

TOWARDS REMEMBERING THE SUFI PHILOSOPHY: DECONSTRUCTION OF BOUNDARY OPPOSITIONS IN DORIS LESSING'S BRIEFING FOR A DESCENT INTO HELL

Burcu GÜNDOĞDU*

Abstract

The aim of this article is to investigate how in her novel, *Briefing for a Descent into Hell*, Doris Lessing deconstructs binary oppositions. In the novel, it is argued that the previous descendents of God are sent to earth to spread the Sufi motto, "Life is one", but the humankind forget the given knowledge in the course of life. Failing to perform God's message, the society begin to act as individuals and create social boundaries gradually. In Lessing's novel, the main character, Charles Watkins, descends into madness and retrieves the Sufi Knowledge as the previous messengers did. His descend into madness enables him to explore the blind spots in ideologies and their impacts on his identity. Although Watkins has to return to his old habits and social life through electric shock in the ending, it can be argued that Watkins acknowledges the importance of both the ordinary truth and the inner truth through his experience of Platonic immanence and transcendence simultaneously. Together with this, the letters sent to Watkins would enable the readers to see and question the inner workings of ideological indoctrination of war, language, science and education.

In this article, utilizing from Platonic, Jungian, Irigaray and Derrida's similar theories on boundary oppositions, it will be argued that Watkins undermines Plato's hierarchical dualism between phenomenal and material world so as to realize "transcendent function" in Jungian sense and recalls the forgotten Sufi doctrine called "oneness".

Key Words: *Doris Lessing, Charles Watkins, Boundary Oppositions, Sufi Philosophy.*

SUFİ ÖĞRETİSİNİ HATIRLAMA YOLUNDA: DORIS LESSİNG'İN CEHENNEME İNİŞ İÇİN BRİFİNG ROMANINDA İKİLİ KARŞITLARIN YIKIMI

Özet

Bu makalenin amacı, Doris Lessing'in romanı, *Cehenneme İniş İçin Açıklama* 'da ikili karşıtlıkları nasıl yıktığını araştırmaktır. Romanda, tanrının Sufi sloganı olan, "Hayat Birdir", öğretisini yaymak için insanları önceden dünyaya gönderdiği, fakat insanların yaşam döngüsü içinde verilen bilgiyi unuttuğu tartışılmaktadır. Tanrının mesajını yerine getirmeyen insanlık, zaman içinde birey olarak hareket etmeye ve ikililik oluşturmaya başlamaktadır. Lessing'in romanında, Charles Watkins delirir ve tanrının diğer peygamberleri gibi Sufi öğretisine erişir. Delirmesi, Watkins'in ideolojilerdeki kör noktaları ve bunların insanların kimliğindeki etkisini keşfetme fırsatına sahip olmasını sağlar. Her ne kadar romanın sonunda, elektrik şoku verilmesiyle eski alışkanlıklarına ve sosyal yaşamına geri dönse de, Watkins'in zihinsel yolculuğu, onun Plato'un dünyevi ve fenomenal dünyasını aynı anda tecrübe etmesini, böylece hem sıradan ve hem de içsel gerçeğin önemini anlamasını sağlayarak iç görü kazanmasını sağlamıştır. Bununla birlikte, Watkins'e gönderilen mektuplar, okuyucunun, beyin yıkayan; savaş, dil, bilim ve eğitim gibi ideolojik kavramların altında yatanları görmesini ve sorgulamasını sağlar.

Bu makalede, Plato, Jung, Irigaray ve Derrida'nın ikili karşıtlıklar üzerine olan teorilerini ele alarak, Watkins'in Plato'a ait kuramda geçen fenomenal ve dünyevi arasındaki hiyerarşik ikiciliği yıkarak Jung'a ait "transendent function" ını" gerçekleştirmesi ve unutulmuş olan, "birlik/ bütünlük" anlamındaki sufi öğretisini hatırlamayı amaçladığı tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Doris Lessing, Charles Watkins, İkili Karşıtlıklar, Sufi Öğretisi.*

In *Briefing for a Descent into Hell*, Dorris Lessing dwells on the issue of Platonic idealism, and her interest in Sufi philosophy, which provides a template for the protagonist's deconstructive journey. Since many cultures involving Islam, Christianity, Indian and Chinese adopt the philosophy of Sufism, the concept of Sufism subjects to many subjective interpretations within these cultures. Yet, as Idries Shah points out, it would not be wrong to call "Sufi ideas 'a psychology', not because this term adequately describes Sufism, but because nowadays 'wisdom' is not a popular word" (2004:20). This is, perhaps, the Sufism's first association within the modern world, but Shah's following definition gives it deeper meaning: "the Sufi who knows the Ultimate Truth acts and speaks in a manner which takes into consideration the understanding, limitations and dominant concealed prejudices of his time" (2004:81). Lessing's novel also has this deconstructive approach of the Sufi in that it makes the readers aware of the concepts that create social boundaries. The creation of the boundaries is what the Sufis avoid; they "abandon three 'I's. He does not say 'for me', 'with me', or 'my property'. He must not attribute anything to himself" (Shah, 2004:81). Therefore, it is a philosophy that foregrounds the needs of the humanity rather than individual needs. In other words, instead of "I", the subject pronoun "we" would be the right word to define their viewpoint. In essence, Sufism and Platonic Idealism are not completely two opposing ideas because "the phenomenal world is nirvana, nirvana is the phenomenal world" (Ch'en 72). But despite this similarity, there is one point they diverge from one another. The Sufis argue that "since sense and reason can not transcend the world of phenomena or see the real Being behind the intrinsic phenomena, it is best to ignore the reason and depend on the "inner light" for guidance"(Waugh, 17: 2005). In contrast, Platonic idealism exalts both reason and transcendental world. In Plato's *Symposium*, Socrates description for attaining the supreme knowledge will illustrate Plato's idea and its difference from the Sufi philosophy.

This is the right way of approaching or being initiated into the mysteries of love, to begin with examples of beauty in this world, and using them as steps to

ascend continually with that absolute beauty as one's aim, from one instance of physical beauty to two and from two to all, then from physical beauty to moral beauty, and from moral beauty to the beauty of knowledge, until from knowledge of various kinds one arrives at the supreme knowledge whose sole object is that absolute beauty, and knows at last what absolute beauty is. (94)

The ultimate aim, then, is to reach the absolute beauty of world of transcendence whereas Sufis philosophy does not disregard immanence, where the inner light would work as guide. This point, where Sufism and Platonic idealism diverge, is also the main concern of Lessing's novel.

The novel rests on an amnesiac and mad male protagonist, Charles Watkins's, inner journey under heavy sedation. Ironically, however, his descent into madness turns out to be a wakeful insight to recall the imprinted innate knowledge that he has lost to attain his social identity. Charles "[recovers] the Sufi knowledge printed within his brain" (Bazin, 1980: 11). That is, reaching oneness both on personal and social level. To this purpose, Charles alternates between his unconscious and conscious, which can also be linked with Plato's immanence and transcendence. Plato refers to the immanence as "the limits of the matter, the body, sensibility, being, worldliness etc." (Haynes, 2012: 1), while transcendence is the very reverse. More precisely, reaching transcendence is to reach philosophical reality beyond the immanence. As opposed to Plato's view, Charles strives to intertwine "transcendence and immanence" rather than a split- world image. He also tries to realize "transcendent function" in Jungian sense "by confronting unconscious contents" (Miller, 2004: 70), which makes him recognize the boundary oppositions created through social institutions such as science, language, education, war and so on. This being the case, Charles's acknowledgement of the Sufi doctrine of "oneness" clashes with Western Humanism, Plato's hierarchical dualism between Immanence and Transcendence, the language system, and the other institutions that base on the differences and

exclusions. Charles Watkins, as a professor of classics, aims to reconcile the set-down dichotomies between "I" and "we", "sane" and "insane", "transcendence" and "immanence" "conscious" and "unconscious" to realize the union of the opposites.

The main plot is concerned with Charles Watkin's inner journey to trace his life back to retrieve his true self and reevaluates his learned knowledge through his departure from the social sanity. In the preface to *The Golden Notebook* Lessing wrote: "This theme of 'breakdown', that sometimes when people "crack up" it is a way of self-healing, of the inner self's dismissing false dichotomies and divisions" (Lessing, 1977: 170). The reader is informed that as a Professor of Classics, Charles, begins to question his theoretical knowledge:

[...] everything taught under the heading of Classics is pigs feed from beginning to end, and never has been anything else, and that we have never had any idea at all of what Plato or Socrates and Pythagoras were teaching-etc. (1971: 218-219)

Charles's journey from the darkness to the light closely corresponded with the Plato's Allegory of the Cave, but it serves to criticize the boundary oppositional Platonic concept that separates the world into two spheres: Immanence and Transcendence. In Platonic sense: "the material world is seen as immanent and substantial, the forms as transcendent in that Plato describes them as being beyond and ontologically superior to the corporeal world" (Nicholls 90). In other words, the earthy life can be considered as an imprisonment in the cave devoid of sunlight, which is embodiment of the true knowledge. In her article entitled, "Lessing's Engagement with Platonic Idealism" in *Briefing for a Descent into Hell*, Canan Şavkay points out that "there is no privileging of one aspect over the other, and Charles moves during his vision from a higher towards a lower scale" (2010: 10). In Charles's case, therefore, there is a reversal of Plato's vision because there is no distinction between the immanence and the transcendental existence.

The novel starts when Charles's friends are taken up by the crystal disk in the Atlantic Ocean while Charles is left to drift in the ocean. Charles first arrives to the Island on the back of the Porpoises, which is a clear word pun on his purpose of finding his true self. His next step is to pass through the cleft, which is blocked by an "impassible mirror like rock" (1971: 53), which he could ascend through the help of the two leopards. Charles then descends into the Prelapsarian world, which Charles depicts with these words: "There was no feeling of hostility towards the intruder in this place. On the contrary, I felt welcome here; it was as if this was a country where hostility or dislike has not yet been born" (1971: 47). In his access to the stone city through passing the cleft, Charles states, "My thoughts and movements were set by it, not by the sun, man's father and creator, no, by the moon [...]" (1971: 65). In the novel, the moon explicitly symbolizes femininity, and the imaginary order while the sun is the masculinity and the symbolic order. In the first section of his Journey, Charles is under the influence of the moon, which is both attractive and repulsive experience to him.

Charles, then, is introduced with the tree women figures, which leads him to perceive that he is a separate gender. His recognition of the gender polarization is followed with the sacrifice of the cattle. The white cattle are killed by an unspecified gender, a boy or a girl, but Charles considers that it was his crime: "I had drawn evil into my surroundings" (1971: 69). Even though the cattle are not specifically gendered as females, they are illuminated by the moon rather than the sun, which give them feminine connotations. The scene, therefore, can be interpreted as an allegorical expression of the world's split into the boundary oppositions through the matricide. The crime Charles feels is heavily connected with Irigiray's criticism of Plato's idea of transcendence and immanence. Irigiray notes, "Plato is using the female body as the symbol of a state of ignorance and illusion[...]in order to achieve knowledge and gain access to reality, one must leave the female body behind" (Stone, 2007: 125). This allegorical scene may therefore be seen as Charles' recollection of his crime: Matricide.

Despite the fact that Charles states "I do not want to be made aware of what I have done and what I am [...]" (1971: 69), he eventually recalls his sacrifice of the female body, "Mother" represented by the cattle to pass the symbolic order. Seen in this light, the Plato's Allegory of Cave is enacted through Charles passing through the cleft and his act of matricide to become "the sun's child" (1971: 76). Also, the scene when Felicity pushes the meat of the cattle to Charles is corresponded with the origin of the sin by eating the forbidden. Through his experience, Charles has an insight to the forgotten knowledge with regard to the creation of boundary oppositions between the genders and the two worlds: the immanence that stands for being inside the female body and the symbolic order that represent the transcendence.

In Charles's case, it is evident that the innate knowledge is embedded in his unconscious part of mind in the creation process. In Planetary Conference, the Gods argue that Human beings are not provided with a manuscript or a roll of microfilm, which they can dispose at any moment, but rather "brain-printing", because it is only through this method, Gods noted, "You will find it is all there, when you need it" (1971: 142). This is closely connected with the Platonic idea called innate knowledge and the state of amnesia.

Plato believes there is a knowledge that is not derived from sense impressions. There are latent in our minds the forms or impressions of the ideas, the realities, which the soul knew before it descent into his body ...The soul enters at birth in oblivion and is covered with a layer of wax there is yet no impression. However, it seems that the wax tablet is not completely wiped clean: there remain imprints of the ideas, so that we retain a latent knowledge of them. (Whitehead, 2009: 17)

As mentioned above, Charles shows parallel to the Platonic notion of amnesia. However, the way Charles obtains his forgotten knowledge is incongruous with the Plato's concept, which argues that innate ideas can be learned in the transcendental realm rather than immanence, where a person only sees only the copies of ideas. In this regard, Charles deviates from the

Platonic notion because "[...] Charles has to literally forget the Platonic concept in order to remember another kind of truth, namely that there is no separation between transcendence and immanence" (Şavkay, 2010: 9).

Just like God, Charles must mediate between these two realms to reach the innate knowledge as well as his real self. Charles aims to achieve an individuality, which J. Singer calls, "Half immanent and Half Transcendent" (1972: 238). As Charles tries to overcome the division between transcendence and immanence, he also combines these two realms in his mind: the unconscious and conscious so that he achieves individual wholeness in Jungian sense.

The psyche consists of two incongruous halves which together should form a whole . . . Conscious and unconscious do not make a whole when one of them is suppressed and injured by the other . . . Both are aspects of life. Consciousness should defend its reason and protect itself, and the chaotic life of the unconscious should be given the chance of having its way too . . . This means open conflict and open collaboration at once. That, evidently, is the way human life should be. It is the old game of hammer and anvil: between them the patient iron is forged into an indestructible whole, an "individual. (qtd in. Miller 60)

According to Jung, "[...] Persona is only a mask of collective psyche" (2004: 158). It is plausible to argue that Charles also develops collective identity in his former life, which leads Charles to subordinate his unconscious, "instinctual" mind to his conscious, "rational" mind. This notion is closely connected with the concept of Western Humanism: "[...]the more you deny yourself the exercise of power, the more you submit to those in power, the more increase your sovereignty" (Foucault, 1977: 120). It is a clear definition of an individual without the power of exerting its own individual instincts, but acts in social orthodoxy. Charles also is a product of his society and act in line with social codes composed of boundary oppositional view to seem "normal" in his outer life. He is "Professor Charles Watkins. 15 Acacia Road, Brink . Near Cambridge" (1971: 161), and this

shows how certain labels constitute who we are. That is, we are removed from our real selves under the impact of social conventions and boundaries. In the novel, Charles strives to combine these two components of mind that complement one another so as to achieve his true self without social pretension and comes against the Western ideology.

Then it can be argued that Charles's act is at odds with the Platonic idea, which necessitates the division of the two worlds. At this point, it is essential to note there is an analogy between Jungian and Platonic idea of the two realms: the Plato's intellectual realm of transcendence can be linked with the "conscious" while the denial of immanence with "the unconscious". Since Charles's act is not a differentiation between the two worlds, but a combination of both realms, he deviates from the Platonic concept whereas his act shows parallel to Jung's idea that combine the two mental realms: "Consciousness allow us to function in our day-to-day lives, whereas the unconscious compensates and complements by providing symbol, fantasy, intuition, and collective images" (Miller, 2004: 15).

Through simultaneous existence of the unconscious and the conscious realm, Charles is able to retrieve the imprinted Sufi concept of "Wholeness". According to the Sufism, "when apparent opposites are reconciled, the individuality is not only complete; it also transcends the bounds of ordinary humanity." (Shah, 1999: 126). In his journey to wholeness, Charles gains a new perception when he is inside the crystal, which he defines as "shadow city" (1971: 103), rather than the earthy one. This shadow city is made in all light, and "this tenuous city, which was a pattern and a blueprint for the outer city, only fitted certain parts or areas or individual buildings in the outer city" (1971:103). The Crystal has fewer amounts of buildings and rat dogs because it has more light. This suggests the crystal, the inner city, represents the image of ideal form or another version of reality that violate Plato's concept. In Plato's case, the sunlight in transcendental realm shows us the real ideal forms. Inside the crystal, Charles observes, "... two identities becomes one" (1971:107), which is indication of lack of boundary oppositions:

The world was spinning like the most delicately tinted of bubbles, all light. It was the mind of humanity that I saw, but this not all to be separated from animal mind [...] nor it was a question of higher or lower, for just as my having drunk blood and eaten flesh with the poor women had been a door, a key [...] in this spin of fusion like a web whose every strand is linked and vibrates with each other... and this harmony runs in a strengthened pulse of which it is a cord. (1971: 107)

As Charles transcends his ordinary human perception, he also strives for social wholeness:

The knowledge that humanity, with its fellow creatures, the animals, the plants make up a whole ,are a unity , have a function in the whole system as an organ or organism[...] the human beings as at present constituted being their inability to feel, or to understand themselves, in any other way except through their own drives or functions[...]. (1971: 136)

Charles comes to see that humanity's acting for their self-interests is their madness: "These mad microbes say I, I, I, I, I for saying I, I, I, I is their madness" (1971: 118), rather than "the sweet sanity of we" (1971: 118). The distinction between the professions is man-crafted machination, which leads each profession to lose its real meaning and function. In fact, Charles learns that the concepts are not plural, but only one in essence:

[...] there is no such thing as "Soldiers" but only Soldier, and not "clerks" but Clerk, and Gardener, and, Teacher... There could not be individuals in this nourishing web. Together they formed one beat in the great dance, one note in the song. Everywhere and on every level the little individuals made up wholes [...]. (1971: 111)

It is thus made clear that Charles is deeply immersed in the Sufi knowledge in his journey and thus, he tries to realize personal and social wholeness.

The next step awaits Charles in his reincarnation after gaining self-knowledge as well as knowledge of humanity. His re-birth serves to demonstrate the process of social conditioning in the following scheme: First, the baby is noisy and refuses to sleep. Then, the baby stops being wakeful. Finally, it learns to sleep in a given schedule so that his parents love it. As Charles wakes from sleep, he states, "I'm grown and gone, and I work and play all regulated ordered and social and correct. (1971: 146)

The clash between the Doctors and Charles reflects the tension between the Sufi knowledge and the rational knowledge. The doctors consider that Charles's waking up is his real insight into the reality while Charles considers, "A dream is life .A life that is a dream. A dream [...]" (1971: 162). Charles discovers another version of reality in the dept of his unconsciousness, and thus, he comes to see that the division between reason and non reason is implausible. As Foucault argues: "the historical division between of reason from unreason led to the death of this shared discourse [...]" (Pickett,2006: 37). This explains why the doctor, X and Y, fails to understand Charles's experience because "The only way then to comprehend Sufi is to shake lose from logical modes of thought" (Hardin,1973: 566). Charles summarizes his inner journey as the working of his intuitive faculty while Doctors, X and Y interpret it as madness:

The important thing is this –to remember that some things reach out to us from the level of living, to here[...] Oh, they make an illness of it, they charm it away with their magic drugs[...]They say, "an anxiety state", as they say, paranoia, but all these things, they have a meaning, they are reflections from other part of ourselves, and that part of ourselves knows things we don't know. (1971: 282)

However non-rational experience it seems to the Doctors, Charles's experience leads him to recognize his true self. "The altered reality of his inner world is invalidated by his family and his physicians. Doctors X and Y examine and treat his "abnormality" as "bad" and something

to rid of" (Hardin, 1973: 575). In other words, they subordinate unreason to reason.

One thing that the Doctors are unable to realize is that Charles manages to express his inner reality by removing his social identity. In sanity, he has to use the language of the society. It can be argued that Charles's descent into madness, therefore, provides him with the perception of the arbitrary nature of the language system and enable him to diverge from societal norms. The distinction between Charles and Plato's notion of language is expressed with these words: "Plato does not regard language as inadequate tool of expressing the thought, whereas Charles rejects the view that language conveys ideas that relate to truth" (Şavkay, 2010: 12). In Plato's Pharmacy, Jacques Derrida deconstructs the binary structure of language that limits meaning with these words:

In order for writing to produce, ...the "opposite effect" from what one might expect, in order for this *pharmakon* shows itself, with use, to be injuries, its effectiveness, its power, its *dunamis* must, of course, be ambiguous. It is precisely through this ambiguity that Plato, through the mouth of King, attempts to master, to dominate by inserting its definition into simple, clear-cut oppositions: good and evil, inside and outside, true and false, essence and appearance (1981:103).

In addition to this, Derrida states, "there has to be a transcendental signified for the difference between signifier and signified to be somewhere absolute and irreducible" (2013: 20), but Derrida notes, there is an absence of the transcendental signified. Therefore, it is impossible to attain a pure meaning. In Lessing's novel, it can therefore be argued that Charles's madness enables him to see things from a different critical perspective just as Derrida did.

In the planetary conference, the Sun is presented as the king of the humanity, but the sun, "this central strength, this majestic core of our web...further out and away from the centre" (1971: 115). This sentence is an obvious

reference to the Derrida's concept with regard to the absence of the transcendental signified. It is also difficult to name the transcendental signified and therefore, there are possible occasions language falls short of expressing. This is shown when Mercury has difficulty in naming the transcendence in two specific occasions. The first time is when Mercury talks about his hopes of the divine intervention "Thanks to of course not to US, but to[...]"(1971: 138) and the second time is when Mercury informs that the Human's are imprinted with the innate knowledge: "And I fact you have already been printed, thanks to[...]"(1971:138). Mercury uses dots to name God because of the absence of pure meaning.

As Charles reflects on the God and its relation with the absence of the transcendental signified, he also questions why the divine presence is gendered specifically male. He states, "But why father? Why father of Gods and Men? For who is our Father? Who... Why not Father Sun, as lord on Olympus, why Jove or Jupiter, Zeus?" (1971: 121), which leads him to recognize that the transcendental signified, which is linked with the concept of the God, constructs the language as a male- oriented form of communication.

Charles's re-birth is followed by our insight into the Charles's past life through the letters from his close relations in the outer life. These people's experiences draw parallel with Charles's case in several ways. Rosemary Baines, who attends to the conference held by Charles, writes about her changing perception upon Charles's lecture about education. Charles argues, "Education means only this –that lively alert fearless curiosity of children must be fed must be kept alive" (1971: 177), but instead, he notes, the parents shape their children identity through education. Upon this lecture, Baines observes, "I was awake. I was as if stung awake. I did not sleep" (1971: 178). Baines continues his statement with the following words:

I was like a child of three, four or five, a creature quite different from the person she was doomed to grow into. I was certainly remembering what I had been as a small child. I remember things I had forgotten for years. Before those "prison shades" had come down. (1971: 178)

Baines's account shows that how an individual is indoctrinated through the societal conventions so that he can act with others. Lessing also notes in the preface to the Golden Book, "[we] have not yet evolved a system of education that is not a system of indoctrination.(1977: xvii). According to her, individuals subject to social conditioning and cease to be individual in real sense. Her novel's main character, Charles also sees through the shades in the outer life, but

later he comes to understand the importance of the inner life.

Baines also talks about Frederick Larson, whose experiences resemble to that of Charles in the old stone civilization. Larson is an archeologist, who made excavation in Asia and Africa, and thus, he recognizes how differences are constituted by the society. In his visit to Africa, Larson observes, "If you judge the society by harmony, responsibility toward its members, and lack of aggression towards neighbors it was a society on high level" (1971: 190), but in case of Africa, the society's bound with nature and their shaping their life according to the river's movements are interpreted in anthropology as "barbaric, backward" (1971: 190). At this point, Larson realizes that we, as human beings set up the differences. He notes, "There was no way of knowing an ancient society's ideas except through the barrier of our own" (1971:190). Larson also discusses,

Certain ideas are accepted, sometimes for decades or centuries, dominating archeology; suddenly they are doubted. That "Greece was the mother of Western civilization and Rome its daddy" directed archeology and excavation for a long time- yet he, Frederick would be able to make out a case that the Arabs, Moors and Saracens were parents to "Western" Civilization, sources of its ideas, its literature, its science [...]. (1971: 192)

He does not make a distinction between the East and the West, but refers to the East as the mother of Western civilization. This indicates how the civilizations complement one another with their different features and create hybrid cultures. Just like Larson, Charles

recognizes that the boundary oppositions are the product of the human mind.

Larson also observes, "As he talked, another stream of words paralleled the stream of words that he was actually using, and this parallel stream expressed opinions ... They were crazy, dotty, batty, and cranky." (1971:187). Just like Sufi, Larson "distinguishes between ordinary knowing of facts and the inner knowing of reality" (Shah, 1999: 338). Similarly, Charles also suffers from stammering at one point in his life. Both Larson and Charles experience simultaneous existence of both conscious and unconscious realms.

Before the final section, it is essential to note the difference between these two war accounts: the war between two animal species and the war in Yugoslavia. In the first part of the book, the reader has an insight into the war between the Rat-dogs and monkeys that do not come out because of survival instincts, but as Charles indicates, because "...the Rat-dogs saw the monkeys as inferior" (1971: 87). The same situation is applicable to the human race.

each with its system of religious and scientific belief, and although they know that it is entirely by chance that any individual among them was born into this or that area...this theoretical knowledge does not prevent them from hating foreigners[...].(1971: 139)

The idea of "the self" and "the other" causes this endless struggle. The previous descents are given the knowledge that "...individuals made up wholes" (1971: 111). Charles also relates his war experience in Yugoslavia, in which he gives an idealistic rather than realistic account of war. His fabricated war story is concerned with a group of partisan soldiers that fight against Nazi to support the communist leader, Tito. Unlike the previous war account, these soldiers live in harmony with different races. The partisan group includes "Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins, Catholics and Moslems" (1971: 241) and they have different types of uniform, which suggest their being a group of differences and none is excluded as inferior.

Charles explains these soldiers' motivation with these words:

In those high mountains, we fought against Evil, and were sure to win, for the stars in their courses were on our side, whose victory would be at last the poor and meek, and the humble had inherited the earth, and the lion would lie down with the lamb, a loving harmony would prevail over the earth. (1971: 245)

These words are reference to Jesus Christ's message: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth" (Kohlenberger, 2004: Matt, 5.5- 24). This was the original message given by the god to the descenders, and these soldiers notes, "We knew all this because- it was as if we remembered it" (1971: 245), which is a reference to the Plato's idea of innate knowledge. Also, unlike the Rat-dogs, these soldiers obviously fight against "Evil", which is written in capital letters so as to undermine the power struggle. Rather than constructing one truth and act under one's leadership, these soldiers advocates the comradeship and relativity of truth. Their aim is to bring harmony to the world by destroying the distinction between races, classes and animal species so that they can establish a communist world order and reconcile opposites. In brief, these two wars are motivated by different reasons. For the Rat-dogs, the aim is to establish the inferior, "the other" and create pure Rat-dog specie while the soldier wants to do away with the boundary oppositions.

Charles' case overlaps with the the Sufi philosopher, Rumi's discussion with regard to immanence and transcendence.

From realm to realm man went, reaching his present reasoning, knowledgable robust state- forgetting earlier forms of intelligence. So, too, shall pass beyond the current forms of perception [...] there are other thousand other forms of mind [...]

But he has fallen sleep. He will say: "I had forgotten my fulfillment, ignorant that sleep and fancy were the cause of my sufferings"

He says: "My sleeping experience does not matter. (qtd in. Shah, 2004: 250)

Though Charles reawakens into the social life with the means of electric shock, nevertheless; Charles's journey serves to undermine boundary oppositions created through the oppressive discourses such as science, education, western humanism, language and war. With this Journey, he is also able to see his true self through delving into the depth of his unconsciousness realm or immanence in Platonic sense. Thus, his journey becomes a clear challenge to the Plato's notion that

gives primacy to the transcendence to reach reality beyond human mind's scope. Charles is able to distinguish the inner reality and the social reality through his mental voyage. As a consequence, Charles retrieves innate knowledge that promotes personal and social wholeness rather than divisions and exclusions. Despite the doctors, X and Y and his social circle work in collaboration to enable him to return his "normal" social self, the reader is shown that what seems to be social sanity is madness, and promotes hierarchical dualism.

REFERENCES

- Abel, Elizabeth. (1986). "The Golden Notebook: 'Female Writing' and 'The Great Tradition.'" in **Critical Essays on Dorris Lessing**, (Ed. Claire Spraguge and Tiger). Boston, G.K, Hall.
- Bazin, Nancy Topping. (1980). "Androgony or Catasrophe: The Vision of Dorris Lessing's Later Novels". **Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies**. 5/3, 10-15.
- CanTERS, Hanneke, and Grace M. Antzen. (2005). *Forever Fluid: A Reading of Luce Irigaray's Elemental Passions*. New York: **Manchester University Press**.
- Derrida, Jacques. (2013). *Of Grammatology*. U.S.A.: **JHU Press**.
- . (1981). *Dissemination*. Trans. Barbara Johnson. London: **Anthlone Press**.
- Foucault, Michel. (1977). "What Is an Author?" in *Michel Foucault, Language, Counter Memory, Practice*, (Ed. Donald F. Bouchard). New York: **Cornell University Press**.
- Hardin, Nancy Shields. (1973). "Dorris Lessing and the Sufi Way". **Contemporary Literature**. 14/4, 566.581.
- Haynes, Patrice. (2012). *Immanent Transcendence: Reconfiguring Materialism in Continental Philosophy*. **New York: Bloomsburry**.
- Jung, Carl G. (2014). *Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 7: Two Essays in Analytical Psychology*. U.S.A.: **Princeton University Press**.
- Kohlenberger. John. R. (2004). *The Essential Evangelical Parallel Bible: New King James Version, English Standard Version, New Living Translation, the Message*. **New York: Oxford University Press**.
- Lessing, Dorris. (1971). *Briefing for a Descent into Hell*. **New York: Vintage**.
- . (1977) "Preface to the Golden Notebook". in *The Novel Today: Contemporary Writers on Modern Fiction*. (Ed. Malcolm Bradbury). Great Britain: **Manchester University Press**.
- Miller, Jeffrey. C. (2004). *The Transcendent Function: Jung's Model of Psychological Growth through Dialogue with the Unconscious*. Albany: **State University of New York Press**.
- Nicholls, Angus James. (2006). *Goethe's Concept of the Daemonic: After the Ancients*. U.S.A.: Camden House.
- Pickett, Brent. (2006). *On the Use and Abuse of Foucault for Politics*. UK: Lexington.
- Plato. (2003). **The Republic**. London: Penguin Book
- . **The Symposium**. Harmondsworth, London: Penguin Books, 1975.
- Rubenstein, Roberto. (2003). **Briefing for a Descent into Hell by Doris Lessing**. (Ed. Harold Bloom). Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Shah, Idries. (2004). **The Way of the Sufi**. Great Britain: The Octagon Press.
- (1999). **The Sufis**. Great Britain: The Octagon Press.
- Singer, J. (1972). **Boundaries of the Soul**. New York, Anchor Books/ Doubleday.
- Stone, Alison. (2007). **An Introduction to Feminist Philosophy**. UK: Polity Press.
- Şavkay, Canan. (2010). Lessing's Engagement with Platonic idealism in Briefing for a Descent into Hell. **Dorris Lessing Studies**. 29/1, 9-13.
- Toit, Du Louise. (2009). **A Philosophical Investigation of Rape: The Making and Unmaking of the Feminine Self**. New York: Routledge.
- Whitehead, Anne. (2009). **Memory**. New York: Routledge.
- Ch'en, Kenneth Kuan Shêng. (1968). **Buddhism: The Light of Asia**. Barron's Educational Series, New York
- Waugh, Winston E. (2005). **Sufism**. U.S. A: Xulon Press,