too believes that Sam had a deprived childhood and wants to rescue her from the results of it. In her eyes, though, the source of Sam's deprivation is that she never had a proper mother since Rosalie Everton is a lesbian. However, Louisa's desire to play mother and savior to Sam ironically brings
out her own latent, unconscious lesbianism and leads her to have enough physical contact with Sam to make her feel disturbed by her husband's accusation that she has become a lesbian. Although it is unlikely that she did anything more than embrace and kiss Sam, there is little doubt that she was sexually aroused by her. Nevertheless, Louisa refuses to acknowledge this arousal and tries to have an affair with Jack to cancel out the effect of her lesbian impulses. This attempt to seduce Jack is also ironic since hitherto she had avoided any hint of sexual interest in any man other than her husband and had been obsessed with pulling her skirt down to prevent any man from being excited by her. Now she not only tells Jack she wants him to have sex with her, but she even tries to undress in front of him when he confesses his reluctance to betray his code of honor for her sake. Her further endeavor to flee from self-awareness by stuffing herself with a suicidal dosage of pills results in her being placed naked in an oxygen tent in the hospital. (Similarly, Jack's refusal to make love to her leads him to lie on top of her naked body in the hospital after he has foolishly loosened her strap.) She had placed her faith in reason and she now exists as a mental vegetable, but someday she will become aware of herself again either in this incarnation or a later one and then she will have to confront the enormity of her errors.
It was Louisa's pride which had led her both to regard herself as extremely desirable and to refuse to grant any man the right to desire her. This pride has also caused her to pin her hopes on absolute beliefs that are unattainable in practice. As Jack observed, her commitment to her New England idealism is such that when she is in certain moods, "you had the feeling . . . that if you disagreed with her even in the slightest way, you would destroy her whole psyche, crumble her all up like a handful of soda crackers" (MMN, 96). Naturally, this idealistic rigidity (which resembles that of the student revolutionaries) is one of the forces that crushes her.

At least part of the reason Louisa's inflexibility has been allowed to become so strong and so destructive is that everyone has protected her. She has never been in a position to see what happens when people try to live by such absolute standards. Thus, she can approve the possibility of Hill being hurt or killed in the revolution because it hasn't actually happened to him and because she hasn't been permitted to witness the injuries inflicted on the other students. Neither has she reflected on the message implicit in her own suicide attempts that this is where such inflexibility leads. In this respect, she resembles Prewitt, who was also inflexible and suicidal. Her last phone call to Jack shows that she is still thinking in
terms of absolutes, such as the "pure, white snow" which contains "no evil, no dirt, no filth" (MMM, 323), immediately after she has taken the nearly fatal overdose.

Since one person has prompted all three Gallaghers to dissolve their ties with each other and to betray their social concern, we strongly need to understand her motivation. Why does Sam play so wantonly with the lives of the Gallaghers and invite them to cast aside the way of life they have worked so hard fashioning for themselves? This question becomes doubly important because of the parallel between the effect of Sam's hedonistic irresponsibility on the Gallaghers and the effect of the students' gay rejection of their government on the workers and citizens of France.

Two features of her character that stand out immediately are her childishness and her narcissism. Her delight in candy bars and her willingness to lie on the floor for hours reading comic books like McKenna point up the childishness that comes out again and again in her readiness to use people like toys and cast them away when they no longer give her pleasure. Her self-absorption is revealed in her solitary dancing in which she becomes so involved with herself that she loses awareness of everyone around her. Since the narcissism can be easily related to her childishness, this combination could be considered sufficient cause for her destructiveness.
Another force in her character that may be more fundamental is her desire to make her identity felt by others. This is the same reason Jack ascribes to Sirhan's assassination of Robert Kennedy:

It is a case of a nonman trying to assert himself. A silly little Arab immigrant boy, probably certifiably insane, but whom society hasn't even bothered to look at or test, whom society stares through like a plateglass window and doesn't even bother to see, tries to prove his existence in the only idiot way he knows how. . . . His motives as stated by himself, all that Arab junk, don't mean a thing. The real motive is that he wanted attention, wanted to make the world admit he existed (MM, 300-301).

Immediately after he develops this theory, Jack tells Sam that he thinks she would be capable of doing the same thing Sirhan did and Sam admits that she probably could. The further implication here is that she would have a similar reason for acting like Sirhan. This motivation is suggested during the first time she appears at the Gallaghers when she refuses to play along with Ferenc's unmaliciously joking attempt to ignore her color in his name dropping routine. Later, this motivation is even more strongly implied when Sam tells Jack that "all of you white motherfuckers are out after my little old black ass. . . . You want to fuck it, fondle it, eat it, rub your noses in it. And then you'll go away, go home, and pretend you didn't do it" (MM, 273). Sam doesn't intend to let anyone walk away untouched by her and thinks that the surest way to
get someone to remember her is to injure him; certainly neither the Gallaghers nor Weintraub will forget her.

Sam's decision to tempt the Gallaghers to their destruction is her own choice, just as Harry's, Hill's, and Louisa's decision to respond to her lures is their choice. The only person who doesn't have any control over the general situation is McKenna, but even she has the choice of how to react to what has happened. Nevertheless, Jack does seem partially justified in his assertion that Sam's influence offered the three Gallaghers the chance to act in a way they might not have acted otherwise and that she was led to behave the way she did by the influence of Sirhan's deed. The question which all this raises is whether such influence can be considered wrong or not. On the one hand, Sam's and Sirhan's activities are destructive and vicious; Sam brings about the dissolution of a stable, if not happy, family which has achieved wealth and respectability through considerable effort and Sirhan kills one of the wealthiest and most respected men of our time. By the end of the novel, the three Gallaghers who had the most contact with Sam have run away not only from their responsibilities but also from their suffering and Robert Kennedy is no longer around to work out any further measure of his destiny. Thus, the influence of Sam and Sirhan seems wrong because it looks as if they have damaged their victims' material
way of life and impeded their spiritual progress to boot. Yet on the other hand, their influence has shaken the complacency not only of the victims but also of everyone around them. Certainly the American nation is still feeling the effect of Robert Kennedy's--and his brother's--assassinations. Moreover, the pain which the Gallaghers have experienced will eventually prove more fruitful than their former comfortable, routine existence would have been, for such is the way of the evolutionary process. Furthermore, if Jones's philosophy of spiritual evolution has any validity, then we can assume that Robert Kennedy has already taken what he learned from his encounter with Sirhan into a new incarnation. Samantha had argued that revolutions (and presumably other disastrous upheavals) change nothing and that the world absorbs everything, both of which statements are true in a material (and possibly a spiritual) sense. However, it is also true that revolutions and other upheavals can lead many of the individuals involved in them to change themselves, and that is their ultimate benefit.

There is an intriguing commentary on the student revolution and on society suggested by Jones's description of the repair work done on the paving stones that had been ripped out by the students. The students' removal of the stones to form their barricades against the police seems
equivalent to their attempt to remove themselves from a society they no longer view as fit to live in and to use their bodies and their lives to block the processes of this despised modern society. It also represents their desire to force this society to notice them as individuals, a desire that is similar to Sam's and Sirhan's to make society see them. In contrast, the government's decision to replace these paving stones with "the sticky-in-the-heat, evil-smelling modernity of asphalt" indicates the government's desire to cover over the individuality of its citizens in the interest of security and efficiency (MMM, 145). Given these opposing attitudes, clash between the students (along with the citizens) was--and is--inevitable. However, a third approach is implied by the way the Italian "master" stone-layers replace the stones in the pavement. They do not try to chip off parts of the stones and force them into tightly-confined patterns, but instead examine five or six possible spots for each stone and choose the one that the stone seems most likely to fit. Some of the largest and most irregular stones are rejected, but most of the stones are placed alongside other stones with which they are "not at all all that evenly matched" (MMM, 144) and yet they fit there perfectly. This presents a picture of what an ideal society would be like with the citizens allowed to express their individuality yet related to a
meaningful overall pattern so that their individual actions would be helpful to society as well. However, this state of society can only be reached when a sufficient number of people have learned compassionate understanding and moral self-control. Until that time, society has to stimulate conflict for the sake of the individuals within it who are still at a low spiritual level. Hence, each new generation begins with an immense self-righteousness and a belief that they know better how to run the world than their parents' generation. This leads to conflict between the generations which may be verbal, physical, or only emotional in which both sides are humiliated and battered so that they are compelled to relinquish part of their pride and their illusions.

In the conflict between de Gaulle and the students of the Sorbonne, de Gaulle's "nineteenth century pride" is "hurt" by the necessity of interrupting his Romanian state visit to deal with a nationwide strike (MMM, 208), and the students' self-confidence is deflated by de Gaulle's shrewd and overwhelming victory over them. During the speech which the French leader makes after his return from Romania, Jack notes that de Gaulle's "old self-assurance seemed to be missing. For the first time since I had watched his talks, he gave the impression that he was not really sure his latest call would be heard by the people"
Thus, even though he "wins," de Gaulle has been educated by the students' activities.

The students also have been humbled by the exposure of their inexperience and of their inadequacy in countering the governmental forces they chose to fight against. When Jack visits the students after de Gaulle has launched his Pentecostal stratagem, he comments, "There was an awful cloud of gloom over the kids' offices. . . . They had come up against a professional of long experience and been bested. And I think by then, that Thursday night, May 30th, they all sensed it" (MMM, 263). Two days later, Harry, who has been working with the Cinema Committee in filming the students' version of the revolution, confronts these students with the clumsy mistakes they have made in their use of the camera and with the indisputable fact that they are still at the student level. Harry points out that only the subjective vision of the Cinema Committee students could have made them think that their film was any good, and he further punctures their egos by chewing them out for failing to perform such elementary tasks as cleaning their lenses and using a light meter properly. By the time Harry finishes his lecture, even the usually cocky chairman Daniel is subdued and willing to admit that he and the other students may not have the ability to rescue themselves from their errors and to do the additional filming
necessary to complete their task, though he and they still want to try.

Earlier, the Cinema Committee students had been forced to concede that their policy of democratic discussion has its limits and that there may be certain situations, such as the need for direction in film-making, that require the single, authoritative leadership of a man with experience and skill. Their willingness to accept Harry's condition that he be given dictatorial control over the students' film of their revolution showed their recognition of the benefits of creative guidance and their respect for professionalism. They ironically accorded to Harry the kind of leadership they spurned from de Gaulle, who was equally a professional. It soon became manifest that they would not be able to make their movie without the help of someone like him. On the other hand, when they swing too fully toward depending on Harry, they become unable to make any further effort on their own when Harry abandons them. They find that they must learn to take care of themselves and that they haven't discovered how to do this yet.

One other thing which Harry wants to teach the students is how naive and unrealistic their conceptions of how to portray the "truth" about their revolution have been. He asserts that they can't just show pictures of students fighting police and expect an audience to see the
same meaning in them that they have seen. Moreover, they shouldn't expect an audience to be interested in the activities of a large mass of students who display no individual qualities. Since the main point of their revolution is to make their society acknowledge them as individuals, this last objection is a devastating comment on the students' approach to their task. Harry argues that what they should do instead is to create an illusion, to tell a false but meaningful story about two students an audience can identify with. Ironically, one of the students Harry picks to take part in this story is Anne-Marie, an offensively dogmatic bitch who appears sweet and touching in the part of the film Harry makes. Harry's point is that even though they intend to use actual events as a background, they have to work through a fictional plot and make-believe characters to convey their sense of the truth. He is even prepared to fake some scenes of rioting when he learns that the students' film of the actual rioting is unusable; as far as Harry is concerned, the students' ideal of absolute honesty is not only impossible, but in many cases—and especially in relation to his way of film-making—undesirable.

The decline in the students' idealism and their gradual loss of control over their revolution are symbolically represented in Jones's description of the students' paving
stone barricades. The "pure barricade" of paving stones naturally suggests the original stage of the revolution when the students were rebelling by themselves and were motivated strictly by their ideals—and their self-righteousness. Significantly, the only such barricade that remains during the latter stages of the rebellion is kept that way as a half-joking reminder of the purity of their original intentions. This purity has been undermined by the students' readiness to imitate their enemy. For example, when Hill defends Dany Cohn-Bendit's use of rhetorical devices to arouse "that greater mass of students, which was where the needed power lay," Jack points out that the students are resorting "to the same bad methods which you hate and attack the Government for using" (MMM, 66). Later, Jack argues that the students' employment of a ratlike group of roughnecks poses a "philosophical discrepancy" in regard to what the students declare to be the aims of their revolution (MMM, 231). Time and again Chairman Daniel, Anne-Marie, and other students assert that the Government has forced such tactics upon them, but that they consider any means justified because they are in the right. However, their tolerance of methods like these plus the entrance into their struggle of "bums and riffraff" who "apparently were in all the fighting just for the hell of it" is equivalent to "the crates and rubbish the garbage
collectors had not collected" which the students begin to pile on their barricades. Finally, the placement of the barricades of park benches, beautiful wrought-iron fences, and iron grilles that had surrounded lovely old trees could stand for the destruction by the revolution of much that was charming and valuable, such as the trees themselves.

Since revolutions, even student revolutions, are nothing new, Jones includes many reminders of the relation between present events and the past. For example, he describes Notre Dame as an "old stone barn, raised to tribal blood gods" (MMM, 99) and reminds us that the Pantheon "was built as a church, but later was taken over and made into a lay memorial to the French Revolution" (MMM, 100). In addition, Jones informs us that the "Place du Parvis Notre-Dame just in front of Notre-Dame . . . is where they used to pull people apart with horses for having committed some crime or other" (MMM, 326) and that the Odeon "was burned in the Revolution and later restored" (MMM, 151). Granting Jones's philosophical premises, such recurrence of patterns of violence from generation to generation conveys how slowly the evolution of individual souls takes place and what an important role clashes play in this evolutionary process. Since different souls learn at different rates and since political, social, military, and quasi-military conflicts provide some of the largest classrooms
for pain to teach in, it can be expected that bloodletting rituals will continue until a majority of souls have moved beyond that stage of development. Evolution operates so gradually that the only way the world can change is in the eyes of a few individuals at a time, or, to put it differently, some individuals change in their view of the world while the world remains outwardly the same so that other individuals may have a similar opportunity to change in their view of the world--and of themselves.

Jones's seventh novel, A Touch of Danger, not only adheres to the conventional patterns of hardboiled detective fiction but also remains true to the basic patterns of his philosophy, including those which relate to his views on individual responsibility and Karmic relationships. This is a difficult technical accomplishment since even the hardboiled version of the detective novel is an extremely rigid form and does not readily permit the introduction of "serious" content. For example, the bulk of a detective novel has to concern the investigation of a crime, and the criminal's identity must be hidden until near the end. In addition, most of the suspects should have something to conceal and should maintain a false front which the detective must cleverly pierce before he can discover who performed the crime he is interested in. These
requirements force the mystery writer to devote a lot of effort to devising an intellectual puzzle founded upon deceptive appearances. Under such conditions, it is far from easy to develop complex characters or complicated meaningful themes. Only a few remarkable writers, such as Dashiell Hammett, Ross MacDonald, and Nicolas Freeling, have managed to devise plots that satisfy both the mystery reader's demand for an intellectually stimulating game and the serious novel reader's desire for substantial psychological, social, and philosophical content.

Jones accomplishes a large part of his difficult task by making the investigation a learning experience for his detective. For example, the Karmic relationships which Lobo forms with some of the suspects compel him to face several of his strongest illusions and to accept the responsibility for some painful mistakes. Most obviously, his involvement with both Chantal and Marie teaches him that he can never entirely escape his isolation and his relationship with Freddy Tarkoff disturbs his confidence in his judgment about other people and about his own values. At the end of the novel, Lobo is still a long way from attaining the level of the spiritual man, but he has at least started to question his belief in the virtue of acting responsibly and to achieve momentary glimmers of compassionate understanding.
However, Jones's major technical feat here is his double surprise ending. The hardest thing for a serious mystery writer to accomplish is to create an ending which both provides the answer to a puzzle and illuminates a theme, yet Jones does this twice. He prepares the way for the revelation of Sonny Duval's motive for murder by calling our attention to the parallel case of Chuck who claims to believe in free love and who finds that he has begun to feel a possessive love for Diane. Yet Jones also uses this motive as a springboard for social commentary on the hippies' desire to reconstruct society along freer lines and for philosophical commentary on the folly of attempting to shun the cloak of evil. In addition, Jones prepares us to accept the discovery that Freddy Tarkoff is the big boss of the drug ring by making it clear that Kronitis seems too weak to hold such an operation together and by stressing Kronitis's acquaintance with Tarkoff. Then Jones points out how this discovery moves both Lobo and Tarkoff toward the humility that is necessary for spiritual progress by forcing them to admit that they too have performed the evil they shunned.

In spite of these technical achievements, however, *A Touch of Danger* cannot compete with most of Jones's other novels. One of the main problems is that it takes place in a fairy tale atmosphere which frequently stretches our
credibility a little too far. The most glaring example of this violation of credibility is Lobo's overdone combative-
ness; Lobo would have to be a superman to survive all the fights he gets into. Even if it achieved a total credibil-
ity, though, A Touch of Danger would still lack the power-
ful myth-making of From Here to Eternity, the philosophical sweep of Some Came Running, the grisly irony of The Thin Red Line, the psychological complexity of Go to the Widow-
maker, and the social scope of The Merry Month of May. Nevertheless, it is a strong minor work, and, as such, it deserves our respect and attention.

As expected, the character in A Touch of Danger who has reached a higher level than the others and who comes closest to being Jones's spokesman is the detective-narrator Frank "Lobo" Davies. One of the main signs of Lobo's spiritual advancement is his sense of dissatisfaction with his life. He has almost as acute an impression of his general failure as Jack Hartley. Although he had once been hailed as a hero for killing the murderer of his private detective partner and had gloried in this acclaim, he has come to regard this shootout as a tragic blunder and admits that he would handle the situation differently today. He feels even more ashamed of the job he did for Freddy Tarkoff in which he terrified a Greek into returning embezzled but legally untouchable money by breaking
one of the Greek's fingers and threatening the lives of his children. Afterwards, he imagines himself in the Greek's position and is disturbed by the image of what he has done. He concedes to himself, "I would not have wanted to be him, in that sour-smelling, awful, evil, lonely area of Paris, for anything in the world. If I had been him, I would have been totally terrorized" (TOD, 39). However, he finishes the task which he had accepted from Tarkoff and acknowledges that he is capable of doing the same thing again under the same circumstances, though he vows never to let himself be placed in similar circumstances. Naturally, his pride is also hurt by the discovery that Tarkoff had used part of this recovered money to mastermind a heroin operation. There is little chance to see the effect which this discovery will have on Lobo's development, but it can only move him further along the path of spiritual growth through ego-reduction.

Several observable changes do occur in Lobo as a result of his past and present experiences. The most obvious of these is the alteration in his attitude toward vengeance. When his partner Jeff Watson died, he was furious and set things up so that he would have a chance to shoot the murderer. He let the killer make the first move so that his own shooting was done in self-defense, but he could have prevented the killer from making that move. He
asserts to Chantal that if the same thing happened now, he would place the black murderer in the hands of the law, even though "six months later he would be back on the Street, terrorizing and extorting other black people, and bragging about how he fooled us whiteys" (TOD, 293). Moreover, he proves the validity of this assertion by his handling of Sonny Duval, a man who has murdered someone who mattered a lot more to Lobo than his partner had. He not only turns Sonny over to the law but he is even willing to let Sonny be confined to a mental institution because he "didn't really want to see Sonny executed" (TOD, 425).

The deal which Lobo makes with Tarkoff and Kronitis about Sonny's punishment and about their heroin ring reflects the same change in attitude which Lobo had shown in his treatment of Sonny. Although Lobo has cause to hate Tarkoff and to wish to hurt him, he reins himself in out of concern for Chantal whom he no longer "loves," but whom he still wants to help. He could let his idealism or his anger influence him enough to make him turn his information about the heroin operation over to Inspector Pekouris and to ignore the consequences, but he chooses instead to accept the compromise which the two men offer him. He does not try to make his own desires paramount, but rather enters into what he calls "horse trading" and proffers only a couple of modest demands of his own in return for keeping
silent and letting them both go free. He fulfills the promise he made Chantal to get her released from her part of the heroin operation and he succeeds in his main goal of halting the operation. These two concessions are sufficient to make him feel satisfied with this compromise solution. Also, he now feels free to seize back the money which his idealism had made him return to Kronitis. This is all he allows himself to gain from the deal and it is obvious that he will use most of this money to meet what he considers his responsibilities to his ex-wife and his two daughters. The last line of the novel, after all, is a reminder that his next alimony payment will soon be due.

A related change in Lobo occurs in his attitude toward violence. Although violence is a form of assertiveness and Lobo is highly competitive, he has reached a point where he strives to limit his violence. Like the "fifth-graders" in Viet Journal, he will not let anyone dominate him, and he is ready to fight for any number of reasons. However, he has come to regard killing as thoroughly wrong and the more extreme forms of violence as too destructive. After the hippies beat him up outside of Steve's nightclub, Lobo reflects, "In all, I was in pretty good shape. They hadn't chest-stomped me. Hadn't kicked in my jaw. I felt a kind of liking for them. No maiming; just good, clean old American fun" (TOD, 248). He acknowledges to himself
that he provoked the beating, and he can later feel friendly toward Harvey Richard who had assisted in the hitting, though not in the kicking.

Presumably Lobo's remorse over his destruction of his partner's killer and his violence toward the Greek embezzler have helped to give him the insight to appreciate the control which these young people exerted in the midst of their demonstration of hostility. When he subsequently battles with Chuck who appears to be Marie's murderer and who has kicked Lobo twice in his testicles, he limits the damage he does to Chuck. The moment he is about to break Chuck's jaw, he finds that "something" stops him, and he grabs Chuck's shirt and shakes him back and forth instead. Afterwards, he almost grinds Chuck's glasses under the heel of his shoe, but then he pauses and contents himself with snapping the bridge of the glasses and throwing the two halves into the water in a place where Chuck can retrieve them. Later, when he concludes that Chuck is not guilty of the murders, he decides not to give Pekouris the machete which he has acquired at great expense to his testicles. He still regards Chuck with anger and contempt, but he believes an action like this would be too harsh a penalty for what he had done in the fight. Moreover, Lobo begins to feel dissatisfied about his own part in the fight and asks himself, "Was I feeling a little sorry for goofy
Chuck? Was I thinking about Marie, who couldn't be brought back, whose murder couldn't be undone even if I solved it?" (TOD, 325). Although Lobo has a long way to go to reach the level of insight attained by Dave Hirsh, he is definitely advancing toward it. At the moment, it is an achievement for him to restrict the harm he does to others and to experience sympathy afterwards for those whom he does hurt.

One other feature of Lobo's character which perhaps undergoes some minute modification is his sense of responsibility. In this, he resembles Jack Hartley. When he takes on an obligation, he feels bound to carry it through no matter what it costs him mentally, physically, or spiritually. One such obligation which he adheres to is his "duty" to his ex-wife and daughters. Part of the reason he accepted Tarkoff's job of terrorizing the Greek was to obtain money for support payments, just as part of the reason he took back Kronitis's retainer was to help them maintain their social life. These consequences of his aid to Joanie are something he will have to think about before accepting other "responsibilities." Although he does not approve of the way Joanie and his daughters live, he believes that his past relationship with them gives them the right to ask his assistance in the path they have chosen for themselves. Yet he is aware of the irony that he can
make contact with disobedient hippies and reunite many of them with their parents at the same time that he must remain estranged from his daughters because they obey their mother and fit into the conventional upper middle class social pattern. Naturally, he is largely motivated by a sense of guilt toward both Joanie and his daughters. He is prompted by a similar though lesser guilt to overtip any lower class person who puts his hand out. Immediately after pondering the failure of his marriage while thinking back over his life, he reflected, "Sometimes I felt all the Spades and Jews and Puerto Ricans, Japs and Chinese on the West Coast, Wetbacks from the Texas border, had all formed a circle, and stood and pointed their finger at Frank Davies and hollered, 'Waspl!'" (TOD, 291). He overtips the taxi-driver who brings him to the boat for Tsatsos at the beginning and he overtips the old cleaning woman just before leaving the island. In these activities, he makes no alteration.

The area of responsibility in which Lobo appears headed for major change is in the working out of his Karmic relationships. The most powerful of these relationships are the ones with Tarkoff, Chantal, and Marie. The one with Tarkoff is especially significant since it precipitates Lobo into this adventure and since it is likely to have the most lasting effect on him. At the time he met
Tarkoff, Lobo's code was simple: "as long as you worked for him and took his money, the client was right. If you didn't think the client was right, or if you didn't like what he wanted you to do, you didn't take the job" (TOD, 35). He felt that Tarkoff was correct in his assumptions that the Greek embezzler "was depending on human decency to let him off the hook" (TOD, 36) and that it was therefore morally justified to go outside the bounds of human decency in his handling of the Greek. His discovery of how hard it is for him to live with the consequences of his actions against the Greek moves him back toward a belief in behaving decently toward others. It also undermines his confidence in his judgment of right and wrong and forces him to view human behavior from a more complex perspective. He still has a sufficient conviction of his personal responsibility for the results of everything he becomes involved in to be hurt by the knowledge that Tarkoff used the money he regained for a purpose which Lobo considers evil. However, he will eventually learn that he can only take responsibility for his own actions and not for the use which others make of them. Once he learns this, he will be able to appreciate the irony that Tarkoff got the idea for starting his heroin ring by accompanying Lobo on his efforts to assist the hippies who had been harmed by misuse of drugs and thus observing what
a large market there was for drugs. The depth of Lobo's distress at the moment, though, can be measured by his refusal to shake Tarkoff's hand, even though he had previously shaken the murderer Sonny's hand.

The encounter between them is also a learning experience for Tarkoff. In his eyes, he is a combination of shrewd businessman and good citizen, but Lobo shows him that both parts of his self-image are illusions. As Lobo points out, Tarkoff's cleverness is suspect since he let his partner Kronitis hire not only a couple of irresponsible thieves like Kirk and Girgis to run the drug operation but also the Narcotics Bureau man Pete Gruner who would probably have destroyed their operation and arrested them if he hadn't been recalled to Washington. Lobo hurls the worst insult he knows when he calls both Tarkoff and Kronitis "amateurs" and Tarkoff is compelled to admit the accuracy of this accusation. Lobo also challenges the apparent paradox that Tarkoff is a member of the City Anti-Drug Commission as well as a heroin smuggler when he argues, "So you're the angry citizen, fighting the criminal drug traffickers. Who turn out to be yourself" (TOP, 426). It is possible that Tarkoff sent Lobo to Tsatsos for a vacation because he subconsciously wished to be caught, just as Edith Barclay arranged to have herself exposed as Frank Hirsh's mistress to exorcize her guilt over having called
her dead grandmother a whore. Anyway, Tarkoff is now in a position where he must abandon his idealized picture of himself and confront some realities of his life that he had been sidestepping up til now.

Lobo's affair with Chantal is also a source of illumination for both of the participants. Chantal tells Lobo that the reason he is doing so much for her as well as making love to her is his concern about "old age. You see it in me just like you see it in yourself" (TOD, 342). Lobo is constantly aware of his age and regards it as uncomfortably restrictive. One of the reasons he is so pugnacious is that he is eager to test himself in physical combat to prove that he is still strong, skillful, and able to endure much abuse. He is also testing himself in the bedroom with Chantal, especially at those times when he comes to her freshly battered. His replies to Chantal's criticism that his fighting is "childish" are clumsy, and he can't deny that there is some truth in what she says, even though he intends to persist in this behavior. After his fight with Sonny, his pride makes him try to make "the long, hard climb up those stairs again . . . look like it was easy for [him]" (TOD, 401). Although he recovers from this and begins to feel proud of his endurance again, it is obvious that age is going to take an increasing toll on his ability to pass through incidents like this relatively
unscathed. He is aware of this and does not look forward to the depredations time will make in ever greater amounts on his body and ego. However, he has reached some acceptance of the inevitability of the ravages of time since his response to Chantal's distress over growing old is to tell her "softly" that "there's nothing anybody can do about that" (TOD, 342). He has also come to terms with the knowledge that he can't get outside himself through loving Chantal, and he bids her farewell with "a medium-light, passionless kiss" in recognition of their past relationship and their mutual failure to achieve anything more than what they did (TOD, 431).

Chantal's affair with Lobo also focuses attention on her own age and on her foremost illusions. When Lobo first visits her home, he notices a painting of Chantal as she looked when she was younger, but he discovers that this picture has been taken down on the day she accuses him of helping her because he sees his old age mirrored in her. Her main asset has been her appearance and she knows that this is losing its value. As a result, she is beginning to find it hard to bear the contrast between her youthful looks and her present appearance. Moreover, Lobo has wounded her ego by his lack of interest in her much of the time and by his indirect pity of the effect of aging upon her. She is especially vulnerable to rejection because
she has centered her life on pride—pride in her beauty, her aristocratic title, and her social position. She has been a social butterfly like Lobo’s ex-wife and the similarity between her and Joanie is probably what both attracted and repelled Lobo. However, Lobo exposes the emptiness of her social life and confronts her with the ugly realities underlying her illusion of social prominence, such as her impecuniousness, the vapidity of her "friends," and the fact that her husband is a homosexual playboy. He also gets her to admit to herself that she has been a petty, greedy carrier of drugs and brings her to the point where she can face getting out of this business, even though this means she will no longer be able to escape from Tsatsos to winter in Paris each year. At the end, she at least has strength enough to joke about her situation and to ask, "What will I do now? . . . I guess I can sell my hot body to a rich old Greek. But I’m getting a little too old even for that" (TOQ, 431). She is willing then to be honest with Lobo about the story she had told concerning Girgis’s imaginary attempt to blackmail her and to reveal that she had only told this story because she was attracted to Lobo and wanted to gain his attention. In making this admission, she is facing up to the implication that there has been little else in her life to interest a man like him.
Age also plays a role in the relationship between Lobo and Marie. Lobo desires her as much as he has ever desired any woman, but he learns that there are other considerations that are more important to him than his sexual excitement. He feels that it would be ridiculous for a man as old as he to become involved with a woman as young as Marie, but he is even more disturbed by the ways in which Marie reminds him of his daughters and by his awareness that he reminds her of her father. His basic feeling toward her is one of protectiveness rather than lust. When he is about to accompany her to her apartment to accept an obvious invitation for sex, he finds that he dislikes the hard look he sees on his face in the mirror and the "whorish" look which he had previously observed on her face when she was striving to be seductive with him. He senses that the overtones of incest and of "kickiness" that would be involved in any sexual act between them would be damaging to Marie as well as to himself, and he is willing to sacrifice whatever pleasure this act might give him for the sake of helping her remain youthfully open to life rather than allow her to make herself jaded and self-enclosed. Although he is probably also influenced by his own fear of "incest" and his distress about what such an act might do to him, he does have a powerful sympathy for her which is at least part of the motivating force behind
his actions. This concern for Marie also lies behind his offer to set her up with a friend in New York and to provide her with money for her flight back to the United States. He does not want her to choose the alternative of going to Capri with Slow John who would introduce her to some of the hard-shelled lesbians there who might brutalize her. He cares about her growth as a person, and he endeavors to do what he can to promote it.

Marie is an apt pupil since she has reached a stage in her life where she has recognized the folly of the direction she has taken and is looking for a way out. In an interview on *A Touch of Danger*, Jones stated:

> I have found the overpermissive liberalism of today somewhat a dead end and wanted to explore the feeling that the young of today are only seeking to reestablish the ancient virtues of honor, honesty, personal integrity, etc. The concept of moral self-discipline seems to be getting lost in today's rush for "absolute" freedom.²

Marie is obviously the chief example of a youth making this kind of search for integrity (the other example being Harvey Richard, who had been honest with Lobo about his part in the beating). Lobo refers to her as "the only bit of true gentility and integrity I'd found here, in their lousy country" (*TOD*, 292). She is candid not only about the extent of her sexual life, but also about her
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realization that it has had a disastrous effect on her and that her present anguish is the result of her own bad choices. Her biggest mistake has been the way she let everyone else make use of her; she has never displayed the vicious self-concern of a Jane Duval or a Jim Kirk. Beyond all this, she has demonstrated courage in spearfishing by herself and in spending the winter in Tsatsos (something which Chantal was unwilling to do). It's little wonder that Lobo becomes interested in her welfare.

The relationship between Lobo and Marie is a Master-Disciple one. Although Lobo hasn't advanced enough to give her more than elementary spiritual guidance, he can oversee her growth toward his own level. Significantly, the first time he notices her she is alone in the water. This indicates to him that she has progressed further than her hippie comrades who bunch together most of the time. Then, once he takes her in tow, he discovers that he can quickly lead her "over the psychological hurdle" in skin-diving so that she can go 45 feet underwater without panicking at the heaving of her diaphragm or the knowledge that she is down so far (TOD, 200). He can also instill sufficient confidence in her to enable her to decide to return to the United States.

Although there is no hint that Lobo has any comprehension of Jones's theory of reincarnation, it is possible
that he dimly senses its meaning and that this is why he becomes so interested in the question of what level she had attained at the time she was forced to abandon this incarnation for the next one. Anyway, it comforts him to learn that she did not surrender to despair when she realized that Sonny was trying to kill her, but rather took measures to preserve her life. It also pleases him that she had the fortitude not to scream or to make unhearable pleas because this implies that she was ready to move on to a new stage of development.

In addition to Lobo's various Karmic relationships, there appears to be a three-way Karmic bond developed between Sonny and Jane Duval and Jim Kirk. The essence of the typical Karmic relationship is that each member of it acts in a way that exposes the illusions of the other(s) and that allows his own to be exposed. The reality which Sonny's involvement with Jane and her lover Kirk reveals to him is that underneath his overpermissive attitudes is a childish desire to have everything go his way and to have all his wishes fulfilled. Given his self-image, this is a hard truth for him to accept. In their turn, Jane and Kirk must learn that they are not the superior beings they consider themselves.

Sonny Duval is an overage hippie who violates every one of his ideals. He is a millionaire who believes in
working and in living strictly on what he earns, but he hires men to clean his boat and spends money which he couldn't afford from his wages to make trips throughout Europe to retrieve Jane whenever she runs off with a lover. Moreover, when Lobo exposes his crimes, Sonny tells him, "When you've got the money, nobody can touch you... And I've got it" (TOD, 393-394). Like Steve and Chuck, Sonny professes to be a pacifist, and he betrays this ideal not only through his murders but also through his knock-down drag-out fight with Lobo. In addition, he claims to be opposed in principle to marriage, yet he is legally married to Jane, even though he usually denies this when questioned about it. Above all, he asserts that he respects Jane's "free spirit" and that he would not wish to hold her down by preventing her from having as many love affairs as she wants when he is really so upset by her promiscuity that he is driven to kill her lovers. His one redeeming trait is his suffering; he was hurt by her indifference to him in the past and he will be hurt even more by her decision to confine him to a mental institution in order to obtain his money. It is undoubtedly this quality of suffering that prompts Lobo to agree to shake Sonny's hand.

In contrast, neither Jane nor Kirk is capable at the moment of the kind of intense suffering that Sonny
undergoes. However, they both have spots of vulnerability where they can be hurt and educated to a limited extent. Jane's weak spots are her sexual vanity and her pride in her independence. She is confident about the appeal of her body and has no doubt she can attract any man or woman she lusts for. In this, she resembles Samantha-Marie Everton who thinks only about her own pleasure and who doesn't give the slightest damn what her pursuit of pleasure does to other people. She is convinced she can get away with anything she wants to. Thus, Jane is stunned at the villa to learn that Sonny has been killing her lovers and that her fate seems to be in his hands. She is also disturbed by the knowledge that Lobo has been immune to her charms and has manipulated her into a humiliating position as bait in his trap for Sonny. Lobo notices that when she appears on the balcony clad in a towel concealing almost nothing that she has "a big broad sexy smile on her face. A fake one. I guessed for the first time since I'd met her anyway, she wasn't looking superior and self-confident" (TOD, 391). Following Sonny's capture, she begins to lean on Kirk for support and to acknowledge her dependence on him. However, since Kirk is untrustworthy, Jane's attachment to him may will further her spiritual education, especially now that she will have Sonny's money to provoke Kirk's cutthroat tendencies since his concern
for the money will probably lead him to view her as an obstacle to getting it.

Kirk's education is a simple and profound one. When Lobo first meets him, he has the impression Kirk "would just bull ahead and do anything, anything that came in his head and that he wanted to do. He would talk or fight his way out of it afterward. And had complete confidence that he could" (TOD, 123). He has no scruples, and deals casually in hashish and heroin. Also, he does not hesitate to shoot at Lobo or to threaten him with a knife. Furthermore, he shows no more fear when Lobo has him at gunpoint than he did when he held the gun on Lobo. However, it is a new experience for him when Sonny points the gun at him and pulls the trigger. Since Lobo did not forewarn him that the gun contains blanks, he believes that he is about to die and that there is nothing he can do to prevent this. Thus, he is shaken to the core of his being by his sense of helplessness at his fate. After he learns he is safe, he sobs and screams that he wants to kill Sonny. Later, he recovers a lot of his outward confidence, but he will never again be able to believe in his indestructibility. It is comforting to think that even a man like Kirk can have his ego dented and be moved along the path toward spiritual growth through his Karmic relationships.
CONCLUSION

If a poll were taken of what author least resembles James Jones, many critics might point to Jane Austen. Yet there are a few striking similarities between Jones's work and Austen's. For example, any of Jones's novels could have been titled *Pride and Prejudice* since he obviously shares Austen's concern with the perils of these two qualities. Also, both of these authors stress the need for lovers to shed their illusions and mature within the framework of their relationship. More elaborate and detailed analyses could be made between the development of Lucky and Ron in *Go to the Widow-maker* and that of either Elizabeth Bennet or Mr. Darcy in *Pride and Prejudice* or Emma Woodhouse and Mr. Knightly in *Emma*. In addition, Jones has a parallel interest in irony (though not as a display of wit) and in tight, complex thematic construction. His focus is generally as sharp and as subtle as hers.

Like Jane Austen, Jones defines his characters in terms of their self-ignorance or self-discovery. Just as the plot of *Emma* centers on the uncovering of layer after layer of the illusions created by Emma's inordinate ego, the typical Jones plot hinges on the alteration in the
main character (or characters) from morally blind selfishness to clear­sighted compassion. However, Jones also allows many of his minor characters to take large strides in their growth. For example, MayIon Stark in From Here to Eternity starts out as "a regular bragging kid who made a pass at [Karen Holmes] as a matter of pride" and ends as a man who can extend sympathy and aid to both Karen and Warden whom he had resented for a while. His penalty for his cruelty to Karen was that he became unable to function "in any whorehouse unless he was properly liquored up" (FHTE, 225). However, after he has learned compassion, he discovers that he is free from his previous nangup: "Something's happened to me. I'm not drunk at all. I used to have to be drunk as hell" (FHTE, 849). Similarly, Dave Weintraub in The Merry Month of May changes from a man with "animal cunning" (MMM, 21) who sponges off film celebrities by playing court jester for them to a man who can display "sudden sympathy and sensitivity on his small tough ageing Jewish face" (MMM, 352). He learns not only to handle his ego-deflation by Samantha "really well" (MMM, 227) but also to commiserate with his rival Hill.

1James Jones, From Hare to Eternity (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 334. The other novel which I will quote in this chapter is: The Merry Month of May (New York: Delacorte Press, 1971). Subsequent references will be to these editions; the works will be identified by the following abbreviations: FHTE, MMM.
Jones has admitted in an interview that he believes he has "a knack . . . for structural organization." This seems a fair assessment. Although he made too many demands on his structure in Some Came Running and structured The Pistol a little too tightly, he has usually displayed a superlative skill at construction. Certainly he has a talent for making the smallest details count and for utilizing his structure to help convey his ideas. For example, in Some Came Running, he presents both Old Jane Staley's and Raymond Cole's deaths by first showing people talking about them after their deaths, then jumping back to their last moments of life, then moving forward to the deliberations of the people affected by their deaths. This not only provides a variation on the traditional flashback sequence but also subtly suggests Jones's theme of reincarnation by keeping Janie and Raymond alive in the mind of the reader after they have been treated as dead. As a second example, in The Merry Month of May, the quiet local color provided by Jack Hartley's visits to Parisian bars and restaurants affords a counterpoint to the revolutionary attitudes of the students. At the Brasserie of the Red Bridge of the Island of St. Louis, Hartley finds among the proprietors a family relationship in which conflicts occur in the
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context of an affection so strong that they become converted into warm, mutually shared jokes and reveal none of the abrasiveness of the conflicts among the Gallaghers. Moreover, the mother's decisions are accepted by the daughter as final, even when she disagrees with them, and the mother has respect for the daughter's attitudes, even when she feels the need to oppose them. Later, at the Brasserie Lipp, Jack observes a rigid hierarchy among the waiters which seems satisfactory to everyone concerned—the younger waiters cheerfully help the waiter designated Number One because he is too old to do much by himself—and a tradition of special respect proffered to writers and film people. All of these things—family relationships with the parents firmly in charge, hierarchies, and traditions—are social patterns which the students found too confining and have been prime targets in the student revolt. Thus, it is unlikely that they are being presented as remedies for the conflicts that the novel deals with. Instead, they imply that people can get along under almost any social pattern, depending upon their attitude toward it, and that there has been some value in the way of life the young are ready to reject, even though this way of life may have some serious drawbacks in it. There is a reminder that the terms "young" and "old" are relative in the fact that the proprietor of Lipp whom everyone thinks of as "young"
Monsieur Cazes is 56 years old. Also, when Harry comments that there's "no Revolution" to be found at the Brasserie Lipp, Jack responds that "they've been through the troubles of '36, when M. Pompidou himself was on the student barricades" (MMM, 149). So many things are relative, such as the way Harry Gallagher's radicalism during World War II led him to enlist in the Army whereas Hill's radicalism in 1968 led him to oppose all wars, and the moment this relativity is forgotten or ignored inflexibility sets in and danger arises.

The quality that sets Jones's work apart from Austen's as well as from that of most of his contemporaries is his effort to incorporate a basically Eastern philosophy into a thoroughly Western context. This kind of assimilation of Eastern ideas has been attempted in America as far back as the Transcendentalists, but Jones usually does it less obtrusively than Emerson, Thoreau, or Whitman. Even though he runs into severe artistic and philosophical problems in trying to combine a mystical conception of life with a realistic depiction of America and Europe, his endeavor is both worthwhile and remarkable. He has shown that reincarnation—and spiritual evolution—can be treated in less exotic settings than in Mircea Eliade's Two Tales of the Occult and in less melodramatic plots than in Max Ehrlich's The Reincarnation of Peter Proud, and that the
"realistic" novel can be used for a wider range of purposes than generally supposed. The variety of ways in which he has dramatized his beliefs indicates that he has a far greater technical dexterity than his critics have granted in the past.

One of the most unjustifiably maligned aspects of Jones's writing has been his handling of the relationships between men and women. Many critics have noted the adolescent behavior of the males trying to score in his novels, yet have failed to observe that Jones too is aware of this puerility and is attacking it. He has long pondered the dangers involved in trying to live according to the traditional American stereotype of the male as silent, aggressive, efficient, ruthless, work-oriented, and sexually athletic. Moreover, his views on the need for men to be sensitive rather than brutal, tender rather than domineering, compassionate rather than strict, and flexible rather than rigid fit in well with the views expressed in sociological works such as Myron Brenton's *The American Male*, Hendrik Ruitenbeck's *The Male Myth*, and Karl Bednarik's *The Male in Crisis*. In addition, he has a keener awareness of the damaging effects of "sexual politics" on both men and women than Kate Millett and of ways to get beyond these effects. One reason *Go to the Widow-maker* is more realistic and compelling than most love stories is that it
stresses the tortuous, torturing, multi-level adaptive process which two people who have similar personalities and beliefs must nevertheless go through in order to sustain their relationship. Thus, even though Leslie Fiedler might not agree with this evaluation, Jones probably comes as close as any American writer to achieving the goal set down in *Love and Death in the American Novel* of portraying a believable and ultimately fulfilling adult love affair.

Although we all do it, most critics would concede that it is folly to guess how posterity will react toward the literary works written in our time. Literary history is strewn with the names of writers who were ignored in their own time and honored later or were praised in their own time and scorned later. It is even perilous to predict which works by a particular author will interest future generations; Melville's contemporaries admired *Typee* and *Omoo* and passed over *Moby Dick*. My guess is that Jones's works will eventually be judged on three levels: 1. the most successful major novels—*The World War II Trilogy* (consisting of *From Here to Eternity*, *The Thin Red Line*, and the work-in-progress *Whistle*), 2 and *Go to the*  

---

3In his letter of February 15, 1974, Jones wrote me: "With regard to WHISTLE, and whether or not you can use it in your dissertation, you might take note of the following. For me, if the 'World War II Trilogy'—or 'Tetralogy', if you include THE PISTOL—is taken as a metaphor of life (or a life) then the last book, which is WHISTLE, is the 'dark side' of the equation. If a life begins in innocence and
Widow-maker; 2. the seriously flawed major novels—Some Came Running and The Merry Month of May; and 3. the minor works—A Touch of Danger, The Pistol, Viet Journal, and most of the short stories. However, this opinion should be taken lightly, and perhaps it would be better to look at Jones's work as a unified whole.

Many of the virtues of Jones's war novels have long been observed, but his civilian novels have virtues as well and there are many links that hold all of Jones's writing together. I believe that in both the war and the civilian novels Jones is an American Master for our own time, and also for future times.

...
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