

1965
C.

I - Existentialism

II - ~~Muggenidge~~ Sexual Revolt

- a.) Marquis de Sade
- b.) D. H. Lawrence
- c.) Norman O. Brown

d.) Reading Muggenidge

1. Mystery of a Fogel

How to explain.

Will attempt this
tonight.

III a second mystery

- a.) alaska - plus d'univers
- b.) Its architecture

C. London

The buildings going up in London are the same as the buildings going up in Anchorage - It is as if we are taking orders from a foreign planet.

IV Conservatism

- a) Burke + Fanny Hill
1. Pleasure + guilt
2. Tom Jones + Werthers.

II b →

In conservatism, one's life is founded on love.

C. So emphasis is on the arts, forms, distinctions, traditions and nuances of society.

V Radicalism — arose out of failure of conservatism. ~~The~~ Figgishness of rich — destruction of idea of a just God + just punishment

IV Radicalism ^{continued}

Society now seen as a
compact between man and
the devil. - God resides
below - is buried in the
exploited

a) Marx + Stendhal
1. Julien Sorel's count
to three is the beginning
of the sexual rev.

b) Life is based on mobility
rather than stasis. So
love is replaced by courage

V cont.

b. which is to say also hate
+ fear. More later.

C.) Behaviourism will
emphasize man, not
society. ~~Abstract man.~~

~~Ab. free Press of two writers~~
~~of God + society produced~~
a new man. The slave, the proletarian
and the man of the ghettos gave
way to the man who was a member of
a minority group.

VI

Minority Groups?
What are they?

a) Road Baldwin + Bushby

b) Texas + Alaska

C. Myself
d. ^{everybody} Definition of man in
minority group.

e. Thus he is Sartre's man -
he is forced, indeed he can
only define himself by his
actions. ⑧

f. So his relation to love
combines conservative &
radical version of sex.

1. Ambivalence or
promiscuity is answer.

⑦[✓]

g. Sex for status is product.

1. Sex is used to define oneself.

2. For existential acts are
the only medicine to
relieve the locks of ambivalence
since existential acts
enable one to define oneself.

h. But women now also
form one large minority
group. Their relation

UNIVERSITY ARMS HOTEL

CAMBRIDGE

TELEPHONE 51241

8

to sex moves from procreation
to an obsession with their
identity.

VII The Plague Unfolds.

- a) Sexual Revolution
- that place in wake of war.
- b) So beauties of Lawrence's
vision were forced to
grow in plague soil.
- c. Plague in medicine
architect
labor
and war

VII The way out - Redefinition
of Individuality - The women
in the movies. The paying of dues.
Reentrance of aesthetics
into politics. - When laws
are passed that no materials can be
used which do not age.
Entrance of existentialism
into morality. What makes
me feel good may be good.
What makes me feel bad
is perhaps evil.
Reengagement of death,

BROOKEMAN

The Magic Finger

ROALD DAHL

When an eight year old girl, angry with her neighbours, puts the magic finger on them, strange and exciting things start to happen. All the amazing changes and each of the surprises in this story for six to ten year olds, are playfully told by Roald Dahl in his third book for children. The fantasy is mirrored to perfection in the delightful pictures of William Pene du Bois. Published October 24th. Illustrated 10s 6d.

Foxy and The Badgers

JOHN MONTGOMERY

Not many boys can claim to own a tame fox. David Grant, living on a farm in Sussex, is lucky. His exciting adventures make an unusual story which will appeal to boys and girls of all ages. 'Can only add more to Mr. Montgomery's many admirers.' Birmingham Evening Mail. Illustrated 18s.

Charlie and The Chocolate Factory

ROALD DAHL

'It is the funniest children's book I have read in years; not just funny, but shot through with a zany pathos which touches the young heart. Dahl's dialogue smacks of Carroll, his verses of Belloc. But he is a great original in that he gives modern children the humour they appreciate in style.' The Times. Illustrated 12s 6d.

James and The Giant Peach

ROALD DAHL

In his first book for children, the author has woven a fast-paced, hilarious saga in the best traditions of the fantastic. 'It is vivid, robust, entertaining and funny. There's some splendid verse thrown in as well and that's rare enough. Good illustrations too.' Times Literary Supplement. Illustrated 12s 6d.

record of his expenses, or, at best, the metamorphosis of the author into a limited and profitable company. But changes in the tax-laws and a galloping optimism now make it clear that this was thinking small and that he really should have been turning in his difficulties to higher-powered advisers, like merchant bankers, or hedging against the grim effects of a revolution in taste by being integrated into a public company with interests safely remote from literature. The prescription these days is for "Novel and sophisticated partnerships... between individual writers, broadcasters and entertainers on one side, and city companies on the other".

This glowing prognosis is made by Mr. Oliver Stanley, writing in the latest issue of *The Author*, the journal of the Society of Authors, which only a year or two ago discovered just how poor many professional or semi-professional writers actually were. Not many of those who transcribed the melancholy story of their

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

Thursday, October 3, 1968

LONDON PRINTING HOUSE SQUARE

finances on to the Society's questionnaire will take what Mr. Stanley has to say about authors and the City very seriously. Even fewer of them, one imagines, will feel grand enough to take up the offer of guidance from the firm of merchant bankers for which he works and which has taken a full-page advertisement in *The Author* as a spectacular prop to his text. There is, after all, a catch; the financiers are only interested in you and will only enrich you "if you have substantial future earnings". The author whose ambition it is to achieve quotation not in the *Oxford Dictionary* but on the Stock Exchange can only go to the market royalties in hand and pledge, presumably, that he is not intending to depart too arrogantly from the formulas and the media that have put him

For as long as his potential of off they will than they ever individuals M sensible if irrel few writers. No to a contract bankers that i cial and in whereby busin patterns of ta backing odd f is already bein Booker Broth commonly p sugar and en who now have sidiary collec Booker's first t to whom they

T.L.S. 30 Oct 1968 p. 1104
NO. 3475

LETTERS TO THE

NORMAN MAILER

Sir,—May I as the "sleek young fellow" responsible for inviting Norman Mailer to Cambridge three years ago, on an occasion that your middle-page review of *Armies of the Night* (September 19) chronically misrepresented, attempt a short account of what actually happened not only in the interests of truth, but also to illuminate two of the major cancers initiated and encouraged by English literary journalists of the late 1950s and 1960s, the Americanization of English letters, and the personality cult-raising that your reviewer seems sure to perpetuate.

The title of Mailer's lecture was "Existential Wanderings through Bog and Fen", and he wandered to good and had effect through eighteenth-century sexuality, progressing to the sexual revolution of the 1960s, that Mailer had discussed with Malcolm Muggeridge in the Mayfair theatre some days before. His thesis was that the eighteenth and early nineteenth century was a period remarkable for its extreme emotional and moral polarities of virtue and sin, Jane Austen at one extreme, Swift and Byron at the other.

There seems no doubt in my mind which extreme Mailer has chosen to explore. Following Stephen Dedalus in *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, I find Mailer's work improper Art: kinetic, and pornographical, exciting loathing and disgust, debasing the elements of pity and fear that I believe Mailer is aware of but stylistically incapable of creating. Much of Mailer's writing is instinctive and reflex action, and he belongs to a metaphor that includes Bogart, Hemingway and John Wayne. This particular tradition, aided and abetted by Kenneth Tynan and A. Alvarez and intellectualized by Mailer, has almost superseded the alternative English tradition of Eliot, Lawrence, Orwell, Huxley and Leavis, whose abilities to detect the phoney shame the debased English critical tradition at present active in English papers and reviews.

C. E. BROOKEMAN,
Flat 1, 4 Mount Zion, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

MAN IN A STATE OF CULTURE

Sir,—It would be good to curb large and inaccurate discourse such as the mere name Lévi-Strauss can provoke. I refer to a number of cardinal errors in your reviewer's advertisement on *L'Origine des nombres de table* (September 12), of which I mention only the following.

(1) It is false that Lévi-Strauss's "ultimate model is neuro-chemical". He never justifies any particular analysis by an appeal to any particular neuro-chemical fact. The chemistry and neurology of the brain do not provide Lévi-Strauss with any more than a metaphorical currency, when they are still so insufficiently understood.

proof", but more simply and immediately on whether certain similarities and relations between certain social and cultural phenomena are indeed shown by him to obtain. It is at this point that his claims constantly deserve to be challenged.

(3) Goedel's proof does not show that "no axiomatic system can demonstrate its own internal consistency", nor does the impressionistic association of his name with those of Freud, Chomsky, and Lévi-Strauss throw any light on the various ways in which appeal is made to various sorts of evidence and empirical test by those writers.

(4) Among the few specific criticisms offered by your reviewer is his hint at the popular but misguided claim that Lévi-Strauss's emphasis on binary relations is a mere superstition. Why, it is said, should the correct analysis of various cultural phenomena not be properly given in terms of very much more complex relations? The answer is this: it is an elementary fact of logic that any relation, however complex (that is, however many variously related terms it may have), may be analysed as a series of binary relations. Thus the description of any set of relations in binary terms is strictly equivalent to, and often more perspicuous than, the corresponding descriptions in terms of higher order relations.

Your reviewer refers to the "intellectual magic" of Lévi-Strauss's work. It is indeed exciting to be present at the early stages of what is surely a major intellectual advance. At such a time the critic is called to be most demanding—more than ever ruthless with confusions, false assumptions, bad practice in his author and Lévi-Strauss is not free from such flaws), more than ever ruthless with any tendency in himself to impressionistic, effusive or un-specific writing of a sort unlikely to serve the advancement of learning.

F. C. T. MOORE,
Department of Philosophy, The University, Birmingham 15.

*Our reviewer writes:—Dr. Moore's letter illustrates all too patently the gap between the nature and intent of Lévi-Strauss's work and the response it finds in certain academic circles. Now for the "cardinal errors".

(1) As anyone concerned with Lévi-Strauss's work since *La Pensée sauvage* knows, his analyses of linguistic and social behaviour, of myth and kinship patterns, point ultimately to *la structure concrète du cerveau*. Lévi-Strauss is a materialist and leaves no doubt that for him this "concrete structure" is physiological. The obvious fact that it has not yet been understood, that, for example, the relations between the hemispheric anatomy of the brain and numerous phenomena of duality and symmetric exchange in human perception are, as yet, no more than hypothetical, in no way invalidates the suggestion that *la science de l'homme* has and must

nomena" which these of course h As *Tristes tropiques* Mythologiques et Strauss is seeking t of man in the fu dealing with is no of nature and cul music, of the rel perception and r cial passages of *tropiques*, *La Pens logiques III*. To recent of Lévi-Stra have been driven c dise would mean *pêche original* occ Eden and lays it gloss had any relev of Lévi-Strauss's w not be, as it is ob central energies in sophic thought, music.

(3) I leave it to between Dr. Moo the summation o offered by Ernest tion with Goedel h the famous autob. Similarly he has en the frequent, mutu mutually illuminati and, indeed, analog uralism" and the son, Harris and, m sky. One finds whether Dr. Moo's the texts.

(4) Dr. Leach, t about Lévi-Straus

from o.

'A monu
'Ah yes
that so o
bores.
Let us,
attributed
1500 pag
Lotus (p
of Clém
great nov