

# Edward Bond's Dialectical Theatre from the Perspective of a Dialectical Understanding of Utopia and Dystopia

## Ütopya ve Distopyanın Diyalektik Anlayışı Perspektifinden Edward Bond'un Diyalektik Tiyatrosu

Mesut Güneç\*

Aydın Adnan Menderes University

### Abstract

Edward Bond asserts that art is significant because it is made up of a constant dialectic of variation in which every idea is subject to criticism. Bond does not argue that a utopian work of art resolves actual conflicts in a fictitious setting; rather, he emphasises that it exposes these issues in a concrete way in its internal structure and reflects the need for a new and different existence. The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how Bond, one of the most prominent representatives of Marxist-dialectical theatre, creates a dramaturgy of utopia (individual)/dystopia (dividual) and hope/hopelessness in his plays *The Bundle* (1978) and *Summer* (1982). Bond believes that art, particularly theatre, should be employed to encourage the desire for a socialist utopia. Bond does not resolve the contradictions of life (within capitalism) in a utopian fiction; rather, he contends that the problems of capitalist exploitation that drive individuals to hopelessness should be made visible in his plays' internal structure. He does this through a kind of Brechtian theatre where the contradictions of capitalism are foregrounded. Like Brecht, Bond attempts to use theatre to promote change in society - both represent the fundamental problems of society to convince spectators that social change is necessary and possible. Bond purposefully employs a mix of political propaganda and a utopian hope for a new and different existence. His plays exhibit a desire for a politically awake society, and a peaceful world that prioritises equality and freedom.

**Keywords:** Dialectic, Utopia-Dystopia, Hope, Edward Bond

### Öz

Edward Bond, sanatın önemli olduğunu çünkü her fikrin eleştiriye tabi olduğu sürekli bir varyasyon diyalektiğinden oluştuğunu ileri sürer. Bond, ütopyik bir sanat eserinin kurmaca bir ortamda gerçek çatışmaları çözdüğünü iddia etmez; daha ziyade bu konuları kendi iç yapısında somut bir şekilde ortaya koyduğunu, yeni ve farklı bir varoluş ihtiyacını yansıttığını vurgular. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Marksist-diyalektik tiyatronun en önemli temsilcilerinden biri olan Bond'un *The Bundle* (1978) ve *Summer* (1982) oyunlarında nasıl bir ütopya (özgün)/distopya (özgün olmayan/bağımlı) ve umut/umutsuzluk dramaturjisi yarattığını açıklamaktır. Bond, sosyalist bir ütopya arzusunu teşvik etmek için sanatın, özellikle tiyatronun kullanılması gerektiğine inanmaktadır. Bond, hayatın (kapitalizm içindeki) çelişkilerini ütopyik bir kurguyla çözmez; daha ziyade, kapitalist sömürünün bireyleri umutsuzluğa sürükleyen sorunlarının oyunlarının iç yapısında görünür kılınması gerektiğini savunur. Bunu, kapitalizmin çelişkilerinin ön plana çıktığı bir tür Brechtien tiyatro aracılığıyla yapıyor. Brecht gibi Bond da toplumsal değişikliği

Cankaya University *CUJHSS* (ISSN 1309-6761), June 2023; 17/1:30-42

<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/cankujhss>. DOI: 10.47777/cankujhss.

Submitted: Feb 22, 2023; Accepted: April 24, 2023 © 2023 authors (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

\*Assoc. Prof. Dr., Dept of Western Languages and Literatures, Adnan Menderes University

ORCID# 0000-0002-7077-1914; mesut.gunenc@gmail.com

gerçekleştirmek için tiyatroyu kullanmaya çalışır-her ikisi de seyircileri toplumsal değişimin gerekli ve mümkün olduğuna ikna etmek için toplumun temel sorunlarını yansıtır. Bond, yeni ve farklı bir varoluş için kasıtlı olarak bir siyasi propaganda ve ütopyik umut karışımı kullanır. Oyunları, politik olarak uyanık bir toplum ve eşitlik ve özgürlüğü ön planda tutan barışçıl bir dünya arzusunu sergiler.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Diyalektik, Ütopya-Distopya, Umut, Edward Bond

### **Dialectical Theatre in Edward Bond**

Dialectic, a kind of didactic reasoning, has been used in various forms from the beginning of human existence on Earth since human life always includes important changes and interactional elements. It is the science of the destruction of that remains stagnant in existence. Dialectics is also identified in the ancient Greek period as the creation of back-and-forth arguments between contradictory notions. In this vein, as Maybee (2016) notes, "Plato, for instance, presented his philosophical argument as a back-and-forth dialogue or debate, generally between the character of Socrates, on one side, and some person or group of people to whom Socrates was talking (his interlocutors), on the other". In the fifth century B.C., this particular philosophy was observed among Socrates, Plato and Aristotle: "What Aristotle says about dialectic in the *Topics* certainly fits to a large extent with what Plato exhibits as Socratic practice in the earlier dialogues" (Hamlyn, 1990, p. 466). This philosophy configures a dialectical relation between philosophy and political freedom.

In the nineteenth century, Hegel honed the dialectical method and evaluated humans and the universe from a historical point of view. As Berti states, Hegel "is well aware of the particular mode of political freedom that was realized in Greece, because he claims that it was a matter of limited freedom on account of the existence of slavery, and to this proposition he adds the famous declaration according to which in the Orient only one is free, which is say no one, in Greece only some are free, and in the Christian-Germanic world all are free" (1978, p. 347). In his definition, Hegel clarifies what is meant by opposing sides in his dialectical method. While in Plato "opposing sides" represented people (Aristotle, Socrates, and so on...) in Hegel opposing sides stand in for various notions of consciousness. In fact, Hegel's formulation indicates that self-consciousness, the intellect or spirit determine the trajectory of human history. Hegel defines dialectics as "the principle of all natural and spiritual life" (*Science of Logic*, 1977, p. 56). Hegel's dialectical method provides the 'negatively rational' (the moment of instability and restrictedness) and the 'positively rational' (the moment of grasping the unity of the opposition between the first two determinations) (*Encyclopaedia Logic*, pp. 79-82) and sets out his famous dialectics as following a movement of thesis-antithesis-synthesis (Being-Nothing-Becoming):

Hegel sees the category of "being" as a contentless abstraction: being in itself has no determinate qualities. Pure being, says Hegel, is "the absolute abstraction" because its purity consists in "an absolute absence

of attributes.” Hence being is nothing; there is no ground on which these two terms can be distinguished since both are without content. Since being both implies its opposite (nothing) and is also indistinguishable from it, the ground of their simultaneous opposition and identity must lie outside of them. They are perpetually passing into each other, and this indefinite transition between them needs to be expressed by a third term, namely, “becoming.” (Habib, 2005, p. 387)

On the other hand, Marxist thought criticises Hegel’s idealist dialectic through the concept of dialectical materialism derived from the writings of Marx and Engels (1857). Both Marx and Engels embraced a realist epistemology (and ontology of economic classes) in contrast to Hegel’s conflict of ideas and “developed Hegel’s idea of man’s self-creation through labour, his objectification, and, in certain circumstances, his alienation or estrangement from his own activity” (Habib, 2005, p. 398). Marx insisted that “Hegel was an idealist in that Hegel thought that the moving force of history had to do with changes in self-consciousness, whereas he, Marx, insisted on his own “materialism”, which held that changes in self-consciousness were to be explained by changes in the economic relations in society” (Pinkard, 2008, p. 122). At the level of economic debate, the sense of reality was recovered. Criticising idealism, dialectical materialism focuses on a torn, damaged, chaotic, bleeding and dirt-filled world. The Oxford English Dictionary defines dialectics as “logic, reasoning; critical investigation of truth through reasoned argument, often by means of dialogue or discussion” and materialism as “the theory or belief that nothing exists except matter and its movements and modifications” and dialectical materialism as “the theory that political and historical events result from the conflict of social forces (seen as caused by material needs) and are interpretable as a series of contradictions and their solutions” (qtd in Anderson, 2020, p. 5). Through his historical materialist view of society, Marx sought to prove that the main factor that creates history is the class struggle and that dialectical thought exists in the functioning of the social process.

Focusing on the writings and ideas of Marx, Bertolt Brecht draws from his interpretation of human nature. Brecht uses Marx’s political thought to nurture his ideas. To understand the history of the world, Brecht applies the insights of dialectical materialism. He challenges previous notions of theatre and applies Marx’s theories to fit the stage. “Akin to how Marx responded to Hegel’s own theories considering the history of the world, epic theatre came about as the rejection of traditional aesthetics of Western theatre as first proposed by Aristotle in *Poetics*” (Anderson, 2020, p. 14). Brecht’s dialectical drama portrays class conflicts by revealing societal inconsistencies. Influenced by Brecht’s Marxist conception of history, Edward Bond aims to change the path of the historical drama from the individual to the common. Bond himself explains Brecht’s influence: “I have worked consciously-starting with Brecht but not ending there. Brecht’s contribution to the creation of a Marxist theatre is enormous and lasting, but the work is not yet finished” (Bond, 1978, p.32). Charles Marowitz also clarifies the Brechtian effect on Bond: “Bond is right in

calling himself perhaps the only post-Brechtian writer working in England” (1972, p. 5). Bond pays homage to Brecht's efforts to form Marxist theatre (Biçer, 2008b, p. 64) and like Brecht, Bond tries to focus on the audience because theatre judges society, interprets the world and tries to shape it as Brechtian order indicates. Bond considers dialectical thought to be a method of analysing social life and the system in which one lives, identifying problems and seeking solutions. The socialist utopia as a model of ultimate justice, equality, and freedom is one of Bond's particular solutions because “Bond is a socialist, personally convinced of the revolutionary potential of the working class in this country” (Coult, 1977, p. 62). He purposefully employs a mix of political propaganda and a utopian hope for a new and different existence. The purpose of this paper is to analyse how Bond creates his dramaturgy of utopia/dystopia, and hope/hopelessness in his plays *The Bundle* (1978) and *Summer* (1982).

### **Utopian/Dystopian Drama**

Utopia is understood in general terms to be that which is impossible to attain. Siân Adiseshiah (2011) clarifies that “Utopia is about what is not but what ought to be. Tantalizingly present as the ungraspable object of the desiring self, utopia remains beyond the discursive realm. Because utopia's presence is located outside of our conceptual horizon” (p. 152). Michael Griffin and Tom Moylan contend that “Utopianism ... is best understood as a process of social dreaming that unleashes and informs efforts to make the world a better place, not to the letter of a plan but to the spirit of an open-ended process” (2007, p. 11). Within the context of a better place and good society, Krishan Kumar (1991) asserts that

Utopia [. . .] is first and foremost a work of imaginative fiction in which, unlike other such works, the central subject is the good society. This distinguishes it at the same time from other treatments of the good society, whether in myths of a Golden Age, beliefs in a coming millennium, or philosophical speculation on the ideal city. Fictive elements no doubt have their part to play in these modes but in none of them is narrative fiction, as in the utopia, the defining form (p. 27).

Claire Macdonald points out that “First conceived by Thomas More in 1516 in a reflective dialogue modelled on Plato's *Republic*, utopia is the perfect state, an ideal place where all is perfectly in balance, where social unity is realized, and where design and planning, hope and civility at last (or perhaps at first) find a home” (2015, p. xiv). Social crises and the concern to find a solution to the issues, pains, terrors, wars, and absences that humanity has suffered on Earth are the basis of the formation of utopias, which aim at an ideal social structure that works in favour of human beings. While utopia offers an alternative to the system in which we live, it is based on definite and strict organization and planning in the name of equality and shared happiness. In the pursuit of this equality and social happiness, suppressing individual tendencies and values and denying them due place is the critical step that turns utopian understandings into dystopias. Trish Reid, focusing on Williams' essay,

explores that “Williams sees the utopian and the dystopian as two sides of the same coin” (2019, p. 77), as “modes of desire or warning in which a crucial emphasis is obtained by the element of discontinuity from ordinary ‘realism’” (Williams, 1997, p. 97). In *The Concept of Utopia*, Ruth Levitas defines utopia as the desire “for a better way of being and living” (2011, p. 7). By depicting a heaven on Earth, the utopian writer is optimistic in his presentation. Conversely, a dystopian writer tries to depict the hell created by individuals who set out with the dream of creating an earthly paradise. Dystopia represents “a fiction of submission (...) of helplessness and hopelessness” (Lepore, 2017).

Utopia has been deemed as a functional element of culture and as needed “for freedom [which is] denied by the class organization of society” (Gartman, 1991, p. 440) because “it postulates the freedom to create and communicate without physical and cultural boundaries” (Klaić, 1995, p. 66). More's *Utopia* is considered as the principal work, written in prose, of the genre. H. G. Wells' *A Modern Utopia* became a classic around the end of the nineteenth century. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are dystopian novels that have left an indelible imprint on the twentieth century. Contrary to prose fiction and novels, theatre is not generally included in fictional utopias. Adishesiah explains one of the reasons for this as follows: “There are several reasons for why not many utopian plays have been written or performed ...but one of them is the perceived constraints on the form of drama in production: in other words, bodies on stage engaged in live performance, and the scenographic limitations of theatre, which are more restricting than prose (as prose depends on the reader's imagination to visualise utopia)” (2020, p. d35). On the other hand, Jill Dolan interrogates the potential of utopia in drama in her book *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at The Theatre*, Dolan asserts that “performances inspire moments in which audiences feel themselves allied with each other, and with a broader, more capacious sense of a public, in which social discourse articulates the possible, rather than the insurmountable obstacles to human potential” (2005, p. 2). The audience can interact with each other in solidarity with the hope of a better future in the theatre. There are compelling reasons for theatre and performance's shared interests and affinities concerning, as well as utopia and its creative potential. This potential creates imaginative and alternative worlds. Janelle Reinelt clarifies how theatre could produce utopian plays in Britain:

The theatre, which seems a well-suited venue for conceiving imaginative or alternative worlds, has not experienced a contemporary outpouring of utopian plays. Britain, however, perhaps because of its well-developed socialist theatre tradition, has produced several plays which might be considered at least functionally utopian (1991, p. 222).

Bernard Shaw's plays *Back to Methuselah* (1921), *The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles* (1934) and *Farfetched Fables* (1950), Howard Brenton's works' *Plays for Utopia*, Howard Barker's play *The Castle* and Edward Bond's trilogy *The War Plays* are examples of utopian drama in Britain. The idealistic

desire for justice and equality dominates Bond's theatre. Bond defines current society as an extreme condition in which inequality is regarded as the "natural" order of things. Bond's drama is a realm where we can make responsible choices, seek the meaning of justice and freedom, without being crushed by late capitalism. Bond's plays offer the potential for individuals to create and maintain a new and utopian society. For conceptualising an alternative society and subjectivity Adiseshiah explores Deleuzian 'dividual' subjectivity: "Markedly different from the self-contained indivisibility of the "individual," the dividual can be broken down into several parts. Whilst for Deleuze the dividual is a dystopian figure (the dividual as interpellated in multiple ways for the benefit of capital), (2020, p.d36)." Bond's characters can be analysed in terms of this Deleuzian concept, with 'individual' (members of the utopian society) and 'dividual' (members of the dystopian society) featuring in his plays.

Bond depicts the current world as a place ruled by authoritarian forces. Bond takes a historical (*Summer*) and dialectical (*The Bundle*) perspective of the authoritarian forces, which exploit their people and separate them from community. Bond is resolute in his hatred of capitalism and predictive conviction in a socialist utopia that would stop systemic capitalist violence, and he is noteworthy for suggesting the necessary dramatic ways of building successful socialist theatre. Bond, building upon the notion of a Marxist tradition, seeks to create a new and more perfect social order and represents the political function of utopian drama. His utopia is a socialist society of equal and free individuals and he argues that encouraging a desire for a socialist utopia should be performed through art, particularly theatre. This paper focuses on dialectical theatre and utopian and dystopian drama, addressing problematics of dividual/individual figures and hope/hopelessness in Bond's plays *The Bundle* (1978) and *Summer* (1982).

### **Dystopian Dividual and Utopian Individual Figures in *The Bundle***

*The Bundle*, which started a different era in Bond's playwriting, was staged by the Royal Shakespeare Company in 1978 at the Warehouse Theatre. He believes that art, particularly theatre, should be employed more effectively to achieve a socialist utopia. Bond explains his intention in the play:

The people in *The Bundle* live by a river. Directly or indirectly, they all live from it. From time to time it floods and destroys them. If, as the play invites, you substitute factories and offices- all industrialism- for the river, then my purpose is plain (qtd in Hay and Roberts, 1978, p. 26).

*The Bundle*, the embodiment of Bond's belief that people can create a rational society, carries optimistic traces that society can be changed positively. The author places the phenomenon of change and the dialectic of change in the focus of the play. In *The Bundle*, which can also be described as a play in which Bond tries to reflect the dialectical change and the social will necessary for this phenomenon to occur, the author clearly states this purpose in the preface he wrote to the play. In his preface, Bond exemplifies the meaning of his theatre:

“theatre can co-operate with all those who are in any way involved in rationally changing society and evolving a new consciousness” (2013a, p. 129). Dealing with human consciousness from a Marxist approach, Bond establishes a dialectical relationship through a conflict between the concepts of good and evil. Thus, in the play, the struggle between the utopian social structure (socialism) in the author's dreams and the existing system (capitalism), which he sees as a counter-utopia, takes place (Biçer, 2008a, p. 132). Criticising landowners (evil) as dystopian individual figures (members of dystopian society), Bond tries to portray oppressive behaviours and social injustice and create social dreaming through Wang's efforts to create better conditions for peasants (good).

The play is set in Asia and depicts the story of Wang, who lives in a peasant community. Wang, a revolutionary leader standing with the people against the landowners, reappropriates the land for the common good. “Wang hurls one into the water so that he can go on with his plans for revolution” (Gourg, 2008). Growing up with financial issues caused by the social structure, Wang enters the landlord's service in return for taking them to the rescue boat when the stream floods and his family and neighbours are in troublesome circumstances. Although “Wang is not a devoted revolutionary in the beginning of the play” (Jones, 1980, p. 515). In the beginning of the play Wang reflects one of Hegel's dialectic characteristics as ‘nothing’.

He begins to promote awareness and educate the people after seeing the ruling class's harsh behaviours and social injustice. His goal is to end the landowners' oppression and save the people by building canals to protect them from the flood, which is a second but equally dangerous menace. (Coult, 1977, p. 57) Wang's goal represents his effort to reach an infinite transition named as ‘becoming’. To create the Hegelian dialectic category (being-nothing-becoming), Wang calls for collective action for the oppressed poor while he voices the idea that today's people should take action in order to stand up to the capitalist system and the inequality that it brings along, and in order to establish a socialist utopia (members of the individuals) that will bring equality among people. Collective action for the oppressed poor represents Brechtian order and hope for the socialist utopia. Bond reflects the dialectical relationship between hope and despair in *The Bundle* through members of the dystopian and utopian society. R. D. Jones notes that “The Ferryman has a more difficult time accepting this new activism because he has always lived with society's repressive morality” (1980, p. 515). Society's repressive morality drives the Ferryman to hopelessness:

The Ferryman: (slight pause) I will try to explain. The landowner owns the boat and the river and the fish. You could say he owns us – he owns the only way we can live. In return he keeps us safe. (Wang moves as if to interrupt.) Wait! You sit on the bank in the sun and wave your arms to keep off the insects. Some still bite – but not many. Well, if the landowner didn't keep the robbers away they'd come down the chimney

and take the food out of your mouth! We're his property. (Bond, 2013a, p. 146)

The play's second part is positioned as the characters take action to eliminate existing problems. Wang and his men try to persuade the Ferryman to bring them weapons to initiate social change. The Ferryman, overcoming his hopelessness and the old way of thinking, agrees to help them. The Ferryman's struggle reflects the root of class organisation of society. This situation also reveals the dialectical progression between the two parts of the play. Wang and The Ferryman as the members of class organisation, does not accept fictional submission of helplessness and hopelessness and tries to create their utopia through radical solutions. These radical solutions represent the social violence and the struggle. Biçer notes that the social violence and the struggle to survive amidst oppression and poverty which pushes the individual to despair are replaced in the second part by the belief that it is not enough for an individual to be good in the society and the necessity of creating radical solutions encompassing the whole community (2008a, p. 138).

Offering a method that necessitates violence in order to eliminate the culture that creates violence, Bond represents Wang as a devoted revolutionary character in the second part of the play. In *The Bundle*, Wang tries to reach a utopian society and become a member (an individual) of this society, and it will definitely not happen through magical thinking. "The present social order is in its own form of violence, and that man can change his society" (Jones, 1980, p. 517). In this respect, the play reflects the painful actions required for Wang to achieve his utopia. For Bond, the role of theatre is to analyse how human beings and individuals are defined within the social context because social analysis can create consciousness and hope in working class people.

With his effort and radical solutions, Wang has evolved from the dividual figure in the dystopian society Deleuze defined to the individual figure. As an individual labourer, "Wang attains a utopian society, but there is nothing magical in the process. The play carefully demonstrates Wang's desire, the possibility of a utopia and the painful actions necessary to achieve it" (Tully, 1979, p. 67). Wang's actions may seem necessary to achieve his goal and to decide between good and evil. He has to consider different alternatives to eliminate all kinds of oppressive systems (colonist system as dystopia). The old Ferryman, who decided to die for him, proves that Wang's desire, his utopia, is real:

Why are our lives wasted? We have minds to see how we suffer. Why don't we use them to change the world? A god would wipe us off the board with a cloud: a mistake. But as there is only ourselves shouldn't we change our lives so that we don't suffer. Or at least suffer only in changing them? (Bond, 2013a, p. 204)

While the play portrays the dialectic of utopia and dystopia by contrasting the communist and capitalist systems, it also explores the dialectic of dividual/individual and hope/hopelessness through the landowners, Wang

and Ferryman. In *The Bundle*, Bond is confident that dialectical exchange can be possible by asking questions of the society.

### **Hope and Hopelessness in *Summer***

Bond's "most reflective and lyrical play" (Marowitz, 1973, p. 128) *Summer* was staged at the National Theatre in 1982, and concerns people trying to heal the wounds of war and events in an unknown coastal town on a fictitious island. To use Macdonald's words in her analysis of More's *Utopia*, the island is "a place that is heard but never found... an island set just out of reach" (2015, p. xvi). In this fictional island, Bond portrays a fictional utopia creating a dialectical relation in society. Bond forms a dialectical relation between hope and hopelessness and treats the subjects of how people made the world uninhabitable and how a hell on earth (dystopia/hopelessness) was created through war, class conflicts as central themes in his play, and yet, at the same time, aims to create an ideal social order (utopia/hope) and living humanely. Bond tries to shed light on human history, which he sees as the history of class conflicts, through the characters and setting of the play (Biçer, 2008a, p. 139). The history of class conflicts and political action is represented by Bond's characters: "My female characters are often involved in political action. . . . Both Agustina Ruez [sic] and Martha [in *Summer*] have argued their case: neither are callous or imperious." (Bond, 1995, p. 198). In *Summer*, Bond reflects the dialectical exchange onto the stage, with the actions of the actors embodying conflicts and contrasts such as old-new generation, ultimate justice-the justice constructed by ruling class, war-peace and hope and hopelessness.

Xia points out that "There are five characters in the play, an upper class woman Xenia, her former servant Marthe, their children Ann and David, and an ex-Nazi soldier" (2014, p. 1188). Through the five characters of the play, he takes on the problems created by class divisions within society and articulates his longing for a better world where there will be equality and freedom. At the first scene of the play, Anne and her mother Xenia depart London for a yearly holiday in the coastal estate that Xenia's family previously owned. Prior to the war, Xenia had a comfortable life on the island with her wealthy family. They had enough financial means to employ maids. The war has destroyed the lives of the characters, forcing them to change. Deaths, destruction, and exile have revealed despair and a dystopian life for them.

Xenia and Marthe are the representatives of the old generation in the play. Xia clarifies how Xenia and Marthe represents "the meaning of the past without which, Bond argues, the meaning of-the present cannot be truly discovered" (2014, p. 1189). Unlike the past, Xenia and Marthe, Bond tries to find the meaning of the current world and future through David and Ann because David and Ann, leaving the thought of hopelessness, carry the hope for a good and reliable society. After the war and the Nazi invasion, nothing is the same on the island. Xenia is now a foreigner living on the island:

Marthe: Wipe out dust from your feet. That's a good advice. This isn't your home anymore. You're a stranger here. Some of the flats have

changed hands eight or nine times since you left. Most of the people in them have never heard your family home (Bond, 2013b, p. 362).

Like Marthe, Xenia has become a victim of the dialectic exchange between ultimate justice and justice by the ruling class.

Ann and David and Marther and Xenia represent the fine line between hope-hopelessness and life-death. While Xenia and Marthe (on her deathbed) embodies old generation, David and Ann, who are waiting for their child to be born, embodies new generation and hope. Actually these characters are representatives of dialectical thought.

Bond creates a new event with the help of the play's fourth character, the German, whom he names with his national identity. The German soldier is entirely ignorant of the crime committed against the citizens of the island. He insists that what Nazi soldiers accomplished in the past was for the welfare of all humanity, while being completely misled by Nazi acclamation of the Arian race (Xia, 2014, p. 1190). The ignorance of German soldier invading the island, the rise of fascism and acts of violence during World War II, demonstrates how dystopian society is created by those in positions of power. The war perpetrated by Nazi forces creates a dystopian society of brutality, destruction, misery and hopelessness. Similar to the pessimism of the early twentieth century "with an increasingly pervasive sense of fear, anxiety, and political uncertainty in the context of mass slaughter of World War I" (Adiseshiah, 2019, p. 2), Bond reflects the pessimism in the shadow of the slaughter and holocaust of World War II. When the German Nazi soldier expresses what happened at the concentration camp "in WWII tells his involvement in crimes committed on the island" (Xia, 2014, p. 1190):

In a war, bodies are a problem even to Germans. Take them to the mainland? More work, porters, boats, more lorries to take them from the quay to the hills. Throw them into the sea? No tide. The beaches are fouled. The town can't go about its business. You would think this was the devil's island it was so difficult for our adjutant to run. Now I will tell you about the end. When we had to go home. By then the island was full of bodies. They had been sealed up in caves and pushed down cracks (Bond, 2013b, pp. 382-83).

Bond, integrating the will for a better future for humanity and reminding the audience that there is a lot of work to be done to achieve this goal, tries to explain that even nature will admit the massacre that took place (Biçer, 2008a, p. 146). This will for a better future also means the hope for human potential to make the world a better place.

Through Ann and David's love for each other, the island, which has been the scene of war, death, and exploitation until now, becomes a hope for "an encounter affirming a solidaristic engagement with the hopeful anticipation of a better future" (Adiseshiah, 2022, p. 30). The conflict created by the difference between the generations, as revealed by the discourses of Marthe and Xenia, gives way to Ann and David's efforts to create a happy and peaceful life. The

old lose their social and political power and the young (as the creators of nomadic utopia society) can shape and govern the future.

Through the presence of the young (future generation), Bond aims to demonstrate that a future without war is possible, embodied by the truths of equality and freedom. As the future generation grow, “this need develops into an advanced concept of justice i.e. that the world is supposed to be a home for everybody” (Xia, p. 1188). A society made up of aware individuals can create a hopeful upcoming generation. Bond, guiding Ann and David to find a meaningful life, reminds readers/audiences that a happy and new life/utopia can be built with effort and hope.

Through his socialist interest, the dramatist seeks to create a better and equal society with individuals, indicating his fundamentally utopian imagination. “To reinforce the atmosphere of hope, the dramatist announces the painful birth of his utopia towards a rational society in the last scene of the play, with the child Ann carries in her womb symbolising the upcoming generation” (Biçer, 2008a, p. 140) and as Adiseshiah (2022) clarifies “theatre has a utopian nomadic quality” (p. 30), characters, getting beyond the borders, create their utopia and freedom in the play.

### **Conclusion**

Bond intentionally merges political propaganda with a utopian desire for a new and different existence. His plays express a wish for a politically conscious society and a peaceful world where equality and freedom are respected. The dominant utopian theme of his plays raises human consciousness to choose between nothing-becoming, hope-hopelessness, individual-individual and good-evil. For that reason Bond focuses on dialectical thought, which exists in the functioning of the social process. Bond aims to divert the historical drama from the individual and toward the collective, influenced by Brecht’s Marxist perspective on history. Laying bare the societal challenges and difficulties people deal with, the dramatist turns to Marxist dialectic approach to find solutions, transforming Wang and system in which they live, aiming to end exploitation by landowners and create the idea of socialist utopia like in *The Bundle*. *The Bundle* reminds us that in order to achieve a socialist society and the possibility of utopia, and to get rid of any oppressive system, we bear the brunt of with painful actions. Bond exploits the landlord’s power (as the source of individual member of the dystopian society) as the cause of social violence, oppression, and poverty and incorporates the dialectical methods of Marxist thought. The most politically brutal dystopian reasoning is pervaded by the utopian dream for society to be significantly different.

The features of the second play of this study, *Summer*, force us to understand two main points: on one hand, how people made the world uninhabitable and how an infernal world (dystopia) was created through war, and, on the other hand, how an ideal social order (utopia)/of living humanely and ideal justice can be created. The strategies of Bond’s works-focusing on ordinary life, remembering the past (*Summer*), suffering in the present (*The Bundle*) and

thinking about the future (*Summer*)-allow audiences to contemplate the relationship between utopia-dystopia and hope-hopelessness. While thought-provoking dialogues and arguments indicate dystopia and hopelessness, the young/future generation and love-making relations evoke hope and utopia. Bond's plays provide new ways of thinking differently about old and future generation, Hegelian dialectic theory and dialectical discourse between dividual and individual figures.

### Acknowledgement

This article is a revised version of the presentation of the International Symposium on Utopian Studies Society 22nd Annual Conference. July 13-15, 2022. University of Brighton, UK.

### Works Cited

- Adiseshiah, S. (2011). 'We Said We Wouldn't Look Back': Utopia and the backward glance in Dorothy Reynolds and Julian Slade's *Salad Days*. *Studies in Musical Theatre*, 5(2), 149-161.
- Adiseshiah, S. (2019). The Utopian Potential of Aging and Longevity in Bernard Shaw's *Back to Methuselah* (1921), *Age, Culture, Humanities: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 1-30.
- Adiseshiah, S. (2020), Drama and Utopian Forms of Relationality, *mediAzioni* 27, D33-D38. <http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it>.
- Adiseshiah, S. (2022). *Utopian Drama in Search of a Genre*. Methuen Drama, Bloomsbury.
- Anderson, W. (2020). Revolutionary Artistry-- Brecht, Marx, and the Evolution of Epic Theatre. *Honors Capstone Projects*. 15.
- Berti, E. (1978). Ancient Greek Dialectic as Expression of Freedom of Thought and Speech. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 39(3), 347-370.
- Biçer, A. G. (2008a). *Edward Bond'un Tarihsel Oyunlarında Diyalektik Yaklaşım*, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmış Doktora Tezi.
- Biçer, A. G. (2008b). Edward Bond'un Diyalektik Tiyatrosu, *Kafkas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitü Dergisi*, 59-72.
- Bond, E. (1978). On Brecht. *Theatre Quarterly*, 8(30), 34-35.
- Bond, E. (1995). *Letters, Volume II*. Ed. Ian Stuart. Philadelphia: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Bond, E. (2013a). *The Bundle; Human Cannon; Jackets; In the Company of Men*. Methuen Drama.
- Bond, E. (2013b). *Bond Plays: 4: Worlds with Activists; Restoration; Summer*. Methuen Drama.
- Coult, T. (1977). *Edward Bond*. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Dolan, J. (2005). *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at the Theater*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Gartman, D. (1991). Culture as Class Symbolization or Mass Reification? A Critique of Bourdieu's Distinction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(2), 421-447.

- Gourg, C. (2008). The “Bundle” in Edward Bond’s Plays, an Avatar of the Unspeakable “Thing” », *Études britanniques contemporaines* [En ligne], 35.
- Griffin, M. J. and Tom M. (2007). Introduction: Exploring Utopia, in Michael J. Griffin and Tom Moylan (Eds.), *Exploring the Utopian Impulse: Essays on Utopian thought and Practice* (pp. 11–18). Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Habib, M. A. R (2005). *A History of Literary Criticism from Plato to the Present*. Blackwell Publishing, UK.
- Hamlyn, W. D. (1990). Aristotle on Dialectic. *Philosophy*. 65(254), 465-476.
- Hay, M., Roberts, P. (1978). *Edward Bond: A Companion to the Plays*, Theatre Quarterly Publications: London.
- Hegel’s Science of Logic [Wissenschaft der Logik]*, translated by A.V. Miller, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Jones, R. D. (1980). Edward Bond’s Rational Theatre. *Theatre Journal*, 32(4), 505-517. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3207412>.
- Klaić, D. (1995). Utopia Sustained. *Theater*, 26(1-2), 60–9.
- Kumar, K. (1991). *Utopianism*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Lepore, J. (2017). ‘A Golden Age for Dystopian Fiction: What to make of our new literature of radical pessimism’, [www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/06/05/a-golden-age-for-dystopian-fiction](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/06/05/a-golden-age-for-dystopian-fiction) 29 March 2017.
- Levitas, R. (2011). ‘Preface to the Student Edition’. In *The Concept of Utopia*, 7. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Maybee E. J. (2016). Hegel’s dialectics. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel-dialectics>
- Macdonald, C. (2015). *Utopia: Three Plays of Postdramatic Theatre*. Bristol, UK.
- Marowitz, C. (1972). If a House is on Fire and I Cry for Fire, *The New York Times*, Sec.2, 2.
- Marowitz, C. (1973). *Confessions of a Counterfeit Critic*. London: Methuen.
- Pinkard, T. (2008). Hegelianism in the Twentieth Century In Dermot Moran (Ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy*. (pp.118-148). Routledge.
- Reid, T. (2019) The Dystopian Near-Future in Contemporary British Drama. *Journal of Contemporary Drama in English*, 7 (1). 72-88.
- Reinelt J. 1991. Theorising Utopia Edward Bond’s War Plays, in Sue-Ellen Case and Janelle Reinelt (Eds.), *The Performance of Power: Theatrical Discourse and Politics* (pp. 221-232). University of Iowa Press.
- The Encyclopedia Logic: Part 1 of the Encyclopaedia of Philosophical Sciences [Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften I]*, translated by T.F. Geraets, W.A. Suchting, and H.S. Harris, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991.
- Tully, M. B. (1979). Edward Bond’s Theatre for Social Change. MA Thesis, The University of British Columbia.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Xia, Y. 2014. Edward Bond’s Call for Justice in *Summer*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(6). 1188-1192.