Arabic and Middle Eastern Literatures, Vol. 5, No. 2, 2002

Carfax Publishing
Taylor & Francis Group

Forging a New Self, Embracing the Other: Modern Arabic Critical Theory and the West—Luwīs ʿAwaḍ

ABDUL-NABI ISSTAIF

I

Luwīs ʿAwaḍ's *al-Ishtirākiyyah wa-al-Adab*[1] (*Socialism and Literature*), in which he expounds his call for 'literature for life's sake', appeared first in Beirut in 1963 at the time when Egypt was passing through a period of socialist transformation.[2] However, this book, which is probably one of the most important theoretical statements on the social function of literature by a Marxist-inspired Arab critic, was, in fact, the culmination of ʿAwaḍ's life-long engagement with socialist thought in general and socialist-inspired critical theory in particular—an engagement which was closely connected with his complex cultural formation in both Egypt and abroad (Cambridge and Princeton in particular) as well as with the political, economic, social and cultural changes that have taken place in Egypt in the 20th century.

Notwithstanding the importance of ʿAwad's other contributions to modern Arabic literary criticism which have received considerable attention,[3] this book merits a detailed consideration on the ground of its author's undisputed status in the history of modern Arabic literature[4] as well as for the light it sheds on the way a modern Arab critic responds to the various internal changes in his society by drawing on certain elements of his cultural formation and employing them in formulating his notions and views about the process of literary production in this society. It is hoped that tracing the genesis of ʿAwaḍ's call and contextualizing his views on its various constituents, articulated over almost two decades, would also shed much-needed light on some aspects of Egypt's cultural encounter with the other since the 1930s.

ʿAwaḍ owed his earliest acquaintance with socialist ideas in the 1930s to al-ʿAqqād, who first introduced the idea of socialism to ʿAwaḍ's generation[5], and to Salāmah Mūsā, who was particularly interested in the social function of literature and who also called on the Egyptian writer to abandon his ivory tower and share the life and fate of his people.[6]

In addition to the impact of Mūsā's progressive review *al-Majallah al-Jadīdah* (*The New Journal*), 1924–1930 and 1934–42, in which he advocated the ideas and ideals of the Fabian Society and called for a literature which reflects and helps to modify social reality, ʿAwaḍ was affected by Mūsā's interest in the language of the people and in their literature.[7] There is no doubt that his use of Egyptian colloquial in some of his experimental poetry in *Blūtūlānd wa-Qaṣā'id Ukhrā* (*Plutoland and Other Poems*), 1947, and in his autobiographical work *Mudhakkirāt Ṭālib Baʿthah* (*Memoirs of an Egyptian Scholar*) (1965) was a direct result of Mūsā's influence, although ʿAwaḍ acknowledges

Abdul-Nabi Isstaif, P.O. Box 11704, Damascus, Syria.

ISSN 1475-262X print/ISSN 1475-2638 online/02/020161-20 © 2002 Taylor & Francis Ltd
DOI: 10.1080/14752620220138953

in his preface to his *Memoirs* that the problem of writing in the colloquial is more vital for the creative writer than for him as a critic, scholar or university teacher.[8]

Marxism was also part of ʿAwaḍ's undergraduate syllabus at the Department of English of the University of Fu'ād I (now Cairo University) and this further consolidated his interest in socialist thought—an interest which was also stimulated by his Cambridge experience at King's College between 1937 and 1940.

Returning to Egypt by sea, via South Africa, ʿAwaḍ was particularly active in disseminating Marxist thought throughout the 1940s, publishing articles, books, translations and creative writings, all of which were clearly touched by Marxism in one way or another, First, there were his influential articles on modern English literature, published in *al-Kātib al-Misrī* (*Egyptian Scribe*) between 1945 and 1946 and later collected and published in a book entitled *Fī al-Adab al-Injilīzī al-Ḥadīth* (*On Modern English Literature*) (1950) in which he put forward a clearly Marxist interpretation of literature inspired by certain Marxist critics such C. Day-Lewis and others.[9]

Later, in 1947, came his translation of Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, with an extended introduction in which he adopted the same Marxist approach, influenced this time by F. J. Fisher and C. Caudwell.[10] In the same year, ʿAwaḍ also published his *Plutoland and Other Poems*, with its revolutionary introduction 'Ḥaṭṭimū 'Amūd al-Shi'r' (Demolish the Poetic Tradition) in which he declared that 'since he was slaughtered by Karl Marx' he:

> no longer sees of the myriad colours of life and death but one colour: before his eyes the green grass has turned red, the skies red, the sandy desert and the blue waters red. Scarlet have become all women, the words of men, abstract ideas, all those the colour of blood. Even sounds and odours and tastes have all become all red as though the whole universe is being consumed by a hellish fire. He is contented to live in this hellish fire, for he has seen chains lacerating the bodies of slaves who cannot think of anything except red liberty.

Early in the 1950s, ʿAwaḍ was appointed by the new regime literary editor of *al-Jumhūriyyah* (*The Republic*), the mouthpiece of the July Revolution, a move which was interpreted by ʿAwaḍ himself as a concrete indication of the Revolution's concern for the new literature. Acting quickly to fill in what he described later as a dreadful vacuum in the literary life of Egypt since 1936, which witnessed the bankruptcy of liberal democracy in the political sphere, ʿAwaḍ chose 'al-Adab fi Sabīl al-Ḥayāt' (Literature for life's sake) as a motto for the literary page, generating a healthy climate for serious discussions of the various implications of this relationship between literature and life.

Siding against his former teacher Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, who led the opponents to this call, ʿAwaḍ, together with ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Yūnus, Muḥammad Mandūr, ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm Anīs, Maḥmūd Amīn al-ʿĀlim, Ṣalāḥ Ḥāfiẓ, Luṭfi al-Khūlī, ʿAbd al-Munʿim Murād, Ismāʿīl Maẓhar and others, stood firmly defending a closer relationship between literature and life than Ḥusayn's camp would have approved of.[12] None the less, this did not prevent him and his close friend Mandūr from expressing their reservations about Anīs' and al-ʿĀlim's narrow and limited understanding of commitment and the so called *al-Adab al-Hādif* ('purposive literature'). According to ʿAwaḍ, who always felt that literature can never exist unless it is articulated in an artistic from, Anīs and al-ʿĀlim were too dogmatic and had gone, in fact, too far in their subordination of literature to life. Mandūr went even further in his objection to Anīs and al-ʿĀlim and modified their

motto; that is, the purposive literature into 'shouting literature' (*al-Adab al-Hātif*) by substituting the *tā'* for the *dāl*.[13]

During the late 1950s and the early 1960s, 'Awaḍ wrote several series of articles which were published in *al-Sha'b* (*The People*), between 1957 and 1958, *al-Jumhūriyyah*, between 1960 and 1961 and *al-Ahrām* between 1962 and 1963. Most of these articles were collected and published in a book under the title *Maqālāt fi al-Naqd wa-al-Adab* (*Essays on Criticism and Literature*) (1965). Introducing them, 'Awaḍ writes that what unifies these article is 'the permanent link between literature, art or thought and the society which produces it'. For 'Awaḍ believes in the organic relationship between society and what it produces of literature, art or thought, without lessening the importance of the cultural formation of the individual in the orientation of the writer, artist or thinker.

Understanding the word society in its broadest sense, in which the spirit of the age as a whole as well as of that humanity embraces the soul of the society with its spatial and temporal boundaries, 'Awaḍ always prefers to talk about the organic relationship between literature and life. For life is far more general and comprehensive than society. It can accommodate the intertwined existence of both the individual and the social, the overlapping national and human existence and finally the past and its legacy, the present and its burdens and the future and its dreams, all combined in one.[14]

In the first part of the book, which he entitles 'On literature and society', 'Awaḍ discusses various intellectual figures such as the great Arab historian Ibn Khaldūn, Aḥmad Luṭfi al-Sayyid, al-'Aqqād, Salāmah Mūsā, Shafiq Ghirbāl, 'Abd al-Laṭīf Aḥmad, Muḥammad Mufid al-Shūbāshī and Aḥmad Rushdī Ṣāliḥ as well as the question of socialist culture. Highlighting the contribution of these figures to Arabic culture, he stresses the relationship between their writing and society. Thus in an article entitled 'A new meaning of realism'[15] he expresses his reservations about al-Shūbāshī's understanding of Belinsky's criticism, particularly what al-Shūbāshi claims to be Belinsky's hostile attitude towards 'the misleading Western literature' (*al-Adāb al-Gharbiyyah al-Muḍallilah*). While acknowledging al-Shūbāshi's contribution to the realistic movement in Egypt and strongly supporting his call for realism, 'Awaḍ rejects his appeal to resist western literature. Belinsky never called for such resistance, 'Awaḍ adds, and it is unjustifiable on any ground unless al-Shūbāshī specifies which of these literatures is truly misleading and why, Furthermore, it was not, in fact, Belinsky who was hostile to Western literatures, but rather his opponents, namely the supporters of Slavic nationalism.

In another article entitled 'On folk literature',[16] 'Awaḍ commends Aḥmad Rushdī Ṣāliḥ's book *al-Adab al-Sha'bī* (*Folk Literature*) for the new horizons which it explores and makes available to the students of folklore and folk literature. Having started from the particular and specific rather than the general, Ṣāliḥ collected his own materials, studied them thoroughly and reached certain conclusions which one can easily agree with once one reads the examples he cited. Ṣāliḥ, 'Awaḍ continues, has demonstrated by concrete and conclusive evidence rather than by assumption and sheer argument that 'We, in Egypt, have a very serious folk literature'.

Recalling his defence of folk literature and his early call for developing and studying it in his introduction to his *Plutoland and Other Poems*, 'Awaḍ refers, in this context, to his attempts during the 1940s to carry out such a study and his subsequent realization that only specialists working within a special institute for the study of folklore can realize his ambition. Hence 'Awaḍ's admiration of Ṣāliḥ's work, despite the fact that it was confined to a very limited area. Ṣāliḥ, in 'Awaḍ's view, tried to extract from the

many folk poems he collected a picture of the Egyptian conscience, sentiment, way of thinking and convention that have been handed down from one generation to another through the various forms of Egyptian folk literature. ʿAwaḍ, however, criticizes Ṣāliḥ for not sufficiently stressing the connection of certain rituals to the ancient religion of Egypt.

Folk literature was, in fact, at the centre of ʿAwaḍ's views on socialist culture as outlined in his two articles entitled 'On socialist culture: I and II'.

In the first article[17] ʿAwaḍ greets 'the great president' ʿAbd al-Nāṣir who acknowledged, in his speech at Alexandria University, the role of the Egyptian intellectuals not only in preparing the ground for the 1952 Revolution but also in building the new socialist society.

Stressing the fact that the intellectual needs to have a socialist mentality and morality if he is to become a true socialist, ʿAwaḍ acknowledges that building a socialist culture is a long and difficult process in view of the cultural division which separates the formal (*al-Rasmī*) tradition from its popular (*al-Shaʿbī*) counterpart. ʿAwaḍ believes that there is a need not only to recognize the popular tradition but also to acquaint the people with the high tradition of both classical Arabic and world literatures.

> Thus if the elite recognizes the literature and art of the people and if the literature and art of the elite are made available to the people, the present gap between the elite and the masses can be bridged. The popular tradition will be influenced by the beauty of the high tradition which, in turn, will be affected by the sentiment of popular literature. The language of the masses (*al-ʿĀmmah*) will be polished by the language of the elite which will adapt from the language of the masses all of its sincerity and flexibility. Out of all of this we can create a society not of one culture but rather a society of a homogeneous and levelled culture in both form and context.

ʿAwaḍ elaborates his views on creating a socialist culture further when he discusses[18] a public lecture entitled 'culture in the socialist society' delivered by the Egyptian Minister of Culture, Dr ʿAbd al-Qādir Ḥātim.

Highlighting the importance of the question addressed by the Minister, namely how a cultural revolution guided by the principles of the National Charter can be initiated into socialist society, ʿAwaḍ agrees with his analysis of Egyptian culture in the first half of the century. It has indeed represented the coalition between colonialism and capitalism in Egypt at the time. However, ʿAwaḍ adds, besides the official established culture, whose sole aim was to maintain the old system, there has been an unofficial or popular culture which, although weak at the time, was working towards initiating the social, intellectual and materialistic changes that the Revolution itself is now seeking. In other words, there had been two cultures in Egypt of the pre-Revolution: the one which supported the established order and articulated the values and interests of the dominant class; and the other which was fighting against this domination. The first principle of socialist culture is, therefore, to abolish the class nature of culture and to work towards creating a popular culture in both its content and objectives, and to make this culture available to all classes of society by resorting to all forms of mass media such as the press, radio and television. It is the first step towards achieving intellectual and cultural unity among all the members of society. According to ʿAwaḍ, the old official culture tried to make the Egyptians doubtful of their abilities and ignorant of their history. The Revolution was the best articulation of the Egyptian character or identity in exercising its belief in its potentials and later in realizing them by purging the country of foreign

domination and by initiating an economic and industrial revolution. What remains, however, is to extend the revolution to the sphere of culture and this is the responsibility and duty of the intellectuals. It is their part of the process of building our socialist revolution. According to ʿAwaḍ, the first step in discharging this responsibility is to reveal our character, which is deeply rooted in our tradition, struggle, suffering and hopes, in such a way as to enable us to understand ourselves and then to realize it without any vanity. What is most remarkable about Ḥātim's call, in ʿAwaḍ's view, is not only his call for the intellectuals to uphold their cultural tradition but also his encouragement to them to open all windows onto foreign cultures so that 'we can have our own distinct culture, which would articulate our distinct character, and we can at the same time open our minds and hearts to what is good in the cultures of other nations, interacting with them without fear ... or vanity'. Furthermore, besides taking what is good from foreign cultures, it is our duty, Ḥātim adds, to export our culture. As for the quality of the new culture, we have to be flexible, and hopeful, at the same time, that our cultural life can gradually recover its balance. ʿAwaḍ agrees that the core of the question is meeting the challenge of combining quality and quantity, or, in other words, to appeal to the masses without sacrificing the high standards of art and literature.

II

In January 1961, ʿAwaḍ was appointed for the second time as literary editor of *al-Jumhūriyyah* newspaper. Returning to the issue of socialism and literature, he published a series of seven theoretical articles on the subject, described nearly three decades later by the Egyptian distinguished scholar and critic Shukrī ʿAyyād as an important contribution to modern Arabic literary thought.[19] These articles, together with several others, were collected and published two years later in Beirut in a book under the title *Socialism and Literature*. In May 1968, al-Hilāl Publishing House reissued the book in its long-established series *Kitāb al-Hilāl* under the title *Socialism and Literature and Other Essays*.

In these theoretical essays, ʿAwaḍ attempts no less than the development of a distinctly Arab perspective on the question of socialist literature in modern Arab society—a perspective which would reflect the Arab socialist experience in Egypt, without, naturally, neglecting to take into consideration the experience of other nations. In fact, ʿAwaḍ was in the unique position of being, on the one hand, deeply involved in the cultural life of Egypt and the Arab world, and, on the other, of being highly steeped in the cultural traditions of the other, particularly the West. To use Shukrī ʿAyyād's words, ʿAwaḍ distanced himself from the intellectual conflict which was taking place at the time between, on one hand, Marxism or what is so called scientific socialism and, on the other hand, a trend which saw the adoption of Leninist Marxism as a form of dependency and called, therefore, for what was sometimes called Arab socialism which is neither eastern nor western. Dealing directly with the original examples of these theories in the West, ʿAwaḍ tried to draw from them 'the most suitable elements for building a social and literary thought that truthfully expresses out nature and the style of our life'. Drawing on his diverse, complex and rich experience of cultural encounter with the other tradition, he objectively and clearly presented the conflicting world theories of literature and literary criticism and later proceeded 'to criticize them from a viewpoint which is less an expression of his personal temperament than an anticipation of the distinctive character of our culture'.[20]

Introducing his discussion of socialism and literature, ʿAwaḍ points out that although

we have travelled since 1954 along the road of socialism without hesitation, we still question the status of literature, its function, aim and relation to life within socialist society. We still ask what are its constituents, principles and elements and how can we protect it from both its enemies and ignorant friends. Hence the need for a reconsideration of the two main doctrines on art, literature, science and thought: the first which stresses their priority over everything else and the second which subordinates them to life.[21]

Because Egypt's experience of socialism was brief, ʿAwaḍ suggests wisely that the issue should be studied in the light of the experience of other nations.[22]

Because life is more general and comprehensive than society; because life embraces the individual and society, the spiritual and the material and the human and the national, it is quite natural for ʿAwaḍ to associate literature with it rather than with society. Thus, the call for 'literature for life's sake', he adds, is both a nationalist and a humanistic call because it makes literature serve both the national and human life; it is both a materialistic and spiritual call because it makes literature serve both the materialistic and spiritual life, and it is a social and an individualistic call because it makes literature serve both society and individual.[23] ʿAwaḍ's emphasis on the humanistic, spiritual and individualistic aspects of this call seems to stem from the humanistic character of his concept of socialism.

For 'this is the essence of our socialism which accommodates and must accommodate all these meanings and aspects'. It is not only nationalist but also humanistic, it is not only materialistic but also spiritual; it is not only social but is also individualistic. In short, 'socialism, as we understand it, is a humanistic doctrine and socialist literature, as we understand it, is a humanistic literature'.[24]

This socialist literature, however, is endangered by either worshipping the individual or worshipping society. In the cultural sphere, the first danger is embodied in the schools which advocate the notion that literature, art, science and religion are sought for their own sake, while the second is embodied in the schools which put literature, art and science at the service of either the material life or the spiritual life. The two dangers, in ʿAwaḍ's view, are the outcome of oversimplifying life and splitting the original unity of spirit and substance, of ideal and existence, of form and content and finally of shape and subject.

Classifying these schools according to their relationship with the ideal and reality, ʿAwaḍ proceeds to present each school, outlining its basic assumptions, quoting its major representatives, showing how it conceives of literature: its nature, function and boundaries; and finally how it poses a threat to the socialist and humanistic literature needed for the socialist society which at the time was in the making in Egypt.

Starting with what he terms the idealistic schools (*al-Madāris al-Mithāliyyah*), he discusses the following.

(i) The school of art for art's sake (*Madrasat al-Fann li-al-Fann*), represented by Oscar Wilde[25] and Walter Pater.[26]

(ii) The impressionistic school (*al-Madrasah al-Taʾaththuriyyah*), represented by J.E. Spingarn.[27]

(iii) The school of Neo-humanism (*Madrasat al-Insāniyyah al-Adabiyyah*; *al-Hiyūmāniyyah*), represented by Irving Babbitt,[28] Paul Elmer More, N. Foerster and others.

(iv) The school of new rationalism (*al-Madrasah al-ʿAqlāniyyah al-Ǧadīdah*) or what is known as Neo-Catholicism or Neo-Classicism, represented by T.S. Eliot.[29]

(v) The school of instinct (*Madrasat al-Fiṭrah*), represented by D.H. Lawrence.
(vi) The school of the collective unconscious (*Madrasat Lā Wa'y al-Majmū'*), represented by C.G. Jung.[30]
(vii) The school of surrealism (*al-Madrasah al-Siryāliyyah*), represented by André Breton.[31]
(viii) The school of the stream of consciousness, represented by James Joyce and Marcel Proust.

'Awaḍ then turns to the materialistic schools (*al-Madāris al-Māddiyyah*), considering the following:

(i) The school of revolutionary socialism (*al-Ishtirākiyyah al-Thawriyyah*), represented by Michael Gold,[32] Ralph Fox and Christopher Caudwell.
(ii) The school of 'purposive literature' (*al-Adab al-Hādif*), represented by Granville Hicks,[33] Joseph Freeman[34] and others.
(iii) The school of economic determinism (*al-Ḥatmiyyah al-Iqtiṣādiyyah*) or historical determinism (*al-Jabr al-Tārīkhī*), represented by Karl Marx,[35] Philip Rahv,[36] V.F. Calverton,[37] John Strachey,[38] Granville Hicks and others.
(iv) The school of socialist realism (*al-Wāqi'iyyah al-Ishtirākiyyah*) which is mentioned only once in passing and without any reference to its basic assumptions or major representatives.

Having presented, critiqued and shown how both the idealistic and materialistic schools are against socialist literature in particular and socialism in general, 'Awaḍ concludes his discussion of the question of socialism and literature by outlining his notion of sound socialism (*al-Ishtirākiyyah al-Salīmah*) which he wants literature to serve. According to him, sound socialism distinguishes itself by the following:

1. Socialism is first and foremost a humanistic idea. Hence, its most important characteristics are its broad and comprehensive outlook which recognizes no boundaries, its tolerance, magnanimity and vastness. It knows no fanaticism or narrow dogmatism, acknowledging everything that enhances the humanity of man, but never claiming that it is the last word in the dictionary of human thought and organization. For it sees itself simply as a step forward on the road of humanity towards realizing its great destiny.[39]
2. Sound socialism recognizes the tradition of the past, present and future and accepts everything which stimulates the human desire for truth, goodness and beauty, confirming man's right to realizing them in his life on the largest possible scale. It acknowledges every serious doctrine in thought, art and literature and accepts all philosophies both idealistic or materialistic, individualistic or societal, as well as all literary schools whether they are those of reason, emotion or imagination. Recognizing the great humanistic tradition with all its contradictions, it sees that the growth of life cannot be accomplished except by the resolution and then the dissolution of these contradictions into a harmonious unity that is higher that its constituents. Because denying these contradictions can only lead to an insoluble crisis which could be suicidal for humanity, and this is utterly unacceptable to sound socialism which stands on the side of life, the life of not only one generation, class or civilization but the life of man, whenever and wherever he is.[40]
3. Sound socialism is based on the greatest recognition (*al-I'tirāf al-A'ẓam*) denouncing the greatest rejection (*al-Inkār al-A'ẓam*), and seeing in every school of thought, art and literature a creative and positive aspect which con-

tributes to the great tradition. This aspect is the criticism of life which is the first prelude towards its growth and improvement.[41]

4. Sound socialism recognizes all schools as a criticism of life but never as an approach to life. It rejects every doctrine that sees itself as the sole remedy for the suffering of humanity, because it believes that this is, in fact, the source of that suffering.[42]
5. Sound socialism considers that the biggest mistake in the doctrines of thought, art and literature lies in the dichotomy that they all exhibit, between subject and object, shape and substance, form and content, thought and mind, principles and behaviour, function and organ and means and aims. In fact, in ʿAwaḍ's view, 'evil' and 'defection' are mere words invented by man to describe this split, and 'death' is nothing except this complete and mutual division between the soul and substance. Thus the only way to achieve intellectual, artistic or literary perfection is the complete unity between these binary oppositions, or their oneness.[43]
6. Because socialism is a social doctrine, clearly defined and born within a certain frame of time and space, it might adopt certain intellectual, artistic or literary trends which serve its immediate circumstances and aims. Thus a socialist thought, art and literature would come into existence. Being a humanistic idea, socialism recognises the great danger in this narrow doctrinaire position on what ʿAwaḍ had previously called the greatest rejection. Realizing that its thought, art and literature are all partial and derived from the contradictions of life, socialism knows all too well that with its victory, humanity will approach its unity and harmony and there will not then be any, art or literature which is aristocratic, bourgeois or proletarian. Only one thing will remain: the humanistic.[44]
7. 'Art, literature, science, truth, goodness for their own sake are merely myths invented by the idealist in order to protect himself from the aggression of the materialist. Similarly, art for the sake of society, purposive art or art with a message are also myths invented by the materialist to protect himself from the aggression of the idealist. The two myths stem from the deep awareness of this split between idea and substance, subject and object, partial and total and temporary and permanent, or from forgetting the unity of existence.'[45] There is no art, literature or thought which exists only for its own sake or for the sake of certain aims or ends. Everything has to be for the sake of man, for the sake of all humanity.

   'True socialism, socialism in its deep and broad sense recognizes that every thought, art and literature which does not spring from man and pour into him, is futile. It also recognizes that the true man from whom it springs and the perfect man to whom it aspires is he who embodies the unity of existence.'[46]

III

Having presented extremely briefly ʿAwaḍ's review of the literary schools that are against sound socialism, which he wants literature to serve, one can examine in some detail (a) ʿAwaḍ's basic assumptions and his approach to the question, (b) his consideration of the literary schools and (c) his notion of sound socialism.

IIIa

As we have seen, ʿAwaḍ first presents the idealistic and materialistic schools and then

proceeds to offer a synthesis of the two types. Categorizing literary schools according to their relationship with the ideal and reality, he talks about idealistic and materialistic schools, reducing the latter to Marxism while failing to refer to the origins of the former. He does not, for instance, make any reference to Baumgarten or Kant when he reviews the school of art for art's sake. ʿAwaḍ refutes the idealistic schools and rejects them on grounds inspired by a Marxist standpoint, as Ghālī Shukrī says,[47] while at the same time he has certain reservations about the same grounds which he has already accepted and used in refuting the idealistic schools (his attitude towards the past). Notwithstanding his eclectic approach (to be considered at length later), it should be pointed out that this is only one strategy among several which he employs in his discussions. Also worth noting here is the fact that his differentiation between society and life is not convincing, and consequently one can hardly be expected to accept all those attributes which ʿAwaḍ freely attaches to the concept of society in order to justify his preference for the use of 'literature for life's sake'. These differences between life and society are, as Ḥusayn Muruwwah rightly remarks, unfounded. One cannot, therefore, accept all ʿAwaḍ's subsequent conclusions.[48] Insisting that we study this issue in the light of the great human experience, ʿAwaḍ proceeds to review all these schools while unfortunately neglecting what, in this context, is perhaps most relevant, namely the views of other Arab critics[49] on this issue. This, in fact, runs contrary to his notion of 'the greatest recognition' as well as to his claim that sound socialism is against the greatest rejection or denial. Furthermore, he fails to relate the question of socialism and literature to Arab life and society, which such a literature is supposed to serve. ʿAwaḍ, of course, cannot be denied the right to recommend what he thinks is best suited to one's society. However, he might also be expected to take account of both the Arab critics' discussion of the issue and the Arab reality itself. In the event, ʿAwaḍ studies only the great western humanistic experience and not the Arab experience in the light of the former, as he promised in the first chapter of his book. This might be attributed to his belief in his pioneering role in calling for a close relationship between literature and society and his assumption that only his contribution is relevant to the discussion of the issue. Whatever the reasons behind his neglect of the Arab critics' contribution, one could not deny that such an omission is still unjustifiable and questionable at the same time. ʿAwaḍ attacks fiercely the separation of subject from object, shape from substance, form from content or, indeed, any split caused by bigoted opinion or narrow outlook. Yet his main argument is built on such a split between substance and idea and based on categorising schools into idealistic and materialistic. Furthermore, the originality of his version of sound socialism is more apparent than real for it is, in a way, a mere mixture of what he considers to be the positive aspects of all the schools he attacks and later rejects for being anti-socialist. In essence, sound socialism, as we shall argue later, is nothing except socialist realism which ʿAwaḍ chose to ignore.

IIIb

Turning to ʿAwaḍ's survey of the various literary schools which he considers to be against socialism, one cannot help noticing his failure to document his review of them, making it extremely difficult to trace his sources, particularly when he quotes from conferences and proceedings. Although honest and accurate, he is none the less eclectic in his quotations which, notwithstanding their original contexts, are cited in order simply to prove his points and support his arguments. Furthermore, ʿAwaḍ does not use his citations in their proper context and this naturally undermines the value of his

account of these schools and consequently weakens his case against them, because he bases his argument on an obvious misreading of the sources involved. To give only one example, one can refer to ʿAwaḍ's misreading of texts when he discusses the objectivity of artistic and human values. Quoting Marx's appraisal of Greek art, ʿAwaḍ points out that Marx's interpretation of its enduring aesthetic pleasure is somewhat naive. It stems from Marx's refusal to acknowledge that there are in the form and content of art essential and objective values which transcend ages, civilizations and classes. This appraisal of Marx is frequently quoted and widely discussed. None the less, none of Marx's students fails to recognize his acknowledgement of these essential human values. On the contrary, all of them assert the objectivity of artistic and aesthetic values and relate them to human values as a whole. Here, for example, is Lukács' comment on Marx's appraisal:

> Marx approaches the question which he poses himself from both contextual and historical points of view, noting the relevance of the Greek world, the normal childhood of humanity, to spiritual life of later generations. The investigation thus does not return to the problem of the social origin but advances to the formulation of basic principles of aesthetics, again not from a formalistic point of view but within a comprehensive dialectical context.[50]

Answering the question: 'How do we read Marx's praise for the enduring glory of Greek art?' Stefan Morawski in his 'Introduction' to *Marx and Engels on Literature and Art* writes:

> I believe it may be interpreted much in the way Marx Raphael has suggested, as (a) recognition for the formal harmonious attributes achieved by ancient art. Yet there seem to be two further criteria in the passage which Marx thought important to enduring character of art. (b) By its own specific means art can express the whole significance of the society (Greek art was sustained by a system of living myth based in the specific mode and level of economic activity). (c) This art expressed the highest human values, and thereby offered a tremendous affirmation of humanity. It seems that Marx believed both the latter attributes were particularly suited to the art of a young or native civilisation. It would be accurate to relate attribute (b) to artistic cognitive value, and attribute (c) to fundamental human value. The cognitive and the fundamental human values might mingle and are both dependent on attribute (a) which denotes the adequacy of form to the embodied values.[51]

Considering these two interpretations of Marx's appraisal of Greek art, the conclusion appears to be that it does imply the existence of certain permanent aesthetic values and standards and whatever one's interpretation of these values, it is obvious that Marx not only acknowledges their existence but also relates them to form and content. It is also difficult to agree with ʿAwaḍ's interpretation of Marx's reservation about the correlation between literary and social economic developments. In fact this reservation suggests that there is no such mechanism as that to which ʿAwaḍ objects and that only vulgar Marxists have misused this association and transformed it into mechanical determinism.

What puzzles the reader most is the fact that ʿAwaḍ himself states, only one page earlier, that Marx explicitly acknowledges the existence of objective artistic and literary values.[52] Yet he continues to describe Marx's interpretation as rather naive and rejects it for no reason except his own failure to grasp Marx's words as such or is simply projecting his own reading into them.

ʿAwaḍ's use of citations out of their context can be illustrated by his reference to Freeman's view of experience. At the end of his chapter on the school of purposive literature ʿAwaḍ discusses the Marxist emphasis on the artist being on the side of life, and comments that by this they mean that the writer should be on the side of the proletariat only. This is naturally rejected by him on the grounds that literature should not be confined to one class. Then ʿAwaḍ quotes Joseph Freeman's view on the concept of experience. Although ʿAwaḍ does not alter Freeman's words, he uses them out of context. For Freeman, in fact, was complaining about the limitations of experience imposed by bourgeois critics, who claim that only the bourgeois values and experiences are the values and experiences of humanity. His main aim, in his introduction to *Proletarian Literature in the United States* is to show that the writer is 'not a creature in a vacuum'[53], but he 'deals with experience rather than theory or action', and the social class to which he is attached conditions the nature and flavour of this experience. Thus he writes:

> A Chinese poet of the proletariat, of necessity, conveys to us experiences different from those of a poet attached to Chiang Kai Shek or bourgeois poet who thinks he is above the battle. Moreover, in an era of bitter class war such as ours, party programmes, collective actions, class purposes, when they are enacted in life, themselves become experiences, experiences so great, so far-reaching, so all-inclusive that, as experiences, they transcend flirtation and autumn winds, and nightingales and getting drunk in Paris cafes. It is a petty mind indeed which cannot conceive how men in the Soviet Union, even poets, may be moved by the vast transformation of an entire people[54] [from one stage of development to another].

Then he adds:

> The creative writer's motives, however human they may be, however analogous to the motives of the savage, are modified by his social status, his class, or the class to which he is emotionally and intellectually attached, from whose viewpoint he sees the world around him.[55]

It might also be relevant here to recall ʿAwaḍ's charge that Marxists are against abstract thought in the works of petit-bourgeois writers,[56] a stand which he utterly rejects. J. Freeman touches upon this very point in his introduction to *Proletarian Literature in the United States* (which includes some of Michael Gold's critical and poetic works) when he states very clearly that:

> Art at its best does not deal with abstract anger. When it does it becomes abstract and didactic. The best art deals with specific experience which arouses specific emotion in specific people at a specific moment in a specific locality, in such a way that other people who have had similar experiences in other places and times recognise it as their own.[57]

This view on the specific nature of art is more likely to be interpreted as a rejection of abstract thought in art rather than a rejection of abstract thought as a whole, as ʿAwaḍ claims. Therefore ʿAwaḍ's objection to Gold's view is unjustifiable, because his interpretation of such a view is obviously not sound: for unless abstract thought is transformed into art, it can never be considered art at all.

ʿAwaḍ also confuses the reader when he does not distinguish between a literary school that has ideological or philosophical foundations and a literary technique which can be used by different schools irrespective of their different ideological bases. Here

one could refer to the school of the stream of consciousness, as ʿAwaḍ calls it.[58] This narrative technique, which developed towards the end of the 19th century and was employed to evoke the psychic life of a character and record the random and apparently illogical flow of impressions passing through the mind, turns out to be an idealistic school in ʿAwaḍ's classification. There is no doubt that ʿAwaḍ is fully aware of such a distinction between these two concepts in western literature. Hence, one is inclined to think that he might have used them deliberately in this confusing manner in order to serve his blanket condemnations of almost all idealistic schools.

ʿAwaḍ discusses 'serious' and 'non-serious' schools without giving his reader any clue as to the criteria of his rather peculiar classification.

At the beginning of his discussion of the materialistic schools, ʿAwaḍ claims that they are all mechanical and deterministic, depriving man of any free will or subjectivity. Obviously, this is an over-simplification of the issue on ʿAwaḍ's part. Distinguishing between the two types of determinism: the abstract one, and the historical one, which involves some kind of human action, it is important to recall that Engels, defending the latter types, wrote in his letter to Block: 'we make our history ourselves',[59] and even within Marxism the objective conditions, which determine the stage of development, are and can only be the result of human actions in the material world. However, as Raymond Williams says:

> There have been many qualifications of the idea of determination, of the kind noted in Engels' letter to Block, or of an apparently more radical kind, such as the contemporary idea of over-determination (determination by multiple factors). Some of these revisions have in effect dropped the original Marxist emphasis, in attempted syntheses with other orders of determination in psychology (a revised Freudianism) or in mental or formal structures (formalism, structuralism).

Despite his reservations about these qualifications or revisions, Williams acknowledges that:

> In its most positive forms—that is, in its recognition of multiple forces, rather than the isolated forces of modes or techniques of production, and its further recognition of these forces as structured, in particular historical situations, rather than elements of an ideal totality, or worse, merely adjacent ... the concept of over-determination is more useful as a way of understanding historically linked situations and the authentic complexities of practice. It is especially useful as a way of understanding (contradictions) and the ordinary version of the dialectic, which can so easily be abstracted as features of a theoretically isolated (determining) situation or movement, which is then expected to develop according to certain (determinist) laws.[60]

Describing the process of transformation in the epoch of social revolution, Marx draws a line between the material transformation and the ideological one, that is, the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic, in which 'man becomes conscious of this conflict [between the material production of society and the property relation within which its members have been at work hitherto] and fights it out'.[61] This distinction that Marx draws is very important in considering the concept of determinism. Also, the role of man—on which Marx insists—must be taken into consideration in any serious discussion of the process of social change and the role of literature in such a process.

In fact, the issue of mechanism has come under fierce attack from many Marxists

such as William Phillips, Philip Rahv,[62] Lukács and others and it has been associated both with vulgar Marxism and extreme leftist.

Compared with this complex concept of historical determination or that of over-determination, and bearing in mind Marx's distinction referred to earlier, ʿAwaḍ's concept seems to be outdated. Lagging behind these developments, which have taken place prior to the publication of his book, it is narrowly defined and naively presented, lending support to the charge which Muruwwah levels against him when he accuses him of misinterpreting the writings of others and attributing to them certain characteristics as a result of viewing them from a particular ideological standpoint.[63]

In discussing the materialistic schools, ʿAwaḍ seems to have been thinking of the radical literary movement in England and America during the second quarter of the 20th century, when 'authors moved politically to the left'.[64] Witnessing the poetry of Auden, C. Day Lewis, Stephen Spender and Archibald MacLeish, 'journals were formed[65] ... which served as organs for Marxist criticism, symposia were edited.[66] ... and books by single authors argued the cause'.[67] The immediate result was an extraordinarily vigorous critical approach. The touchstones seemed clearly defined: dialectic materialism; the method of application seemed sure: how does the work contribute to the cause of this social truth? Consequently, as Wilbur Scott says:

> ... the judgement could be made with an old Testament force of conviction. So literature and its creators were sorted as being with or against the Truth, the single-minded critic, frequently unfazed by the complexities of art's relation to society, and strengthened by the mood of faith and the sense of revelation, demanded that writers share his creed, and that literature shows its validity.

However, there were exceptions, such as Christopher Caudwell and others:

> But there was madness in the method. As the yardstick became shorter and the applications more naive, it became achieved at the price of its breadth. Finally, with the Russo-German pact and the outbreak of World War II in 1939, and the consequent confusion and defection of many votaries, the movement lost its central strength and ceased to be a major force in literary criticism.[68]

Taking into consideration this brief account of the American and English radical movement, the student of ʿAwaḍ's survey of what he calls the materialistic schools is inclined to think that ʿAwaḍ is too selective and far from being objective when he presents the materialistic schools exclusively through this movement. As we have already seen, ʿAwad criticises Babbitt for not taking the historical context into consideration in his evaluation of art or thought, individual or society.[69] Yet in his discussion of this movement he himself ignores this historical context altogether.

The Achilles' heel of ʿAwaḍ's critical survey of the materialistic schools lies in his eclectic approach. First, it is difficult to accept those labels which ʿAwaḍ has coined, especially when he himself has mixed two of them, namely the school of economic determinism or historical determinism and that of purposive literature. Secondly, ʿAwaḍ refers only once to the school of socialist realism without discussing it at all. Thirdly, ʿAwaḍ's selection of representatives is confined mainly to Americans while Marxism originated in Europe. Furthermore, even when he refers to British representatives, he fails to present their ideas or quote from their relevant writings. One wonders how a treatment or a discussion of the materialistic schools in literature can be undertaken without considering the continental representatives, and how such a study

can be comprehensive when it neglects figures such as Georg Lukács, Alick West, the Frankfurt school, the Soviet Union's representatives and others. The paradox here is that ʿAwaḍ considers that these schools express only one type of socialism which is the Marxist one, embodied in the Communist regime, while forgetting to study these schools in Communist countries. Fourthly, ʿAwaḍ only uses Marx's *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* in presenting his views on literature and art. Yet there are several collections of Marx' and Engels' views on literature and art, and had he been objective and fair-minded, ʿAwaḍ could have presented these views through the relevant texts. Also the student of his call can find no justification for neglecting the Sartrean concept of commitment in this context, especially when this concept had exerted a very important influence on modern Arabic literature during the 1950s.[70] Finally, an anthology of *Proletarian Literature in the United States* edited by Granville Hicks (school of historical determinism) and Joseph Freeman (school of purposive literature) including works by Michael Gold (school of revolutionary socialism) and others, was published in 1935. To include works by all of them in one anthology implies that the editors agreed on certain common views (on literature and society and their interrelation) which would justify bringing them together in one volume. This might encourage the student of ʿAwaḍ's classification to question its foundations and to conclude that this classification is ʿAwaḍ's alone. Yet ʿAwaḍ does not even acknowledge that he classifies them, let alone justify what he does.

IIIc

ʿAwaḍ's concept of sound socialism is basically, as Muruwwah rightly remarks, nothing but socialist realism, which ʿAwaḍ considers to be against sound socialism in its truly humanistic sense and which he also never discusses. It might, therefore, be useful at this point to compare the elements of sound socialism with their origins in socialist realism, in order to illustrate ʿAwaḍ's debt or assumed originality and consequently reach a better understanding of his call for literature for life's sake.

ʿAwaḍ's emphasis on the humanistic characteristic of sound socialism is, in fact, a notable feature of Marxist thought in general and socialist realism in particular. Thus the most distinguished Marxist aesthetician and critic, Georg Lukács writes:

> Now humanism, that is, the passionate study of man's nature, is essential to all literature and art; and good art and good literature are humanistic to the extent that they not only investigate man and the real essence of his nature with passion but also and simultaneously defend human integrity passionately against all attacks, degradation and distortion. Since such tendencies ... attain such a level of inhumanity in no other society as under capitalism just because of the objective reification we have mentioned, every true artist, every true writer as a creative individual is instinctively an enemy of this distortion of the principle of humanism, whether consciously or not.[71]

For, artistic creation and aesthetic gratification presuppose—in Marx's eyes—the specifically human appropriation of things and of the human nature that is to prevail in a Communist society.[72]

Comprehensiveness is also very important in socialist realism. For 'a socialist perspective, correctly understood and applied, should enable the writer to depict life more comprehensively than any preceding perspective, not excluding that of critical realism.'[73]

The heritage of the past is crucial for socialist realism and the assimilation of this heritage determines the extent of the originality of a literary work. 'The stronger a writer's ties with the cultural heritage of his nation, the more original his work',[74] writes Lukács.

In the field of aesthetics, literature theory and literary history:

> Marxism raises to conceptual clarity those fundamental principles of creative activity which have been presented in the philosophic outlook of the best thinkers and the works of the outstanding writers and artists over the centuries.[75]

So, only those who do not have any real knowledge of Marxism believe that the cultural liberation of the proletariat means the complete abandonment of the past.

> The classics and the founders of Marxism never maintained such a view. In their judgement the liberation struggle of the working class, the working class ideology and culture to be created, are the heir to all mankind has produced of value over the millennia.[76]
>
> Lenin once declared that one of the superiorities of Marxism to bourgeois ideologies lay precisely in its capacity critically to accept the progressive cultural heritage and to absorb whatever was great in the past.[77]

Finally, because socialist realism is based on class structure, which is a dynamic formation, it contains within itself the past, present and future of the society in question. Hence in literature a critical understanding of the present is the key to the understanding of the past, and since the ideological basis of socialist realism is based on the understanding of the future, individuals working for that future will necessarily be portrayed from the inside.[78]

Turning to the concept of totality which covers the following three aspects:

(i) the totality of man;
(ii) the relationship between reality and appearance; and
(iii) the dialectical relationship between the parts and the whole,

one can easily notice that Marxism, to begin with, emphasizes the totality of man. Engels, for instance, points out (in his criticism of Lassalle's drama) that 'only with representations of the multifaceted life of the people could he provide genuine and vivid characters for his drama'.[79]

Engels and Marx, therefore, urged the writers of their time:

> ... to take an effective stand through their characters against the destructiveness and degradation of the capitalist division of labour and to grasp man in his essence and totality. And because they missed in most of their contemporaries this attempt at viewing mankind individually as a whole, they considered these writers insignificant epigones.[80]
>
> For the struggle of the proletariat is for a free development of a many-sided integrated man.[81]

As for the relationship between reality and appearance, it is not that of absolute opposition, as 'Awaḍ tries to suggest, and there is no such separation between the two in Marxist aesthetics or in socialist realism. Marxism 'does not admit an exclusive opposition between appearance and reality', Lukács says, but 'seeks the reality in appearance and the appearance in its organic relation to the reality'.[82] The aesthetic capturing of the reality and of the idea is not a simple, definitive act but a process, an

active, step-by-step approximation of essential reality, a recognition of the fact that the most profound essence of reality is never more than a part of the total reality to which the surface phenomena also belong.[83]

Finally, Marxism in general, and socialist realism in particular, emphasize the concept of the dialectical relationship between the parts and the whole. Lukács, as Alan Swingewood writes, stresses that:

> ... the elements of totality are not defined as uniform and identical, as was the case with vulgar Marxism; but form a dialectical and contradictory relation with one another, as a unity of oppositions; there is no mutual influence or reciprocal interaction of otherwise unchangeable objects and the complex unity of any totality (whether economic, political, cultural etc.) is not dependent on one single contradiction.[84]

Furthermore, this unity is comprehensive enough to combine the universal, particular and individual into a dynamic unity. This particular dialectic must be manifested in specific art form. For, in contrast to science which dissolves this activity into its abstract elements and seeks to conceptualise the interaction of these elements, art renders this activity perceptually meaningful as movement in a dynamic unity.[85]

'Awaḍ's insistence that literature, art and thought should exist only for the sake of man is, in fact, the starting point of Marxism, and Marx directly and indirectly touches on fundamental human equivalents throughout his aesthetic thought. This, as Stefan Morawoski rightly suggests, is the necessary background to his all-out search for the means of social disalienation which assumes a fundamental human potential.[86]

'Awaḍ's rejection of proletarian literature, thought and art, seems to be derived from Trotsky, who asserts in his *Literature and Revolution* that such terms as proletarian literature and proletarian culture ('Awad substitutes socialist for proletarian) are dangerous, because they erroneously compress the culture of the future into the narrow limits of the present day. For Trotsky, as Edmund Wilson says:

> ... did not believe in a proletarian culture which could displace the bourgeois one. The bourgeois literature of the French Revolution had ripened under the old regime; but the illiterate proletariat and peasantry of Russia had had no chance to produce a culture, nor would there be time for them to do so in the future, because the proletarian dictatorship was not to last: it was to be only a transition phase and to lead the way to 'a culture which is above classes and which will be the first truly human culture'.[87]

IV

'Awaḍ's exclusive emphasis on the American representatives in particular and western ones in general in his discussion of the main literary schools, especially the materialistic ones, can be explained by his cultural formation which is, almost exclusively, western and American. He has no direct contact with East European sources. Sympathetic readers of his criticism might refer to his discussion of al-Shūbāshī's concept of realism, considered earlier in this study, in which he quotes Belinsky or to his studies of Mayakovsky[88] and Pasternak[89] in his book *Socialism and Literature*, as well as to his attack on Khrushchev's hostile attitude towards modern art.[90] On the other hand one must not, however, exaggerate the importance of such references, in view of the following:

(i) ʿAwaḍ knows no Russian and therefore relies for his knowledge of Russian literature on English or French sources;
(ii) ʿAwaḍ's studies on Eastern literature, compared with those on western literature are very limited indeed; and
(iii) ʿAwaḍ's views on Pasternak or Mayakovsky reflect in part a western standpoint, both of them having acquired a distinguished status in the West, an achievement which might indicate that ʿAwaḍ's interest in them is merely an extension of his interest in western literature as a whole.

ʿAwaḍ's emphasis on the importance of the past can be attributed to his profound interest in Classical studies, whether Ancient Egyptian, Greek, Latin or Arabic, and is evident in his translations of Greek and Latin critical texts[91] and dramas,[92] as well as his comparative study[93] of *The Epistle of Forgiveness* by al-Maʿarrī.

ʿAwaḍ's attempt to reconcile the idealism of al-ʿAqqād, the rationalism of Ṭāhā Ḥusayn and the materialism of Salāmah Mūsā seems to be behind his assembly of all these ambivalent ideas in his concept of sound socialism and his proposed synthesis. Also, his insistence on the free will of man and on taking individuality into consideration throughout his discussion can be related to the influence of al-ʿAqqād whose interest in individualism and freedom had left a strong impact on his writing in all fields.[94] On the other hand, the social aspect of ʿAwaḍ's ideas seems to be connected with the influence on him of Mūsā and Marxism while his attempt at a reconciliation of these ideas stems from Ṭāhā Ḥusayn's rationalism.

Nothing would better sum up his position than M.M. Badawi's observation when he perceptively notes that, in view of the confusion and ambivalence of his position,

> in his attempt to reconcile the freedom of the writer with his social and political responsibility, ʿAwaḍ wants, as it were, to eat his cake and have it too.[95]

The fact is that ʿAwaḍ tries to go beyond socialist realism because he sees it merely as the literary and artistic articulation of the Leninist Marxism which happens to be opposed by the Egyptian regime at the time on the ground that it is a form of dependency, an infringement of the independent stand on which the regime has prided itself. However, in his elaboration of his notion of sound socialism which he wants literature, art and thought to serve, ʿAwaḍ gets nowhere. For he presented only what he decided to ignore or rather to keep silent about, namely socialist realism itself.

Notes

1. Luwīs ʿAwaḍ, *al-Ishtirākiyyah wa-al-Adab* (Dār al-Adab, Beirut, 1963). Henceforth *Socialism and Literature*.
2. See John Waterbury (1983) *The Egypt of Nasser and Sadat: The Political Economy of Two Regimes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), pp. 432–4.
3. See Muḥammad Mandūr, *al-Naqd wa-al-Nuqqād al-Muʿāṣirūn* (Dār Nahḍat Miṣr, Cairo, n.d.), pp. 196–215; Ḥusayn Muruwwah, *Dirāsāt Naqdiyyah fi Ḍaw' al-Minhaj al-Wāqiʿī* (Dār al-Maʿārif, Beirut, 1965), pp. 59–141; Ghālī Shukrī, *Mādhā Aḍāfū Ilā Ḍamīr al-ʿAṣr* (Dār al-Kātib al-ʿArabī, Cairo, 1968), pp. 166–70); Jalāl al-ʿAshrī, *Thaqāfatunā Bayn al-Aṣālah wa-al-Muʿāṣarah* (Cairo, 1971), pp. 87–109; Ḥannā ʿAbbūd, *al-Madrasah al-Wāqiʿiyyah fi al-Naqd al-ʿArabī al-Ḥadīth* (Damascus: Ministry of Culture and National Guidance, 1978), pp. 157–67; ʿAbd al-Munʿim Ṭallīmah, 'Taṣawwur al-Tārīkh al-Adabī fī Kitābāt Luwīs ʿAwaḍ, *Adab wa-Naqd* (Cairo), no. 57, May, 1990, pp. 12–24; Sayyid al-Baḥrāwī, 'Luwīs ʿAwaḍ Ṭalīqan', ibid., pp. 33–41; Shukrī Muḥammad ʿAyyād, 'Luwīs ʿAwaḍ wa-al-Adab al-Ishtirākī', *al-Hilāl* (Cairo), vol. 98, October

1990, pp. 38–43; and Jābir 'Uṣfūr, 'Dr Luwīs 'Awaḍ Nāqidan: Min Muḥammad Mandūr Ilā Luwīs 'Awaḍ', ibid, pp. 50–8.

4. For more details on 'Awaḍ's contribution to modern Arab culture see M.A. Khouri (1970) 'Lewis 'Awad: A Forgotten Pioneer of the Free Verse Movement', *Journal of Arabic Literature* (Leiden), vol. 1, pp. 137–44; Hilary Kilpatrick (1982) *The Modern Egyptian Novel* (London: Ithaca Press), pp. 65–71; Muhammad Abdul-Hai (1982) *Tradition and English and American Influence in Arabic Romantic Poetry* (London: Ithaca Press), pp. 225–37; Ali B. Jad (1983) *Form and Technique in the Egyptian Novel: 1919–1971* (London: Ithaca Press), pp. 157–60; Marina Stagh (1993) *The Limits of Freedom of Speech: Prose Literature and Prose Writers in Egypt Under Nasser and Sadat* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, Stockholm), pp. 227–90; Ghālī Shukrī (1965) *Thawrat al-Fikr fī Adabinā al-Ḥadīth* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Anglū al-Miṣriyyah), pp. 5–52; Maḥmūd Amīn al-'Ālim (1994) *al-Insān Mawqif*, 2nd edn (Cairo: Qaḍāyā Fikriyyah), pp. 247–56; *Adab wa-Naqd* (1990) (Cairo), no. 57, special issue devoted to L. 'Awaḍ; Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mu'ṭī Ḥijāzī *et al.* (1990) *Luwīs 'Awaḍ Mufakkiran wa-Nāqidan wa-Mubdi'an* (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-'Āmmah li-al-Kitāb); Ḥilmī Muḥammad al-Qā'ūd, *Luwīs 'Awaḍ al-Uṣṭūrah wa-al-Ḥaqīqah* (Cairo: Dār al-I'tiṣām, 1994) and Nasīm Mijallī (1995) *Luwīs 'Awaḍ wa-Ma'ārikuh al-Adabiyyah* (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-'Āmmah li-al-Kitāb).
5. For more details see Luwīs 'Awaḍ (1965) *Maqālāt fī al-Naqd wa-al-Adab* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Anglū al-Miṣriyyah), pp. 91–102.
6. Ghālī Shukrī (1962) *Salāmah Mūsā wa-Azmat al-Ḍamīr al-'Arabī* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī), pp. 249–300.
7. M.M. Badawi (1975) *A Critical Introduction to Modern Arabic Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 205.
8. Luwīs 'Awaḍ (1965) *Mudhakkirāt Ṭālib Ba'thah* (Cairo: Rūz al-Yūsuf), p. 9.
9. Muhammad Abdul-Hai, *Tradition and English and American Influence in Arabic Romantic Poetry*, p. 226.
10. Ibid., pp. 228–30 and Muhammad Abdul-Hai (1971) 'Shelley and the Arabs', *Journal of Arabic Literature*, vol. iii, p. 80.
11. *The Literature of Ideas in Egypt*, part 1, Selection, Translation and Introductions by Louis Awad (1986) (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press), p. 225; Luwīs 'Awaḍ (1989) *Blūtūlānd wa-Qaṣā'id Ukhrā Min Shi'r al-Khāṣṣah*, 2nd edn (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-'Āmmah li-al-Kitāb,), pp. 26–7 and also (his Afterword entitled Ba'd Niṣf Qarn (After half a century), Ibid., pp. 131–50.
12. Nasīm Mijallī, *Luwīs 'Awaḍ wa-Ma'ārikuh al-Adabiyyah*, pp. 105–49.
13. Luwīs 'Awaḍ (1967) *al-Thawrah wa-al-Adab* (Cairo: Dār al-Kātib al-'Arabī), p. 160.
14. Luwīs 'Awaḍ, *Maqālāt fī al-Naqd wa-al-Adab*, p. 4.
15. Ibid., pp. 133–43.
16. Ibid., pp. 145–54.
17. Ibid., pp. 155–65.
18. Ibid., pp. 167–75.
19. Shukrī Muḥammad 'Ayyād, 'Luwīs 'Awaḍ wa-al-Adab al-Ishtirākī', ibid., p. 39.
20. Ibid., p. 40.
21. Luwīs 'Awaḍ, *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 7–8.
22. Ibid., p. 8.
23. Ibid., p. 9.
24. Ibid., p. 10.
25. 'Awaḍ refers to, and qotes from, Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1891) which he translated into Arabic and published in Cairo in 1946.
26. 'Awaḍ cites here Pater's *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (1873).
27. 'Awaḍ cites here Spingarn's (1931) *Creative Criticism and Other Essays* (London: OUP).
28. 'Awaḍ refers to Babbitt's *Rousseau and Romanticism* and discusses it at some length, see *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 16–23.
29. 'Awaḍ cites here Eliot's 'Religion and Literature' and *For Lancelot Andrewes*, see *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 24–32.
30. See C.G. Jung's *Four Archetypes*.
31. 'Awaḍ cites here Breton first and second manifestoes. See *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 35–9.
32. 'Awaḍ cites here Gold's speech at the American Writers' Congress held in 1930, see *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 41–2.
33. 'Awaḍ refers here to Hicks' *The Great Tradition*, see *Socialism and Literature*, p. 50.

34. 'Awaḍ cites here Freeman's 'Introduction' to *Proletarian Literature in the United States: An Anthology*, Edited by Granville Hicks and Joseph Freeman (New York: 1936). See *Socialism and Literature*, p. 53.
35. 'Awaḍ cites here Marx's *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, see *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 51–2.
36. 'Awaḍ refers here to one of Rahv's articles in the *Partisan Review*, see Socialism and Literature, p. 44.
37. 'Awaḍ quotes Calverton's *The Liberation of American Literature*, see *Socialism and Literature*, p. 45.
38. 'Awaḍ refers to Strachey's paper 'Literature and Dialectical Materialism', see *Socialism and Literature*, p. 45.
39. Luwīs 'Awaḍ, *Socialism and Literature*, p. 56.
40. Ibid., pp. 56–7.
41. Ibid., p. 57.
42. Ibid., pp. 57–8.
43. Ibid., pp. 58–9.
44. Ibid., p. 59.
45. Ibid., pp. 59–60.
46. Ibid., p. 60.
47. Ghālī Shukrī, *Mādhā Aḍāfū Ilā Ḍamīr al-'Aṣr*, p. 168.
48. Ḥusayn Muruwwah, *Dirāsāt Naqdiyyah*, pp. 64–5.
49. Such as Muḥammad Mandūr, Muḥammad Mufīd al-Shūbāshī, 'Abd al-'Aẓīm Anīs, Maḥmud Amīn al-'Ālim, Ḥusayn Muruwwah and others.
50. Georg Lukács (1970) *Writer and Critic*, edited and translated by Arthur Kahn (London: Merlin Press), p. 73.
51. Stefan Morawski (1974) 'Introduction', in; Lee Baxandall and Stefan Morawski, *Marx and Engels on Literature and Art* (New York: International General), pp. 46–7.
52. *Socialism and Literature*, p. 51.
53. Granville Hicks and Joseph Freeman (eds), *Proletarian Literature*, p. 12.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid., p. 14.
56. *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 41–2.
57. Granville Hicks and Joseph Freeman (eds), *Proletarian Literature*, p. 13.
58. *Socialism and Literature*, p. 35.
59. Raymond Williams (1977) *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p. 85.
60. Ibid., p. 83.
61. Baxandall and Morawski, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
62. Hicks and Freeman (eds), *op. cit.*, pp. 369–70.
63. Ḥusayn Muruwwah, *Dirāsāt Naqdiyyah*, p. 62.
64. Wilbur Scott (1974) *Five Approaches of Literary Criticism* (New York: Collier Books), p. 124.
65. Such as the *New Masses* under Michael Gold's editorship and the *Left Review* under Edgell Rickwords.
66. Such as Granville Hicks and Joseph Freeman (eds), *Proletarian Literature in The United States* and C. Day Lewis, *The Mind in Chains* and Bernard Smith, *Forces in American Criticism*.
67. Such as V.F. Calverton, *The Liberation of American Literature* (1931), and John Strachey (1933) *The Coming Struggle for Power*.
68. Wilbur Scott, *op cit.*, p. 125.
69. *Socialism and Literature*, p. 18.
70. Ḥusām al-Khaṭīb (1977) *Malāmiḥ fī al-Thaqāfa wa-al-Adab wa-al-Lughah* (Damascus: Ministry of Culture and National Guidance,), p. 44 and M.M. Badawi (1985) *Modern Arabic Literature and the West* (London: Ithaca Press), pp. 12–16.
71. Georg Lukács, 'Marx and Engels on Aesthetics' in: *Writer and Critic*, ibid; pp. 69 and 61–88.
72. Adolfo Sánchez Vázques (1973) *Art and Society*, translated by Maro Riofrancos (London: Merlin Press), p. 10.
73. Georg Lukács (1972) *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*, translated by John and Necke Mander (London: Merlin Press), p. 98.
74. Ibid., p. 105.
75. Georg Lukács, *Writer and Critic*, p. 75.
76. Ibid., p. 74.

77. Ibid., pp. 74–5.
78. Georg Lukács, *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*, p. 95.
79. Georg Lukács, *Writer and Critic*, p. 72.
80. Ibid., p. 71.
81. Ibid., p. 70.
82. Ibid., p. 80.
83. Ibid., pp. 80 ff.
84. Alan Swingwood (1978) 'Marxist Approaches to the Study of Literature', in: Jane Routh and Janet Wolff (eds), *The Sociology of Literature: Theoretical Approaches* (Keele: University of Keele), p. 135.
85. Georg Lukács, *Writer and Critic*, p. 77.
86. Stefan Morawski, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
87. Edmund Wilson (1972) 'Marxism and Literature', in: 20th *Century Literary Criticism*, edited by David Lodge (London: Longman), p. 244.
88. *Socialism and Literature*, pp. 77–92.
89. Ibid., pp. 93–108.
90. Luwīs ʿAwaḍ (1965) 'al-Muṭāradūn', in: *Dirāsāt ʿArabiyyah wa-Gharbiyyah* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif), pp. 9–13.
91. Luwīs ʿAwaḍ (1965) *Nuṣūṣ al-Naqd al-Adabī ʿInd al-Yūnān* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif).
92. Luwīs ʿAwaḍ (1987) *Thulāthiyyat Ūrist li-Aeskhilus* (Cairo: al-Hayʾah al-Miṣriyyah al-ʿĀmmah li-al-Kitāb).
93. Luwīs ʿAwaḍ (1966) *ʿAlā Hāmish al-Ghufran* (Cairo: Dār al-Hilāl), and Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir (1972) *Abāṭīl wa-Asmār*, parts 1 and 2, 2nd edn (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat al-Madanī).
94. Muḥammad Mandūr, *al-Naqd wa-al-Nuqqād al-Muʿāṣirūn*, pp. 89–92.
95. M.M. Badawi, *Modern Arabic Literature and the West*, p. 16.