

Confrontations with the Anima in *The
Dispossessed, The Left Hand of Darkness, and
Tehanu* by Ursula K. Le Guin

by

Mary Sarah Barrett

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in the subject

English

at the

University of South Africa.

Supervisor: Prof. Deirdre C. Byrne

30 November 2005

I declare that

Confrontations with the Anima in *The Dispossessed*, *The Left Hand of Darkness*, and *Tehanu* by Ursula K. Le Guin

is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Signed

Date

.....

.....

Mary Barrett

To Jesus, the Lover of my soul.

Acknowledgements

My deepest thanks go to my supervisor Deirdre, for your patience, tolerance and guidance. To Mom, Dad, Ruth Robert and Anne, for the many nights we spent sharing *The Lord of the Rings*, *The Dragonbone Chair* and *The Earthsea Trilogy*. That is where this dissertation began. Thank you for the role each of you has played in nurturing my love of language, community and family. I couldn't have asked for a better one! You are all treasures to me. To Maria Prozesky, for being such a gift and encouragement to me in so many ways. And above all, to my Father, Brother, Mother, Sister, Lover, Saviour and Friend Jesus. For the mind and heart you gave me. All my work and life is yours. May I always use these gifts to give You the Glory.

Summary

This dissertation analyses the protagonists in *The Dispossessed*, *The Left Hand of Darkness*, and *Tehanu* by Ursula K. Le Guin, and looks at the extent to which they confront the Jungian archetype of the anima. I demonstrate that individuation and wisdom are not achieved in these characters until they confront the anima archetype within their individual psyches. I analyse the experiences and behaviour of each protagonist in order to identify anima confrontation (or lack thereof), and I seek to prove that such confrontation precipitates maturity and wisdom, which are goals of the hero's journey. The essential qualities of the anima archetype are wisdom, beauty and love. These qualities require acceptance of vulnerability. I argue that the protagonist is far from anima integration when he displays hatred and fear of vulnerability, and conclude that each protagonist is integrated with the anima when wisdom, beauty and love are evident in his character.

Key Words

Gender studies; archetypes; anima; individuation; science fiction; fantasy; Ursula K. Le Guin; Jungian psychology; collective unconscious; journey.

Contents

Declaration.....	2
Dedication.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Summary.....	5
Preface.....	7
Introduction: Anima.....	8
Chapter 1: Shevek.....	51
Chapter 2: Genly Ai.....	89
Chapter 3: Ged.....	124
Conclusion.....	154
Bibliography.....	161

Preface

I write this dissertation out of a profound belief in human wholeness. The views and interpretations it contains express my own, personal convictions about the texts and human interaction. I am aware that debates about literary interpretation frequently hinge on recapitulating others' utterances, but, in my dissertation, I have consciously avoided such rehearsals in favour of emphasising my own interpretation. Since interpretation is ultimately a matter of saying what one thinks, I have used this dissertation to express my thoughts as directly as possible and often without the buttressing of extended references to critics and theorists. This does not mean that I am unaware that Le Guin's novels, and Jungian psychology, have generated a great deal of debate and discourse. I allude to this body of discourse only where it is directly related to my discussion.

Introduction

Anima

To find our identity in the morass of conflicting parts with which it is faced means to go down into deep, unconscious places. We must go beyond the limits of our personal histories, of our memories and the memories of those close to us, into the collective unconscious – the objective psyche – that underlies all human life. We must suffer our egos being pulled across the boundaries of their own world into Self country, that place distinguished by its own particular demands and goals. Jung defined it as “the unconscious realm of the psyche ... the place where the living Spirit that is more than man manifests itself.” Anima and animus bring us, drag us to face the Spirit.

(Ulanov 1994: 13)

Avril Rubenstein, in her doctoral thesis *Bearers of Dreams: A Study of Archetypal Symbolism in Fantasy and Science Fiction Writing*, proposes that ‘an analytic approach within the parameters of the Jungian concept of the collective unconscious and the powerful symbolism contained within the archetypal image will be fruitful in revealing much of the power and significance of certain [science fiction] and fantasy writing’ (1998: 26). One of the reasons for such an analysis is that Carl Gustav Jung defines the collective unconscious as a realm in which powerful archetypal symbols are autochthonous, and ‘become visible in the products of “creative fantasy”’ (Rubenstein 1998: 30). Jung argues that we all have access to the realm of the collective unconscious through our forays into the world of fantasy and imagination (through dreams, fantasies or conscious efforts to conceive symbolic meaning), and attempts to show that these archetypal images stem from primordial human experience.¹ Although such a realm containing these symbols cannot be

¹ Rubenstein defines archetypes as follows: ‘[Jung] finds that certain images are universal in that they recur endlessly, and that such images are not always culturally specific, but appear in diverse cultures

empirically discovered, it seems fitting to take Jung's conception of the archetypes and apply it, in a distilled form, to 'creative fantasy' novels in which, he claims, these archetypal patterns become visible. Due to the connections that I have observed between the archetypes of which Jung writes, and certain novels by Ursula K. Le Guin, I have chosen to apply Jung's theory of the archetype of the anima, which is the archetypal expression of femininity inside a man, to three of her novels: *The Dispossessed* (1999), *The Left Hand of Darkness (Left Hand)* (1969), and *Tehanu* (1990). *The Dispossessed* and *Left Hand* fall into the category of science fiction (sf), while *Tehanu* is the fourth of five books in a fantasy series written by Le Guin. I have chosen the archetype of the anima as the focus of this analysis because, according to Jungian psychoanalysts, it is a feature that plays a large role in the psychic development of men, and the protagonists in most sf and fantasy novels, including those I have selected, are usually male.² In this chapter I will first discuss the relevance of Ursula Le Guin and the characters she has created to an application of the psychological concept of the anima archetype. Then I will address and attempt to integrate the various ways in which the anima has been defined. The purpose of this is to give the reader a coherent sense of the framework of analysis that will be applied to each character in each story. Finally I will bring the discussion back to Le Guin and the characters she has created, in order to show how the reformulated concept of the anima will be applied in their contexts.

and societies at all levels of human development. Jung calls these thought patterns *archetypes*, and finds them to be part of a vast, impersonal reservoir available to all humanity' (Rubenstein 1998: 28).
² Some of Le Guin's novels have been weighed and found wanting by critics such as Sarah Lefanu for remaining too much within the 'parameters set by mainstream narrative modes to explore the full explosive potential of science fiction' (1988: 146). Joanna Russ says that '... one of the things that handicaps women writers in our ... culture is that there are so very few stories in which women can figure as protagonists. Culture is male' (1995: 80). Lefanu values Joanna Russ's deconstructionism more than Le Guin's holism. Although Lefanu believes that Le Guin has fallen victim to the 'dominant patriarchal orientation of science fiction as a genre' (Woodcock 1994: 195), Bruce Woodcock suggests that a closer look at her novels, especially *Left Hand*, shows that it is not so (cf. 1994: 195). He suggests that Genly Ai's unrelentingly patriarchal view, for instance, is a 'continuing exposé of the limitations of Ai's own male perception' (1994: 196).

I have chosen three novels by Le Guin on which to base this investigation, first of all, because they belong to the genre of fantasy and sf. I have already referred to the connection between fantasy writing and the theories of Carl Gustav Jung. To elaborate on this point, both genres are richly endowed with imaginative contents, which possess particularly mythical or symbolic qualities. This makes them particularly suited to the examination of archetypal images and patterns, which, Jung has said, ‘become visible in the products of “creative fantasy”’ (Rubenstein 1998: 30). Le Guin’s protagonists usually undertake an outward quest that involves an inward journey towards individuation. Individuation is, generally speaking, the life-long process by which a person becomes his/her individual or true Self. I follow Jung in making a distinction between the inner Self and the ego-self (the outward characteristics of the persona) by spelling the inner Self with a capital letter. This helps to distinguish the two, as they can be seen as separate forces within an individual psyche that are in conflict until they are integrated. The entire individuation process, as I understand it, concerns a struggle to integrate the ego-self and the inner Self. It should be noted that, by the true Self, I do not mean God, as Jung sometimes suggests. My definition of the Self is equal to the biblical definition of the *image of God* within each individual, which can be found in the book of Genesis: ‘God created man in the image of himself, ...male and female he created them’ (*New Jerusalem Bible* 2002: Gen 1: 27). This Self is not subject to the will of the ego, but is created and used by God to guide the ego to fulfilment and integration. Le Guin’s characters’ experiences often involve painful challenges that lead to self-examination and growth. Also, perhaps because of the author’s familiarity with Jungian archetypes, her characters’ experiences are frequently of an archetypal nature. She calls Jung ‘the

psychologist whose ideas on art are most meaningful to most artists' (Le Guin 1993a: 58). Although this comment is clearly very subjective, it bespeaks her personal partiality for Jung and his theories about the human psyche and the archetypes that reside therein, which, she says, are 'all worth meeting' (Le Guin 1993a: 59). Anna Valdine Clemens claims that ' [t]heories of depth psychology developed by C. G. Jung ... and others ... can prove particularly helpful in elucidating themes of [*The Left Hand of Darkness*] that have been overlooked by most critics' (1986: 424). I believe that these theories prove helpful in elucidating themes in most of Le Guin's novels, especially the novels on which I have chosen to base this investigation.

The books on which I concentrate are particularly rich in anima motifs and individuation experiences. The protagonists of *The Dispossessed* and *Left Hand* are men who struggle with (and against) themselves and the various ways in which they are related to/partake of femininity. While the focus shifts from Ged to Tenar and Tehanu in the fourth and fifth books of *Earthsea*, it is Tehanu and not Tenar who plays an anima role in Ged's life. Also, the very fact that the focus shifts from the male protagonist to a female protagonist in *Tehanu* is evidence of anima activity, because anima experiences introduce unconventional perspectives, and it is unconventional to have a female protagonist in the sf genre. Le Guin has created these characters in such a way that their masculinity does not express itself as macho, 'alpha male' dominance. Such an expression of masculinity in a character would make a discussion of anima integration very simple: there would be none! Rather, Le Guin's characters are often 'weak' (in terms of social conventions) or annoying, intellectual, and prone to introspection. They are not one-dimensional, but rather display realistic human foibles, and their quests to a large extent involve grappling

with these foibles.³ These are male characters seen through the eyes of a woman author, which means that a female perspective on masculinity is already written into them. Le Guin is clearly not interested in stereotypical, one-dimensional heroes, and seems to be on the look-out for a deeper, more well-rounded understanding of masculinity. She is a woman writing about fictional men who struggle with their masculine and feminine aspects. She writes about leaders in fictional, fantastical societies who struggle to find a way for themselves before they can show others the way, and so presents us with a complex and sympathetic interpretation of what it might mean to be a man. The imaginative contexts deployed in these novels make them ripe with opportunities to examine masculinity and femininity from the more objective stance made possible by cognitive estrangement. Bertolt Brecht describes ‘[a] representation which estranges’ as ‘one which allows us to recognise its subject, but at the same time makes it seem unfamiliar’ (cited in Suvin 1972: 60). Darko Suvin develops this idea into the concept of ‘cognitive estrangement’, which he believes is the distinguishing characteristic of sf. Suvin defines this term as the way in which sf takes what is familiar and represents it in a way that is new to us. We are encouraged to look at the subject with the ‘detached eye’ of Galileo, so that we can arrive at a new evaluation of its meaning (Suvin 1972: 60). Estrangement is uneasy and prompts readers to re-evaluate their perceptions of themselves, and to ask questions such as: ‘what is it to be human?’ both collectively and individually. Not only are Le Guin’s fantasy contexts an estranging factor, but her distinctly feminine perspective also sheds an unusual light on the masculinity of her heroes, and offers a new way of

³ Robert Scholes says in *Elements of Fiction: An Anthology* (1981) that ‘[a]ll human fantasy involves some resemblance – however far fetched – to life. For the student of fiction, then, the *combination* of historical and imaginative materials becomes crucial. This is so because our understanding of fiction depends on our grasping the way in which any particular work is related to life’ (1981: 6). No matter how ‘alien’ to reality Le Guin’s characters may be, they always speak to real human concerns.

understanding the meaning of masculinity, especially when it comes to an application of Jung's anima theories.

An analysis of the archetype of the anima as a feature in the psyche of a male seems appropriate to these characters because of the complexity and ambivalence with which they are imagined. Even the most basic understanding of the anima requires one to see the psyche of an individual as multi-faceted and difficult to grasp in simple terms. Le Guin's fiction often involves encounters with others, both external and internal. The main characters that she creates, especially those that occur in the selected novels, are multi-faceted men who do not go through life simply or straightforwardly. Of all the enemies they battle, their greatest wars are ultimately fought within themselves. Genly Ai struggles throughout *Left Hand* to be free of his own blinding arrogance and deep insecurity as a male living in an androgynous society, so that he might become a better envoy and friend, and learn whom to trust. Shevek slowly and reluctantly learns to let go of the largely naïve social ideals that prevent him from reaching his true potential as a physicist. After taking the first novel, *The Wizard of Earthsea* (1979), to confront his own shadow,⁴ I believe that Ged's ultimate enemy is his location of his value as a man in his achievements as a mage. Although this is inspired by the values of his society, Ged finds that his journey leads him away from the conventions of society to a unique conclusion. In *Tehanu*, he must learn to let go of his pride in his position in order to accept himself in his true being as a man: no more and no less. Each of these confrontations necessarily requires

⁴ This is a different shadow from Jung's concept of 'the shadow' present in the psyche of every individual. Jung's archetype of the shadow is made up of all the qualities or inclinations that a person has suppressed from consciousness. Jung often refers to the psychic shadow as each person's capacity to do evil, which must be acknowledged in order to be kept under control. Le Guin's shadow is an evil presence that is loosed upon Earthsea when Ged performs a dangerous spell unwisely. I see the shadow or *gebbeth* that Ged loosed upon Earthsea as an imaginative manifestation of Jung's psychological concept.

that the individual delve deeper inside himself in order to learn about all that he is. Knowing all that he is will allow him to know more clearly all that he can do. In explaining her own understanding of Jung's psychological theory, Le Guin tells us that the ego of a person '...must turn inward, away from the crowd to the source: it must identify with *its own* deeper regions, the great unexplored regions of the Self. ... it is in them, where we all meet, that [Jung] sees the source of true community; of felt religion; of art; grace, spontaneity, and love' (Le Guin 1993a: 59). What each of these men find, as they learn more about themselves, is the unconscious activity of the anima: a feminine capacity that has a direct impact on the way in which they perceive and decide to live out their conscious lives. They do not identify this activity as anima functioning within the course of the plot, but their increased awareness of their unconscious life, which I identify as anima functioning, brings about conscious change. The extent to which each character confronts his own anima determines the extent to which he reaches individuation and maturity.

The term individuation describes what Jung perceives as the 'central concept of [his] psychology' (Jung 1961: 235), because he sees it as the ultimate purpose of each human life: to grow towards greater awareness of one's true Self, and the purpose for which one's unique being exists (cf. Jung 1961: 414). Although this belief that human life is a journey towards an ultimate goal of Self-knowledge is by no means universal, it does coincide with the fictional experiences of the protagonists in the selected Le Guin novels. For example, towards the end of *The Dispossessed*, the main character, Shevek, reaches a point at which he feels that his 'life has been fulfilled' (Le Guin 1999: 231–32). This kind of experience presupposes the view that the life of a person is a process of fulfilling a particular goal, purpose or destiny,

which may not be consciously known to the individual, but may instead be buried within his/her unconscious, true Self. The theme of destiny in Le Guin's novels mirrors Jung's concept of individuation. My contention is that the process of individuation, as it is played out in the life of each character, is largely governed by the extent to which he confronts the archetype of the anima, and that any avoidance of such confrontations results in prolonged immaturity and lack of Self-knowledge. In the following chapters I highlight and examine various instances of anima confrontation in the quests of the three protagonists in order to illustrate the large degree to which such confrontations precipitate growth and maturity in the individual, and ultimately lead him to a deeper understanding of himself, and a more evolved state of individuation. First, though, the anima needs to be more clearly and carefully defined.

I use Jung's writing as my starting point in defining the anima, as it is he who first gave the word its meaning in the context of analytical psychology. The word 'anima' is literally the Latin term for 'soul' – a word that has a feminine grammatical allocation. Its meaning is different and more specific, though, in the context of Jung's thought. I analyse aspects of Jung's anima definitions also in order to bring to light those things that I find are contradictory in his thinking, or contrary to the purposes of this study – in particular his androcentric bias. I introduce and discuss the views of Ann Belford Ulanov, who offers an explanation for the problem of sexual discrimination that makes any definition of the anima such a minefield. The perspectives of Ulanov, and the other critics I discuss, lend insight into the essence of the anima by providing more objective understandings of masculinity and femininity. Ulanov blames the problem of sexual discrimination on fear and hatred of the

feminine element of being (another term for the anima, as I shall explain later) – fear and hatred of which both men and women are guilty. In so doing, Ulanov discusses certain features of the feminine element of being, and hence provides material with which to identify the anima. For it is chiefly compensatory to the outward, social mask (persona) of an individual, and thus receives from the persona those things that are feared, and rejected from consciousness as a result. Jung writes:

As to the character of the anima, my experience confirms the rule that it is ... complementary to the character of the persona. The anima usually contains all those common human qualities which the conscious attitude lacks A very feminine woman has a masculine soul [animus], and a very masculine man has a feminine soul [anima]. This is due to the fact that a man is not in all things wholly masculine, but also has certain feminine traits. The more masculine his outer attitude is, the more his feminine traits are obliterated: instead they appear in his unconscious. (1983: 100-1)

Certain cultures label specific human qualities as either masculine or feminine, and so lead individuals to repress those qualities in themselves that do not adhere to the cultural or social norm. This is why a very masculine man will try to ‘obliterate’ his own feminine qualities from his conscious life. But what he really does is merely to repress them so that they go into the unconscious and disturb him in his less conscious moments. The fact that it is the feminine element of being that is feared by vast numbers of men and women explains why the anima may appear in so many instances in the form of a female. The rest of my discussion makes the point that, although the anima is often seen as a woman, it is a mistake to *define* it as ‘a woman’. For the anima is primarily a function that is performed within the psyche according to the immutable, autonomous pattern of the archetype. Hence I assert that the anima is identified by its activities and functions rather than by its appearance and content. The anima will ultimately be addressed on two levels: firstly I will look at the distorted manifestations of the anima as they appear in the individual psyches of the protagonists (in order to reveal projections and lack of integration), and secondly, I

attend to the ultimate functional aspects of the anima itself, which are autonomous and unchanging. As I shall discuss later, these are chiefly wisdom, beauty and love. These aspects are evident in the behaviour of a character whose anima is integrated.

At the heart of this study is a concern for human wholeness: not only female wholeness or male wholeness, but fully integrated *human being*. My agenda is not a feminist one, since feminism focuses on a very specific part of human existence and the completeness with which it is perceived, whereas I am concerned with masculinity and femininity as poles of the whole that is humanity. I do not wish to focus on one or the other, but, as Le Guin does, on the integration of the two. Hence my discussion of the integration of the feminine element into the masculine consciousness of the three male protagonists in my chosen texts. Thus, my agenda is not so much feminist as holistic and Christian. While the Christian concern remains largely understated in this dissertation, it does form the foundation of my concern for wholeness, and is a constant undercurrent in my development of an understanding of the function of the anima. I see what Carl Gustav Jung has called individuation as a process by which such wholeness might be achieved, although the nuts and bolts of what the individuation process involves must be examined and perhaps refined for the purpose of this enquiry. According to Jung, individuation involves an inward journey by the conscious ego away from the outward persona towards the inner Self. The ego can be defined as the centre of consciousness in a person. Eric Pettifor describes the ego as

... identity. It is "I". But it is not the totality of the psyche. Being the King of consciousness amounts to dominion over a small but important land surrounded by a wide world of terra incognita. The more aware the King is of the lands beyond his domain the more secure he will be on his throne, but he must not be tempted to open the borders to it all. In Jungian theory the unconscious is far too vast to ever be made fully conscious. Poking about in it is not without danger, yet ignoring it is also a mistake since it leads to brittle fixedness which at best impedes growth, at worst can break when under the pressure of the "threat" of change. (1995: 2)

The true, inner Self encompasses the entire psyche – both its conscious and unconscious aspects. The Self includes the persona and the ego within its frame, which is the whole of a person's being (spirit, soul, mind and body), though an individual may quite easily live entirely according to his/her ego consciousness without being aware of the existence of the Self. To a large extent the inward journey involves a conscious confrontation with unconscious contents belonging to the personal and collective unconscious. Jung believes that the collective unconscious is 'a vast, impersonal reservoir available to all humanity' (Rubenstein 1998: 28). He claims it is a realm in which powerful archetypal symbols and patterns are autochthonous and 'become visible in the products of "creative fantasy"' (Rubenstein 1998: 30). He goes on to say that the anima is an archetype that is autochthonous in the collective unconscious, which manifests in the personal unconscious of a man as an image of Woman. Ann Belford Ulanov elaborates on Jung's definition by explaining that 'a man tends to experience the deep aspects of his unconscious as presented to him in the feminine images of the anima archetype, which he feels as something like his own soul' (1981: 18). She also states that the anima is the bridge across which the questions from the unconscious Self come to address the ego: 'These questions seem to issue from an other – personified as an anima ... figure – who says, in effect: You must deal with me, respond to me, even if it is to reject me, but here I am and you cannot escape' (1994: 10). Thus the anima can be seen as an essential function in the growth of the individual towards greater Self-knowledge, wholeness and wisdom: the ultimate goals of individuation.

By introducing the concept of the anima to psychological theory, Jung goes a long way towards reuniting masculinity and femininity within individuals by insisting

that ‘... the whole person is contrasexual – a man consciously related to the feminine aspects of himself, a woman consciously in touch with her masculine side’ (Ulanov 1981: 55). He describes four developmental stages of anima integration in which a man views the feminine in these ways: Eve (primitive mother – something to be fertilised); Eros (romantic lover – has some value as an individual); Mary (spiritual mother – raised to the heights of religious devotion) and Sophia (wisdom personified). While these stages are useful to keep in mind when one is observing anima integration in the behaviour of an individual, it is important to remember that shifts from one stage to another do not signify change taking place in the archetype itself, which, as a pattern or a function, is autonomous and immutable, but are rather indications of the stage of individuation in the person who perceives the anima/feminine in these ways. Should a man perceive the feminine merely as something to be fertilised, then he is still in a very primitive stage of anima integration/individuation, and very far from wisdom and Self-knowledge. The function of the anima remains the same in the psyche of each person, while it is the content of the unknown Self that makes the anima appear in a particular way to a particular person.

This distinction between the anima’s immutable function and its content, which differs from person to person, leads me to question the rigidity and dualistic logic with which Jung comes to label the male soul/anima as ‘female’ and the female soul/animus as ‘male’. There is an account of Jung’s first conscious encounter with the anima in his autobiographical work *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (1961), which may give some insight into the particular way in which Jung’s individual understanding shaped his definition of the anima.

When I was writing down these fantasies, I once asked myself, “What am I really doing? Certainly this has nothing to do with science. But then what is it?” Whereupon a voice within

me said, "It is art." . . . It had never entered my head that what I was writing had any connection with art. Then I thought, "Perhaps my unconscious is forming a personality that is not me, but which is insisting on coming through to expression." I knew for a certainty that the voice had come from a woman . . . Obviously what I was doing wasn't science. What then could it be but art? It was as though these were the only two alternatives in the world. That is the way a woman's mind works.

. . . Then came the next assault, and again the same assertion: "That is art." This time I caught her and said, "No, it is not art! On the contrary, it is nature," and prepared myself for an argument. When nothing of the sort occurred, I reflected that the "woman within me" did not have the speech centres I had. And so I suggested that she use mine. She did so and came through with a long statement.

I was greatly intrigued by the fact that a woman should interfere with me from within. My conclusion was that she must be the "soul," in the primitive sense, and I began to speculate on the reasons why the name "anima" was given to the soul. Why was it thought of as feminine? Later I came to see that this inner feminine figure plays a typical, or archetypal, role in the unconsciousness of a man, and I called her the "anima". The corresponding figure in the unconscious of woman I called the "animus". (1961: 210)

This encounter with the anima comes at a time in Jung's life that he calls 'a state of disorientation' (1961: 194). It came after he and Freud had finally parted ways, which left Jung feeling suspended and lost. He says that during this time he was forced merely to confront the unconscious without bringing any theoretical perspectives to bear upon his experiences within himself or with his patients. One can imagine that, for a man of such a rigorously scientific aspirations, this time must have been a great trial. In the midst of this particular confrontation with his unconscious fantasies, Jung is forced to stop and question the fundamental purpose of his activities by asking 'What am I really doing?' It is clear that, as someone who sees himself chiefly as a natural scientist and empiricist, he has a need to know the direction in which his work is taking him and to what goal his efforts are pitted. His first answer to his own question is 'Certainly this has nothing to do with science,' which shows that he already doubts the chiefly scientific nature of his work. He seems to have hit a boundary of unconscious experience past which he knows he can no longer examine his unconscious contents scientifically. The voice that subsequently answers him is in agreement with his doubts about the 'science' of his work. The alternative category that it offers him is 'art'. There are two aspects of this conversation that I wish to

address: the first is Jung's approach to the anima/the feminine, and the second is his approach to art. Firstly, it does not take long for Jung to label the voice that replies to his questions as the voice of 'a woman'. Immediately I detect the danger of confusion between real women and the femininity of his anima. A reading of Jung's discussion of the anima and women indicates that he does not distinguish between femininity as the property of women themselves, and femininity as the property of the anima, who, he claims, is the presence (both psychologically and biologically) of feminine elements inside *a man*, which give him his perspective on femininity. This lack of distinction, I believe, leads him to confuse the *reality of women* with the *male perspective on femininity* provided by a man's anima, which he then applies to real women. This confusion is a clue to the reason for Jung's immediately negative approach to the anima. It is Jung's already negative (although seemingly unconscious) approach to real women that leads him to transfer this negativity to the female voice of the anima within his own psyche, and to label the anima as female purely on the basis of his own perceptions of its characteristics.

There is evidence of Jung's misogyny in the next part of the excerpt. He articulates a conundrum between the possibility of his work as either art or science. This conundrum is his own: in his struggle to define the nature of his work he is considering the label of either art or science. His response to this choice is that these two options cannot be the only ones available to him – it is simplistic to think in terms of such rigid dualisms. What is interesting to observe is the way in which he automatically attributes this simplistic way of thinking to all women: 'That is the way a woman's mind works.' This statement is uttered cleanly and confidently, as if it were an unquestionably universal truth. There is subtle preparation earlier in the

excerpt, which Jung seems to have used to cushion this outright avoidance of responsibility for his own thinking process. The way in which he rationalises the existence of the voice is by suggesting that his unconscious 'is forming a personality that is not [him], but which is insisting on coming to expression' (1961: 210). Jung avoids perceiving the oversimplified distinction between art and science as a fault of his own thinking: instead he attributes it to another 'personality' that is not himself, speaking from within himself. In this context he does not even attempt to acknowledge that this personality is a part of himself that contains qualities he has not yet integrated, although they are firmly present in his unconscious. Then Jung explains the simplistic nature of the question by referring to the way a woman's mind works. Yet it is clear from the excerpt that the only mind at work during this internal dialogue is his own. While it may be true, as he claims, that he possesses an anima, which has a chiefly feminine quality within the psyche of a man, I feel it is important to maintain the distinction between the reality of femininity in women, and a man's understanding of femininity formed by his anima. Simply because, through a series of experiences with women, Jung has come to perceive them in general as simplistic in their thinking, this perception should not be understood as a reflection of the reality of women themselves, but rather as a reflection of Jung's own as yet unintegrated anima. I say unintegrated because his view of women and their femininity seems to be very harsh. It is a view that in no way makes room for wisdom and depth (Sophia) within the feminine, neither divine quality (Mary), nor barely even an admirable personality (Eros). This leads me to suspect that, even much later in his life (when Jung wrote this autobiography), Jung was in a very primitive stage of anima integration – closer to Eve than any of the other stages. According to his own definition of the anima, it

performs a chiefly compensatory role (cf. 1983: 93) in relation to the conscious ego or persona of the man in which it occurs.

If, through negative experiences with his mother and other females with whom he came into contact, Jung has chosen not to identify himself with those qualities he has labelled as feminine, but rather has chosen to cultivate qualities he perceives as masculine, it follows (from his own definition) that the 'feminine' qualities he excludes from his consciousness will go into his unconscious and form a compensatory opposite personality to his conscious ego. Therefore, if Jung perceives and consciously cultivates in himself qualities of scientific enlightenment, complex logical thought processes and rigorous empirical analysis (which he perceives to be fitting to his manhood), then it follows that his anima might be identified by the opposing qualities. He would have categorised these as feminine and thus discarded them – though they are not necessarily truly feminine elements of human being. But the fact remains that they do belong to him, and would include simplistic, dualistic thinking, artistry, spontaneity and vague and intuitive perceptions. It seems, however, that Jung needs reminding of his own definition. These qualities are not necessarily those belonging to women or femininity, but rather those belonging to his own distorted patriarchal understanding of the feminine which – having been eschewed by his conscious personality - have populated and given substance to his anima.

Secondly, the fact that Jung had never before thought of his activities as artistic, interestingly, seems to preclude from his mind the possibility of their artistic nature altogether: 'No, it is not art!' I am suspicious of his immediate resistance to the idea, and wonder whether the patriarchal ideology within which Jung lived and

moved did not shape and limit his thinking more than he could realise. For, later on in the same chapter, Jung says:

What the anima said to me seemed to me full of a deep cunning. If I had taken these fantasies of the unconscious as art, they would have carried no more conviction than visual perceptions, as if I were watching a movie. I would have felt no moral obligation towards them. The anima might then have easily seduced me into believing that I was a misunderstood artist, and that my so-called artistic nature gave me the right to neglect reality Thus the insinuations of the anima, the mouthpiece of the unconscious, can utterly destroy a man. (1961: 211-12)

There seems in this statement and the previous one to be a mixed suspicion of anything feminine (first of all woman, and thus the anima, which he calls 'a woman') and anything artistic. This suspicion looks disturbingly like a direct product of traditional patriarchy, which tends to devalue anything that is not 'masculine' hard, rational science or empirical fact. In Jung's reasoning there is evidence of an assumption that art and visual perception are inferior intellectual pursuits; that they are devoid of moral conviction, and that only science or nature may inspire these in us. His ensuing comments about the anima and 'her' artistic proposition become quite pejorative, and one is led to wonder where this extremely negative, in fact irrational, reaction to the anima's encouragement of 'so-called artistic nature' comes from. Immediately the words of the anima become cunning 'insinuations', as if the purposes of the anima were unquestionably sinister and harmful.⁵ What has led Jung immediately to suspect the anima's motives? And what has led him to believe that an artistic approach to his work would be a denial of reality? He seems to fear this approach to the extent that he claims it would 'destroy a man'. Later on Jung states that, for himself, 'reality [means] scientific comprehension' (1961: 213), which

⁵ In Chapter Two I discuss a similar tendency in Genly Ai's character to devalue that which is unknown by plastering it with negatively biased feminine labels. The fact that the fictional experiences of Le Guin's characters mirror (to some extent) the lived experience of Jung is yet another reason to engage in an analysis of her characters according to some of Jung's psychological approaches. Jung's struggle to reconcile the archetypes within his own experience gives a practical map with which to examine the archetypal struggles endured by the three protagonists.

reveals his complete identification with the rational/empirical bias of patriarchy. It is clear from the above statements that he sees himself and his value as a person as entirely determined by the fact that he is 'a man' (in the patriarchal view) and a scientist. To this particular view of reality, the more intuitive, less decisive or secure approach heralded by art and what Jung calls 'the feminine' might well threaten disaster.

Despite his belief in the ultimate value of the unconscious and our attention to it, it seems that this attention will only be valuable to Jung as long as he maintains control of it. There is no question of surrendering himself to an unknown world, which would allow new knowledge to be gained, and new approaches to be witnessed. Jung is a victim of his own fear of that which he does not know; that which he cannot grasp scientifically, and therefore that over which he cannot maintain control: the feminine, the anima, art and the unconscious (of which the anima is the mouthpiece). His fear seems to have led him to be the unwitting pawn of his own unconscious projections, shaped in him by his patriarchal upbringing. It is ironic, and yet fitting, that a man who devoted his life to individuation and freedom from unconscious projections through confrontation of the unconscious would be such a victim of unconscious projections himself.

The excerpt closes with a consideration of the reason for the (grammatically feminine) Latin name for the human soul: *anima*. I am willing to accept Jung's conclusion that a man's soul somehow does have a feminine quality in a patriarchal context, which notoriously encourages men to eschew any feminine-seeming qualities from their conscious persona. Naturally the anima (as a compensatory function)

would thus become the internal receptacle of those ‘feminine characteristics’, and thus appear to the man as a woman: everything he despises within himself. I am also willing to accept that the same structure applies to women who, within a patriarchal structure, are led to eschew any masculine-seeming qualities in their own nature, which thus appear in their unconscious as the image of man, and thus give their souls masculine faces. What strikes me, though, is the vast separation in Jung’s understanding of humanity between male and female. It seems that, although both men and women are human, there is nothing else he can see that they share in common – even something as deep as a soul with a particular, fundamental structure. Jung seems not even to consider the possibility that both men and women have access to, or perceive, an anima *and* animus, which are both, as he says, archetypes resident in the collective unconscious, and therefore ‘available to all humanity’ (Rubenstein 1998: 28). His immediate assumption is that the anima is the exclusive property of men, and that another entity, the *animus*, belongs to the psyche of women (cf. 1961: 210, 1983: 102). Nowhere else does there seem to be any justification for this dualistic conclusion other than the simplistic equation that male and female are opposites,⁶ and therefore men and women must have opposite souls. If men have a female soul, women simply must have a male soul. The thinking pattern here reflects very closely the simplistic and stereotypical duality previously attributed to the minds of women in the excerpt concerning how his perception of the anima came about. Is this perhaps not more evidence of the way in which Jung’s unintegrated, projected anima has distorted his view of women and men due to his own seemingly unconscious androcentric bias, which takes for granted that patriarchy is the universal context of all human beings? Jung’s problem seems to lie in the fact that he sees male

⁶ ‘What can a man say about woman, his own opposite?’ (Jung 1927: 236).

and female as binary opposites. This assumption ensures that he is unable to consider the common humanity of both men and women as equally valuable, and uniquely expressed in each individual and in the archetypes that, he claims, inform us all.

The modern psychoanalyst, Ann Ulanov, disputes Jung's dualistic conclusion in her book *Receiving Woman: Studies in the Psychology and Theology of the Feminine* (1981). She states that, on the basis of his discovery of the anima in a man,

Jung tried to say that feminine psychology is the obverse of masculine, and that a woman experiences her unconscious as a masculine spirit – the animus. This contention has not held up A woman finds her soul link in distinctly feminine terms. The feminine cannot be grasped as simply the converse, obverse, or reverse of masculine psychology. (1981: 18)

Yet this does not make her abandon Jungian theory entirely, for she perceives that Jung, like most men and women, is scarred and shaped by the world into which he was born. In *Transforming Sexuality* she states that

A cursory reading of Jung might support objections to anima/animus theory as a mere recording of stereotypes. Seizing some passages out of context, we can come away with the conviction that Jung exactly equates Eros with feeling, with anima, and with women, and Logos just as precisely with thinking, with animus and with men. The two sexes appear then to be divided up as matter and spirit, feeling and thinking, home and public life, action and passivity, penetration and receptionThese categories appear to hold regardless of a person's typology and without showing any awareness of the power of cultural conditioning to foist gender roles upon the sexes. Jung's metaphors in such passages seem to stand as absolutes, and his own feeling reactions – such as negative responses to a woman's animus – seem to be written into definition. (1994: 17)

Yet she shows us that the context within which these passages need to be read is that of a man with deep mother and father wounds, and a personality that was split as a result. In a similar vein Jacques Lacan claims that the human psyche is always and irremediably split (cf. 1979: 70). I echo John Eldredge in his book *Waking The Dead* (2003) in claiming that it is due to lack of love that the human psyche becomes wounded and split, and that with grace, love and openness to healing, that split may gradually be remedied (2003: 14). Robert C. Smith writes in *The Wounded Jung*

(1996) that Jung experienced his mother's absence during his early childhood as abandonment, which caused him to develop an 'ambivalent attitude towards [her] This internalised ambivalence provided the basis for a deep distrust of women in general' (1996: 15-16). When Jung speaks of his Number 1 and Number 2 personalities in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, it echoes his observations of a dual personality in his mother also. Smith states that Jung

insists that his experience of dual personalities has nothing to do with a split or dissociation in the ordinary medical sense Quite amazingly, he argues that this same phenomenon is played out in the life of every individual. This shows, I think, how conditioned he was by his own unique childhood experiences. He assumed others shared his experiences. (1996: 18)

Jung writes that his Number 1 personality was his conventional self, who needed to fit into the world and make a living. His Number 2 personality was more intuitive and uncanny, always resisting the pull of practicality and the persona: 'Science met, to a very large extent, the needs of No. 1 personality, whereas the humane or historical studies provided beneficial instruction for No. 2' (1961: 91). Ulanov says that June Singer and Claire Douglas offer an interesting way to understand anima/animus theory in the light of Jung's broken personality:

Using Jung's own descriptions of what he called his Number 1 and Number 2 personalities, they attribute certain limiting aspects of [his] anima/animus ideas to his first self, the product of generations of pastors in a Swiss society branded by its own misogyny, child of a father disheartened by his loss of faith, and a complex, confusing mother, who suffered from severe depression in Jung's early childhood, but who also offered uncanny insights Where the Number 1 personality is reflected in anima/animus theory, conventional thought dominates. With Number 2, a radical originality arrives, as Jung works to free our understanding of contrasexuality from the gender stereotypes of his time, setting us the task of integrating differences into identity, otherness into wholeness, whether it fits the socially prescribed mode or not. (1994: 19-20)

In the light of these perceptions I have proceeded carefully in isolating parts of Jung's theory that reflect his 'radical originality' as the basic structures on which to build a discussion of the anima, while maintaining an awareness of those passages that throw

a spanner into the works of the liberating, broadening potential of anima integration.

For, no matter how well Jung may have succeeded in defining his subjects,

... the anima/animus contents that cross the ego/Self bridge are insistently individual. They do not permit reduction to culture-bound prejudices or anything resembling a narrowing sexism. Reductive thinking altogether misses the epochal nature of Jung's insight, however difficult his articulation of it, or "clumsy," as it seemed to him Everything about archetypes combats the finality of systems and the reductions of stereotyping. (Ulanov 1994: 17)

It seems from this examination that it is necessary to come to a revised understanding of femininity, masculinity and the anima. Merely to state that a man must integrate his 'feminine' side (anima), or a woman must integrate her 'masculine' side (animus) is not enough. The application of these concepts is not at all simple, due to continued distortions of what 'masculinity' and 'femininity' actually mean. Sexism, patriarchy and fear of 'the other' are cultural and ideological constructs that have robbed individuals of wholeness by stereotyping people into rigid and generalised categories. This forced levelling-out of individuality has obscured and deflated the meaning of the archetypes of masculinity and femininity, and what they offer actual men and women. In her book *Receiving Woman*, Ann Ulanov has done much to retrieve the all-but-lost meanings of masculinity and femininity. It is from this reverent ground established by Ulanov in her approach to human wholeness, as it is expressed through the polarities of the masculine and the feminine, that I wish to come to a clearer understanding of the anima, and what anima integration means for the individual protagonists in the selected novels.

Sexual stereotyping is a force that runs in direct opposition to human wholeness, and its dehumanising effects may be observed in all areas of personal and collective life (cf. Ulanov 1981: 33). Ulanov says that

[t]he construction of hard and fast roles for all who want to become “real men” and “real women” not only stunts the lives of particular persons but often comes close to murder in the constriction those roles demand. Persons are measured against sex roles, judged and inevitably found wanting, because actual persons, with their idiosyncratic variations on human themes, can never fulfil an abstract role with its various generalities. (1981: 33)

Sexual stereotyping becomes a massive obstacle to a discussion of individuation and contrasexual integration, because the stereotypes according to which our ideologies rear us place limits on the qualities we are able to discover in ourselves, depending on our sex. If a man is told he must be entirely masculine in every aspect of his being, and he believes what he is told, he will be led to suppress or reject anything he experiences about himself which presents a feminine quality. What he sees as either feminine or masculine will depend to a large extent on what his society has labelled as ‘feminine’ or ‘masculine’. Generally speaking, the largely patriarchal societies in which we live have labelled qualities of passivity, corporeality and receptivity as purely feminine, while their polarities (activity, mind, ambition and penetration) are labelled exclusively masculine (cf. Ulanov 1981: 22, 1994: 17). Feminine qualities are seen as altogether weaker, while masculine qualities are perceived as strong. Hence, should a man discover an inclination to passive receptivity within his psyche, he will be led to suppress this quality outright, and thus lose a significant chunk of himself to the unconscious. Jung explains in many places that anything we deny or suppress in our conscious ego does not disappear, but instead arrives in our personal unconscious (Hillman 1985: 4) where, detached from our conscious attention, it has free reign and may possess us in our less conscious states: in dreams or moments in which we feel overwhelmed or out of control (cf. Jung 1983: 122). A society that encourages its individuals to be either entirely masculine or entirely feminine according to their biological sex has devastating implications for the unconscious, if what Jung says is true. If every man in society becomes deliberately unconscious of his femininity by

forcing it out of his ego, that feminine content – instead of being a ‘function of relationship to the unconscious’ (Jung 1983: 122) – inhabits the anima, which then expresses itself indirectly by ‘disturbing the peace’ (Jung 1983: 122) of a man’s consciousness. This is what, in psychological terms, is called a complex, and it is a sign that something in the psyche has become split and needs reintegration. An added danger of this (consistently unattended-to) anima possession in men on a grand scale is identified in what it implies for real women. Jung also calls the anima the ‘projection making factor’ (1983: 92), since a masculine man’s unconscious is populated by his suppressed feminine characteristics, and since the unconscious ‘does the projecting’ (Jung 1983: 92) a man will meet with his own projected anima in other, real women. Whether or not real women actually behave like his anima, a man who is unconscious of his anima cannot distinguish between what real women are like, and how his projected anima has made them appear to be. Jung states that ‘[t]he effect of projection is to isolate the subject from its environment, since instead of a real relation to it there is now an illusory one. Projections change the world into the replica of one’s unknown face’ (Jung 1983: 92). This understanding explains to a very large degree why women over the years have come to be perceived as passive, weak-minded and prone to hysteria. This view of women is really the ‘unknown face’ of men who have suppressed their femininity. If a man has labelled his own femininity as unworthy of his maleness, and therefore suppressed it, the unconscious personification of his femininity in the form of his anima might well become hysterical at being so rejected; or weak-minded and passive at being so deprived of active attention. If men then project this anima onto women in general, actual women have very little hope of being perceived *as they really are* by the men in their society. This realisation makes anima integration all the more urgent, since the suppression of

feminine characteristics among men in patriarchy not only deprives *men* of their own wholeness of being, but women also. Anima possession leads to discrimination against real women who are nothing like the twisted, compensatory animas projected onto them by men. Men who ignore their femininity as a result of sexual stereotyping ironically end up facilitating their own possession by that femininity in a starved, weakened, inferior and rabid form.

Ann Ulanov asks the question of what causes people to stereotype themselves into rigid sexual roles. She asserts that ‘sexual differentiation of men and women is ... [not] the root of discrimination against [women]’ (1981: 31). She speaks of the masculine and the feminine as poles that ‘move in a symbolic universe describing generalised human experience, not simply this man or that woman’ (1981: 35). She argues that they act as ‘central symbols in describing all of life’s polarities. They give ... imaginative elaboration to the human experience of difference and otherness, both presupposing and building a culture of images that express human reality’ (1981: 35). Seen in this way, masculinity and femininity are poles that help us to define the humanity that occurs in all of us. The fact that men and women are different is no reason for discrimination between the sexes, since differentiation that is acknowledged, received and appreciated can lead to mutual acceptance, and provide an opportunity for identifying similarities between men and women as well, both individually and collectively. Through this understanding, the polarities of masculinity and femininity appear as equally available both to men and women, to develop in themselves according to their individual natures and Selves. However, when we function in a world of stereotypical labels,

[t]he original dynamic tension of paired opposites is violently split apart into polarised dualism, pitting sex against sex in a competitive struggle for supremacy. Difference is experienced as

hostile to identity and cancelling it, rather than enlivening and encouraging the expression of all of one's nature. (Ulanov 1981: 35)

Ulanov argues that, when these polarities become polarised (split) in our minds, we act out this splitting in the form of social oppression:

For example, the symbols of the feminine as meek, mild, and gentle, when severed from their obvious opposite signs [also feminine], those that are excited, heroic, or forceful, undergo such distortion that the feminine comes to be equated with only one extreme. Thus a woman's qualities become ripe for reification and application as stereotypes. Woman now is defined as weak and trembling like a frightened rabbit. What a loss for both sexes! (1981: 35)

Society is left to answer for this violent polarisation of the sexes, and one wonders whether sexual polarity cannot instead enlarge consciousness when one 'hold[s] both modalities of being human in simultaneous awareness' (Ulanov 1981: 37).

If sexual polarity is not the cause of polarisation and discrimination, what is? Ulanov asserts that there is a repressed, but firmly present 'fear of the female' in vast numbers of men and women (1981: 16). What is meant by 'the female' is not the reality of females, but rather the vast, symbolic world of 'imagery people have consciously or unconsciously associated with women from the beginning of time' (1981: 74). This is not the same as the concrete meaning of 'the female', which comprises the personal and collective life of women, and 'differs from culture to culture and person to person' (1981: 74). This system of feminine symbols, Ulanov claims, is not dependent on private, unconscious life, nor is it limited to objects introjected from the world of our daily existence. 'This world lies somewhere among ... these areas, ... [in a] transitional space between our private inner world and the outer world ...' (1981: 74-5), and within it, '... symbols of the feminine exist to perform a mirroring function, reflecting back to us our apprehension of a major modality of human existence' (1981: 75). These feminine symbols, which stem from

the feminine element of being, are therefore not the property of women as opposed to men, but reside in the collective and the personal unconscious of all human beings, where they inform all of our experiences to a larger or lesser degree, which is determined by the Self and the extent to which the Self is allowed to inform the ego.

But what are these symbols and why do we fear them? Of course there is no way fully to define and capture in a few words such a vast and immutable realm of symbols. For, although these symbols cannot be described or captured according to any fixed content, their function or pattern is fixed. Ulanov focuses on three aspects of the feminine element of being, which have also been addressed in different ways by D.W. Winnicott in his paper 'Primary Maternal Preoccupation' (1975) and Harry Guntrip in *Schizoid Phenomena, Object Relations and the Self* (1969). Ulanov asserts that these elements are observable in every child's experiences with a mother (1981: 76-7), which means that they apply to, and have an effect on, every human being who was ever born. She also states that 'these three elements form the basis for any significant experience in its birth and growing phases' (1981: 77). This is an important point with regard to this study, since I examine in particular the growth that takes place in each protagonist's individuation journey. I shall therefore focus on identifying these elements in the particular growth experiences that are examined in the life of each protagonist. All three feminine elements have to do with *being* as opposed to *doing*. 'They are: being as being-at-the-core-of-oneself, being as beginning by being-one-with another, and being as possessed of a personal continuity' (1981: 77). I shall only focus on the first two of these since they are most pertinent to Le Guin's protagonists. A sense of being-at-the-core involves a capacity to be calmly, knowing that one is 'given ... instead of achieved ... or manufactured' (1981: 77),

and this sense is nurtured in a child through its first experiences with its mother, who mirrors the child's being-there in her responses to the child:

Looking into the mother's face looking back, the infant discovers a sense of its own personal being. Here unfolds for the first time a child's capacity to feel alive, real, possessed of unique and personal existence. Being-at-the-core, then, means *being vulnerable* In each experience we initially find our being through its being reflected back to us by another. We depend on that; we are totally vulnerable to its presence or absence. Surprisingly, a successful dependence yields not a fixation but a full-bodied sense of individual being rooted at the core (1981: 77-8, my emphasis)

From this passage it seems that there are two conditions that are necessary in order for vulnerability to be authentic. First of all, one must have something precious to lose, something that is at risk, in order to be vulnerable to damage or loss. Hence, to *be* vulnerable means to know that one *is*, and to know simultaneously that one's life and Self are unique and priceless and worthy of love. The second condition of vulnerability is to know that one is dependent on the free will of others, and the grace of circumstances, in order to be recognised as unique and priceless and worthy of love. David Holbrook states that 'the female element of being is the capacity to perceive the world, to love, and to develop symbols and a sense of richness in union ... the capacity to be, to be alone, relying on inner resources' (1981: 78) and he argues that an inability or refusal to find ourselves vulnerable, and accept our vulnerability in this sense, deprives us of an inner stillness, which then acts as the root of alienation in our relationships and cultures.

The above description is reminiscent of the characters of Tenar and Tehanu in *Tehanu* and *The Other Wind* (2003). Both demonstrate an extraordinary capacity to perceive the world with a wisdom that allows them to be, remaining as they are, instead of feeling the need to intervene more than is absolutely necessary. Their love is also extraordinary in that it crosses barriers that convention would not usually

allow. Tenar accepts and loves Tehanu as her own daughter, not only despite, but because of, the way she has been damaged. They definitely seem to rely on inner resources: where else would they find the strength to love against the odds that are thrown at them throughout *Tehanu*? Tenar and Tehanu's vulnerability in relation to people such as Aspen and Tehanu's birth parents is extreme, yet they accept it, and find the strength to fight and defeat their enemies from within their own vulnerability. And there is a sense of richness in their union, demonstrated by the way in which Tenar mourns the loss of Tehanu deeply, while freely letting her go at the end of *The Other Wind*, and by the way in which she longs so insistently to be home with Ged, even though her circumstances in Havnor leave nothing to be desired (cf. Le Guin 2003: 86).

Palat also, in *The Dispossessed*, displays a capacity '... to love, ... and a sense of richness in union ... the capacity to be, to be alone, relying on inner resources' (1981: 78) in the way that he nurtures and forges a strong relationship with Shevek despite the absence of his partner, Rulag. His inner resources must be abundant indeed if he is able to choose to remain committed to his son, despite the freedom his society grants him not to be so. Both Holbrook and Ulanov agree that hatred stems from our protest at being deprived 'of that reflecting love which enables us to consent to be' (1981: 78). The feeling of being deprived stems from an expectation that one deserves or is entitled to the thing of which one is deprived. This expectation is a refusal to accept one's fundamental vulnerability (that one cannot demand, but can only receive), which then cuts one off from one's inner resources and ability to love, and displaces one's knowledge of one's value from one's precious *being* itself to the presence or absence of recognition of one's being by others. A refusal of vulnerability

is an effort to control, which leads one to see other individuals as 'inferior' (since one must see oneself as superior to that which one wants to control), and hence to attack their being primarily by refusing to recognise their vulnerability and free will. Genly Ai demonstrates this refusal of vulnerability and need to control in *Left Hand* (1969), in his arrogant and judgemental attitude towards the femininity in Gethenians. He sees their difference as a threat to his masculinity, because his pride in his identity as a man is not rooted in a strong sense of Self. He lacks the ability to love Gethenians in the beginning of the novel, and to find a sense of richness in union with them, because he lacks the 'capacity to be, to be alone, relying on inner resources' (1981: 78). His inability to accept his vulnerability in relation to them deprives him of his inner stillness, which acts as a root of alienation between him and the Gethenians in general, and Estraven in particular.

An acceptance of vulnerability will inevitably involve a painful blow to one's pride, and this links an experience of vulnerability to an experience of growth, for, as Rick Warren says in *The Purpose Driven Life*, '[t]here is no growth without change; there is no change without fear or loss; and there is no loss without pain. Every change involves loss of some kind: [one] must let go of old ways in order to experience the new' (2002: 220). It is thus that the core vulnerability that comes with the feminine element of being inspires fear in the fragile ego, which then is displaced onto hatred of the feminine element of being. But the general archetypal construct of the feminine element of being is vastly too large and numinous for people's hatred of it to have any real impact or control, and thus their hatred is doubly displaced (cf.

1981: 85) from the general feminine element onto actual women,⁷ who are then subjugated and rigidly categorised in order provide a feeling of control over those things that inspire such an overwhelming fear. The great and powerful vulnerability at the core of the feminine element of being (which demands true strength and courage by asking consciousness to partner with the unknown) is hated because it denies control. Thus the ego attempts to limit its power by calling it 'weakness' and despicable 'fragility', and then projects it onto women, who thus become 'the weaker sex'.

The experience of being-at-one-with-another arises out of the initial mother-child relationship before there is any distinction between me and not-me (Ulanov 1981: 78). It involves knowing other individuals through identifying with them, or receiving them into oneself, rather than differentiating oneself from them. We may fear knowing by being-at-one-with because

[i]n these experiences consciousness tends to dissolve into degrees of intense identification of self with other. Even to contemplate such a dissolution of ego boundaries makes us feel dissociated, for we re-enter modes of experience that lie beneath our achieved distinctions of me and not-me. There, to be means to be-at-one-with. (Ulanov 1981: 80)

Unless one has a clear experience of being-at-the-core, one will not have the courage to enter into the experience of being-at-one-with.⁸ Since being-at-the-core involves a sense of Self that is truer and deeper than the ego identity, this knowledge will maintain the Self's true identity within the relationship of being-at-one-with another.

However, if the person is identified completely with the his/her ego identity, such an

⁷ It is possible to speculate that a simplistic connection is made between the vast world of the feminine element of being, which is an element belonging to all people, and actual women, who are not the only keepers of this element, and yet are made to carry responsibility for the frightening challenge that it poses to all, by receiving others' projections of it in a twisted, diminished form.

⁸ Ulanov writes : 'Many of us, however, cannot rely on ... a sense of continuity. We do not feel we go all the way back into the hidden origins of existence. We lack a clear experience of being-at-the-core and as a result fear that in our being-one-with-another, which we so much desire, we may destroy the fragile sense of self we have barely managed to create' (1981: 84).

expansion of its limitations threatens disaster and disintegration, since the ego, left to itself, maintains the illusion that *it is* the fullest extent of the Self (of which it is actually only a small part). The feminine way of identifying through receiving another being extends the ego's 'boundaries to include the other in contrast to mere self-preoccupation' (1981: 83). Fearful though it may be, it is a way of knowing towards which both men and women are drawn, just as both men and women are drawn (in various degrees) towards linear goals that allow 'even valuable fragments to fall away in the movement towards perfection' (Ulanov 1981: 75). This masculine symbol of striving for fulfilment by casting-off contrasts with the feminine symbol of all-inclusive wholeness of being (Ulanov 1981: 75). Though these are contrasting symbols, from the complementary realms of the masculine and the feminine, both symbols manifest equally strongly in the psyches of both men and women at various stages of growth. Shevek, in *The Dispossessed*, for instance, displays a very masculine mindset during his teenage years and his studies at Abbenay. Left to himself, he casts off all other concerns in his efforts to perfect his scientific theories. It is through his friend Bedap that he is introduced to a more inclusive and perceptive view of life, which then provides him with the balanced perspective that eventually leads him to the fulfilment of his goals in physics.

Both the feminine and the masculine modalities of being – however different – offer important ways of knowing to men and women, and are essential to the achievement of wholeness in individuals. But there is an imbalance in a society that fears, and thus hates, the feminine element of being on a grand scale, which makes anima integration an important point for contemplation and discussion in the name of social healing. Ulanov says:

Men who come to terms with their own feminine element, what Jung calls the anima, know the unsettling nature of this fear. The anima confronts a man's ego with an entirely different way of viewing himself and the world. At first, it seems that his view and "hers" stand irrevocably opposed. To consider "her" view fills a man with dread that he may have to sacrifice his hard-won conscious value system [ego]. From this dread may spring a need to see the feminine as entirely secondary, inferior, less stable than the masculine. If a man remains unconscious of his fear of the feminine element in his own being he may compulsively act it out by projecting its threat onto actual females. (1981: 81)

In this excerpt, Ulanov equates the feminine element of being in a man with his anima. This means that identifying anima confrontations in the life of a man is not simply a matter of looking at his relationships with the women in his life, or looking at his perception of women in general, or even femininity itself – although these are essential starting points. I look for growth experiences in the life of the protagonist in which he feels especially vulnerable, and experiences in which he undergoes an extension of ego boundaries, through the feminine way of knowing, which leave him feeling lost and out of control. An examination of these experiences will lead one to understand to what extent he allows the feminine element of his being to challenge his established conscious value system, and to what extent his ego is eventually able to open up and include in itself those things it consciously fears and hates most. When such ego extension is manifest, the person is close to the goal of individuation. Since, as I established earlier, it is only possible to experience the feminine way of knowing through receiving and being-one-with once one has a clear sense of being-at-the-core, only a man who is firmly rooted in his true Self will be able to undertake this challenge. The true content of the Self is able to penetrate the ego from within, through the passage of the feminine element of being, and so fertilise and give life to an ego that would otherwise be barren. Here the anima is perceived for what it really is – a function of true knowing and wisdom – as is the Self: that part of the person which is unknown but beloved, which one must receive in order to be whole.

I wish to highlight this view by contrasting it with some of Jung's Number 1 personality claims. In all her descriptions of the feminine element, Ulanov uses words such as 'being', 'wholeness', 'vulnerability', 'receiving', 'identifying', 'perceive', 'love', and 'union'. While these words together do convey a very particular (though abstract) image, they do not seem to coincide comfortably with Jung's claim that '[w]herever [the anima] appears ... *she* appears personified, thereby demonstrating that basically *she* possesses all the outstanding characteristics of a female person' (Watsky 2001: 2 my italics). I could not employ this as a criterion in my investigation, for it would be a mistake to see Takver as Shevek's anima (although she does perform an anima role in his life at times), or Tenar as Ged's. Simply to assume that all figures who possess the outstanding characteristics of a female person are anima figures would be to miss the meaning of the anima entirely. John Beebe says, in his checklist for identifying anima motifs in film, that the anima figure will usually come from an unfamiliar place into the reality of the character (Watsky 2001: 8). Therefore female characters who are close to the protagonist cannot usually be anima figures because they are familiar to him. Anima figures need to possess a quality that is somehow unfamiliar. First, Jung insists that the anima is primarily an archetype: it does not merely belong to the personal unconscious of individuals, but belongs to the collective unconscious, which manifests in various ways in the personal unconscious. Archetypes are by their very nature autonomous and immutable, which means that they are permanent and not susceptible to change or manipulation by particular human understandings. Paul Watsky states in his lecture, 'Anima' (2001), that it is incorrect to refer to the anima as an image with any kind of fixed content. He states that 'Jung introduced the word *archetype* "to avoid any suggestion that it was the content and not the unconscious irrepresentable outline or pattern that was fundamental"

Images are thus products of archetypes Although the content of images may vary, the patterning shows consistency' (Watsky 2001: 3). In keeping with this definition of the anima as an archetype is the idea that it is a *function* of relationship between the ego and unconscious, rather than a fixed personality with an attached anatomy. While Jung himself insists on this distinction, he seems to be unable to resist affixing content to the archetype as if it were a character or a person, and not an abstract pattern and a function. To say of the anima that 'she possesses all the outstanding characteristics of a female person' is to affix very definite content to the function right down to the level of bodily features. For what are the outstanding characteristics of a female person if not her biological features? To generalise any further about, perhaps, the outstanding behavioural features of a female person would be to risk degenerating into stereotypes (cf. Watsky 2001: 3). I do admit that, in many cases, the anima does appear to many of those who are subject to its influence in the form of a woman, but I become uncomfortable when this is made into a fixed rule (by calling *her she*), since the unconscious and the archetypes that are native to it, by their nature, defy delineation or gender stereotypes. It is useful to remember that the ultimate qualities of the anima and ways in which it appears in the consciousness of individuals are very different things. I concede that Jung might have been describing the content generally assumed by the anima in the personal unconscious of each male in his society, and not the archetype itself. But consistently to refer to it as *a female* is to divest the archetype of any other possible characteristics or contents it might assume in the minds of its male and female observers, because it assumes that all men and women are co-extensive with the patriarchal ideology in which Jung conducted his research. To describe the anima rather in terms of verbs or functions (being; perceive; love) and states or patterns (vulnerability; wholeness), as Ulanov has done, seems much more

appropriate to an understanding of the archetype as a function. Watsky states that his favourite definition of the anima emphasises the psychological functions of *relatedness* and *mediation*, especially between the ego and the unconscious, processes which commonly entail love (2001: 1). In the light of these insights, any attempt to give the anima a fixed body (that of a woman) in the experience of each protagonist will miss the point entirely. For this reason I do not subscribe to any mechanistic assumption that *she* is *female*, since this only helps to perpetuate an inaccurate blurring of boundaries between the feminine element of being and actual women with bodies and souls, and thus helps to create a false illusion of control over what *she* may or may not express/reveal/contain/look like.

I do not, however, overlook or underestimate the fact that several analysts and theorists have referred to 'love' in their descriptions of the anima function. In T. S. Eliot's first quartet, 'Burnt Norton', the speaker says that 'Love is itself unmoving, Only the cause and the end of movement' (2000: ¶11). This interpretation helps the reader to understand the way in which the 'unmoving' quality of love coincides with the 'unmoving' quality of the archetype. This kind of description makes the function of the anima clearer than other definitions based on sexual differentiation, which are context-bound, and therefore cannot convey the permanent, immutable nature of the archetype. In his article Watsky goes on to discuss Jung's own experience of the anima, and the way Jung speaks of it in a negative and critical way, as if he fears it. It is clear from the preceding discussion that Jung did blur the line between his perception of the anima and the nature of real women, which I believe is one of the primary dangers of attributing a permanent female content to the anima and calling it

she. Watsky then refers to a change in Jung's view of the anima after a near-fatal heart attack. He explains:

Jung's "illusion of personal power came to an end". For the first time he underwent "a total submission to his seemingly immanent death ..." and "a direct and immediate experience of beauty unmediated by his intellect". As a result Jung came to perceive the anima differently, as "purely and irremediably irrational, the archetype of life, ... direct, awesome, immutable ...". (2001: 4)

The theorist David Tresan, quoted by Watsky,

posits that what is true for Jung is true for most males: "Paradoxically, it seems to take great suffering and/or loss of what we cherish most in order to defeat the last vestiges of the ego and to connect us most deeply with the ultimate mysteries of the anima: namely love, beauty and wisdom". (2001: 4)

Although, in many cultures and contexts, these three qualities, together with those mentioned by Ulanov and Holbrook, might be seen as the 'property' of the female sex, they cannot be given a definite sexual character, or be said to belong to one sex to a larger or lesser degree. Just as the feminine element of being does not belong specifically either to women or men, neither do these. Is it even possible to say with any amount of certainty that women love more than men? Or that men are only capable of love once they have integrated their feminine qualities? Is it possible or fair even to suggest the same of the qualities of wisdom and beauty? Thus, if the functions of love, beauty, wisdom, relatedness, perception, vulnerability and being are in fact the ultimate qualities of the anima, how is it possible to give the anima any kind of fixed sexual body/character – unless one is working within a fixed, rigidly patriarchal context in which these qualities are believed by everyone to belong to one particular sex, and therefore cultivated and suppressed accordingly? These qualities inform both masculinity and femininity in equally noticeable (though different) ways, and so I choose not to identify the anima simply by *her* gender. Tresan also emphasises that, even after Jung's transformation, his 'capacity to express the various aspects of the

anima was at best uneven: “Jung knows the numinous well, ... the direct emotional experience of love less, ... and beauty least” (2004: 4). If this is true of Jung, he cannot be trusted to do justice to an archetype whose ultimate qualities are wisdom, beauty and love.

A brief look at the basic structure of the psyche may yield more insight into the importance of ‘love’ as a particular feature of anima activity. Although this structure is a reflection on the psyches of real persons, I will apply it to the fictional characters in each novel, since Le Guin has a particular liking for Jungian psychological concepts (cf. 1993a: 58), and seems to have shaped her characters, whether consciously or sub-consciously, according to his structure. The shadow or *gebbeth* that chases Ged in *The Wizard of Earthsea*, for instance, seems directly inspired by Jung’s concept of the shadow in the psyche. The psyche can be visualised as an abstract sphere in which the persona is the outward layer, and the most superficial, enclosing the ego just beneath. The inner Self occupies the core of the sphere and is connected to the ego by the layer of the anima. The anima is seen as the ‘relatedness’ (Watsky 2001: 1) and the ‘communication’ between the ego and the Self. In view of the fact that the anima is the factor that reaches out and connects, reaches between and bridges the gap by bringing the ego and the Self closer, it makes sense to understand the anima as the ‘loving’ function within the psyche. The views of Watsky, Tresan, Ulanov and Holbrook support this conclusion.

Too many critics and theorists become bogged down in the sexual questions of whether it is fair and right to say that men alone have a female soul and women alone have a male soul. Notions of ‘femininity’ and ‘masculinity’ are endlessly contested

because they are context-bound. In addition, a definition of the human soul is almost impossible due to its abstract, unconscious nature, which makes it meaningless to say that a soul can be masculine or feminine. Love does not have a sexual identity, in that it cannot be said to be the exclusive 'job' of either men or women: it is a function of which all humans are capable, and thus it can take any personified shape or form. As a result one can understand the anima more according to its function and less according to its appearance. It is helpful to understand it as a function that can take many forms, because this explains the many instances in which the anima takes on natural inanimate forms, or in which it is symbolised as, or projected onto, an animal or a man. Especially in the context of sf and fantasy novels, in which societies and ideologies do not always conform to those in which we really live, characters can encounter their animas in unusual or unexpected forms.

Knowing now that actual female figures are not necessarily the place to look in these novels for anima activity, it seems appropriate to summarise its qualities. From Jung's and other psychoanalysts' definitions it appears that the anima is compensatory or complementary (Jung 1983: 101) in relation to the ego. Jung asserts that the anima is a projection-making factor when it is unrecognised by the ego, and therefore as yet unintegrated. Thus I can begin to identify, not the anima itself, but the anima-stage of a man by inferring it from the qualities evident in his ego. This inference can help the reader to discern which persons, planets, animals or plants in his immediate environment might be receiving his projections. Another way of possibly identifying projections is by taking into account Ulanov's view of projections as aids to wider consciousness (cf. 1981: 61). She claims that projections

can be identified if the subject knows what signs to look for. The hallmark is that one feels extremely agitated by a particular quality belonging to a particular person,

... whether the agitation is excessive admiration or condemnation. We cannot leave this issue alone, but must rehearse it in our minds over and over, writing still another letter, consulting still another friend about it The reason we cannot leave the issue alone is that we have dumped on another person part of our own psychology that really belongs to us. If we can observe the agitation, the compulsive emotional show, the obsessive behaviour, we can finally sense our identification with this trait in the other. (1981: 61)

To look for this kind of behaviour in the three protagonists might yield positive results, by enabling us to attribute specific qualities to the personal anima image that needs integration. For instance, Shevek's reaction to his mother Rulag in *The Dispossessed* displays an inexplicably negative agitation. When he shrinks away from her 'in unconcealed fear, as if she were not his mother, but his death' (1999: 102), he is clearly projecting his sense of abandonment brought on by her absence in his early childhood. Her outward appearance and behaviour towards him pose no significant threat, which means that his extreme fear of her must come from deep hurt (associated with her) inside him, which causes him to feel the need to protect himself from her. What he actually sees in her is his own fear of his extreme vulnerability in relation to her (he knows the power she has to hurt him), which he denies in order to prevent her from hurting him again. It appears that Shevek needs to learn to accept his vulnerability in relation to her, so that he may begin to understand her also as a human being with needs, whose absence is not necessarily a lack of love. And even if it is, that vulnerability still needs to be integrated in order for Shevek to have a greater sense of his Self (being-at-the-core), so that Rulag's docile presence will not cause him to fear for his life.

These qualities, once identified, may be seen to coincide with one of the figures in Jung's integration construct: Eve, Eros, Mary or Sophia. While this construct may seem oversimplified after the preceding discussion of the feminine element of being, it is a construct into which the feminine element of being fits, since the ultimate realities of the feminine element and Sophia are one and the same. When the hated feminine element appears in the form of something devoid of desirable qualities, something to be fertilised and controlled by the man, Jung uses the name Eve. This can be said to be the stage at which Shevek is in relation to his mother, although he may be at a more advanced stage of anima integration in other areas of his life. Genly Ai shows signs of the Eve stage of integration in his early attitude to the Gethenians, as does Ged in his attitude towards Serret and Elfarran. An unintegrated feminine element stands outside the individual and challenges his established ego boundaries, causing fear, frustration and hatred. An accepted and integrated feminine element resides within and allows *the man to be fertilised* by the rich content of his true Self. The feminine element within a man is what allows him to understand his true position of vulnerability, which allows him to perceive truly, accurately, with wisdom and with love. This construct also implies that the closer an individual comes to his goal of individuation, the more obscure the outstanding characteristics of his anima become. While a man still perceives his anima as *someone* with a form and a personality (Eve or Eros), he is still quite far from individuation because that part of himself still stands out to him as an other – a separate being whose will is different from or opposed to his own. The devotion inspired by Mary will place a man further along the path towards integration, because she is a spiritual personality, and so requires a certain amount of personal identification before she can be acknowledged at all. She still, however, stands apart

from him, outside him, on a pedestal, and so is not yet fully integrated. The closer he comes to perceiving Sophia (wisdom), the less distinguishable the anima becomes from the individual's own Self. One can observe this shift in Ged towards the end of *Tehanu*, and in *The Other Wind*, when Ged's only desire is to cherish his loving relationship with Tenar and Tehanu as husband and father. His willing and appreciative participation in these relationships gives him the wisdom he needs to guide Alder to the next stage of his journey, without which Alder would have remained lost or been misled. Ged's love for Tenar and Tehanu leads him to suspect (rightly) that the solution to Alder's problem lies in the being of Tehanu, and in Alder's love for his late wife Lily, and not in any art of which he or anyone else might be capable.

In the book of Proverbs, Wisdom is personified as a woman who actively and passionately calls humanity to identify with and receive the truth of God. She is seen as the active guide, as well as the receptive passage, to the truth: '... by the gates, at the entrance ... she cries out, "I am calling to you, all people, my words are addressed to all humanity ... I hate pride and arrogance ... I am perception: power is mine!"' (NJB 2002: Prov 7:3-14). Although wisdom is often personified as a woman, Sophia or Sapiientia itself is not a person, but an abstract quality, which can only be identified when it is manifested in a person. The same applies to love and beauty. All three of these concepts are nebulous and cannot ultimately be defined or given a fixed representation. They can only be identified in the subjective experiences and behaviour of individuals, which necessarily differ from person to person. The fact that these are the ultimate qualities of the anima coincides with Jung's assertion that '... the real nature of the archetype is not capable of being made conscious, it is

transcendent Moreover, every archetype when represented to the mind, is already conscious and therefore differs to an indeterminable extent from that which caused the representation' (1972a: 213). When wisdom takes up residence in the protagonist, we may say that he has moved from an understanding of the anima as an opposite other to a state in which he and his anima are one. It becomes a part of him: it is the receptive passage to, and the active communicator with, his true Self. The anima becomes his own spiritual passage/bridge/vagina through which he receives signposts towards individuation, and hence progresses further in the quest to fulfil his destiny. In Le Guin's works it becomes clear that each protagonist's destiny is unique, but they undergo similar confrontations and tests in order to achieve these goals. Shevek's destiny is to develop a scientific theory that will enable instantaneous interplanetary communication. Genly Ai's destiny is to invite the Gethenians to join the Ekumen in such a way that they accept the invitation and become part of the peaceful household of planets. Ged's destiny is to be a husband to Tenar and a father to Tehanu. In the beginning of each novel, however, each protagonist is very far from being able to reach his goal. Shevek is bogged down in his scientific work by the constraints of his society. Ged is a mage, and therefore sworn to a life of celibacy. The contempt, distrust and misunderstanding between Genly Ai and the Gethenians makes the prospect of peaceful resolution very unlikely. In the following chapters I highlight the images and instances in which each protagonist shows progress in integrating the anima by confronting the problems that face him. All three protagonists begin their journey at a point of minimal integration, at which each is still very naïve, immature, arrogant and self-righteous. These qualities may be understood as each character's efforts to protect himself from the threat of his vulnerability to the problems he fears. Each novel takes the protagonist through a series of experiences that expand his ego

boundaries and enable him to embrace the vulnerability that lies at the core of the feminine element of being, and through embracing this vulnerability, each character reaches his destiny.

Chapter 1

Shevek

... [I]t was joy they were both after – the completeness of being. If you evade suffering, you also evade the chance of joy. Pleasure you may get, or pleasures, but you will not be fulfilled. You will not know what it is to come home.

(Le Guin 1999: 275)

Shevek's individuation quest is a fascinating and multi-faceted one. Individuation is a process that is largely facilitated by the anima. In my introduction I established that the anima is neither a person nor a deity, but is a psychological function that, according to the Jungian analyst Ann Ulanov, forms a passage between the ego and the Self. I concluded that the closest we can come to defining the ultimate qualities of the anima is to say that its function is to communicate and reveal wisdom, beauty and love. A largely un-individuated person will be stunted in his/her ability to perceive these things (primarily within him/herself). Thus the desire for wholeness in the Self leads the anima to address the ego with unconscious contents (usually in the form of dreams, fantasies and irrational emotional states), which present a person with parts of him/herself that need to be integrated, so that a greater state of wisdom and individuation may be reached. Anima literally means soul, which, according to the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, is 'The animating principle of thought and action in man, commonly regarded as an entity distinct from the body; the spiritual ... emotional ...vital, sensitive ... part of man's nature' (Little et al 1933: 1950). In this sense the anima can be seen as the imperative of life or *animation* that impresses upon

a person the need to delve deeper than the mere superficial, limited life of the ego. The anima lets one know that one is more than one thinks one is, and that there is an option to delve into the deeper regions of one's psychic constitution. Le Guin works in her novels with the idea of an individual's 'destiny' or 'essential self', and represents the process of the individual's coming to terms with this self. She says in her essay 'Why Are Americans Afraid of Dragons?' (1974), addressing a fictitious reader, that '[t]he use of imaginative fiction is to deepen your understanding of your world, and your fellow men, and your own feelings, and your destiny' (1993a: 38). In order to deepen her readers' understanding of destiny, she often locates her characters' destinies in unusual or previously unsuspected areas of their lives. For instance, the purpose of Shevek's scientific genius is to equip him to be an Anarresti ambassador to Urras as well as a brilliant physicist. I have come, via the readings discussed in the Introduction, to think of the anima as the form taken by the grace that Self-love extends towards the ego within the psyche: it is the grace that allows one to know that human life is much bigger than it appears on the surface; the grace that shows one that the deeper one goes inside oneself, the vaster one becomes. In her essay 'The Child and the Shadow' (1974) Le Guin herself shows that she understands the collective unconscious, and the archetypes that reside therein as 'the source of true community; of ... grace, spontaneity, and love' (1993a: 59). In the same essay, she also describes the Self as 'much larger than the ego' (1993a: 58) in that it is 'transcendent' (1993a: 58). In other words, the spiritual volume of the Self, which communicates through the anima, is much greater than the spiritual volume of the ego. Ulanov explains an apprehension of the anima in this way:

[o]ur ego identity is seen and reflected back to us through the figures of the unconscious [the anima in particular] that face us in our dreams. These "others" may lead us to that central experience of beholding objectively our subjective experience, the integrating centre of the

psyche that Jung calls the [S]elf. The paradox confounds us. We feel seen by a greater subject that exists objectively within us and confers objectivity on our subjective existence. (1981: 80)

This paradoxical experience of interior infinity within exterior limitation can be identified at certain points in Shevek's journey. I, like Le Guin, call it grace since grace is defined in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* as unexpected, undeserved or unlooked-for favour or countenance from an unseen source (Little et al 1933: 817). Favour in this instance is not to be seen as little pleasant gestures afforded to the individual by the anima, but rather the favour of being able to partake of something much larger than s/he can imagine through consciousness alone. The subject may not always experience this favour or countenance in an immediately pleasing or gratifying sense, but rather as an awesome challenge that promises real growth and wisdom. Experiences with the anima involve inexplicable and mysterious, yet very real communications with great realities, which stretch the individual's consciousness in ways and at times for which reason cannot account. Grace features often in the story of Shevek, as Le Guin elucidates its functioning on many occasions throughout the novel *The Dispossessed* (1999). The grace afforded the ego by the anima includes the idea of 'going home', which is a key element in the plot of *The Dispossessed*. It is important to examine the definition of 'home' in this instance in order to understand the concept of returning home, as Le Guin uses it, and the way it relates to individuation facilitated by the grace of the anima.

Initially it is difficult to understand why the concept of 'return' or 'coming home' is so important in the novels of Le Guin, which often involve great journeys and adventures. One would imagine that the true value of a journey is in the journey itself, not in the return. This concept of return is complicated further when we

encounter Shevek's view that 'you can go home again...so long as you understand that home is a place you have never been' (1999: 48). Home, therefore, must be more than just the house, town, country, planet you lived in or on before you left. On the simplest level we can understand Shevek's assertion from within the context of time. Because time causes change, though one may return to the same place from which one departed, time would have changed that place into something different from what it was when one left. Hence '[y]ou shall not go down twice to the same river, nor can you go home again' (1999: 48). But the concept of home in this novel involves much more than a physical place. As a young boy Shevek has a dream in which he encounters a massive wall. Encountering the wall causes him deep frustration, which is articulated in the words: 'He had to go on or he could never come home again' (1999: 30-1). Assuming he has come from his physical home to the wall, there should be nothing stopping him from turning around and going home again. But the fact that only 'going on' can allow him to 'come home' suggests that home is not so much a place one has been, as it is a destination towards which one is headed. Understood in this way, home is equal to *destiny*: it is the destination to which one's whole life points. Fulfilling one's destiny involves much more than simply arriving at a physical place. Joseph Campbell writes in *The Power of Myth* (1988) that

[t]he usual hero adventure begins with someone ... who feels there's something lacking in the normal experiences available or permitted to members of his society. This person then takes off on a series of adventures beyond the ordinary, either to recover what has been lost or to discover some life-giving elixir. It's usually a cycle, a going and a returning. (1988: 123)

The key is to understand that the hero always returns to the community with a material treasure that possesses spiritual value not only for the hero, but also for the community. Campbell says in *Hero With a Thousand Faces* (1949) that '... the norm of the monomyth, requires that the hero shall now begin the labour of bringing the

runes of wisdom ... back into the kingdom of humanity, where the boon may redound to the renewing of the community, the nation, the planet ...' (1949: 193). Usually the journey or story is not complete until the hero has come home again with a new thing that in some way revives and changes the life of the home.

The rest of Shevek's dream is a clue as to what his destiny actually is. The wall in the dream seems to me to be a symbol of all the 'walls' Shevek will encounter throughout his life. One may understand these as the ideological and egotistical walls inside his own mind, the collective Anarresti mind and the collective Urrasti mind that Shevek later seeks to 'unbuild' (1999: 65; 274). The idea of unbuilding walls is consolidated by the fact that in the dream, Shevek cannot merely climb over the wall. The strength, height and texture of the wall make it insurmountable. The wall itself will have to be unbuilt in order to reunite what it separates, and not merely to allow passage for a few who are brave and skilled enough to climb. Having to unbuild the wall implies that Shevek's destiny is not only for himself, but for the sake of everyone. Had he merely climbed the wall, he might have been able to 'go on' and reach *his* destination/home. But having to unbuild the wall so that anyone may pass to the other side implies that the activity of unbuilding the wall *in itself* is his destiny. It also implies that unbuilding the wall is the only way through. Were there chinks, doorways or weaknesses, unbuilding the wall would not be necessary.

There are other dimensions to this destiny (evidenced in the dream) that involve *how* these walls are to be unbuilt:

He beat the smooth surface with his hands and yelled at it. His voice came out wordless and cawing. Frightened by the sound of it he cowered down, and then he heard another voice saying "Look". It was his father's voice. He had an idea that his mother Rulag was there too, though he did not see her (he had no memory of her face). It seemed to him that she and Palat were both

on all fours in the darkness under the wall, and that they were bulkier than human beings and shaped differently. They were pointing, showing him something there on the ground, the sour dirt where nothing grew. A stone lay there. It was dark like the wall, but on it, or inside it, there was a number; a 5 he thought at first, then took it for a 1, then understood what it was – the primal number, that was both unity and plurality. “That is the cornerstone,” said a voice of dear familiarity, and Shevek was pierced through with joy. There was no wall in the shadows, and he knew that he had come back, that he was home. (1999: 31)

It is at a point in the dream when Shevek feels most hopeless and vulnerable (cowering) that the voice comes to guide him. This vulnerability is a sign that what Shevek is experiencing in the dream has to do with the feminine element of being. There are also signs of femininity in the earth and stones in the dream, since earth is often used to symbolise a ‘mother’ that nurtures its inhabitants. The feeling of helplessness that is precipitated in Shevek becomes the doorway through which the anima can communicate its message from the Self. Shevek recognises that the voice is that of his father, and seems to sense that his mother is there too, though he never knew her because she left him and Palat when Shevek was only two. The voice seems to come from his father, Palat, who was very dear to Shevek as a child. The narrator tells us that Palat always showed Shevek love and care, despite the ordering of their society, which gave him a way out of having to care for Shevek alone. Palat assumed the role of nurturing mother in the absence of Rulag, his partner, whose interests lay outside of the family. It was mostly through the selfless love of Palat that Shevek was initially encouraged to pursue his passion for numbers and science (cf. 1999: 29-30). It is clear that love, in this instance, plays an important role in facilitating Shevek’s journey to Self-discovery and his destiny. Were it not for Palat’s love and attention to Shevek’s interests, the boy would only have had the discouraging, envious influence of his teacher at the learning centre who seemingly sought to extinguish anything resembling genius and initiative in a child (cf. 1999: 27-9). It is this love associated

with his father, and apparent in an altered, internalised form of his father, which now guides Shevek to the 'cornerstone'.

Shevek's mother says nothing, though she is also clearly present to him in the dream. Her presence is significant in that Shevek's genius and creativity with numbers mostly comes from her – a brilliant engineer (cf. 1999: 25). It is significant that their form in the dream is not entirely human – they seem to have become a part of a structure that goes beyond physical human limitations. These are very clear signs of the working of the anima that has allowed Shevek to be addressed by an unconscious knowledge of his destiny in symbolic, immortal forms that resemble his mother and father. I say immortal because these figures seem designed by the dream/anima to transcend time and space, as does the soul to which the word 'anima' refers. Firstly, they 'are' his mother and father, who have everything to do with Shevek's beginning and past – how he came to be born. Secondly, they are 'bulkier' than human beings, which implies that they are somehow not transient, but rather permanent, eternal, yet material also – like the universe. Thirdly, they point towards the cornerstone, which is the key to Shevek's future and fulfilment of his destiny. In a profound way these figures are personifications of aspects of Shevek's own immortal Self that have come via the anima to demand integration or attention so that they may guide him and prepare him for his journey. The nature of this dream and its presences seems to foreshadow Shevek's destiny in another powerful way. The dream in every aspect transcends and redefines time, which is what Shevek will ultimately do through his physics in the form of his ultimate goal – the General Temporal theory, which will enable transilience: instantaneous communication from anywhere to anywhere in the universe without any time delay. Dreams also use the non-rational, indirect logic of

the unconscious, which prefigures the way in which Shevek will unify his intuition with the super-rational field of science.

Why does Shevek receive this guidance? It is not a question of deserving, but one of love. In the darkness at the foot of the wall Shevek experiences a vulnerability associated with the feminine element of his being. He experiences an urgency that arises out of a need to fulfil a precious destiny without knowing how to do so. It is only in this state of complete vulnerability in which answers are absent that he is able to receive the love and guidance of the anima. This is what Keats referred to as ‘negative capability’, in which a ‘man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason’ (Abrams 1993: 124-5; Keats 19 Dec. 2005: ¶4). If, as Jung claims, the Self is a whole whose parts must function in harmony in order for growth to occur, then Self-love (not vanity, which is the ego’s infatuation with itself at the expense of the true Self) is the glue that holds the different parts together. This guidance is the grace extended by the love at work in Shevek’s anima, addressing his ego about the fullness of his potential. Again, love is the facilitator of Self-discovery, and it is in love that anima activity originates, however scary or threatening that activity may appear on the surface. As in real relationships, love is not always pretty, while it is perhaps often ‘bulkier’ than the individual might expect and ‘shaped differently’ (1999: 31).

Still in the dream Shevek finds a stone with the primal number ‘in or inside it’. It seems to me that the primal number – both unity and plurality – is a symbol for the groundbreaking theoretical physics that will become his primary occupation and genius. Physics involves discovering the scientific foundations of the universe (cf.

1999: 29) (a metaphor for unity) and all that it contains (an indicator of plurality). This symbol takes the form of a stone, it seems, because a stone is the basic unit with which the wall is built. Le Guin often uses stones (as can be seen in much of her poetry) as elemental units of the earth that have sacred significance. This interest can be seen in the power and significance with which this dream stone is imbued. The stone Shevek finds is also the ‘cornerstone’ – the stone upon which all the other stones rest, without which the wall cannot stand. With the cornerstone in his possession, Shevek has the power to unbuild the wall.

But what does physics have to do with ideology, since I have said before that the walls that need unbuilding are, to a large extent, the ideological walls in the minds of the Anarresti and the Urrasti? There is a sense in which ideology itself is ultimately subordinate to physics, which (in this case) is philosophical, physical and scientific, and therefore can transcend ideological and abstract boundaries between people by shedding light on concrete, powerful, yet mysterious, realities about the ‘unity and plurality’ of the universe in which these ideologies occur. As the story unfolds Shevek’s genius in the Noble Science (cf. 1999: 283) of Cetian physics is in fact what allows him to go to Urras, against the will of many on Anarres, to share his revolutionary General Temporal theory, not only with the Urrasti, but with all other races in the known universe. In doing so Shevek begins to shatter the ideological walls in the minds of both the Anarresti and the Urrasti, not only by stepping through the wall of ideology and communicating with ‘the other’ himself, but by advancing himself in the field of physics to the point at which he develops the General Temporal theory, which will make instantaneous interplanetary communication possible. This means that inhabitants of the universe, who were previously isolated and estranged

from one another due to a lack of opportunity to communicate, will have access to one another to a degree that will enable mutual acceptance and friendship instead of enmity. The General Temporal theory eliminates the most formidable obstacles to interplanetary communication – those of time and distance – and so allows societies the opportunity to understand and embrace one another in a way that was not possible before. This is the ideal application of Shevek's scientific discovery, but as *Left Hand* shows, communication does not always necessarily translate into understanding and mutual embrace. All that the General Temporal theory provides is an 'open door' through which to communicate. What will be communicated through the door remains uncertain.

The dream tells us that Shevek hears a 'voice of dear familiarity' point him to the cornerstone. This brings us to an even deeper understanding of 'home' in the context of individuation and anima guidance for, although Shevek asserts that 'home is a place you have never been' (1999: 48), we cannot rid the word of its association with familiarity. Home is a place one has never been, yet it is also a place of familiarity and contentment: a place we know we belong, and a place for which we yearn. Jung's basic structure of the psyche and the concept of the anima give insight into how a person can long for a place s/he has never known. The purpose of the anima is to facilitate communication between the ego and the Self. The ego, which controls the persona, is the characteristic face with which people live their daily lives. Ego is consciousness, and left to itself, maintains illusions of completeness, self-sufficiency, and control over all aspects of the Self. A person who lives entirely through the ego thinks that the ego *is* the Self, instead of recognising that it is largely identified with the outer persona, and not the inner Self. Un-integrated people

generally equate their identity with their egos or personas, and in so doing lose the insights that their unconscious Selves can bring them. The ego constructs rigid images and patterns according to which a person should behave, which necessarily exclude less desirable parts of a person.⁹ This exclusion pollutes the unconscious, which, in turn, reacts in fits of irrationality and psychological disturbance when the individual's ego defences are low – usually in private. Jung says that

[a] man cannot get rid of himself in favour of an artificial personality without punishment. Even the attempt to do so brings on, in all ordinary cases, unconscious reactions in the form of bad moods, affects, phobias, compulsive ideas, backslidings, vices etc. The socially “strong man” is often in his private life a mere child ... (1983: 95)

The anima introjects unconscious contents or emotions into the consciousness, and projects what has been suppressed in order to make the ego aware that all is not well: there are things within the Self that need to be grappled with and accepted. In Jung's view, the Self inside each person already knows who s/he is and where s/he should go, and will interfere with her/his consciousness when s/he lives her/his life deliberately in a contrary direction. It is from the Self that passions, gifts and intuitions stem. These things cannot be consciously or rationally explained, yet they play an enormous role in how our life unfolds. A person might say something like this in response to the promptings of the Self: ‘I do not know why I love ... , I just know that when I occupy myself with it, I feel fulfilled – complete somehow. I know that it is what I was meant to do’. This kind of ‘knowing’, it seems to me, stems mostly from the Self, which is informing the ego in an unconscious way of the path that it should take. In this sense the Self is a person's destiny and ultimate home, since it already

⁹ The desirability or undesirability of certain characteristics may be determined by the culture or ideology within which a person must function, and how those ideological constructs interact with the individual emotional and psychological scars and inclinations of that person. For instance, a male identified with a rigidly patriarchal ideology will generally eschew all feminine characteristics from his persona, while a man with a rebellious streak might react against the ideology of his society by deliberately nurturing the feminine characteristics in his nature, and eschewing his masculine inclinations.

contains the map that should be followed in order to arrive at fulfilment and complete integration: individuation. It is the main claim of Jungian psychological theory that every human is destined to become fully her/his true Self. Some theorists, such as D.W. Winnicott in 'Primary Maternal Preoccupation' (1975), have claimed that a baby is close to its true Self when it is born because it is not yet fully conscious: it can only act according to who it is – the fact *that* it is – since consciousness has not yet given it other egotistical motives. But this Self, although it is true to its being, is not yet individuated because individuation demands the integration of the ego with the Self, to a point at which they may function in relative harmony with one another, and not in conflict. An absent ego is not the answer, since consciousness is a necessary part of human being. According to Jung, the ego must not disappear, but rather learn to step aside stage-by-stage, and allow the unknown parts of the Self to speak and be heard. A healthy relationship between the ego and the Self is facilitated by love, just as relationships with other people are. And the communication of this love is the job of the anima.

So the conscious ego must inevitably develop, and all too easily becomes almost entirely identified with its favourite ally/puppet: the persona who, unchecked, exists entirely according to the conscious, visible, material, world. Jung states that the persona is exclusively concerned with relation to objects (Jung 1983: 99), and is essentially the ideal picture of a person as s/he wishes to appear to the outer world (Jung 1983: 96). Jacques Lacan refers to this as the 'ego ideal' (1977: 61). Complete identification with the persona and the social role, according to Jung, is the most fruitful source of neuroses (Jung 1983: 95). Each individual can undertake a journey to 'return' to the true Self; in order to discover for the first time *consciously* – yet

rediscover what has been there since the beginning and will always remain – the full extent of one’s identity, and what one has the potential to become. Hence the paradox: the Self is a familiar place because it is always inside the individual, but it is also a place one has never been because the ego has not yet become fully integrated with it, and needs the journey of life¹⁰ in order to learn to surrender to the guidance of the anima and arrive at its inner destination. This is individuation: the process by which one comes home. The anima is the passage that allows a person to come home, or allows home to come to her/him. It is thus that the reader may understand the voice of ‘dear familiarity’ in Shevek’s dream. For, while Shevek hears this as the voice of his father, we know that Shevek’s real father can no more appear in a dream and know Shevek’s destiny than he can know the meaning of ‘the cornerstone’ with such authority. The familiar voice can be seen as the voice of the anima that puts on the guise of one who is dearly loved by Shevek, in order to communicate the nurturing, fulfilling intention of its activity. Had Shevek’s mother been the one to stay with him and care for him, the anima may have used her voice as the guise through which to speak to Shevek. Ultimately, though, Le Guin is using the archetype of the Self to address Shevek, to communicate to him, however deeply or unconsciously, the destiny towards which she is leading him. Through the grace of the anima working upon his ego at this tender age, Shevek is pointed towards his true Self – his destiny – his home. It is the anima that allows him this glimpse into his future, and it is the anima’s grace that allows him to experience the fruit of this future, which is joy and not trepidation at the prospect of so large a task. This joy seems to stem from the

¹⁰ This could mean that a person can only achieve Selfhood at the end of his/her life, unless one understands the ‘journey of life’ as a destination in itself. The measure of Selfhood is not the age of a person, but rather the openness of a person to the Self at any given point in the journey. One hopes that each growth experience will lead one to greater openness, but this may not always be the case, and so it is important to understand the *process of integration* as the ‘destination’ of individuation, and not any given standard or level of integration.

unselfish yet satisfying knowledge that simply by Shevek's being true to his Self, he is fulfilling a great purpose in the world and opening doors through which others may pass and fulfil their destiny.

This dream makes it clear that walls are symbolically very important in this novel. Walls are boundaries or divisions, and are therefore used to symbolise Western political binaries: self/other, male/female, body/spirit or white/black. They represent the ideological boundaries that separate people (individuals and groups) and cripple communication and integration. As discussed previously, the General Temporal theory that Shevek completes on Urras proves to be a 'door' in the 'wall' dividing Anarres and Urras. The wall in the dream is what causes Shevek to feel helpless and vulnerable. At other points in the story when Shevek comes up against walls of a different kind, the pattern is the same. He feels helpless, frustrated and vulnerable, which is the necessary condition for the kind of growth that the feminine element of being facilitates. It is through the intensity of his vulnerable feelings that Shevek learns the importance and value of the role he has to play in unbuilding walls. Without these feelings, Shevek would not be led to discover within himself the strength to overcome the challenges that the wall represents. Understood in the context of the feminine element of being or the anima that was defined in the Introduction, these walls become much more than barriers to growth. I have shown that the feminine element of being involves knowledge through receiving another, identification with another, or being-at-one-with another. Ulanov says that this experience originates in the womb between a mother and her child before the child's ego boundaries have been formed. The mother receives the child into her womb, and the child receives life from the mother's womb. Yet this life cannot exist forever in the womb and both

mother and child need to undergo the painful process of birth before real growth can occur. If one understands the unbuilding of a particular wall as a kind of birth or rebirth process, then the wall can be seen as the womb wall: it is life-giving initially, but becomes too small for the life that grows within it. The womb wall must be broken through in order for the next life stage to begin. It should also be noted that the womb is a vessel into and out of which there is only one (natural) way. Thus this image also makes room for the anima as it is analogous to the vagina, through which the womb is fertilised, and also the passage by which the wall is broken or unbuilt, and the life's destiny achieved. On the one hand, the anima allows one to know through receiving, identifying or being-one-with another, which can be rewarding and life-giving (fertilising), but, on the other hand, it is also the guide that asks one to outgrow these identifications stage by stage, and emerge through vulnerable, painful birth-processes to a life that has extended boundaries. According to Jung, the Self, then, is the ultimate goal of this one life and all its births and rebirths. Because it is the unconscious, immortal part of the psyche, it is infinitely larger than the ego, and therefore constantly challenging the ego to grow towards full integration. This image also explains the joy Shevek experiences when suddenly 'there is no more wall in the shadows' (1999: 31). This helps the reader to understand that unbuilding the wall is not simply the laborious process of *actually* unbuilding it stone by stone, but metaphorically indicates the acquisition of a new perspective, which then allows the subject to see the wall in a wider context: not as a restrictive prison but as an essential and life-giving stage in the growth process. What were darkness, isolation and vulnerability on the one side of the (womb) wall, on the other side become the joy of new life.

To illustrate this point, I will look at one particular wall with which Shevek is confronted on his individuation quest. Shevek grows up with an apparently passionate approach to Odonianism: the particular ideological belief embraced by his society – the people on the planet of Anarres, who were exiled from their mother planet, Urras, for rebelling against the capitalist and rigidly authoritarian rules of its governments. Odonianism is an ideology of mutual aid and brotherhood, which rejects ownership and government of any kind, and is anarchistic in the sense that it is based entirely on the idea that the only true authority is the ‘integrative function’ (1999: 40): the inner moral sense of the individual being who knows s/he cannot survive without the goodwill of her/his fellows. All other forms of law and economy are seen as a prison since they inevitably end up imposing the will of a few upon the will of many. On Anarres nobody owns anything, there is no money since everybody shares everything, and everyone seems to work at what her/his Self inclines her/him to do, which may be personal academic work for scientific or social advancement, or manual labour for the good of the community and its day-to-day functioning. Although life is tough on Anarres, and resources are scarce, the system seems to work.

Odo was a woman on Urras who was imprisoned for her ideas about a truly just society, and for her resistance to the authorities who denied or granted freedom on the basis of wealth, class and sex. A large part of Odo’s philosophy is that possessions are what really imprison people, and that only once one’s hands are empty is one truly free. In the same way that accepted vulnerability leads one to discover inner strength, so it is that a person who is free of the desire for material wealth is led to discover inner riches. Shevek advocates this philosophy in such a passionate way at the age of sixteen that he identifies with it entirely, and cannot see

himself apart from it: he is subjective in it, and not objective towards it. Although this may simply be part of the extremism of being a teenager, it is nevertheless an identification that must be broken through in order for Shevek to reach adult maturity. He speaks about Odonianism as part of their nature (1999: 40) since he sees it as fully consistent with the fundamental elements of human being and survival. He scolds his friend Tirin for criticising the fear and hate with which the Odonian society on Anarres approaches the 'propertarian' society on Urras. All Anarresti children are taught from birth that Urras is '[d]isgusting, immoral, excremental' (1999: 39), and Tirin feels that this may not be the truth any more, since no one has communicated with Urras in the one hundred and fifty years since the settlement of Anarres. He suggests that Anarres should be open to the possibility that Urras and its people have perhaps changed, or that they are not as totally bad as the Anarresti children have been led to believe. He even suggests that one might actually want to go there, to see what it is really like, in spite of the ways in which their education forbids them. This suggestion 'startles' (1999: 40) Shevek, whose unconscious and complete identification with not only his society's philosophy, but his society's people as well, becomes evident. An examination of this conflict leads us to realise that Tirin is further ahead on the path to breaking through his identification with their ideology. Tirin has already metaphorically been 'born' into a broader way of thinking, and challenges Shevek to do the same. Yet Shevek is clearly not ready for that challenge. He insists that on Anarres there is no authority that 'forbids' or 'orders' anyone to hate or fear except the 'integrative function itself' (1999: 40). He is so closely identified with their society, their planet, that he sees them all as a literal part of it – as a part of its very being: 'we are Anarres' (1999: 40).

Yet what about Urras, which is their true and original home? Shevek works within the belief that remaining true and responsible to one's being is the only way to be truly free. Trying to be what one is not is not freedom but a cage. This idea is completely consistent with the idea of individuation and Self-discovery as it stands. The fact that this understanding even exists in one so young and that it is to a large extent a product of his society's teaching shows that the anima is already powerfully at work in that society. What else was it that showed Odo that a person's true value lies not in outward possessions that masquerade as value, but in one's inner being who is invaluable? Or what was it that showed her that one needs empty hands in order to discover one's inner value, which is the treasure of the Self; the only gem of its kind in the universe? While Odo can be read either as a political visionary with conceptual roots in a surfeit of capitalistic greed, or as a woman whose ideas are based on connection instead of competition, I see her mainly as Le Guin's spokeswoman for the anima to Anarresti and Urrasti society. It is the anima that communicates this kind of knowledge to the ego, and thus to a society based on these principles. Yet these ideas alone do not account for Shevek's unconscious assumption that his nature as *Shevek* is equal to and the same thing as his 'nature' as an Odonian. We see signs of the feminine element of being in the powerful way in which Shevek has come to identify with his society: he is as yet a foetus in the womb of Odonianism. He is totally trusting of it and at home in it. I believe he makes this unconscious assumption because he has been taught that the ideology of Odonianism is consistent with truth to one's very being. But if Odonianism is part of their being or nature, then it means that the fear and hatred with which they approach the Urrasti is also a part of their own nature. This cannot be – fear and hatred must be a choice, like Odonianism – otherwise the Odonian society would have failed long ago, since hate

divides and disintegrates. It would also run contrary to the anima urge/influence of love, which, Le Guin implies, is responsible for forming the Odonian society in the first place, although the current exile and isolation of that society on Anarres may not be its ultimate goal. The anima has seemingly provided a mother to nurture Shevek in the way that his own mother never did, and Shevek has accepted this mother wholeheartedly. Shevek, as a very intelligent young man, sees only the logic and the truth in what he is told and sticks to it firmly. But his firmness is so rock-hard that it shows signs of becoming somewhat fanatical. He cannot yet see that self-deception is a possibility for Odonians as much as it is a possibility for (and evident in) the Urrasti. He has not yet seen that Odonianism is something that is taught, and therefore not inherent in human nature.

Although fundamental human nature is the same in the Anarresti and the Urrasti, Shevek cannot see that the Anarresti are equally susceptible to comfort zones: to becoming a society that demands conformity in order to function properly (like Urras), and is not the permanent revolution that it proposes it is. Dependency on the approval of others or consensus of the group can be as stifling as egotistical greed and capitalistic competition. Le Guin seems to be suggesting that Anarres and Urras are two sides of the same coin by juxtaposing the equally questionable attitudes of each society. The difference between the human nature and the Odonian nature in Shevek already shows itself when he is a small baby. In his tender, as yet unconscious, being he becomes upset when another baby in the dormitory steals the bit of sun shining on the floor by pushing Shevek out of it, at which Shevek cries ‘Mine sun!’ (1999: 26). Odonianism teaches that no one owns anything (1999: 26), and that everything must be shared; yet it is evident that there is a very strong urge in Shevek as a baby (as in

many, if not most babies, I am sure) to want to own; to have, and to control. There is a strong tendency in humans towards attachment to various objects, and there is a definite resistance to separation from these objects: hence Shevek's 'tears of rage' (1999: 26). Denying the urge to possess is a discipline that needs to be learned. To deny that there is a strong proclivity in human nature towards possession and authoritarianism is to allow this proclivity to grow waywardly inside of one unchecked. And it is only much later that Shevek's eyes are opened to his society's proclivity to conformity and non-revolution. In many ways this is the first wall – inside Shevek's mind – that needs to be unbuilt in order for him to proceed with the unbuilding of other walls. I focus on this wall because it shows Shevek's most crucial and profound breakthrough on his journey towards individuation. Whether it is with Odonianism itself that he ultimately finds fault, or with the people who claim to be Odonians but behave otherwise, he must ultimately make room for grey areas in his as yet black-and-white brain. The anima must guide him to a greater state of consciousness in which he is able to see the virtues of Odonianism alongside its shortcomings, so that he may come to a point at which he can see to be able to choose his own path. He has to learn to see Odonianism as something learned and chosen; something interpreted and practiced differently in every person, and not a fixed biological or psychological feature of human being. Because of its reactionary, revolutionary nature, Odonian society can be seen as even more susceptible than the Urrasti society to forming an us-and-them mentality, which is the most fertile ground for projection, and probably the most powerful and fundamental form of mental 'wall' in the novel. Later in the novel Shevek admits that '[w]e've ... built walls all around ourselves, and we can't see them, because they're a part of our thinking' (1999: 272). Victims of the us-and-them mentality are prone to locate all capacity for evil in the

'other' (Urras), and are therefore not compelled to recognise their own capacity for wrong. Not being able to recognise one's own weaknesses and capacity for evil is the most insurmountable barrier to becoming more integrated, individuated and wise. The process of becoming dis-identified with Urrasti society was one good breakthrough that allowed Anarresti society to be born and grow. But Anarres and its inhabitants run the risk of stagnating unless they break the wall of self-righteousness enclosing them now, and see themselves within a wider context, and understand that they are as human as the Urrasti, and equally susceptible to fault.

When Shevek moves from the regional institute, where he first practices physics, to Abbenay – the biggest and most central town on Anarres – he is exposed to aspects of his society's 'Odonianism' to which he has not been exposed before, or of which he was not previously aware. A small aspect of this exposure is the grass and trees of the park in Abbenay: the only one of its kind on the entire planet. He has never seen grass and trees full of lush, green leaves before, since these kinds of plants do not thrive in Anarres's arid climate, and would take too many resources to sustain. The grass and the trees in this particular park are vestiges from Urras, where this kind of vegetation is indigenous and ubiquitous. The speaker tells us that Shevek questions and repudiates the extravagant foliage of the trees: '[h]e disapproved of their lavishness, their thriftlessness' (1999: 85). He even goes so far as to wonder whether their beauty is not 'mere excrement' (1999: 85), since Odo taught that all '[e]xcess is excrement ... [and] excrement retained in the body [social organism] is poison' (1999: 84). These are the thoughts of someone accustomed to suffering and sparse material comforts, and unused to gratuity, grace and blessing from his surroundings. It seems to me that these thoughts stem from Shevek's as yet puritanical stance with

regard to his society. Because his experience of life on Anarres has been tough and unadorned by material abundance until this point, he seems to assume that this experience is the mean by which all situations should be measured. Like Jung, '[h]e assumed others shared his experiences' (Smith 1996: 18). Thus what has been seen is 'enough', and what he sees now is 'more than enough', and therefore 'excess' which is 'mere excrement'. He does not yet see that there are other contexts and experiences beside his own; that to some societies and environments, leafy trees *are* necessary, and not only necessary for their utility, but for their beauty also. Shevek's inability to perceive and appreciate the beauty of the trees signals a lack of anima integration, since beauty is one of the anima's ultimate qualities. Things do not only exist to be appreciated for their functionality, but also for the pleasure they bring, just as people do.

These puritanical thoughts arise in Shevek seemingly so that they might be reconsidered or challenged. It is quite unexpectedly then that '[a]we came into him. He knew himself blessed though he had not asked for blessing' (1999: 85). There is a distinct sense of another presence in this moment, since his awe seems to come out of nowhere, like an epiphany. It certainly does not stem from his disapproving thoughts of a moment before, but rather seems to surface and overwhelm them from a place deeper inside himself. The speaker tells us that, for Shevek, walking on the grass felt to him like 'walking on living flesh', and that 'the dark limbs of the trees reached out over his head, holding their many hands above him' (1999: 85). There is no doubt of the metaphor in this image. The description of his natural surrounding suggests that there is in fact a presence, on and beneath whom he is walking, pondering. This presence harks back to the presences of Shevek's mother and father in his earlier

dream, which were ‘bulkier than humans and shaped differently’ (1999: 31). This presence is also bulkier than humans and shaped differently, yet distinctly *there* as a will that impresses itself upon him psychologically and emotionally. Jung has often said that the anima is a projection-making factor when it is largely unintegrated (cf. 1983: 92). Thus, while the Self is present *within* a person, certain of its un-integrated aspects may often be projected onto external people and objects by the anima so that they may receive conscious attention. This seems to be happening to Shevek as he contemplates the trees and grass. The parts of his Self that have not been allowed to desire or experience such beauty, physical comfort and blessing before (and yet are designed to appreciate it) seemingly well up and become projected onto the limbs of the trees and the grass. As he walks on the ‘flesh’ of the grass, and as the trees hold out their ‘hands’ over him, the image shows that Shevek is being held, supported and blessed by a presence greater than himself. This image communicates the unique and paradoxical relationship between the ego, which is small and limited in its capacity to experience (Shevek’s puritanical conscience), and the Self, which offers the ego a much larger, more gratuitous experience of life. Although we imagine the Self to be contained within the ego (as the outer shell of the psyche’s sphere), in fact the Self is too large to be ‘contained’ by the un-extended ego, and thus projects outside of the person in order to challenge and enlarge the ego’s limited sphere of experience.

It is interesting to note that, while there is a statue of Odo on the bench in the park, the anima does not use this female figure through which to communicate with Shevek, but instead uses the grass and the trees. This alludes, like the earth and stone in Shevek’s dream, to the feminine associations of the natural world, which clearly belong to the trees and grass here, summarised in the commonly used term ‘mother

earth'. Le Guin may already have used the teachings of Odo as an anima influence through which to nurture and educate Shevek into a total belief in the value of communal existence, but it is now as if she is shifting the shape of the anima in order to prepare Shevek to be stretched beyond his identification with Odonianism. Having already brought him into identification with Odo, the anima is now challenging him to outgrow this identification and be 'born' into a new and clearer way of apprehending his society. This helps to explain why the anima should reveal itself through the trees and the grass that are not native to Anarres, but come from Urras, the sworn enemy of his society and also its 'mother'. They foreshadow the fact that Shevek will one day see the Urrasti vegetation in its indigenous context, which is an idea beyond the capacity of his current imagination. This revelation also foreshadows a possible reunion of the two estranged societies, although the novel's ending does not give us this assurance. The anima seems to have chosen this park through which to reveal itself not only because its grass and trees are native to Urras, Anarres's mother-planet, but also because the park is the only natural environment on Anarres that can communicate anything like the gratuitous love, desire for growth and wholeness that is characteristic of the anima's functioning.

It is during his studies at Abbenay that Shevek's almost complete identification with his society is powerfully challenged. With the help of his friend Bedap, Shevek's self-righteousness and rigid Odonian conscience are brought to light and called into question. Having not seen each other since their young Learning Centre days, Shevek and Bedap find one another to be much-needed, trusted companions with whom each can share his deepest concerns. Shevek tells Bedap of his deep unhappiness and frustration with work in physics since he has been at

Abbenay due to his domineering study leader Sabul, and due to the fact that his solitude as the only one practicing in his very advanced field has led him to seeming dead ends in his work. At one point they discuss the nature of ideas – that they need to be used and, like grass, grow better for being stepped upon (1999: 62). While Shevek’s ideas about the goal of his physics are extremely advanced and intelligent, he finds that his academic work stagnates due to lack of communication with other physicists working in the same field. His work does not grow because it is not fed by engagement with others. The only other physicists who are advanced enough to engage with Shevek’s work live on Urras, and Shevek is not allowed to communicate with them because of Anarres’s ideological contempt towards Urras.

Bedap offers Shevek his own concerns for their society as possible explanations for Shevek’s unhappiness. He introduces to Shevek the possibility that their society has largely ceased to function according to Odonian ideals of change, revolution and freedom, and has in fact, in its administrative activities, basically become an ‘archistic bureaucracy’ (1999: 139). Bedap reminds Shevek that there is a difference between human nature and Odonian nature, that ‘the will to dominance is as central in human beings as the impulse to mutual aid is, and has to be trained in each individual, in each new generation. Nobody is born an Odonian any more than he is born civilised! But we have forgotten that’ (1999: 140). Shevek despises Bedap’s accusations against their society, and takes these criticisms personally since he is still so strongly identified with the ‘social organism’ (1999: 142) to which he belongs and for which he feels responsible. His resistance to these criticisms is a sign of his immaturity in relation to what lies ahead. Bedap tells Shevek plainly that he is ‘self-righteous’ (1999: 141) and challenges him to step outside of his ‘own damned

pure conscience for once!' (1999: 141). Shevek shows himself to be a prime victim of projection and lack of Self-knowledge by finding the suggestion that there is evil present in their own social organism preposterous. The fact that Shevek has projected all capacity for evil outside of himself and his society shows that the anima influences in him are largely unintegrated, since psychoanalytic theory states that the anima is the projection-making factor when it is still an unconscious element in the psyche. Ann Ulanov states that, although projections are destructive, in many ways they are signs from the anima that something needs to be resolved in the Self, and that, by examining the things that agitate us most in other people, we may identify the projected aspects of ourselves and proceed with their withdrawal from the person or thing onto which we have projected them (cf. 1981: 57). Yet Shevek does not allow his extreme discomfort and disapproval of Bedap's ideas to make him dismiss him as a friend. There is something in the sincerity with which Bedap speaks and his astounding freedom of mind that calms Shevek's 'righteous wrath' (1999: 143) and keeps him coming back for more argument and more challenge. The speaker tells us that Shevek '... fought Bedap every step of the way, but kept coming, to argue, to do hurt and get hurt, to find, under anger, denial and rejection, what he sought. He did not know what he sought. But he knew where to look for it' (1999: 144).

While Shevek's anger may be attributed merely to the upsetting of his self-righteous comfort zone, the reference in this passage to denial and rejection suggests that, in his past, Shevek has been the victim of evil treatment from others in his society whom he was unable to criticise because their behaviour was justified by the authority of public opinion, which was assumed always to have the best interests of society at heart. Shevek's first rejection as a child came from his mother who left him

and his father after he had turned two. Because the absence of ownership and ‘belonging’ is a key element in Odonian thinking, Shevek’s mother’s behaviour was seen as acceptable. There were facilities that took care of children so that parents were not bound to a particular place, but could move freely to where work needed doing. Family extended to the whole of society and was not determined by blood relation; hence, Rulag’s placing of work above her blood family was not seen as abandonment. It is clear, however, from Shevek’s various encounters with his mother or her absence, that he feels deeply abandoned and rejected by her. He seems to feel that somehow it was not right for her to leave himself and his father to live and love on their own. Shevek’s instinctive feelings of abandonment contradict the Odonian principle of non-ownership – at least when it comes to family relationships – and seem to assert a more primal view of the mother and child bond. In her book *In the Chinks of the World Machine* (1988), Sarah Lefanu claims that Le Guin punishes Shevek’s mother ‘for being a career woman by [giving her] a really unpleasant character’ (1988: 141) But Shevek is usually the focaliser when we encounter Rulag (cf. 1999: 102-3), and his unpleasant, traumatic experiences with her seem simply to be proof of the crucial role that the mother plays in the life of her son, and the possible ways in which he might be damaged by her absence, no matter how pleasant or otherwise her character may truly be.

Another instance of rejection in his childhood occurs when Shevek is sharing his clearly intelligent ideas at the Learning Centre’s ‘Speaking and Listening’ group, and is told not to show off or ‘egoise’ (1999: 27-8) by pretending that such advanced ideas are his own. These rejections drive Shevek into denial and self-imposed solitude in which he reconciles the contradictory elements of his society for himself. Lack of

opportunity to communicate leads him to rationalise these incidents. He appears to have loaded the blame on the individual (himself) whose ideas and activities do not support and maintain the functioning of the group, no matter how wrong the group may be. Thus he comes to see himself and his gifts as subordinate to the authority of public opinion by making no distinction between the unjustified ill-treatment and arrogance of others and the real needs of mutual aid that lead to 'the greater good'. Much of his conscience grows from this false guilt that was germinated in him when he was too young to distinguish between unjustified rejections and proper discipline stemming from love. He has not yet consciously accepted that his human, natural desire to feel a sense of belonging is justified, and that he was right to feel hurt when his elders did him wrong. He needs still to come to terms with the thought that others in his society other than himself can be at fault on a large scale, repeatedly, and can act in a way that does not contribute to the greater good. Yet having his rigid conscience challenged by Bedap to this extent allows Shevek to discover these deeply buried rejections and suppressed experiences of pain caused by his own people, and finally empowers Shevek to open his mind to a new, more objective way of seeing his society, which is less identified with it, and more identified with his true Self. He is finally able to recognise the truth in what Bedap tells him because he has personal experience of it (cf. 1999: 140).

The next paragraph tells us that his time with Bedap in Abbenay 'was, consciously, as unhappy a time for him as the years that preceded it' (1999: 144). We are also told that his advanced work in physics came to a halt, as if he were giving up. Several things in these assertions lead me to believe that room is being made in Shevek for another kind of growth and development. His unhappiness stems from his

feelings of helplessness and vulnerability with regard to his domineering study leader and his solitude in the context of his subject. Again we see signs of anima functioning in this vulnerability, and are able to classify it as another 'darkness at the foot of the wall' for Shevek. Thus we are prepared for the unbuilding of a wall, and the birth of Shevek into a wider experience of life. Since, in the current chapter, the speaker specifies that it is 'consciously' an unhappy time, the suggestion is that unconsciously, things are not unhappy, and are more active than Shevek's surface life reveals. It is as if the anima is making room for Shevek to grow in social and ideological wisdom before he can be allowed to continue with his work in physics. In a sense his scientific knowledge and his social conscience need to work together in order for him to be able to unbuild the necessary walls in a fitting way. To acquire a sufficient level of knowledge in temporal physics would be meaningless if Shevek did not possess a more objective social conscience that would lead him to use it properly. At this point in the novel Shevek's conscience (due to his identification with Odonianism) is far too limited for him to be able to know that walls will have to be unbuild on Anarres before he can proceed with unbuilding walls on Urras. As long as Shevek cannot see that his society has walls, he cannot unbuild them. Hence the need for this time of challenge with Bedap in which '...the walls of his hard puritanical conscience were widening' (1999: 145).

It is important to note that this time 'was anything but a comfort' (1999: 145) to him, and that '[h]e felt cold, and lost. But he had nowhere to retreat to, no shelter, so he kept coming farther out into the cold, getting farther lost' (1999: 145). Le Guin seems frequently to expose her protagonists to extreme elements, like cold, in order to unseat their prejudices. She does this to Genly Ai in *Left Hand* when he crosses the

Gobrin Ice with Estraven; to Ged in *Tehanu* when he goes up into the mountains to herd goats, to Ged and Tenar in the chapter 'Winter' when they are attacked (cf. 1990: 215), and here she places Shevek in a situation in which he feels psychologically 'cold' and 'lost'. This description communicates the intensity with which Shevek feels his own psychological birth pangs. The image of him as an infant emerging from the womb of Odonianism communicates the terror the outside world presents compared to the warmth of the comfort zone inside the mother. This feeling is typical when one is in the process of stepping outside of known boundaries, and it is a necessary stage in the individuation process. Jung and many psychoanalysts have told of the necessity to strike out on one's own into unfamiliar territory in order to discover oneself. Identification with a social group into which one fits is only a stage of individuation, and only part of the way to finding one's true identity. In order to discover who one is in the depth of one's being, one needs to cast off the superficial identity assumed in the group, abandon the campfire, and strike out into the darkness. Le Guin states in 'The Child and the Shadow' (1975) that, in order to avoid becoming fully identified with society, an anonymous member of the masses, the ego must 'turn inward, away from the crowd to the source: it must identify with *its own* deeper regions, the great unexplored regions of the Self' (1993a: 58-9). The feeling of being lost is natural, since the depths of one's being are as yet uncharted, yet simply by allowing oneself to become lost, one is making room for the Self to be revealed through the anima. More of the nature of the Self is always revealed when the ego relinquishes control by letting go of its fixed and safe version of reality. The ego takes a hard knock in these later birth experiences, which makes this time uncomfortable, but the fruits yielded by this struggle are immense – as we shall see.

There are signs of true courage in Shevek's thought that he '... did not know what he sought. But he knew where to look for it' (1999: 144), since it takes true courage willingly to embrace the unknown. This is proof of the unconscious anima working upon his ego, allowing him to know that there is something he needs to acquire (beyond that which he already has), although he does not know what it is, and the only way he can find it is by getting lost. Uncharted territory is fertile ground for revelation and growth. It is fitting that this feeling of becoming more and more lost should happen in his interactions with Bedap. He coincides with the concept of Self/home, since he is familiar to Shevek from long ago, but he is also unfamiliar and challenging to Shevek in the way he has subsequently learned to think and share his thoughts. Shevek seems to have an unconscious knowledge that his conversations with Bedap are the right place to get lost, because Bedap has an aspect to him that is familiar and trustworthy (just as the Self does), although the subject matter of his conversation is not. This makes Bedap an appropriate midwife of Shevek's immanent rebirth. It is partly through the realisation that there are aspects to his friend of which he was previously not aware that Shevek is brought to realise that there are aspects of himself that also await discovery. Shevek experiences great discomfort also because he is forced to acknowledge the way in which his friend has gone ahead of him while he was left behind wallowing in unconscious identification. In this sense Shevek's relationship with Bedap becomes a fitting metaphor for his ego's relationship with his Self. Bedap becomes the messenger (anima figure) of the Self who calls the ego to extend its territory. Shevek's ego must relinquish its grip on its current view of reality in order to allow room for the wider reality of the unconscious Self, just as he must make room in his very rigid conscience for Bedap's new ideas. But it can also be seen as a fortunate time for the Self since Shevek is finally making room for its expression

and integration into his ego. The anima uses Bedap to prompt Shevek into his initial steps away from his identification with his society to a more objective understanding of its needs and the individual role he will have to play in fulfilling those needs. This involves coming to terms with the fact that his people may not be aware of what their needs are, and that he might be largely alone in his pursuit of 'the greater good'. This is the wall in his mind that needs unbuilding. Just as there is darkness at the foot of this wall, there is also joy on the other side of the breach.

This joy arrives in the forming of a life long partnership between Shevek and Takver. After a short period of searching and feelings of sterility, Shevek is introduced to Takver who, it turns out, has known of Shevek for years. In this sense Takver has a similar quality to Bedap, in that she is both familiar and foreign to Shevek at the time at which he becomes fully conscious of her. She of whom he was previously unconscious suddenly becomes apparent, which gives her an anima quality as the vehicle through whom unconscious messages are brought to light. She is also an anima figure in the sense that she is aware of, and drawn to, Shevek long before he is aware of her. She therefore reflects the idea of the Self as supremely aware of the ego before the ego becomes aware of the Self. Jung's theory states that it is the Self's desire to integrate with the ego that leads the anima to interfere with the ego's conscious life. But the Self's desire to be integrated with the ego can only be realised when the ego chooses to integrate with the Self. In the same way, Takver desires Shevek first, but can not engage in a relationship with him until he chooses to desire her also. Shevek never really notices her before, but now is unavoidably drawn to her. Through a strange working out of their feelings about life and one another, Takver shows Shevek 'what really matters' (1999: 151): not just copulation with another

person for one's own pleasure, but actually to form a bond with another for life (1999: 152). Both of them realise, through the grace of the moment, that life-long identification with the other is their path to true fulfilment. Here we see the pattern repeat itself, as Shevek emerges from one identification into another. The difference between them is that the previous identification with Odonianism was largely unconscious – it happened to Shevek without his choosing, as a way of compensating for the absence of a real mother with whom to identify. Now, Shevek perceives Takver as the fulfilment to answer his past barrenness, and consciously chooses to pursue an identification with her for the rest of his life. Another important difference between Shevek's identifications is that the first one, out of which he has recently been born, is with a philosophy and an idea, which has limits and can only nurture one to a limited extent. This identification is with a person: another Self who is infinitely deep, and capable of initiating and requiting love. Shevek's eyes open within the 'abruptness' of his new 'joy' (1999: 153) as he is able to view his recent pain with new insight: '[i]t was now clear to Shevek, ... that his wretched years in this city had all been a part of his present great happiness, because they had led up to it, prepared him for it. Everything that had happened to him was a part of what was happening to him now' (1999: 153). Thus he begins to see the pain of growth from without, as a part of a larger, beautiful whole, and not as one perceives it from within, as all-encompassing darkness. Takver shows Shevek the work that she does in the fish laboratories, and in so doing introduces him to the variety of life their world is capable of producing. Shevek's thoughts in this new context contrast drastically with his earlier thoughts about lush vegetation as 'excrement' (1999: 85). He finds the variety 'bewildering. It had never occurred to Shevek that life could proliferate so wildly, so exuberantly, that indeed exuberance was perhaps the essential quality of

life' (1999: 155). Rather, these thoughts reflect the 'awe' that 'came into him' (1999: 85) when the anima began to interfere with Shevek's thoughts in the garden at Abbenay. While the anima had to interfere from without at Abbenay, by suddenly contradicting Shevek's own puritanical thoughts, now these thoughts seem to be Shevek's own. This is a sign that anima integration has occurred in him, since we are no longer able to distinguish between the wisdom of the anima and his own wisdom: their thoughts are one. Without the new identification that Shevek and Takver choose with each other, such a widening of his consciousness would not have been possible. Through the feminine element of being, Shevek has allowed his ego to extend so as to include Takver's experience within his own. In a sense he has begun to see through her eyes, and she through his, which has broadened their capacity to perceive. Wisdom shows itself to have replaced the fear and hatred of beauty that was evident in his thought processes, as he is able to see the fundamental purpose of 'exuberance', and not despise it for its wastefulness. Shevek's ego seems to have been stretched further than he would have imagined possible, and it is this newly grown consciousness that enables him to continue fruitfully with his work in physics. The speaker tells us that

the false starts and futilities of the past years proved themselves to be groundwork, foundations, laid in the dark but well laid. On these, methodically and carefully but with a deftness and certainty that seemed nothing of his own but a knowledge working through him, using him as a vehicle, he built the beautiful steadfast structure of the Principles of Simultaneity. (1999: 156)

It is interesting to note that the goal of the anima in individuation does not seem to be to strengthen the individual to a point at which he is able to live completely independently of others. It is through identification and communion with another that the true Self is fully realised. Shevek's anima leads him to identify with Takver so that his consciousness may be broadened to a point at which he is able to receive the

full capacity of his Self into his ego. This sort of broadening cannot be achieved alone: I mentioned in the Introduction that a sense of being-at-the-core of oneself is totally dependent *first* on being recognised by another. Shevek could not have received the cornerstone of physics purely by his own conscious capacity, and needs the new eyes of Takver to help him see the larger realities of the physical universe: its beauty and wholeness. Clearly this cornerstone is a formidable and demanding one if it is to be the one with which walls between worlds will be unbuilt. For these Principles of Simultaneity are only the means by which Shevek first makes contact with Urras, and hence, are only a step towards the final General Temporal theory that Shevek finally completes on Urras itself, and offers to the universal community.

When Shevek finally comes to a point at which he is able to perceive and articulate the General Temporal theory, which has been the goal of his whole life, we are told that

[t]he wall was down. The vision was both clear and whole It was simplicity: and contained in it all complexity, all promise. It was revelation. It was the way clear, the way home, the light. The spirit in him was like a child running into the sunlight. There was no end, no end It is strange, exceedingly strange to know that one's life has been fulfilled. (1999: 231-2)

Shevek's dream as a little boy is a symbol and a summary of this moment and all the details that led up to it. The aim of the anima has been achieved in that its unconscious messages have been brought to light and lived out in Shevek's conscious reality. The timelessness of the anima connects the unconscious moments of the dream with these conscious moments, and allows Shevek to experience his fulfilment in a transcendent manner: as a child and a middle-aged man all at once. The anima has led him through an identification with Takver, who serves as the mouthpiece of his destiny, and in so doing helped him to discover and fulfil his true purpose. For it is

Takver who first tells Shevek with conviction: 'Oh yes [you will go to Urras]. And you will come back If you set out to. You always get to where you're going. And you always come back' (1999: 312), before he has even allowed himself to contemplate the possibility of doing such a revolutionary thing. Her words are another allusion to Le Guin's characteristic circular quest for home as destiny. In this sense, Takver acts as the conscious bridge between Shevek and the ultimate fulfilment of his destiny. His identification with her does not ultimately limit him, but rather frees him through her selfless letting-go and faith in his destiny in the face of such insurmountable odds. Here is clear evidence of the way in which the feminine element of being, properly surrendered to, brings about true Self-discovery and being-at-the-core through identification and love shared fully with another. Sarah Lefanu has criticised Le Guin for representing Takver as a 'token strong woman' who 'keeps the home fires burning while Shevek is off changing the future of mankind' (1988: 141). This is couched within a broader complaint that all of Le Guin's important characters are always men (1988: 136). My argument is that a woman should not be limited to women as her primary subjects simply because she is a woman. Surely a female perspective on masculinity is something that is sorely needed in a patriarchal society, which is largely shaped by men's understanding of themselves. I see the demand that a woman must write about women in order to do justice to her sex as unforgivably simplistic, since it is equally limiting to women authors as those who first claimed that women were not able to write at all. The joy of the freedom to write lies in the fact that one may write about whichever subject one chooses. For a woman to write about men is not an abdication of her feminine responsibility to women, but rather an acknowledgement that she is able to write about any subject she sets her mind to. Simply because Takver remains on Anarres while Shevek takes off for Urras, does not

mean that she has sacrificed her own desires for Shevek's sake. Her support of his plight, while simultaneously remaining true to her calling as a natural scientist on Anarres is, as far as I am concerned, a sign of strength. To say that she is undermined because she is not the focus of the novel is to perpetuate the false belief that only those in the lime-light are worth looking at.

When Shevek finally leaves for Urras, he has no idea that he will represent his planet not only as a physicist, but as an ambassador of Odonian thought as well. His newly gained Self-knowledge and increased level of anima integration allow him to perceive the lack of integration in the Urrasti, which leads him to be wiser in the way in which he deals with them. During a conversation with Urrasti physicists, he observes that '... he had touched an impersonal animosity in these men which went very deep. Apparently they ... contained a woman, a suppressed, silenced, bestialised woman, a fury in a cage. He had no right to tease them. They knew no relation but possession. They were possessed' (1999: 64). Because Urrasti society is an authoritarian, capitalistic patriarchy, these men have suppressed their femininity to a point at which it has possessed them in that 'inferior and rabid' form, which was discussed in the Introduction. Surprisingly, Shevek views their animosity with empathy, as one who knows what it is like, and sees that he must not tease or try to argue them out of it. Instead he proceeds with the working out of his scientific theory, concealing its details from the Urrasti authorities, while seeking out the poor on Urras, in order to make sure that his theory gets into the hands of ones who will share it and not use it to increase their personal power and dominate the world. His efforts to find the poor and help them lead him eventually to the Terran embassy, where he is safe from Urrasti control. In this way he manages to give his General Temporal theory

to those who will use it more wisely than the Urrasti. The Terrans not only help Shevek to share his theory as widely as possible, but also help him to get back to Anarres where he can share the wisdom he has gained on Urras. In the words of Joseph Campbell, he brings ‘the runes of wisdom ... back into the kingdom of humanity, where the boon may redound to the renewing of the community, the nation, the planet ...’ (1949: 193)

Thus it is possible to say that individuation, which is about one person’s destiny, begins and ends in communion, since Self-knowledge originates in identification with another, while the discovery of a true and singular purpose by an individual is not only for his/her own sake, but, according to Le Guin, benefits society as a whole. This can be seen in the effect that the General Temporal theory has on the entire universe. All people share the fruits of one person’s fulfilment. Yet, to say that Shevek is completely individuated in that moment of knowing that his ‘life has been fulfilled’ is once again to place limits on the infinite reality of the archetype of the anima and the Self. The fact that the story does not end here, and that there are still huge obstacles that Shevek must face, shows us that even when one feels that one is utterly fulfilled, there is always more. The infinite and indeterminate nature of the archetype, ‘towards which the whole nature of man strives’ (Jung 1972a: 212) makes it so.

Chapter 2

Genly Ai

Alone, I cannot change your world. But I can be changed by it. Alone, I must listen, as well as speak. Alone, the relationship I finally make ... is not ... We and They ... but I and Thou.
(Le Guin 1969: 219)

My previous discussions have argued that the anima goes far beyond the limitations of a particular sexual allocation, and thus one should refer to its ultimate qualities of love, beauty and wisdom in order to understand the particular way in which it speaks to the Gethenian condition in Le Guin's novel *The Left Hand of Darkness* (1969). Most of the story is told in the first-person voice of Genly Ai, an envoy from Earth (Terra) who is sent by the Ekumen (the household/organisation of human-inhabited planets in the known universe) to investigate the conditions on the planet Gethen, and to invite the people as a whole to join the Ekumen. In the words of Genly, the ultimate aim of the Ekumen, in inviting the participation of all inhabited planets, is to increase '[m]aterial profit' and 'knowledge' as it seeks '[t]he augmentation of the complexity and intensity of the field of intelligent life'; '[t]he enrichment of harmony and the greater glory of God', and also because it pursues '[c]uriosity. Adventure. Delight' (1969: 35). But, as the messenger of such a noble cause, Genly does not escape great difficulties in acclimatising to the harsh political and geographical conditions on Gethen, known to the Ekumen as 'Winter'. After a brief discussion of the place that Gethenian sexuality holds in relation to the feminine element of being, I will focus this chapter on the growth that takes place in Genly Ai

on Gethen, with specific reference to his friendship with Therem Harth rem ir Estraven, the Karhidish prime minister on Gethen who is exiled from his nation for his support of Genly's cause. It is mostly within this friendship that Genly Ai grapples profoundly with the feminine element of being.

It is crucial to understand Gethenian sexuality in order to grasp the significance of anima activity in their society, because of how sexuality determines gender roles. For this reason it is necessary to summarise chapter seven of *Left Hand* in some detail. According to the speaker, the Terran envoy Ong Tot Oppong (a woman from the peaceful planet Chiffewar), Gethenians have a sexual cycle of 26 to 28 days. 21 of these days consist of sexual latency (*somer*) during which the individual is completely neuter: neither male nor female in her/his biology, and therefore sexually inactive. On the 22nd or 23rd day the individual enters the phases of *kemmer*, which gradually lead up to a state of sexual potency and fertility to which all other drives and aspects of personality are subject. However, full potency is not reached in isolation, and the presence of another individual in kemmer is needed to trigger (through touch, secretion, scent) hormonal secretion to a point at which male or female hormonal dominance is established in one partner. Ong Tot Oppong explains that '[t]he genitals engorge or shrink accordingly, foreplay intensifies, and the partner, triggered by the change, takes on the other sexual role' (1969: 82). Ancestral descent is taken from the flesh parent – the mother – of a particular kemmering or sexual union. Sexual proclivity differs from kemmering to kemmering, and the father of one child can be the mother of another. The ambisexuality of Gethenians manifests in the positive instance that there is no sexual discrimination between male and female, since all Gethenian individuals have both natures stamped

in their biology and psychology. The speaker explains that every Gethenian has '*his* holiday once a month; no one, whatever *his* position, is obliged or forced to work when in kemmer. No one is barred from the kemmerhouses, however poor or strange' (1969: 84, emphasis added). Psychological and social effects are extreme: 'Anyone can turn *his* hand to anything... Burden and privilege are shared out pretty equally; everybody has the same risk to run... Therefore, no one is quite so free as a free male anywhere else' (1969: 85, emphasis added), nor quite so 'tied down as women elsewhere' (1969: 84). The various narrators and Genly himself all use the male pronoun in order to refer to Gethenian individuals who are not in kemmer, and who are therefore neither male nor female. This seems primarily to be because there is no neuter, singular pronoun for human beings in English. Le Guin criticises herself for having used the male pronoun in *Left Hand*, and suggests in her essay 'Is Gender Necessary? Redux' (1993) that one use the plural pronouns *they/them/their* as singular generic pronouns in such cases, as was the case before the sixteenth century (1993a: 169-70). I feel that English grammar has developed too far for such a reapplication of old grammatical rules to be viable or pleasing to readers. I prefer an invented pronoun to a common one that will certainly make 'the pedants and the pundits [myself included] squeak and gibber in the streets' (Le Guin 1993a: 170). To use *one* or *they* whenever one would ordinarily use he or she can make the writing process laborious and clog the otherwise pleasing rhythm of an author's writing style. This grammatical difficulty illustrates how fundamentally difficult it is for ordinary human beings to approach other human beings without classifying them in ideologically toned sexual terms from the outset. Bruce Woodcock says in 'Radical Taoism: Ursula K. Le Guin's Science Fiction' (1994) that Le Guin gives us a 'biased and partial male narrative view point which itself enforces a gendered categorisation on the bisexual

Gethenians' (1994: 196). It can be understood through this observation that Le Guin is illustrating how difficult it is for ordinary human beings to think impartially about sexuality, rather than falling victim to that partiality herself. The fact that the male pronoun is used, and that the Gethenians are more like men as opposed to menwomen,¹¹ is a result of the flaws in the character of Genly Ai, which in fact 'open out a far-reaching investigation of gender issues' (Woodcock 1994: 196) when juxtaposed with the Gethenian bisexual context. In response to Joanna Russ's criticism of Le Guin's usually male protagonists in 'The Image of Women in Science Fiction' (1970), Anna Valdine Clemens says that 'Feminist critics ... too frequently assume that science fiction should be overtly prescriptive, and consequently fail to recognise Le Guin's ironic intent in her presentation of a protagonist with an excessively masculine point of view' (1986: 423). Woodcock confirms this view when he points out that the male voice in *Left Hand* is a 'narrative device which generates a self-exposé of patriarchal assumptions and relations' (1994: 198). Woodcock laments that Le Guin herself seems to have missed this, judging by her previously discussed self-criticism in 'Is Gender Necessary? Redux' (1993).

It seems to me that Le Guin has explored this androgynous sexual biology and society as a possible answer to the human problem of sexual discrimination, which – in our world – stems from hatred of the feminine element of being, and stagnation in the primitive Eve stage of anima integration. From the content of the novel it is clear that, on a superficial level, many problems are solved by androgyny when it comes to living within political and social structures. The above discussion mentions the advantage that no sexual discrimination occurs because every person's sexual

¹¹ Which is a criticism levelled at Le Guin by the Polish critic Stanislaw Lem (1993: 127).

experience is the same, and leaves him/her equally vulnerable to the natural movements of his/her biological make-up. It also mentions that this manifests in delightful fact that any individual is free to do any kind of work, and there is no such thing as “man’s work” or “woman’s work”. However, Ulanov criticises androgyny as one of the false and dead-end solutions that have been attempted to the problem of sexual discrimination. She states that androgyny ‘obliterates the distinct existence of the female as female and the symbols of the feminine’ (1981:31), and she believes that, by resorting to androgyny as a solution to sexual discrimination, we merely impose another kind of repression on exactly those things that are begging to be expressed to their full extent within ourselves. Instead of forming a

reliable identity as woman or man, and of finding and creating one’s personal style of sexual identity, one can simply float, merge, blend, remain vague in outline. This state seems more flexible on the surface, but breaks down when intimacy is attempted with another person. (1981:51)

And in truth, although Gethenians are neuters most of the time, they ultimately do not escape the knowledge of what it means to be distinctly a man or a woman. In agreement with the above statement, androgyny breaks down when concrete intimacy is called for, and the closest human encounters between Gethenians are experienced through distinctly masculine or feminine modes of being. The individual must always be either male or female in order for the kemmering to be successful and life-giving. In this intimate situation it is impossible for an individual to be neither or both.

Because Gethenians experience distinct sexuality within the kemmering bond, this means that each individual does have concrete experiences of the feminine and masculine elements of being through the sex, conception and birth processes. Consciousness still extends from the mother-child bond, from which the experiences

of being-one-with and being-at-the-core stem. Thus there is still the necessity of having to relate to the feminine element of being – to choose to receive and integrate it or to despise and eschew it. Gethenians, even in somer, are still responsible for the ways in which they exercise and integrate both the masculine and feminine elements of themselves, since, as I have established, the feminine and masculine elements of being are not dependent on our biological sex, and biology does not limit the ways in which individuals may experience them. In a sense Gethenian biology is a metaphor for human individuals who have come to understand their biology as distinct from their social functioning. They have not obliterated their sexual differences, but have merely understood that social behaviour is not dependent on sexuality. They believe that sexuality is something that is expressed fully in intimate and private spaces, and therefore does not need to be carried over into political and social functioning. Their somer-kemmer cycle is a kind of biologically induced self-control, which ensures that sex occupies its rightful place within society, and is not used and abused in inappropriate contexts.¹² Their biology does for them what our minds, hearts and libidos so often fail to do for us. Gethenians are seemingly better equipped than ordinary Terrans to receive both the masculine and feminine aspects of themselves without fear, since all individuals are equally open to male and female instinctive biological processes. However, even though women may experience actual manifestations of the feminine element of being through their female bodies, this does not guarantee their sympathy with the feminine element and the vulnerability that it asks. Ulanov says

Literal birth-giving is paradigmatic of all kinds of metaphorical birth-giving in creative arts, in intense love, and in religious experience. We learn in all of these to yield to a will that moves in

¹² Since the consent and participation of another in kemmer is needed for genital formation to occur, it follows that rape and other sexual abuses are not possible. However, emotional or physical abuse and manipulation are possible for Gethenians, as the plot of *Left Hand* shows in many places.

us but is not our own, that does not snuff out our own will, but moves ours strongly into accord with its own. ... We know in it simultaneous mixtures of self and other, flesh and spirit, strong emotion and intellectual reflection. Women realise this on an instinctual level. ... Similarly, in childbirth, with all our modern medical techniques, we wait on a hidden moment of conception, never sure it will occur. We wait for the body to announce the coming birth. Even with the techniques of induced labour, we wait until the body signals the beginning of the birth process. We wait to receive ... Alert to promptings beyond our control we stand ready to consent ... To know she possesses personal access, in her own body, to this experience of cooperation with a life force beyond her control gives a woman a special spiritual potential. The experience of being a woman, in touch with a larger reality that religion speaks of, she views not as nullifying her personal identity but enlarging it. (1981: 26)

This will be the case for a woman who accepts her body the way it is, and allows herself to live freely and productively in harmony with the intuitive drives over which she has very little control. It may also be the case for a man who shares these experiences with his female partner and attempts to understand and identify with her, allowing her experience to enlarge his own. However, in every individual there is a choice to be made: whether or not to accept or reject this 'will that moves in us but is not our own'. Just as men can choose to accept or reject the feminine element of being, so can women. There is evidence of this in women who have reacted to discrimination by reverting to the opposite, equally violent extreme.¹³ They become hard-line feminists who deny sexual difference of any kind, and insist that humans are all the same. Political identity replaces sexual identity, but remains equally stereotypical and restrictive (cf. 1981: 39). Diana Fuss states that 'the problem with attributing political significance to every personal action is that the political is soon voided of any meaning or specificity at all, and the personal is paradoxically de-personalised' (1989: 101). Ulanov articulates the situation as follows:

The horrible irony of this dilemma shows forth in the hard-line feminist who behaves in a flagrantly sexist manner towards other women [as well as men]. She seeks them out for a job, for example, not on the basis of talent or qualification, but simply on the basis of anatomy But let the candidate for employment reveal a different view of politics ... and the ardent

¹³ There is the example of 'Blanche Taylor Moore (1966-1989) [who] killed 2 husbands, one or more lovers, a pastor, her father and mother-in-law in Burlington, North Carolina by arsenic poisoning Her husbands and men she had affairs with reminded her of her abusive father, whom she killed at a family reconciliation meeting' (Female Serial Killers 2005: ¶13).

feminist will drop her cold, labelling her with contempt as a ... “queen bee” or “the enemy”.
(1981: 42)

There is ample evidence in human history of the fact that women are equally as capable as men of violence, abuse and hatred of vulnerability. Since 1970, there has been a 140% increase in the number of crimes committed by women in the USA, ‘and the upward trend is steady’ (Female Serial Killers 2005: ¶2). A Justice Department study conducted in 1991 found females who were incarcerated for murder were twice as likely as men incarcerated for murder to have killed an intimate (husband, boyfriend or child) (Female Serial Killers 2005: ¶2). A website dealing with child abuse issues states that almost two-thirds of the perpetrators of child maltreatment are women, although this maltreatment usually takes the form of emotional or physical abuse rather than sexual abuse (The Big Secret 12 Sept. 2005: ¶1-2). Though women’s bodies may prompt them to do one thing, they are perfectly free to choose to do another. In the bodies of both men and women one may find lessons, but lessons do not guarantee learning. A lesson needs a will that agrees and desires to learn in order to teach successfully. So one can see that, just as women do not necessarily accept the will of the feminine element of being as it manifests within their own bodies, so all Gethenians do not necessarily accept the lessons in vulnerability and love that they experience through their ambisexual bodies. There are many Gethenians who demonstrate lack of integration, ego-centricity and power-seeking, which all show that their ego and Self are as yet split. King Argaven of Karhide, for instance, gives himself over to fear of the unknown to the extent that it makes him mad. In the chapter ‘Soliloquies in Mishnory’, the Commensal Susmy says that ‘Argaven thought [Genly Ai] mad, like himself’ (1969: 129). The source of his fear, after examination, seems to be that very same vulnerability that belongs to the

feminine element of being. Tibe, his second prime minister, is a prime example of self-aggrandisement as an end that (to him) justifies cruel means. He too acts out of fear of vulnerability and weakness, by manipulating the ego of the King to make his political position more secure. Power-seeking is not only sexually motivated, but can occur in any individual with a fragile ego to protect against 'the other'. The binary relationship between self and other remains even in the absence of the binary relationship between male and female, even though ordinary human sexuality has often been used as a metaphor for the self and other binary.¹⁴ Argaven's life seems to be devoted to rejecting his vulnerability through expertise in 'shifgrethor' – a Gethenian way of structuring communication so that personal power and authority is maintained, and weaknesses are kept hidden. Of shifgrethor, the envoy Genly Ai says: 'Whole areas of that relationship were still blank to me, but I knew something about the competitive, prestige-seeking aspect of it, and about the perpetual conversational duel which can result from it' (1969: 35). Like Macbeth, Argaven's subconscious knowledge of his fragile power and security as King leads him to fear any threat to his power, especially from hitherto unknown directions. He uses this fear as a weapon to ward off any new challenge, even favourable ones that would enlarge his power rather than diminish it. He responds to Genly Ai's invitation to join the Ekumen in this way:

But I do fear you, Envoy. I fear those who sent you. I fear liars, and I fear tricksters, and worst I fear the bitter truth. And so I rule my country well. Because only fear rules men. ... You are what you say you are, and yet you're a joke, a hoax. There's nothing in between the stars but void and terror and darkness, and you come out of that all alone trying to frighten me. But I am already afraid, and I am the King. Fear is King! Now take your traps and tricks and go
(1969: 40)

It is clear that King Argaven remains in a primitive stage of anima integration from the way in which he chooses to perceive the unknown, and Genly as a messenger of

¹⁴ 'Sexuality functions as a metaphor of otherness; the spiritual hides in the sexual' (Ulanov 1994: 13)

the unknown. He demonstrates what looks like a classic case of paranoia, for he sees threats where there is no evidence that they exist. He is incapable of perceiving Genly as an individual human being, and instead sees him and those who sent him as an imposing and a malevolent force that he labels 'liars' and 'tricksters'. Irony lies in the fact that he admits also to fearing the 'bitter truth', as if the truth also is a force that is in direct opposition to his own will. By this admission he indirectly reveals his own culpability as a liar and trickster within his own administration and life. First of all, the truth is something that is bitter to him, and secondly, he fears and despises it. His egocentricity makes him unable to perceive objective truth around him, and in this sense, he lives a lie, which makes him fear the truth. It is thus that he projects his own condition as a liar and a trickster onto those that are 'other' and unknown. The threat he perceives, not only in Genly and the Ekumen, but in the 'void and terror and darkness' of the unknown universe, is the threat posed by his own unknown face, which, Jung says, is the illusion created by projection. The void, terror and darkness he perceives in outer space is merely the void, terror and darkness that is within himself in the place where his true Self should be. It is those dishonest, weak, vulnerable, and therefore threatening, aspects of King Argaven's own nature, with which he has not come to terms, that he sees in the face of Genly Ai, which make it impossible for him to perceive the envoy's presence as a peace offering instead of a hoax. As was discussed in the introduction, projection is something that the anima exercises when it is rejected by the ego. The anima is only a projection making factor when it is still separate from the ego and its persona. Argaven sees its call to become more integrated and wise, by acting against his fear of the unknown and embracing his vulnerability in relation to the greater universe, as an unadulterated threat. Instead of choosing to brave the unknown in spite of his fear, he remains safely within the

limits of his fear by proclaiming that ‘fear is King’. There is no doubt that Argaven, as someone who experiences within his own body both the masculine and feminine elements of being, has nevertheless chosen to reject the vulnerability foregrounded by the feminine element of being by refusing to acknowledge that his power is subordinate to, and reliant on, the goodwill of the Ekumen, which is made up of people who are as valuable as himself. Fear has overtaken his personality, stunted his growth, and therefore made a receiving and loving relation to others impossible.¹⁵ Tibe and King Argaven collaborate in their efforts to aggrandise their own egos at the expense of those they fear, and so bring about the exile of the loyal Prime Minister Estraven on account of his support of Genly Ai’s challenging cause.

Apart from the friendship of Estraven, Genly Ai finds the Gethenian environment to be hostile to him in many ways. In fact, for a large part of their friendship, Genly even fails to see that Estraven is his friend, due to his exaggerated defensiveness against Gethenian cultural inscrutability. The previous Ekumenical investigator, Ong Tot Oppong, warns the next envoy that ‘unless he is very self-assured, or senile, his pride will suffer. A man wants his virility regarded, a woman wants her femininity appreciated On Winter, [this appreciation] will not exist’ (1969: 86). Although he may not be conscious of it, there are signs that Genly does struggle with this lack of recognition. On Gethen he is labelled a pervert because those whose genitals are permanent fixtures in their bodies are the exception to the rule, and are therefore seen as perversions of ordinary, healthy sexuality, which has its place in kemmer and does not interfere with daily living. The suggestion of this aspect of the novel is that that which we consider ‘normal’ is not given, but is rather socially

¹⁵ ‘The psychoanalyst directs us back to this central insight of Christianity: altogether negative splitting results in stopped-up loving, from a consciousness too small to embrace self and other simultaneously’ (Ulanov 1981: 46)

determined. In one way, the ambisexuality of Gethenians threatens Genly on the level of his personal masculinity: his assumed virility, natural strength and honour as a man are not recognised, but rather called a 'perversion'. But in another way Gethenians also threaten Genly's conditioned Terran concept of masculinity and femininity as mutually opposed ways of being that cannot coexist comfortably in one person. It is clear from the very beginning that he has a deep-seated suspicion of Gethenians primarily because they combine masculine and feminine elements equally abundantly within their individual personalities. His fear of the coexistent femininity alongside their masculinity becomes obvious in his observations of the behaviour in particular individuals. He seems, even in these non-sexually driven people to assume that the man in all of them is dominant, while the woman is a subtle and cunning 'other' inside them who rears her ugly head whenever his guard is down. His attitude is very similar to Jung's attitude to the anima when he first became aware of it (as I discussed in the Introduction). In Genly the binary relationship of masculine 'strength' and feminine 'weakness' that he acquired on earth is still very strong. He shows his true, imperfect humanity in the fact that he is only comfortable thinking of individuals as either wholly male or wholly female in their psychology as well as their biology. On Terra, this would be appropriate *to an extent*, but it is not at all appropriate on Gethen. Even on Earth (and especially for the purpose of this study), the ideal is to come to an understanding of 'those differences between male and female and the modes of being symbolised as masculine and feminine as belonging in many ways to both sexes' (Ulanov 1981: 27). While Genly, at the start of the novel, seems more than willing at least to try to accept the biological ambisexuality of Gethenians, he proves himself incapable of accepting the masculine and feminine as coexistent and complementary in the psychic framework of any individuals – Gethenian or otherwise.

Some examples of this prejudice in Genly can be found in his initial observations of Gethenian behaviour. While observing the politically strained relations between Prime Minister Estraven and soon-to-be-Prime Minister Tibe, he feels ‘annoyed by [a] sense of effeminate intrigue’ (1969: 14). Because both Estraven and Tibe are no more women than they are men at that moment, we can infer that what really annoys Genly is the subtle, high-context and high-content communication that goes on between Gethenians in political relationships. It annoys him, seemingly, primarily because he does not understand it and feels he is excluded from it because of his lack of understanding. What is it that makes him label this exclusive inscrutability as ‘effeminate intrigue’? This term belittles the situation from one with dire political implications to a minor and predictable twist in a cheap soap opera. Genly’s ego, in its own defence, is grappling for handholds that will allow him to feel at least slightly in control in a position in which he is actually very vulnerable with no control over events at all. The old Terran stereotype equates masculinity with consciousness and light, and femininity with unconsciousness and darkness. So Genly resorts to a simplistic and familiar stereotypical framework in order to explain away his own helplessness in the situation. Within the safety of the stereotype, masculine strength stands in a dominant position over female weakness, and so, even though that which threatens Genly is much larger than himself, by calling it ‘effeminate’, he stows it safely into a position of inferiority in relation to his maleness, which is the only thing he seems to be able to hold onto in this precarious position. He has not yet acquired a sense of Self that is strong enough to maintain his stability in being-at-the-core, and so resorts to a false sense of security in an illusion of male ‘strength’ against female ‘weakness’.

Not much later, when he is at dinner with Estraven, Genly uses the same label to condemn the way in which Estraven speaks in a seemingly elusive and equivocal way. He damns Estraven's 'effeminate deviousness' (1969: 19) in not being direct and outspoken about his political situation in relation to Genly. Again, he labels the unknown in a derogatory and a reductive way, instead of being honest about his weakness and inability to understand his circumstances. He is the alien in that environment, alone, who fails to understand and therefore participate in the cultural idiosyncrasies of Gethenian communication, even though Estraven is attempting to explain them to him in the best way he knows how, without being offensive. Instead of admitting his own weakness and reaching out to Estraven across the cultural gap, he uses a worn-out stereotype to shift Estraven into an inferior position within his own mind. He rejects the pain of vulnerability and growth in favour of an illusion of safe superiority. What else but an illusion or false logic can allow one automatically to assume that anything devious in anyone is necessarily 'effeminate'? Again, in his own mind, masculinity is strong, clear and straightforward, and thus it is only femininity that can be devious or sinister. It does not occur to him that most male-dominated political contexts are rife with deviousness and manipulation, without needing anything 'effeminate' to make them so. Thus, deviousness is no more a feminine quality than it is a masculine quality. His suspicion of the femininity in Estraven finds another handhold, though a very brittle one. There is a double displacement of responsibility in Genly's defensive attitude, which thus stunts communication. First of all, Genly assumes that Estraven's subtlety is deviousness. The second assumption is that this deviousness stems from the feminine part of him. Genly, because of his hatred of his own vulnerability, lacks the capacity to consider and reach outside of his

own ego to that which might be agreeable in Estraven. He loses an opportunity to extend his ego boundaries, by erecting further walls between himself and the 'other' with whom he must communicate. He places Estraven's efforts within a category that is safely apart from his own maleness, which allows him to continue to function within the limits of his own fear. It is clear that, despite their biological and sexual differences, both Terrans and Gethenians are equally capable of self-deception and splitting through fear and hatred of the feminine element of being, which keeps them both securely stuck in the early stages of anima integration and individuation.

There are many other examples of Genly's prejudice and inability to grow, which seem to dominate his journey for most of this story. Shortly after observing that his superintendent reminds him of a 'landlady, for he had fat buttocks ... and a prying, spying, ignoble, kindly nature' (1969: 46-7), Genly remarks to himself that Gethenian society does not ever go to war, because it lacks the capacity to '... mobilise. They behaved like animals, in that respect, or like women' (1969: 47). These comments drip with condescension, self-satisfaction and misogyny, not only at the expense of women, but also at the expense of Gethenian individuals and their society as a whole. Genly uses anything vaguely different or unknown he can observe in these people in order to bring them down a notch in his own estimation, by calling that difference 'feminine' (however remotely it may resemble actual femininity) so that he may continue to find superiority and value within his manhood, and so feel stronger in his situation. There is evidence here of the struggle of which Ong Tot Opping warned. Genly is neither senile, nor is he extremely self-assured, and so he feels it necessary, at least within his own mind, to reiterate the virility he is supposed to possess in his manhood in a context in which that virility has no relevance. In his

latter remark, it is almost as if he uses the fact that Gethenians have never been to war with one another as a reason to pity them. He, of all people, as an Envoy of the peace-loving, knowledge-sharing, culture-nurturing Ekumen, should know that any nation that manages to avoid war should be commended and exemplified. Instead he calls their acts of violence in forms other than war ‘a repertory of accomplishments’ (1969: 47). Gethenians only lack the ability to ‘mobilise’ large numbers of people in order to ‘achieve’ war. Again, he is thinking within the inaccurate stereotype that only men are ‘active’ or ‘mobile’, while women are ‘passive’ and lack conviction. Not only does he denigrate the female sex by depicting women as incapable of action, but he also takes his contempt even further by placing them in the same category as animals. While he may intend to be ironic by calling Gethenian acts of violence ‘a repertory of accomplishments’, the juxtaposition of this label with the much more pejorative labels attributed to the ‘passive’ female glorify the so-called masculine ‘action’ and ‘mobility’ involved in violence and war as more desirable ‘accomplishments’ than anything that femininity might achieve. Thus Genly’s identification with his false sense of manhood leads him into an attitude that goes directly against the ideals of the Ekumen of which he is an envoy. Fortunately these disturbing thoughts never translate into actions that cause irreparable damage to his cause.

It is immediately evident from all of these examinations that Genly has a very unfavourable view of femininity in general. This disfavour may not extend to actual women, since there are no women in his current environment towards whom his behaviour can be observed, but he definitely exhibits animosity towards the woman inside every Gethenian. The fact, for instance, that he places women in a similar category to animals (unconscious, irrational, dark and mysterious, immobile) betrays

his very primitive stage of anima integration. Women, or femininity, in his eyes, seem to possess no positive qualities at all in relation to the quality he associates with masculinity. In fact, just as the Eve stage of integration dictates, the only value the female seems to hold for him is that it can be fertilised: an adequate carrier of male offspring, like a female animal. Perhaps on Terra, these things are not so urgently dealt with, for there, Genly is not so vulnerable, and there is no obvious mixing of the sexes in individuals to deal with to the same degree. Indeed, the insecurity and threat to control posed by Gethenian sexuality and society seem to have awakened in him insecurities about his masculinity and his true value as a human being. He seems to place most of his value as an individual on his purely male ego identity, which threatens to be unseated in his current environment. This means that he is not yet aware of the presence or value of his true Self, and has not yet consciously approached or accepted the communications of the anima. He has not identified his projections as projections, which would have enabled him to withdraw them. Thus, the anima remains an outsider, an 'other', with a will that is hostile and opposed to his own conscious ego. Because he is a victim of Terran male and female stereotypes, he sees the unknown, forever mysterious quality of the feminine element of being as dark, fear-inspiring, and therefore at odds with his own need to control. This leads him to hate it, to reject it as a force within himself, and thus to project it even further onto anything in his environment that exhibits vaguely challenging or unfamiliar qualities. Thus, he is unable to perceive Gethenians and their culture with wisdom, as they really are. What is really a highly intricate, strange and beautiful way of communicating and being becomes a threatening morass of 'feminine intrigue'. Even those parts of Gethenian politics that are truly despicable (such as Tibe and Argaven's deception) are not perceived as the result of the *same fear of vulnerability* that is in

Genly, but instead are attributed, again, to feminine 'inferiority' within them. He calls anything he finds threatening in their behaviour 'womanly' or 'effeminate' in order to dissociate it from his 'manliness', within the limits of which he feels safe. Thus he comes away from these encounters unscathed, unchallenged, and does not need to grow. This also compounds his perception of the feminine as *something* with very little human quality, and closer to animalistic un-enlightenment – something to be fertilised and nothing more. This is how, for the most part of the plot, Genly denies his vulnerability and the feminine element of being, and so fails to realise his true value as a human being, which goes much deeper than his superficial ego identity.

He expresses something resembling an honest view of his vulnerability earlier in the story after he feels Estraven has just betrayed him. He states that he was 'cold, unconfident, obsessed by perfidy, solitude and fear' (1969: 25). In this statement Genly very courageously admits to being 'unconfident'. Admission of insecurity is always courageous because it consciously avoids the easy way out, which is to put on a show of confidence in an effort to ward off the feelings of insecurity. This can never eliminate the permanent condition of vulnerability in relation to all things. Genly is often guilty of this show of confidence and superiority, as the above discussion shows, but he is not guilty of it here. Although he does mention perfidy, which is what he has perceived in Estraven's behaviour and inability to help him further, he blames himself for his own obsession with perfidy, and not Estraven for his performance of it. The fact that he admits that he, and not Estraven, is obsessed with 'perfidy and solitude and fear' shows that he is close to admitting his own culpability in perceiving these things, for an obsessed person does not see reality, but always finds in others what the obsession leads him/her to look for. Obsession is projection,

since, as Ulanov reminds us, excessive agitation with particular qualities in persons is always a sign of projection. She writes: 'The reason we cannot leave the issue alone is that we have dumped on another person part of our own psychology that really belongs to us' (1981: 61). Genly has seemingly 'dumped' the darker, more vulnerable part of his own psychology, not only onto Estraven, but on the whole Gethenian race also. But there is hope in the fact that, in this instance, Genly shows that the perfidy, solitude and fear that he perceives have not necessarily been inflicted upon him, but have rather been brought about by his own fear of vulnerability, which has led him to project his worst fears outside himself, and so become faced and obsessed with that illusion that is his unknown face: his worst fears realised.

It is chiefly through his later, deeper friendship with Estraven that Genly becomes more integrated with the feminine element of being. However, before this actually occurs, there is a point at which the anima interferes and shows Genly a positive image of femininity, which goes against his habitual prejudices. It happens through the Handdarata, a group of monks who follow a similar philosophy to that of Taoist non-interference and inactivity (cf. 1969: 56). Genly visits them in order to appease his curiosity about them, and to understand how they fit into Gethenian culture. He encounters a sub-culture that values ignorance above knowledge. In the sense that knowledge brings power, and power control, the Handdarata ignore it, since they believe that '[t]he unknown... the unfortold, the unproven, that is what life is based on. Ignorance is the ground of thought. Unproof is the ground of action' (1969: 65). In the light of this philosophy, the Handdarata seem very close to anima integration, for they have seen the size of themselves in relation to the greater scheme of things. Ignorance, to them, is not a way of avoiding challenge, which is how King

Argaven views it. King Argaven's ignorance of the universe and its inhabitants, of those nations that exist beyond his rule, is a voluntary rejection of the frightening knowledge of the truth of his condition. To the Handdarata, ignorance is perceived as a manifestation of their permanent condition of vulnerability in relation to the greater scheme. To embrace ignorance, for them, is to embrace the truth. They perceive the condition of ignorance in human beings as necessary to life, since ignorance of the truth of the universe, and our condition within it, is what motivates the search for that truth. To understand that they are a smaller part with a purpose to perform in a much greater whole invests them with a sense of the gravity of that purpose, and motivates them to seek out that purpose, and not simply to live a life of superficiality and avoidance. Marthinus Versveld says in his book *Persons* (1972) that he 'among human beings is most wise who like Socrates has learnt that in reality his wisdom is worth nothing' (1972: 6). One of the most famous lines from Shakespeare's play 'As You Like It' (1962) goes '[t]he fool doth think he is wise, but the wise man knows himself to be a fool' (1962: 238 Act 5 Sc1, 35-7). This condition stands in direct contrast to the egocentric condition, in which the isolated ego becomes the full extent of the world to itself. An isolated ego will maintain an illusion of absolute knowledge, power and control, because it makes no room within itself for the larger, more mysterious realities within which it exists. This condition is one of complete ignorance, because the 'absolute power' of the ego prevents it from perceiving its actual state of vulnerability and ignorance within a greater, more powerful scheme. However, when the ego begins to extend itself to include within its functional reality those mysteries over which it has no control (however painful this extension may be), it begins to perceive more clearly the truth of its ultimate condition. Hence the paradox: to know one is small and ignorant is closer to wisdom than to think one is

all-knowing and wise, which is absolute ignorance. The Handdarata pursue the greater mysteries of the universe first and foremost by embracing their ignorance in relation to the truth of that universe. They embrace this ignorance by understanding that '[t]he only thing that makes life possible is permanent, intolerable uncertainty: not knowing what comes next' (1969: 66). If individuals all knew the full extent of the purpose and the meaning of the universe, and themselves within that universe, what would be the point of journey, discovery or growth? Again, Versveld says: '[i]f man had all the answers to the problem of himself he would cease to be man' (1972: 1).

It is through their own integration of the feminine element of being - that vulnerability that enables true strength, love and wisdom - that the Handdarata reveal the anima to Genly in a positive way. Genly calls on their gift of foretelling to answer a question to which he can otherwise not know the answer. The Handdarata practice foretelling in order to illustrate 'the perfect uselessness of knowing the answer to the wrong question' (1969: 65). They tell stories of others who have asked questions like '*[o]n what day shall I die?*' (1969: 43), who then are driven into madness because the vagueness of the answer matches the vagueness in the question. These people's lives are destroyed by 'knowing the answer to the wrong question', and so Faxe, who is the weaver or patterner of the unconscious material that reveals the foretold answer, warns Genly to make his question as specific as possible. He does, and, I believe, is saved also by the unselfish motivation of his question. He asks whether Gethen will be a member of the Ekumen within the next five years, to which the answer can only be 'yes' or 'no' (1969: 58). His motivation is unselfish because the question focuses on the fate of Gethen and the Ekumen, rather than the fate of Genly himself. Because of his ability in mindspeech, Genly is not simply an outsider to the process of finding

the answer, but actually must participate in the unconscious and meditative processes that lead to the answer. His experience of the process is highly symbolic of the process of ego extension that anima integration demands. At first he is drawn in against his will: 'I felt, whether I wished or not, the connection, the communication that ran, wordless, inarticulate, through Faxe ... I tried to keep out of contact with the minds of the foretellers' (1969: 61). Genly clearly feels the threat of the uncontrollability of the unconscious, and resists it because he fears it. As Jung says in his essay *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*,

... consciousness struggles in a regular panic against being swallowed up in the primitivity and unconsciousness of sheer instinctuality. This fear is the eternal burden of the hero-myth and the theme of countless taboos. The closer one comes to the instinct-world, the more violent is the urge to shy away from it and to rescue the light of consciousness from the murks of the sultry abyss. Psychologically, however, the archetype as an image of instinct is a spiritual goal toward which the whole nature of man strives; it is the sea to which all rivers wend their way, the prize which the hero wrests from the fight with the dragon. (1972a: 212)

It is clear that Genly's consciousness does struggle in a 'regular panic' against the unconscious process that unfolds before him, especially when he tries to shield himself against it:

But when I set up a barrier, it was worse: I felt cut off and cowered inside my own mind obsessed by hallucinations of sight and touch, a stew of wild images and notions, abrupt visions and sensations all sexually charged and grotesquely violent, a red-and-black seething of erotic rage. I was surrounded by great gaping pits with ragged lips, vaginas, wounds, hellmouths, I lost my balance, I was falling If I could not shut out this chaos I would fall indeed, I would go mad, but there was no shutting it out. The empathic and paraverbal forces at work ... were far beyond my restraint to control. (1969: 61)

This experience illustrates very clearly the negative picture of the anima and of the unconscious that is formed when it is feared and rejected. The 'light of consciousness' is perceived as opposed to the will of the unconscious, and therefore avoids the unknown and as yet dark spaces of the Self at all costs. Because the conscious mind perceives these unknown forces as a threat to the ego, they become dire forces that

threaten to swallow and extinguish life itself. The walls or barriers constructed against the unconscious, instead of shutting it out, rather augment its threat and increase the negative influence it has over the ego. Unconscious images take on the colours of mortality and death, and express violence towards life that inspires only fear. In the context of wine and celebration, the colour red symbolises life, but in combination with the colour black, and in the context of fear and chaos, red gives an impression of violence and death. It is blood that is bleeding and not coursing through the veins as it should be. In this collection of images described by Genly, he feels himself as small and insignificant in relation to the powers that surround him. He perceives them as pits, lips, vaginas, wounds and hellmouths. It is through these that we are able to see that Genly's fear of the unknown Self and unconscious within him stem from his fear of the feminine. These repressed energies that threaten to extinguish his life take on the shape of women's genitals, equating them with hellish darkness, abysses and wounds, and so make it clear that it is the feminine element of being, experienced through the mystery of birth, that is Genly's greatest enemy because it is his greatest challenge. It is clear that his fears do not express themselves through phallic symbols. While this direness, violence, painfulness and death-like quality of the feminine element of being may not be its ultimate quality, it must appear so to someone who is not open to its influence in his conscious life. Someone whose life is limited totally to consciousness cannot see the unconscious in a favourable light, until something happens that allows his/her consciousness to shed light on the unknown, and so to dispel the 'dark' threat. That is why Jung distinguishes between the 'violent ... urge to shy away from' (1972a: 212) the early, emotional experience of unconscious instinctuality, and the very different psychological significance of it. By mentioning the positive significance of the unconscious archetype as a 'spiritual goal to which the

whole nature of man strives' (1972a: 212), he foreshadows what will ultimately come of the confrontation Genly is experiencing. While still inside the unconscious hallucinations that threaten to submerge him and drive him mad, Genly perceives that the chaotic unconscious activity is still controlled by Faxé, who remains at the centre. He loses his sense of time and space, and seems to drift into an indefinite waiting that slowly changes his resistance into acceptance: though Genly himself is not in control, he rests in the trust that Faxé is in control, which allows him to let time pass without struggling further against the unconscious. Genly exercises the 'negative capability' of which Keats writes (Abrams 1993: 124-5). Faxé, as a more integrated individual, becomes the doorway through which the anima reveals itself. It is only then that he has a vision of Faxé as 'a woman dressed in light. The light was silver, the silver was armour, an armoured woman with a sword. The light burned sudden and intolerable, the light along her limbs, the fire, and she screamed aloud in terror and pain, "Yes, yes, yes!"' (1969: 61). It is thus that Genly receives an image of the feminine that is truer than his experience of it as gaping, threatening female genitalia. Although those images are not the ultimate quality of the anima, they point to a problem that needs to be integrated in order to arrive at the truth. In my Introduction, an image of the anima as the passage or vagina connecting the Self and ego was discussed. This image is positive, because it draws on the life-giving and receiving function of the feminine. Yet Genly's picture is of a gaping, ragged vagina that threatens to smother and bring death, which is a common fear among misogynistic men. Genly's fear of vulnerability and the unknown makes him see it so, even though the true feminine function is very different.

Genly experiences the truth of his own lack of integration in these negative images before he can persevere through them to the objective truth of the anima, which is not limited by his own ignorance and fear. This truer image of the anima is one of light and not darkness. It is an image of purity, since the woman is dressed in silver and in light: the light burns, and silver is made purer and more precious by extreme heat. It is also an image of masculine strength, in that the woman is dressed in armour, with a sword, and also dressed in intolerable light. Light, in its symbolic sense, reveals truth and conquers ignorance/darkness. The woman's 'scream[ing] in ... pain' implies that this strength is different from the conventional understanding of masculine strength. While the traditional image of 'pure masculine strength' suggests immunity to pain, Faxe's strength does not exclude pain, since real strength lies in vulnerability to pain, and the ability to endure that vulnerability and pain. It is the strength that comes with wisdom, since it includes the knowledge of its vulnerability, and sees fit to endure pain for the sake of a greater cause.

The image of strength and wisdom in a feminine form becomes the mouthpiece of the unconscious as it screams the answer to Genly's question. The answer is positive, and shows the ultimately augmenting and prolific urge of the anima. The answer to Genly's question is yes. But the anima screams this answer in a way that is anything but indifferent, rational or devious. The anima appears in this image to be personally involved in the answer and the process that will lead to its future manifestation. It seems to matter personally in a profoundly moving way, as if it emerges from the anima's very being like a child from the womb. The fact that the woman of light screams the answer suggests that she is not so much saying the answer as giving birth to it. This image portrays the anima not only as an extremely powerful

force that fights for truth and growth (hence the masculine sword and armour), but also as a vessel, passage of that same truth and growth, through whom it shall be fulfilled. This interpretation makes sense in the light of the question, which has great universal significance: it has to do with the fate of an entire planet and its people in relation to other planets and their people.

In my preceding discussion I have identified the anima as a force that connects and integrates truth with consciousness; as a force that loves and bonds and unifies through communication and wisdom. It is understandable, therefore, that it would take up the cause of communication and integration between Gethen and the Ekumen to this extent, and give Genly (although he may not realise it) so much more than the answer he was looking for. What the anima has done through this experience is to confront Genly with the reality of his own lack of integration, and, through his allegiance to the benevolent Ekumen, reveal to him not only the inevitable integration of Gethen into the Ekumen, but also his own inevitable integration with his true Self and his destiny as a person and an envoy. This feminine image, as it is related by Genly, stands in direct contrast to his previous remarks about femininity, and promises to be a personal turning point past which fulfilment, integration and wisdom are inevitable. It makes sense that this positive revelation of the anima should arise out of Genly's encounter with the 'fecund darkness of the Handdarata' (1969: 56). For, to them, darkness and the unknown are not a threat but a welcome truth, and so they are able to perceive it and live peacefully in its 'fecundity'. The word fecundity is important here, for it speaks not only of something that is receptive and fertile, but something that is also active: that fertilises and proliferates. Within itself this unknown/unconscious/anima contains the ability to be spiritually prolific. It therefore

cannot be reified into a limited sexual stereotype, or be called deviousness – feminine or otherwise. For it goes beyond the limits of any category, and the spiritual riches that it has to offer are no less valuable for the fact that they cannot be seen, pinned down or named.

Genly's vanity, arrogance and narrow-mindedness persist in his behaviour many pages into the novel. Even after he is captured and nearly killed by the Sarf agents of Orgoreyn, and rescued by Estraven, he still fails to perceive or believe Estraven's receiving and trusting intentions towards him. He cannot let go of the feeling of betrayal he associated with Estraven, before Estraven was exiled from Karhide. Estraven tells Genly that he is unjust not to trust the only Gethenian who has trusted him fully since the beginning (1969: 170). He says '[t]he fact is ... that you're unable, or unwilling, to believe that I believe in you' (1969: 171). Genly's inability to receive Estraven's love and trust, however unwarranted, makes him unable to love in return. The discrepancy between Genly's cause and his personal capacity to carry it out becomes evident. His cause on Gethen, which is that of the Ekumen, is noble and worthy. Estraven recognises this from the start and, despite the incredulity and fear of the Gethenians who surround him, manages to find it within himself not only to believe, but also to *believe in* Genly's cause. To Estraven, Genly represents the end of the political divisions and struggles to which his world has adhered since it's beginning: 'He is not to be feared Yet he brings the end of Kingdom and commensalities with him in his empty hands' (1969: 78-9). He recognises, in Genly's solitary presence, the benevolence and greater spirit of the Ekumen, which transcends ideological boundaries through its vulnerability and openness to others/strangers. However, Genly's own spirit is unable, because of personal insecurities, to perceive

the reciprocal openness and loyalty in Estraven's behaviour. It is as if he himself is too small a carrier for such a large ideal. He comes to realise his own smallness through a profoundly humbling and eye-opening journey with Estraven across the Gobrin Ice.

The Gobrin Ice is a vast and treacherous glacier over which a journey might be considered madness. Once again, as I discussed in Chapter One, Le Guin exposes her protagonist to extreme cold as a way of forcing him to confront himself and his unconscious prejudices. However unreasonable this choice of road may seem, in their circumstances it offers them the greatest chance of escape from the Karhidish and Orgota authorities who would do them harm. The cold and treacherous ice on their road overstrains them both, especially Genly, since his body is not accustomed to the extreme Gethenian climate. But at a particular point on the ice he remarks: 'I was hungry, overstrained, and often anxious, and it all got worse the longer it went on. I certainly wasn't happy. Happiness has to do with reason, and only reason earns it. What I was given was the thing you can't earn, and can't keep, and often don't even recognise at the time; I mean joy' (1969: 204). What seems to be happening here is similar to that which Tresan described, as quoted in my introduction: '... it seems to take great suffering and/or loss ... in order to defeat the last vestiges of the ego and to connect us most deeply with the ultimate mysteries of the anima' (2001: 4). Genly's suffering here is conscious and physical. Yet this conscious experience of suffering seems to become an opening through which he is able to perceive truer, inner realities. This is similar to Shevek's consciously unhappy experience at Abbenay discussed in the previous chapter. In an environment stripped of every comfort and prop, leaving only silence and the whiteness of snow, Genly's allows his ego to let go of its

crutches and habitual occupations so that his inner Self speak of its presence, and be heard. For he acknowledges that the joy he feels does not come from his conscious, material, rational reality: there is no apparent reason for him to feel joy. He acknowledges that this joy is something 'given': who or what does he think gives this joy? The description of a sense of being-at-the-core in the introduction also speaks similarly of knowing one's Self to be 'given ... instead of achieved ... or manufactured' (1981: 77). He seems not to be able to say who or what gives what he has received, and yet remains comfortable with the thought that it is not of his own making. Again there is evidence of grace making a deep impression upon Genly, as it did upon Shevek in the park at Abbenay. Here we see Genly, for the first time, actually embracing and receiving something that comes from an unknown source. As part of the same thought process Genly says: 'In such moments as I fall asleep I know beyond doubt what the real centre of my own life is, that time which is past and lost and yet is permanent, the enduring moment, the hearth of warmth' (1969: 204). T. S. Eliot also uses paradox to speak of spiritual enlightenment in the first of the *Four Quartets*: 'At the still point of the turning world Except for the point, There would be no dance, and there is only the dance' (2000: ¶4). Genly's spiritual experience seems to be nothing other than the inherent, always present familiarity of the Self impressing its permanence and truth softly upon the mind and heart of Genly. It seems that his ego has abdicated its throne enough for him to glimpse the true familiarity and love of his unknown Self: the hearth of warmth within him. This is how Genly is able to experience a sense of peace and home in a place that could not be more cold, strange and unfriendly in material terms. His vague and yet specifically mystical choice of words demonstrates that he has encountered something that goes beyond, and comes from much deeper than, the rational security of reason and

consciousness. Paradoxical expressions such as 'enduring moment' often describe mystical, spiritual or non-rational experiences. Scientifically speaking, a moment cannot endure, and so such a concept must occur outside of the limits of physical reality. To refer to 'the real centre of [one's own] life' is to speak of a place that cannot be geographically or scientifically located, but must be discovered in spiritual terms. Genly is allowing this knowledge to penetrate him from within, which is a sure sign that the anima-passage has been opened, and is in use. A rationalist would call these words mystical or crazy. But he is in the process of discovering what goes deeper than the rational, superficial life of the ego, and is more permanent: his true Self. Fear no longer contaminates his perceptions, and we see signs of the anima changing in his mind from an unwanted other to a welcome, long-lost friend who gives joy. There is definite movement here to the deeper stages of anima integration. Although this movement is not always linear or necessarily chronological, his expressions of this sort of experience become more frequent closer to the end of the novel.

There is a real breakthrough in Genly's understanding in the midst of their journey over the ice. It comes at a time when Estraven is struggling in the throes of *kemmer* to avoid Genly as much as possible. Genly cannot help but take this avoidance to heart, and believe that he has done something wrong to cause it. Upon questioning Estraven about it, there is a moment of silence in which he looks at Estraven and sees that '[h]is face in the reddish light was as soft, as vulnerable, as remote as the face of a woman who looks at you out of her thoughts and does not speak' (1969: 210). Because Genly is permanently male, his presence has seemingly precipitated the female to dominate in Estraven's state of *kemmer*. Because the sexual

drive of kemmer overrides all other aspects of personality, Estraven must avoid Genly completely in order not to let kemmer take over and trigger a sexual union. For Estraven this seems to be an immense struggle, but for Genly it is an epiphany to see his friend as a full-blown woman. He says:

[a]nd I saw then again, and for good, what I had always been afraid to see, and had pretended not to see in him: that he was a woman as well as a man. Any need to explain the sources of that fear vanished with the fear; what I was left with was, at last, acceptance of him as he was. Until then I had rejected him, refused him his own reality. He had been quite right to say that he, the only person on Gethen who trusted [me], was the only Gethenian I distrusted. For he was the only one who had entirely accepted me as a human being: who had liked me personally and given me entire personal loyalty: and who therefore had demanded of me an equal degree of recognition, of acceptance. I had not been willing to give it. I had been afraid to give it. I had not wanted to give my trust, my friendship to a man who was a woman, a woman who was a man. (1969: 210)

Here is the humility and Self-knowledge that has been largely absent in the behaviour of the envoy. This epiphany is a realisation of his own fault in his relationship with Estraven, rather than an observation of the faults of Estraven in his efforts to meet Genly's needs. Through this realisation Genly comes to terms with the fact that it is his own fear of the female that has limited his relationship with Estraven for so long. He begins to see his sexual prejudice for what it really is, in the light of its true context, and not as a projected illusion. He sees that it is because he has been unable to accept the woman in Estraven that their dealings have been so strained and so bitter. But this is not to say that it is only the biological woman in Estraven with whom Genly was at odds. It is significant that the initial reaction in Estraven towards Genly is one of absolute vulnerability. Estraven has been an anima figure all this time in the way that he has made himself so vulnerable to Genly by accepting and trusting him against all the odds. Estraven proves to have been a very wise and integrated being all along. But his integration with the feminine element of being is what has made him appear so threatening to Genly, and perhaps to Tibe and King Argaven as well. For such vulnerability and openness to the unknown demands much of the

person in relationship with it. To love someone deeply demands an equally profound love in return. However, if the object of love and vulnerability is not ready to receive it, s/he will shy away from it and see it as a threat to the safe limits of his/her current identifications. Estraven has identified very strongly with Genly's presence as an alien, as a human being, and as a representative of the Ekumen. He has allowed his current, conscious frame of reference to be extended to include within itself Genly's very large and intimidating reality, and all that Genly represents. He has allowed Genly and his purpose to make him grow. But Genly has not been able to identify with Estraven in the same way, until now.

Out of this observation of his own past weakness grows another key assertion that highlights this moment as a great, psycho-spiritual growth spurt in Genly's life. He says that a

... great and sudden assurance of friendship between us rose: a friendship so much needed by us both in our exile, and already so well proved ... that it might as well be called, now as later, love. But it was from the difference between us, not from the affinities, but from the difference, that that love came: and it was itself the bridge, the only bridge, across what divided us A profound love between two people involves ... the power and chance of doing profound hurt. It would never have occurred to me before that night that I could hurt Estraven. (1969: 211)

There is clear evidence here of anima function in the image of the bridge that love has formed between them. The fact that Genly perceives this image shows that he is making remarkable progress towards the wiser stages of anima integration, for he perceives its ultimate realities, and they are becoming a part of him. He also speaks of the bridge of love between them as built upon their differences and not their similarities. This is a profound point to make, since it recognises mystery and difference as something to be loved and accepted. When a person 'loves' that which is similar to him/her in other people, that love is little more than vanity or narcissism,

for s/he is loving only what 'is like me' in the other person. The moment the other proves to be different, the love will cease. Genly has discovered within himself the capacity to love more profoundly, in a way that sacrifices the comfort of what is known in order to welcome what is different, and could therefore possibly cause hurt and challenge. He has discovered the ego-sacrificing love of the anima that reaches across differences at its own expense (risking rejection) to connect and communicate with others. I believe that this perception in Genly has been made possible by the intrusion of his Self that was discussed earlier. The experience that he articulated then spoke of a sense of being-at-the-core: 'the hearth of warmth' where he feels he is utterly safe, valuable and joyful. This is an aspect of the feminine element of being that leads the individual to be-one-with another. One can only reach out and bridge the gap of difference when one knows that one's foundation on the bank is secure. Before that experience, Genly only seemed to find value in his own maleness and ego feelings of power. However, these proved flimsy and faltered when love and identification with another were called for. Genly lived his relationships in a limited way until his ego had suffered enough to let the Self show through and give him the joy and security he needed to be able to love truly. His revelations on the Gobrin Ice are a prime example of the profoundly changing effect that anima functioning has on the ego when its efforts are not eschewed but are allowed to pierce the hard wall of consciousness. Genly finally realises that he did not necessarily come to Gethen in order to change it and its people, but rather in order to 'be changed by it' (1969: 219). His focus has shifted from the need of others to change to his own need to change. To accept that he needs to change is to understand that his destiny is not a place he gets to, or a thing he achieves by his own strength, but rather that it is a process of becoming more and more who he was made to be. This understanding of the destiny

Le Guin has purposed for Genly¹⁶ gives him the strength to move in accord with that ‘will that moves in us but is not our own’ (Ulanov 1981: 26). It relates very closely to the image of home discussed in chapter one. Shevek reaches his destiny first and foremost by allowing his perception of himself and his society to change, and to be widened. However unfamiliar that will may have seemed to Genly, the feminine element within himself and within Gethenians, he has found the strength to let it move and improve him. He has finally accepted his vulnerability in relation to the world in which he functions, and so we leave him at a point that is well on the way to individuation and wisdom.

There is evidence of change in Genly’s new perception of his own people at the end of the novel. When his space ship is at last able to land on Gethen and be welcomed by its inhabitants, men and women from Terra and the other planets of the Ekumen step out to meet him. Genly remarks that, although Lang Heo Hew looked ‘precisely as [he] had last seen her, three years ago in [his] life and a couple of weeks in hers’ (1969: 249), they all were nonetheless ‘strange to [him], men and women, well as [he] knew them. Their voices sounded strange: too deep, too shrill. They were like a troupe of great, strange animals, of two different species ...’ (1969: 249). It is clear from these remarks that Genly’s immature identification with his own people has been broken through, and that he now has a much stronger and more accepting understanding of difference, to the extent that he is able to view his own people through the eyes of an other: a Gethenian. His immature identification with his people is reminiscent of Shevek’s early identification with Odonianism (as discussed in Chapter One), as is the way in which each protagonist breaks through his immaturity

¹⁶ The author admits that she sometimes allows her personal didactic purposes to shape the lives of her characters in her ‘Introduction to *The Word for World is Forest*’ (1993: 146).

into a wider, wiser perspective. The changed perception with which Genly meets his own people is a metaphorical illustration of the scientific idea proposed in *The Dispossessed*, which claims that 'you can go home again ... so long as you understand that home is a place you have never been' (1999: 48). It also echoes the claim in T. S. Eliot's fourth quartet, *Little Gidding*, that '... the end of all our exploring/ Will be to arrive where we started/ And know the place for the first time' (Hayward 1956: 442). Genly's once-familiar people have become strange to him, not because they have changed, but because of the way in which Genly has grown through his anima confrontations on Gethen, and '[been] changed by' (Le Guin 1976: 219) its people.

Chapter 3

Ged

Deep are the springs of being, deeper than life, than death (Le Guin 1979: 449)

This chapter looks at the character of Ged, the protagonist of the first three books of Earthsea: *The Wizard of Earthsea* (1979), *The Tombs of Atuan* (1979), and *The Farthest Shore* (1979), and the way in which his role is changed and developed in the fourth book of Earthsea, *Tehanu* (1990), and in the fifth, *The Other Wind* (2003). While in the first three books Ged is generally a young, proud, energetic hero who becomes archmage of all Earthsea, in *Tehanu*, he is a subdued and rather unimpressive old man. Because of his loss of the ability to perform ‘the art’ magic,¹⁷ he is forced to withdraw and rediscover, through the pain of that loss, who he really is. In *The Wizard of Earthsea* we are told that all of Ged’s ‘... pleasure in the art-magic was, childlike, the power that it gave him over bird and beast, and the knowledge of these. And indeed that pleasure stayed with him all his life’ (1979: 17). In *Tehanu* he no longer has the props of skill and great supernatural achievements upon which to rest his identity. At the same time Tenar’s elderly woman’s wisdom

¹⁷ I believe that the meaning of the word ‘art’ in this context is its earliest, broadest meaning, which the *Shorter Oxford Dictionary* (1933) says is ‘[Human] skill as a result of knowledge and practice’ (1933: 102). According to this meaning, the word includes scientific practices in its frame of reference, and does not limit itself to ‘[s]kill applied to the arts of imitation and design’ (1933: 102), which is a usage that only began to be applied after 1668. In this way one can understand the scientific *and* artistic nature of magic, and not be confronted with the dubious, modern belief that art and science are mutually exclusive. Jung seems to have been guilty of believing this modern fallacy, which is illustrated in his struggle to name his activity, as I have discussed it in the Introduction to this dissertation.

and compassion for the burned child, Therru/Tehanu, are foregrounded in a way that reveals the quieter, deeper magic that seems to underlie their relationship and daily life. I argue that it is Ged's inclusion into this powerful family relationship that becomes his redemption and escape from despair. Contrary to his initial expectations and desires, Ged's ultimate fulfilment lies not in wizardry and mastering the elements, but rather in surrendering himself *to* the elements – and ultimately (in *The Other Wind*) to the most humble and profound element of human existence: love and service in family. This chapter examines the context of Earthsea, especially the relationship between dragons and humans, and the way in which it affects Ged as an individual. The ensuing discussion shows how a great privilege can also become a great burden, and how Ged ultimately lays down the burdens he chose to take up as a young man. It is through laying down his will to power, and embracing his ultimate vulnerability that Ged finally becomes a truly free and integrated man.¹⁸ I believe that this integration happens in Ged's late middle age because it is only once he has sampled the fruits of mage-power fully, and found them unfulfilling, that he is led to seek fulfilment elsewhere, in the only place he has not yet looked: in an intimate relationship with a woman, and in family life.

Near the beginning of the fourth book of Earthsea, *Tehanu*, we are told about the wise old mage¹⁹ Ogion, who was once the master of Ged, and an experience he had with a fisherwoman on the island of Gont. The fisherwoman, according to Ogion, was neither traditionally educated nor versed in the art of magic, although she did 'make songs' (1990: 10). One of her songs tells of her kinship with those who dance on 'the other wind' (1990: 13). At Ogion's request, the fisherwoman explains what

¹⁸ It is only after Ged spends his power in the dry land, and gives up his desire for power that he learns (in *The Other Wind*) that magery itself is responsible for the existence of the dry land.

¹⁹ 'Mage remained an essentially undefined term: a wizard of great power' (Le Guin 2001b: 294)

she means in this song by telling of the beginning of the creation of Earthsea, at which time humans and dragons were one race. Throughout the Earthsea books, the image of human beings, as we know them, is developed into an image of absolute consciousness, rational enlightenment and control. The focus is on magery, which is a chiefly masculine activity, and has to do with the ability to subdue and manipulate the natural elements.²⁰ It is a completely conscious, reasoned and structured activity that takes place within an organised hierarchy, obeying the authority and knowledge of the archmage and the other masters on the island of Roke – the centre of the practice of magic arts. Dragons, however, are much less accessible in the significance they hold in the story. Their existence is often only mentioned and left unexplained. Their formidable appearance and being are focused upon much more than their activities. Dragons are described as powerful and fear-inspiring creatures, although they are not evil. They are feared and loathed by many, if not all, in Earthsea. They are marginalised, living in the far, mostly uncharted west, and therefore largely unseen. This invisibility and ineffability allows their existence to be taken up by the imagination, which then magnifies their threat and creates an image of them that may not reflect their reality. Hence the perception of their evil is not a true reflection of their instinctive wildness and wisdom. When dragons are seen and described in the story, the experience is always vivid, leaving a definite mark on the observer, just as their claws and tails leave scored marks wherever they land (cf. 1990: 44). While mages and most humans are seen often and busy with numerous activities – acts which need to take place over an extended period in order to build significance – dragons need only say one word, or be seen in one place in order to affect history profoundly. In *The Farthest Shore* Ged says ‘dragons do not do, they are’ (1979:

²⁰ In this sense it is similar to science, which is also coded in patriarchy as ‘masculine’.

335). This makes them an appropriate image of the unconscious, and the feminine element of being that resides therein. For, like the feminine element, dragons are not evil (except for Yevaud in *The Wizard of Earthsea*), but inspire fear in the isolated conscious mind because of their magnitude, wild nature and inscrutability. In *A Study of Dragons, East and West* (1992), Qiguang Zhao says that '[t]he Western dragon is a demonic image while the Eastern dragon is an apocalyptic one. ... just as the Eastern dragon's apocalyptic image is closely associated with heaven, so its dialectical opposite, the Western dragon-Leviathan-Rahab's, is linked with hell' (1992: 61). But however clear the symbolism of dragons is to each culture, Le Guin insists that the Earthsea dragons she has created are not 'St. George's earthy worm, nor are they the Emperor of China's airy servant. ... These are dragons of a new world, America, and the visionary forms of an old woman's mind. ... The dragons of Earthsea remain mysterious to me' (1993b: 21-2). She clearly makes room for her dragons to be either good or evil, depending on the perspective from which one is looking, but they are primarily 'wildness. ... subversion, revolution, change – a going beyond the old order ... of oppression. [A dragon] is the wildness of the spirit and of the earth, uprising against misrule' (1993b: 22-4). Le Guin's depiction of dragons emphasises *being* over *doing*, which, as I discussed in the Introduction, is also the emphasis of the feminine element.²¹ It is important to remember that to discuss the feminine element's emphasis on being is not to support the conventional binary that 'men do and women are'. As I established in my Introduction, the reality of women and the feminine element of being are not the same thing. Le Guin confirms this distinction between the feminine element and the real, daily life of women when her character Tenar says in *Tehanu* that '... all [she] understand[s] about living is having your work to do, and

²¹ Their wildness and revolution is reminiscent of the Odonianism of the Anarresti in *The Dispossessed*, or rather, reminiscent of what it was meant to be. The emphasis Le Guin places on their mystery is also reminiscent of the Handdarata in *Left Hand*.

being able to do it. That's the pleasure, and the glory, and all. And if you can't do the work, or it's taken from you, then what's any good?' (2001a: 118). Although Le Guin does emphasise *being* in images of the feminine element (of dragons, for instance), she does acknowledge the need of actual female characters to *work* and to *do* in their individual experiences.

The fisherwoman's story tells of how these two aspects of being – the masculine doing/known and the feminine being/unknown – which existed harmoniously in the first race, slowly become polarised into two races: humans and dragons. She says that, when both were integrated, they were 'beautiful, strong, wise and free' (1990:12). This image depicts a formidable and integrated people, whose conscious and unconscious selves interact as harmonious poles of existence. The fisherwoman is Le Guin's mouthpiece in equating beauty with wholeness and integration. Now that they are split, the focus of those who incline towards humanity is consciousness and activity, while the focus of those who incline towards the dragon is instinct and unconscious wisdom. This has to do with the fact that, at the splitting between dragons and humans, when dragons chose to fly and be free, and men chose to keep and to dwell (2003: 202-3), each had to make a choice. Those who chose to be free could keep the Language of the Making, while those who chose a life of doing and keeping chose to forsake that Language (2003: 202-3). Dragons are born speaking the Language of the Making, for 'the dragon and the dragon's speech are one thing, one being' (2003: 97), but after the split, human beings, sorcerers or mages, have to learn that Language in order to perform their art. There is conscious and reasoned wisdom to be found in the art of mages, and there is deeper, more ancient and natural wisdom to be found in the being of dragons. Mages must study and practice for many

years in order to become powerful. Dragons simply are. Apart, each form of life has its own positive and negative aspects, but together, before they were split, they are described as 'beautiful, strong, wise and free' (Le Guin 1990: 12). This description alludes to the ultimate qualities of the anima when it is integrated with the conscious ego: love, beauty and wisdom. Love is implied by the positive qualities observed in the original race: love between the woman describing her kin and those whom she describes. The fisherwoman sees beauty in the wholeness achieved by love, which is the goal of anima integration. According to Le Guin, wisdom and love are inseparable, since it is through loving and open communication between self and other that wisdom is acquired. No one who stands isolated, alone, untouched – unknown and inexperienced – can ever acquire wisdom. Lisa Bevere says in her book *Kissed the Girls and Made Them Cry* (2002) that '[Love] sees things we ... are blind to. And yet love remains unwaveringly true, even when flaws are in plain sight. Love sees all, because love is the very force behind all true discernment' (2002: 105). This is confirmed by the fact that the anima, as the loving function, is also the function that leads to greater Self-knowledge and wisdom.

When relating the fisherwoman's story to Tenar, Ogion admits that ever since that day he has wondered '... who we are and where our wholeness lies' (1990: 14), since even a brief glance at the state of Earthsea on all levels shows that wholeness is not a way to describe the status quo in any person's heart or home or country. The fact that the fisherwoman's story leads him to ask this question suggests that the answer to humanity/Earthsea's disintegration lies in the relationship between humans and dragons. It is interesting to note that, though the conscious wisdom of mages and the unconscious wisdom of dragons seem opposed, it is generally mages who show the

greatest respect for the power and being of dragons, and dragons who seem to respect and admire mages above other human beings. The many courageous deeds of Ged in the first three Earthsea books testify to the tenuous esteem that exists between mages and dragons. Ged, through his art, seems to be the only human being who can confront the unwieldy, unpredictable force of a dragon without becoming overwhelmed and consumed. In the relationship between a mage's art and a dragon's being, the courageous light of consciousness is seen as a worthy adversary, and therefore ally, of the deep, instinctive power of a dragon. This illustrates the prominence of the relationship between the conscious ego and the unconscious archetype. Though in many cases they may seem to be forces in opposition with one another, which would destroy one another, they are only opposed because they are poles of the same existence that, having become split, need each other in order to reach wholeness and integration. They persist in their opposition, each confronting the other, until a point is reached at which opposition becomes challenge, challenge becomes growth, and growth becomes integration and identification, one with the other. They need each other, ultimately. The unconscious needs the ego; the conscious mind needs the Self; dragons need mages, and humans need archetypes. The Self without the other is half-formed, half-lived.²² Thus the goal of integration of the anima archetype is not for the unconscious Self to subdue the conscious ego (which is what fear of the unconscious forebodes), or for the feminine element to subdue masculinity, but for each to confront the other until it is known by the other and wholeness can be achieved. This involves vulnerability and risk on both parts. In many images throughout the Earthsea novels, Ged is depicted in a position of extreme

²² Ulanov asserts that '[t]he person reaching towards wholeness is a contrasexual person, looking to join within himself or herself the energies of both the feminine and the masculine modes of being human. We are not either one or the other, but a mixture of self and other, same and opposite. This is what anima/animus looks like from a theoretical perspective' (Ulanov 1994: 4).

vulnerability against that which he confronts, be it a dragon, his shadow or a woman, and it is these images of vulnerability that convey his true courage and strength.

By the time we reach *Tehanu*, Ged is already a very wise man, who has been archmage of Earthsea for several years. Ged says to Tenar, 'I have died and been reborn, both in the dry land and here under the sun, more than once' (1990: 222). This claim is evidence of the many trials he has been through, and the deep growth they have stirred in him. Yet despite all of his best and most daring deeds, his world is as yet in a state of turmoil and disintegration. What is more, after his final act in the land of the dead (in *The Farthest Shore*) his power as a mage is gone, and he now exists as no more than an ordinary man with an unusual past. In *Tehanu* the mage Beech, when speaking of the present bad time, expresses hope that an act by the archmage will be the ultimate solution to the disintegration again (1990: 16). Yet the archmage's power is no more, which can only mean that his kind of power, that of magery, is not the ultimate solution to the problem. Conscious action and the drive to control the elemental world alone cannot mend that which is severed. It is revealed in *The Other Wind* that it is the misuse of mage power that caused the rift in Earthsea in the first place. That is why Ged at first despairs at having lost his power, for 'what difference did it make? ... Is the desert gone?' (2001a: 88). This leaves the reader with the question: what is the power that will ultimately bridge the gap in Earthsea? Although at first this question may not seem to have anything to do with the focus of this chapter, I pursue it nonetheless because the answer to the troubles in Earthsea is also, it turns out, the answer to Ged's troubles. The plot of *The Other Wind* tells, as I have mentioned above, that it is in fact magery that caused the rift in Earthsea. For, although men forsook the ability to speak the Language of the Making when they split

from dragons, mages have sought to learn it again and use it to perform magic and great works of power (2003: 203). In the Language of the Making, or the Old Speech, 'to tell the story is to make it be' (2003: 52), and so mages, by speaking their desire for immortality in the Old Speech, claimed for themselves (and all Hardic people) immortal life in a realm that belonged to dragons alone, who had chosen that freedom.

So [mages] made a wall which no living body could cross, neither man nor dragon. For they feared the anger of the dragons. And their arts of naming laid a great net of spells upon all the western lands, so that when the people of the islands die, they would come to the west beyond the west and live there in the spirit forever. But as the wall was built and the spell laid, the wind ceased to blow, within the wall. The sea withdrew. The springs ceased to run, the mountains of sunrise became the mountains of the night. Those that died came to a dark land, a dry land. (2003: 227-8)

The rift in Earthsea is brought to the fore in *The Other Wind* by the spirits of the dead who call to the living to set them free from the dry land. They find that immortal life in a lifeless, isolated realm is no life at all, and beg to be set free to rejoin the natural balance and order of things. The one to whom they call is no great mage, but a simple country sorcerer, Alder, whose greatest success is not in his art, but in the fact that he loved a woman deeply and well.

After Ged spends himself and his art in the land of the dead on Selidor, the alliance between him and dragons does not cease with the end of his art. While the first three Earthsea books tell us that dragons and mages have the utmost respect for each other, and that only a mage, through his art, has the power to confront a dragon, the ending of *The Farthest Shore* and *Tehanu* introduce a new element into the relationship between humans and dragons. When Ged is utterly without hope and power, it is the oldest dragon, Kalessin, who rescues him and the future king, Lebannen, by flying them back to Roke and Gont. In their utter vulnerability and weakness, the dragon perceives their great worth, and becomes their carrier, their

passage, from the unconsciousness and loss back to consciousness and home. Likewise, the anima is not only the function that leads the ego to delve into unconsciousness, it is also the function of wisdom, which returns the ego to its rightful place in the light of consciousness once experience has expanded its boundaries. The beauty of a bridge is that it is crossed both ways. The vagina is the passage that receives the seed as well as the path by which new life emerges. In a previous quote, Jung mentions the terror within consciousness of being swallowed up by the unconscious (the dragon). Without understanding the love of the anima, and thus rejecting its influence, this might easily be the case. In fact in many places, Jung has said that it is precisely the act of fearing and running away from unconscious experience that results in finally being swallowed up and possessed by it. It is only the running, screaming man who will be burnt up and eaten by the dragon. The one who stands and speaks will be heard. Jung says

[t]o the degree that the world invites the individual to identify with the mask [persona], he is delivered over to influences from within. "High rests on low," says Lao -tzu. An opposite forces its way up from inside; it is exactly as though the unconscious suppressed the ego with the very same power which drew the ego into the persona. The absence of resistance outwardly against the lure of the persona means a similar weakness inwardly against the influence of the suppressed unconscious. (1983: 96)

But the loving function of the anima recognises not only the worth of the Self, but also the worth of the ego, and so guides in a way that ultimately sustains and enlarges the life of the ego. Just as Kalessin does not abandon Ged to his death in the unconscious world, so the anima protects the treasure of expanded consciousness by bringing it back to the light after it has courageously received what the unconscious experience has to offer: '... the prize which the hero wrests from the fight with the dragon' (Jung 1972a: 212). The prize, in this case, is that Kalessin sees in Ged a value that goes beyond the usefulness and power of his art, because of his willingness to

sacrifice himself for the cause of life and the balance of the world. Ged could easily have chosen not to help the dragons against their unmaking; to conserve his own power and leave the world to its fate. His ultimate victory is achieved through his selflessness, vulnerability and love, not through his magery. This is a victory that stems from his being, and not from his doing. The treasure is that Kalessin perceives this, and so uses his/her²³ power to bring Ged's valuable life back to its rightful place. The treasure is that a once dark and imposing force has become his friend, one who identifies with him, and so has enlarged his experience beyond reckoning. To be a slayer of dragons is one thing, but to be their friend is much more.

Another aspect of this new relationship between dragons and humans is that we find Kalessin speaking freely and respectfully to Tenar, who is by now an ordinary woman with no particular skill in magery at all. Although the mage Ogion identifies magical power in Tenar she chooses against it, and prefers the life of an ordinary wife and mother. Kalessin has never witnessed a selfless or daring act by Tenar, so what is it that allows this previously unheard-of communication to take place between a dragon and a woman? Not only do we find that Tenar can speak to Kalessin, just as Ged has, but also that she is able to look him/her in the eyes, which is something that Ged, or any man, can never do. One could put this down to the increased feminist consciousness in the author of these novels, which has subsequently informed the plot. Le Guin says in *Earthsea Revisioned* (1993) that she couldn't continue her hero tale until she had, 'as a woman artist, wrestled with the angels of the feminist consciousness. ... From 1972 on I knew there should be a fourth book of Earthsea, but it was sixteen years before I could write it' (1993b: 11). While critics like Jill

²³ 'Whether Kalessin was male or female, there was no telling' (1979: 475).

Paton Walsh suggest that in *Tehanu* Le Guin was merely ‘doing penance’ (1993b: 12) for her male-dominated *Earthsea Trilogy*, I believe there is a deeper significance in these developments that can alert one to the important role the anima has to play in this story. For, although Tenar may not be the performer of any great acts in the eyes of Kalessin, she remains standing in front of him/her and finds the strength within herself to look the dragon in the eye, fully aware of her own vulnerability to the disastrous things of which Kalessin is capable.²⁴ Perhaps it is simply that the dragon respects all those who can find it within themselves to approach him/her with a willingness to see and understand the real, complex and valuable being of a the dragon, and not merely run away, fearing it as a singularly evil thing. Once again Le Guin depicts the need of the dragon to be recognised by the human being, and the need of the human being to be recognised by the dragon. This is the accepted vulnerability that leads to love at the heart of any anima-guided relationship. The feminine element of being is the very fabric of the relationship between dragons and humans. Will it also be the stuff with which the rift in Earthsea may be repaired?

Despite the treasure and the honour Ged received through the help of the dragon, he experiences shame and despair where pride and a sense of fulfilment ought to be. In *Tehanu*, when Ged arrives on Gont where Tenar awaits him, he is in a state

²⁴ I would not be surprised if the men of Earthsea found that they also could look a dragon in the eye without being burned to a crisp, were they simply and courageously to let go of the taboo that tells them they cannot. It is pure fear that keeps them from trying. In fact, I am a little disappointed that in the plot of *Tehanu* and *The Other Wind* Le Guin does not eradicate this taboo, by allowing one of the male characters to transgress it and find it substanceless. Without such a discovery, the suggestion in the novels is that women are in possession of a being or power that is greater than that of men, and so sexual controversy is not nullified, but merely reversed. In *Tehanu* Aunty Moss explains the difference between men’s power and women’s power with this analogy: ‘[Women’s] is only a little power, ... next to theirs, ... [b]ut it goes down deep. It’s all roots. It’s like an old blackberry thicket. And a wizard’s power’s like a fir tree ... great and tall and grand, but it’ll blow right over in a storm. Nothing kills a blackberry bramble’ (2001a: 122). It seems to me that Moss is speaking here of the power of the feminine element of being, rather than the power of actual women. The analogy she uses implies the depth, wisdom and invisible strength that we have discussed as functions of the anima, to which all human beings are said to have access.

of deep woundedness that demands an extended period of recovery. At this point in the story Ged still takes a back seat and it is Tenar and her burned, adopted child, Therru, who occupy the foreground. Yet this backgrounding of Ged does not come as a surprise, for there are several places in *The Farthest Shore* in which this time is foreshadowed in Ged's own words, as if he knew it had to come and desired it. In the boat *Lookfar* on the way to the island of Selidor with the young king-to-be, Arren/Lebannen, he relates a point of view with regard to his art and the use he makes of it:

When I was young I had to choose between a life of being and a life of doing. And I leapt at the latter like a trout to a fly. But each deed you do, each act, binds you to itself and to its consequences, and makes you act again and yet again. Then very seldom do you come upon a space, a time like this, between act and act, when you may stop and *simply be*. Or wonder who, after all, you are. (1979: 333 my italics)

Ged speaks of a very common human tendency, especially in the young, to equate meaning with doing and with use. The pursuit of achievement and glory is traditionally a masculine tendency.²⁵ When he was still the very young apprentice of Ogion in *The Wizard of Earthsea*, Ged asks his master what is the use of the plant fourfoil, since he has seen fit to point it out to his young ward. Ogion's reply is that the more important thing is to know '... its being ... which is more than its use. What, after all, is the use of you?' (1979: 26). Here already Ogion is teaching Ged about what lies ahead of him, and preparing him for the lessons he will have to learn for himself. Earlier in the passage, Ogion says, '[m]anhood is patience' (1979: 26), and Ged shows in his words to Arren that he has learned this after his many years of activity. He finds himself, as a grown man, longing for the ability simply to be rather than to do, and suggests in his communication of this discovery that too much doing,

²⁵ ... though I am not at all sure that this tendency is not equalled in women, but simply involves other forms of achievement and glory.

in fact, gets in the way of simple being. Le Guin implies here that there needs to be an absence of activity in order to give one the room to be able to contemplate one's being: one's inherent potential. Ged shows in this assertion that he now understands the deeper meaning that stems from knowing one's being, or contemplating one's true Self. He sees that doing can lose its meaning, or do great damage when it is not grounded in a true sense of being. This is illustrated by the terrifying consequences of Ged's first great act of magic, when he calls up the dead and brings upon himself a vicious shadow that hounds him until he is able to accept it as his own shadow. I believe that Le Guin's shadow clot is an imaginative manifestation of Jung's psychological feature of 'the shadow' in the psyche, which is a person's unrecognised but ever-present capacity to choose evil over good (cf. Jung 1958: 107). At the time he did not realise that the act was condemned from the very start because it stemmed from a false and arrogant sense of Self. He is still in a very immature (Eve) stage of growth in which thoughts such as this are frequent: 'But surely a wizard, one who has gone past these childish tricks of illusion to the true arts of Summoning and Change, was powerful enough to do what he pleased, and balance the world as seemed best to him, and drive back the darkness with his own light' (1979: 48). His dismissive approach to both Serret and the spirit of Elfarran at this stage in his life also demonstrate his lack of anima integration, for he sees them as valueless, other than the power they have to boost his own sense of self-worth. This is evidence of the fact that he is in the Eve stage of integration, for he can only see these women as objects for the satisfaction of his own desires. At the time he is firmly ensconced in the ego's tendency to believe in its own conscious 'light' and 'power' over and above the ancient and much-proved 'light', 'power' and 'balance' of the world into which he is born, which is perfectly capable of taking care of itself without him. He has very little

idea of his true Self, and so has no real sense of what he can and cannot do. Now, in relating this lesson to Arren, he conveys a very deep longing to be 'done with doing' (1979: 477) in order simply to *be*, which is in fact what will happen to him.

Later on in *The Farthest Shore*, and again in conversation with Arren, Ged says in his old man's wisdom: 'I stand in the daylight facing my own death. And I know that there is only one power worth having. And that is the power not to take, but to accept. Not to have but to give' (1979: 424). 'Accepting' and 'giving' instead of 'taking' and 'having' are very much evidence of the feminine element of being in Ged's current thought processes and lessons. Accepting and giving are reminiscent of the receiving and loving on which the whole discussion of the feminine element has centred. Accepting and giving are closer to the Mary stage of anima integration, for one is able to appreciate value in giving to and accepting other persons, instead of seeing them as objects to be taken and used as one sees fit (which is what someone in the Eve stage would do).

In the poem 'Song' by Le Guin, the speaker says that 'have and receive is the feminine for live' (1975: 21). In the context of the poem, I believe that the meaning of 'have' is closer to the meaning of the word 'hold', than it is to the word 'take', which is Ged's meaning when he says 'have' in the above excerpt from *The Farthest Shore*. Ged's powers as a mage certainly enable to him to take and have as much as he likes. Yet he seems to have learned that taking and having from the outside world only obscures and suffocates the treasures that are already inside him, waiting to emerge. They also disturb the balance in that the one who 'takes' and 'owns' everything for himself in fact burdens himself beyond his own capacity to bear the weight, while at

the same time impoverishing the world of gifts that have a rightful place. This is in fact what happens when mages claim for themselves the immortal freedom of the dragons, and we see the dire consequences of their greed in *The Other Wind*. The risk is that the scale will tip too far and bury him underneath all his own deeds and possessions. This is the risk of becoming involved in too much ‘doing’, ‘taking’ and ‘having’. With an adequate sense of being, and the patience with which to discover one’s being, one discovers the true freedom of manhood – the manhood of which Ogion says ‘[m]anhood is patience’ (1979: 26) – and the ability simply to exist within a world that already has its own order and performs its own mysterious magic. While it may seem that Le Guin is advocating renunciation of material things, and that I support her in this, it is not so much material things that are the problem, but rather certain skewed, power-seeking attitudes towards them, and other ‘things’ that human beings wish to possess. It is the desire to exert power through ownership that the author is questioning, which, I believe, is what leads her to divest her protagonist of the desire to own, have or take anything towards the end of his life. She spells out the consequences of taking and having, not material things, but life itself, in *The Other Wind* (2003), when the lives of the living are threatened and disturbed by the ‘dead’ who are made to endure a dry and desolate immortality.

Although Ged does show signs of needing and desiring freedom from ‘doing’, he struggles painfully with the task when the time comes for him simply to be, and not to ‘do’ anymore. In contrast to his own previous articulate and erudite persona, he now struggles to express even the most basic of ideas: ‘But don’t you—can’t you see—all that is over—is gone ... I have no power, nothing. I gave it—spent it—all I had. To close—so that—So it’s done, done with’ (1990: 78). This stammering answer

to Tenar's question seems to stem mostly from a lack of acceptance or understanding of what has happened to him. To have lost one part of himself seems to make him doubt all of himself, even his ability to communicate. Previously, as archmage of Earthsea, he was always the one who made things happen. Now the balance has shifted and something profound has happened *to* him, about which he can *do* nothing. It is as if he is being made, by a greater power, to practice the words he previously preached to Arren: that the only power worth having is the power 'to accept' and 'to give' (1979: 424). Though this may seem cruel at first, I will show later what a grace it is to be placed in such a position. Now Ged stands in a place where he has *given* everything he feels he ever had, which is his ability as a mage; now he has no power but the power to *accept* what he has/is now. Though this is exactly the desire he expresses to Arren while still archmage, there is nonetheless great resentment and despair in his entire demeanour at being bereft of his former gifts. Apparently there is a massive difference between speaking about and desiring those things associated with the feminine element of being, and actually integrating and manifesting them both physically and spiritually in one's life. It is as if Ged's previous connection to the feminine element/anima was merely an intellectual one, which brought him only as far as the Eros or Mary stages of integration: it was a figure in his mind that he respected and desired, but could not become a part of him until he crossed the threshold of vulnerability and made it a part of his very being. Ged is struggling deeply with the loss of a major part of himself, which, as hitherto the most public and active part of him, has left a very visible hole in his heart and mind. As the most prominent part of him, one can understand that it was also the part of him that occupied the most, if not all, of his persona. His face to the world was that of a wizard and the archmage, and the face by which most of his young and adult life was defined.

I have previously discussed the ego's attachment to the persona, which allows one to understand its resentment and anguish at the loss of the substance of its persona: the ego's biggest safety net/crutch throughout conscious life. The loss of the protective mask of the persona leaves the ego feeling vulnerable and exposed. One can understand that Ged would not be ready to accept this vulnerability yet because it is so completely new to him. Thus there is a necessary mourning period during which the ego must learn to live without the old persona, and be free to grow a new persona informed by more than just the conscious world and his 'usefulness' within it. This explains Ged's request not to have to face the King's men who come to do him honour, but instead to go away alone '[t]ill I learn to *be* what I am now' (1990:91 *my italics*). Marthinus Versveld says in his book *Persons* (1972) that man 'hides from himself by constructing a *persona* under cover of which he leads an unreal life' (1972: 87). At this point in the development of his character, Ged has clearly come to a point at which he has forsaken the persona under cover of which he has lead an 'unreal life' in order to embrace other, real aspects of himself that he has hitherto neglected. It is significant that the emphasis is already on learning to *be*, rather than *do*, which belies the acceptance that has already started to germinate inside him. This request signals Ged's internal acceptance of the fact that he is 'done with doing' (1979: 477).

There is an interesting comparison to be made between the image of 'a cup of water' (1990: 78) that Ged uses to describe his art/magic, which is now lost,²⁶ and the glasses of wine that he and Tenar now drink as they discuss his future. The water is appropriate as an image of magery, since it communicates the conscious clarity and

²⁶ 'Like pouring out a little water,' he said, 'a cup of water onto the sand. In the dry land. I had to do that. But now I have nothing to drink. And what difference, what difference did it make, does it make, one cup of water in all the desert? Is the desert gone?'. (1990:78)

abstract quality of the magic arts, which function mostly in a world of thought and air and intellectual wisdom. In its fluid, changing and mutable quality, water has also been seen as an image of femininity, which complements these masculine associations. But the fact that it is only 'a cup' of water also communicates the idea that, however pure, crystal, thirst-quenching and valuable it may seem when it is used, it is limited as a resource of power. Magic, knowledge and skill can only *take* one so far, they cannot *make* one who one is. In fact, to be a disciple of magery is to isolate oneself from many other fundamental human experiences and relationships. It is an imposed law that every mage should be celibate and live alone and mysterious in the eyes of others, usually till death, as a result of his gifts. Now that Ged's 'cup of water' is poured out (1990: 92), he sits and speaks with Tenar over a glass of wine. Though it is not literally stated, the wine seems to emerge as a response to Ged's earlier complaint '... now I have nothing to drink' (1990: 78). It becomes a symbol of the new phase into which he is growing: the drink that will nourish him now is not the cool clarity of magery, but rather the warm, carnal richness of relationship. For the wine does contrast with Ged's 'cup of water' in its richness, body and abundance. There was only one cup of water, but there are bottles and bottles of wine stored in Ogion's house, as if Ogion, being a mage, never had anyone to drink it with, and so saved it for one who would. As he sips it, Ged remarks that he 'never drank its equal' (1990: 92). Although this appears to be a rather insignificant remark within the conversation, it reveals much about what Ged will discover about life without magery. Though he may not realise it while still so preoccupied with his loss, he speaks also of his life and relationships to come, of which he has never lived the equal. In a sense the red wine offers a subtle glimmer of hope that counteracts Ged's current despair by seemingly filling the space previously occupied by the 'cup of water'. Red is the

colour of blood, and therefore is used to symbolise life. Although it may not offer the same promise of clarity and control, it does offer warmth and the enrichment of fellowship that is associated with wine and those who share it. Red wine is not something that is generally drunk alone, and in ancient and modern society it is often associated with celebration and the coming together of friends in love.²⁷ As he ‘pour[s] her glass full’ (1990: 94) it is as if the sharing of this wine between them marks the beginning of a new kind of bond: a phase during which Ged will finally be able to share himself with another in ways that go deeper than magic. In its colour, its intoxicating effect on the human body, and its associations with relationship, it foreshadows the link of love that will develop between these two companions: not merely an abstract one, but a real, physical, sexually consummated one. The image of the glass of red wine is much more physical and carnal than that of water, which also heralds a stage of life during which Ged will finally be able to proceed with the most basic, physical elements of human being in a much broader sense, and not only in his relationship with Tenar.

At one point, as Tenar drinks ‘a mouthful of wine’ (1990: 93), she observes to herself that ‘[i]t was like the dragon’s name in her mouth’ (1990: 93). This seems to be connected to the claim that, ‘[i]n the true language [of dragons] the deed and the word are one’ (1990: 133). Again the image alludes to a time of being as opposed to doing: to say a word in the Language of the Making is to experience its tangible reality, just as Tenar experiences the tangible reality of the wine in her mouth. The

²⁷ According to the New Testament, the first miracle Jesus performed on earth was to turn the water into wine at the wedding feast in Cana (cf. *NJB* 2002: John 2:1-12). Christians have inferred from this that wine is, at the very least, an important part of celebration: enough to warrant a miracle. Of course there is more meaning attached to wine within the celebration of the mass in Catholic tradition. Barbara Biziou, in her essay ‘Sacred Symbols’, claims that wine symbolises ‘celebration, bounty, [and] creation of new life’, while red wine symbolises ‘feminine power’, and white wine symbolises ‘masculine power’ (2005: 1).

ethereal, intangible suggestion of water (magery) is now juxtaposed with the carnal, hot-blooded being of dragons who, like the taste of wine in the mouth, simply are. I have already discussed the way in which dragons are fitting images of the feminine element of being. It is thus, through the thought of dragons and the drinking of wine, that the feminine element becomes a tangible force between Ged and Tenar. In the image Tenar uses to describe the wine, the *name* of the dragon, something abstract, becomes substantial: it assumes a body, taste and physical effect.²⁸ It is as though the feminine element also becomes something substantial and physical between them in the form of their need and love for each other. Never before has Ged (because of his art) really needed Tenar, although he may have loved her. Even in *The Tombs of Atuan* his power as a mage gives him strength to stand alone in opposition to the forces of the nameless ones, and save Tenar from them also. Now, through the changes that come with acceptance of the feminine element, vulnerability and need for another, Ged can become whole through another human being, and not through his personal power only. Though he still feels the absence of his previous powers as a great loss, he is taking the first steps towards a realisation and acceptance of the fact that he ‘... didn’t learn everything on Roke’ (1990: 113), and that it is only through the loss of his former invincibility that he would be able to experience the ‘lovingness that [Harold Searles says] is the basic stuff of human personality’ (1981: 46). This kind of love is only made possible through a deep awareness and acceptance of one’s own vulnerability and need for another. The physical manifestation and

²⁸ In Earthsea, to know the true name of something or someone is to have power over it, and therefore people only tell their true names to those they feel they can trust. Mages discern people’s true names through their knowledge of the Language of the Making. Kurremkarmerruk the Namer (one of the Master mages on Roke) says in *The Other Wind* that mages ‘granted to those who bear their true name life beyond the body’s death’ (2003: 226). Since each true name is a word in the Language of the Making, to know one’s name is to possess spiritual immortality. The problem is that this spiritual immortality must be lived out in a place of desolation.

consummation of the love that will henceforth give meaning to the lives of Ged and Tenar begins through a conversation over a shared bottle of red wine.

A final resonance of the red wine is revealed after Ged has just escaped the messengers of the king from Havnor, and fled to Tenar's Oak Farm, where he seeks solitude and healing. The men arrive at Ogion's house to find Ged gone and Tenar unwilling to lead them to him. At the taste of the same wine that Tenar offers them, one of the king's men recognises that the wine is from 'Andrades—the Dragon Year' (1990: 98). Based on the solid connection that has already been made between dragons, the anima and the new phase in Ged and Tenar's lives, this remark brings home the significant role that dragons still have to play, not only in the life of Ged, but in the well-being of Earthsea. The messenger's reverent response is to say: 'You honour us with a king's wine, mistress' (1990: 98). This wine, which solidifies a deep bond between Ged and Tenar, symbolising the integration of the anima into the being of Ged, and which harks back to the Dragon Year, is also 'a king's wine'. This allows us to make the connection that the feminine element, which now begins to heal the wounds in Ged's life, will also have a part to play in the work of the new king, Lebannen, to restore the wound in Earthsea. The fact that the wine is that of the Dragon Year is not coincidental, but suggests that the part of dragons in this new phase will take on a different form. Before this, they have been distinctly threatening and other or wild. Now they are alluded to with great reverence in relation to wine that is shared by human beings. The allusion is that they will become, in a sense, a part of the life that the human beings in Earthsea now live, as if the original unity of the first race will be remade. Their wildness will be combined with the rational efforts of humanity to form a whole again. The suggestion made by drinking wine of the

Dragon Year is this: before, a dragon would approach from afar – a danger on the horizon – an other of whom to be afraid. Now it is as if they will somehow emerge from within human individuals, not as an enemy, but as a necessary part of being with which to mend the whole, politically as well as spiritually.

This emergence of the feminine element of being in the form of a dragon is exemplified in the child Therru/Tehanu. She has suffered much, and lives with scars that leave her half-formed in a way that is grotesque to outsiders. For much of her young life she is dogged by rejection and misunderstanding because of the burn scars on the left side of her face and her left hand, which is now nothing more than a mangled claw. Having been abused by her birth parents, pushed into a fire and left for dead, she now finds solace and healing in the arms of Tenar, who takes on the role of mother when she finds her. Tenar and a few others (Lark, Aunty Moss, Ogion and Ged) are the only ones who, in the beginning, find it within themselves to show love to this poor, abused creature. The rest of society averts its gaze at the sight of her, making a ‘sign to avert evil’ (1990: 17), and assuming that her scars are the result of some punishment that she deserved (cf. 1990: 231). Yet despite the extreme vulnerability, weakness and threat-of-the-other declared by Therru’s scars, Ogion, in his dying moments, says ‘They will fear her’ (1990: 23). All through her childhood, suggestions of a greater significance, which goes beyond the limitations of the scars she bears, emerge around Therru. Before her true nature is revealed, Ged returns from his time of isolation and joins Tenar and Therru as husband and father in their family. In agreeing to take on this role, he ties himself with bonds of love to the scarred child, just as Tenar has done. Though their connection is not one of blood, they forge an intense bond of trust and love which seems to stem from the vulnerability each

experiences within his/her own being: the wine of the Dragon Year. The suggestion is that surrogate parenting (a family of choice) is more loving than a blood family. Although, of the three, only Ged and Tenar have shared this bottle, which is a symbol of the bond between them all, Therru proves to be the real, physical manifestation of that bond, not only in her utter vulnerability, but also in her kinship with dragons.

Shortly after Ged and Tenar have finally consummated and fully revealed their loving relationship to the world, they and Therru leave Oak Farm to go and help Aunty Moss who has fallen ill. On the way they are attacked and enslaved by the evil spell of the wizard Aspen, a disciple of the wizard Cob, whom Ged defeated in the dry land. His motive is hatred of Ged for the way in which he defeated the selfish will to power and eternal life sought by Cob, and also hatred of Tenar and the child for the way in which they display their vulnerability so freely, and turn it into a source of strength. At his first serious encounter with Tenar his true contempt is revealed in these words:

... a woman's tongue is worse than any thief. You come up here ... casting ... the dragonseed every witch sows behind her. Did you think I did not know you for a witch? When I saw that foul imp that clings to you, do you think I did not know how it was begotten, and for what purposes? The man did well who tried to destroy that creature, but the job should be completed. (1990: 127)

His hatred of Tenar stems directly from her loving connection with Therru, who he calls 'foul imp' seemingly because he sees, through his tainted art, that she is more than she appears to be on the surface. If she were nothing more than a scarred little girl, he would have nothing to fear from her. But his deep fear of Therru is belied by the reference he makes to 'how [she] was begotten, and for what purposes'. It is because he can see her true nature and the purpose for which she exists that he hates

her, and as a result takes Tenar for a witch who put some sort of power into the child. He perceives that the place occupied by Therru in the context of Earthsea is a very significant one, and that the purpose of her existence runs contrary to his own motives. The wizard Cob wants power over death and so (apparently) to unite the living and the dead. But through his efforts he unsettles the equilibrium and divides Earthsea. This radically opposes the drive for union between Ged, Tenar and Therru. The loving and unifying effect that Therru will eventually have opposes Aspen's divisive and selfish purposes, which is why he uses his mage's power to try and destroy her and her loved ones on their way to Aunty Moss, before Therru can mature. Although the powers of Aspen and Therru appear to be vastly unmatched, in the forms they occupy (he, a powerful wizard, she a mere scarred child), it is useful to remember the images used previously to describe magery (a cup of water) in relation to the feminine element of being (the red wine of the Dragon Year). The juxtaposition of these images suggests that the power contained in magery will be 'poured out' long before the power of the dragon/feminine element is spent. The suggestion is also that the effect of the feminine element is much more potent and lasting than the effect of magery (in view of the strong flavour and effect of wine). Aspen's cup of water pales in comparison to the wine of the Dragon Year with which Tenar's family has been fed. This leads us to anticipate what happens in the final chapter of *Tehanu*, which bears the same name as the book. Contrary to his intention, Aspen's efforts to destroy Tenar and family ultimately cause the full extent of Therru's power/being to be revealed.

As Ged and Tenar are caught in the wizard's spell, Therru becomes the focaliser (cf. 1990: 244) and we are made aware that her true, instinctive nature has

allowed her to avoid being caught in the same spell. Just as Aspen sees beyond her outward appearance, she is also able to perceive his true nature beyond his human form, which she sees as a 'forked and writhing darkness' (1990: 244). Therru is able to recognise spiritual reality as vividly as she sees physical reality. The suggestion is that her powers, in fact, outstrip his. She remains hidden from him while observing where he has taken Ged and Tenar. She then runs directly to 'the path along the cliff and to the edge of the cliff' and calls 'with the other voice the name she heard in her mother's dream' (1990: 244-45). Although she is still a child, she seems to have a knowledge inside her that surpasses her surface limitations and shows her what to do in the danger of her situation. Therru unconsciously knows what to do because of her 'other' sight, which comes from her burned eye (cf. Le Guin 1993b: 21). The eyes she sees with and the language she speaks in her Self are not those that were given her by her human 'parents'. She is acting now out of a deeper being within that is truer than her outward appearance, which is what gives her the power in this time of need to help Ged and Tenar. The name she calls is Kalessin, the oldest dragon, at the sight of whom Tenar is suddenly freed from Aspen's spell. At the cliff edge, where Aspen has brought Ged and Tenar in order to throw them off, Kalessin flies to their aid, and with one breath of fire, obliterates Aspen, his men and his spell (1990: 247). Kalessin asks after Therru in the Language of the Making, and it is thus that her true name and nature - Tehanu, child of Kalessin - are revealed. She is both dragon and human, or dragon in the form of human: one of the original race.

Tehanu is significant because she saves Ged and Tenar through her nature as a dragon, and through the loving connection between them as a family. Her instinctive wisdom saves them from the contempt of Aspen, and thus allows their family life to

continue in peace. In specific reference to Ged, she saves him in his newly accepted fragility and powerlessness (in the hands of the evil will of another), so that he may continue to live out the new life of love and family that has been given to him in middle age. Yet Tehanu, true to the feminine element/anima, does not do this only in her own strength, but achieves it by drawing on the truth of her being as the daughter of Kalessin, the eldest dragon in Earthsea. It is through a recognition of her own vulnerability and loving connection to her dragon kin that she saves her human family. In *The Other Wind*, her true being and loving connection both to humans and to dragons will also prove to be the stuff that mends the rift in Earthsea and saves humanity at large (although she is always shy and socially awkward in her human form). Although Aspen was still in possession of 'the cup of water' that is magery, the power that it gave him was not enough to outdo the wine of the Dragon Year, the feminine element, that runs in Tehanu, Tenar, Ged and Kalessin's blood.

The effect of this on Ged is that he settles into family life with a calm but deep passion, different from the active passion with which he pursued wizardly success. We see in *The Other Wind* that the focus of his life has shifted by the choices he now makes. At the King's invitation to come to Havnor to advise him on a matter of great importance, Ged refuses, and sends Tenar and Tehanu to go to the King's aid, claiming that they have more to contribute to the situation than he does. He not only accepts, but desires to remain in the margin, at home, where he can look after things while his family is away. He assumes a role that is traditionally feminine by choosing to stay and keep the house, like a 'wife', rather than seeking to be visible and active in

the public sphere.²⁹ When the sorcerer Alder comes to Ged seeking help, he suggests that the root of Alder's crisis lies in his power as a lover rather than in his power as a sorcerer (2003: 37). His wife Lily, who died at the height of their loving relationship, calls Alder to the wall between the world of the living and the realm of the dead at night in his dreams, asking him to free her from that place of desolation. During their conversation Ged asks 'what do we know of eternity but the glimpse we get of it when we enter that bond?' (2003: 38). He is speaking of the bond of love between a man and a woman. The fact that he expresses such reverence for relationship above any other power illustrates the extent to which he has grown and matured. This understanding could not be held by one who is still living through the persona of 'archmage of all Earthsea', for mages, by their own choice, do not know that kind of love. These are the words of a man who has experienced and learned from many, many things, who has come to a stage of acceptance of, and contentment with, his inner Self. These are the insights of a man who has learned through struggle to find value in simply being who he is, without having to do anything to prove his worth. Ged seems to have embraced the whispered and bellowed messages of the anima as fully as any man can, although it clearly was not an easy process. One sees evidence of the Sophia stage of anima integration in the fact that he now lives a life that is full of wisdom, beauty and love. He experiences these things as a part of himself, and no longer sees them as things apart that either need to be learned or eschewed. The passion with which he loves, the depth with which he appreciates beauty (cf. 2003: 36), the calm with which he waits for Tenar to return, the dedication with which he cares for things while she is gone, the freedom with which he shares his knowledge

²⁹ Ged turns away from public life completely, which is baffling because his reasons are not explained. It seems like betrayal of his friendship with king Lebannen, or surrender to shame. It might be over compensation for the extremely public life he lived before, just as the pendulum swings from one extreme to the other before it settles in the middle.

with those in need, all testify to the qualities of wisdom, trust, love, beauty, peace and faith, which stem from a deep sense of 'being-at-the-core' and 'being-one-with-another': the essential elements of the anima.

Among the people the King calls to Havnor to uncover the mystery of the rift in Earthsea, Tehanu begins to uncover her own destiny. She becomes an anima influence in the world and the lives of those around her through her ability to communicate with dragons, and so plays a crucial role in revealing the source of the division. Through the combined efforts of many at the King's court in Havnor, the people discover that the selfish desire for immortality of certain wizards has caused the dragons to lose half their realm, which has since become a place of desolation where the dead spirits of men and women live in perpetual despair (cf. 2003: 225-26). The dead spirits now call to the living to be set free. It is Tehanu and Alder who lead the way in unbuilding the wall between the living and the dead worlds, so that the dead may be set free, and so that the dragons may reclaim their realm. Le Guin chooses them seemingly because vulnerability is an overriding quality in both of them. In fulfilling this destiny, Tehanu takes her true form as a majestic dragon, and so is freed from her scarred and limited life as a human. She embodies beauty, wisdom and love in her dragon form/being, as the daughter of Kalessin, and in her loving connection to her human family. Her realisation of this destiny allows these things to be released again in Earthsea too. Through her role in unbuilding the wall, wisdom, beauty and love are released again where there was division, selfish ignorance and desolation before.

Ged's inclusion in the powerful family relationship is what saves him from despair in the sense that he is one of those who would have been condemned to live eternally in the dry land: living, but lifeless and loveless. By embracing Tehanu as his daughter, by nurturing and protecting her, despite the severe damage that has already been done to her, Ged is essentially protecting the one who eventually effects his own freedom to live and *be* according to the true Self he has been discovering all his life.

Conclusion

I walked through the world with the worldly
I craved what the world never gave;
And I said: "In the world, each Ideal 15
That shines like a star on life's wave,
Is wrecked on the shores of the Real,
And sleeps like a dream in a grave."

But far on the deep there are billows
That never shall break on the beach; 50
And I have heard songs in the Silence
That never shall float into speech;
And I have had dreams in the Valley
Too lofty for language to reach.

(Ryan 2003: 240-1)

Nora Barry and Mary Prescott say in their essay 'Beyond Words: The Impact of Rhythm as Narrative Technique in *The Left Hand of Darkness*' (1992) that U. K. Le Guin 'attempt[s] to introduce readers to a mystery by referring in her novel [*Left Hand*] to truths that are misunderstood when they are anchored to everyday logic' (1992: 154). They refer to W. Bittner's suggestion that 'Le Guin's critics read the novel measuring it against some standard of realism and emphasising what they can "talk about"' (1992: 155). I have attempted in this dissertation to focus on the more mysterious realities that are broached in the fiction of Le Guin, by using the mysterious archetype of the anima through which to understand the characters in her novels. It might be much easier to talk about the things that one usually can 'talk about': things that have to do with everyday logic, the 'mundane and familiar' (1992: 154), which conform to a general 'standard of realism' (1992: 155). But it is the mystery engaged by Le Guin that draws me to her novels, and the mystery engaged by Jung that draws me to his anima theory, because I am ever more fascinated by the

mystery involved in being a human person. Marthinus Versveld says in *Persons* (1972) that ‘civilisation is polluted by resolving reality into a series of problems the solution of which we hold to be certain, instead of being seen as a togetherness of mysterious beings who escape their own grasp’ (1972: 2). I have tried not to provide definite answers to indefinite problems, by embracing the mysterious aspects of the human psyche as it is expressed in Le Guin’s characters, and by treating them as metaphors that reveal human nature and do not minimise it. If one is interested in wholeness of being, then one needs to be willing to seek out the mysterious aspects of that being. I have focused on the material provided by Le Guin and Jung because their writing implies that there is much more to being human than meets the eye. Things are not what they seem. Jung and Le Guin courageously address and grapple with realities that rationalists would usually dismiss, simply because they cannot rationally or conventionally be understood, and do not fit into simple categories. The mysterious realities involved in being human, I believe, demand great respect and care when they are approached by an observer, just as one might tiptoe around a sleeping giant while being inextricably drawn to contemplate the mystery of what it is and why it is there. Contemplation, rather than explication or categorisation, is the only appropriate response to mystery. That is why I have largely avoided the opinions of rationalists and deconstructionists in my dissertation, except when I have felt it necessary to refute their claims. The rationalist would stand before the giant and say ‘there is no such thing as a giant’, and the deconstructionist would attempt a systematic picking apart of the giant, which is an impossible task for a puny human being, and will either result in false, limited perspective of the giant, or it will bring about the waking of the giant and the squashing of the deconstructionist.

Le Guin's novels introduce the reader to a mystery: the mystery of the journey an individual can take in order to move from immaturity to wisdom. Jung's anima theory has given me one way to contemplate the mysteries that lie beneath, in and around the surface life of a human being, male or female, which are often illustrated in the journeys taken by Le Guin's protagonists. I have attempted to reorganise Jung's assertions about the anima while simultaneously maintaining respect for the sleeping giant of the unconscious archetype, which, by its nature, is unrepresentable, and cannot be made fully conscious. I have also taken a risk in observing and discussing what I surmise are the ultimate qualities of the anima archetype: wisdom, beauty and love. These realities are also mysterious and extraordinarily difficult to talk about, but that does not make them any less true, real, or worthy of attention. The sacrifice involved in contemplating things that one cannot fully understand is equivalent to the sacrifice involved in the protagonist's journey from immaturity to individuation. Full Self-realisation and integration cannot be achieved without coming to terms - first of all - with the fact that there are aspects of one's own nature that one does not know or control. Anna Valdine Clemens claims in 'Art, Myth and Ritual in Le Guin's *The Left Hand of Darkness*' (1986) that '[i]n [*Left Hand*] Le Guin shows how sacrifice is a necessary condition for the experience of the transformative power of the archetypal feminine (as explored by Jung ...)' (1986: 424). This has been my own contention about the protagonists in each of the discussed novels. The protagonist is only transformed or individuated through the sacrifice and vulnerability that an approach to the anima demands.

In my Introduction, I focus on Le Guin's works and why it is appropriate to an application of Jung's concept of the anima. I have also taken the opportunity in the

Introduction to re-evaluate Jung's claims about the anima, and to revise the claims that I find are contradictory to his own primary argument that the archetype is autonomous and immutable, and not defined by its content, but by its function within the human psyche. The Introduction shows how Jung's personal biography greatly influenced his thinking about the anima, and archetypes in general, and I conclude that his assertions can only be trusted up to a point. With the help of Ulanov and other Jungian analysts, I have reformulated the concept of the anima as a feature of the human psyche that may also be called the feminine element of being. This, I believe, is also the 'archetypal feminine' referred to previously in the quote by Clemens. Based on the theoretical evidence provided by Jungian analysts and critics, I conclude that the ultimate qualities of the anima are wisdom, beauty and love. Because these are concepts or realities that have no definite form or content, they coincide with the nature of the anima archetype. The anima is fundamentally a function, and if its ultimate function is to connect disparate forces through love, wisdom and beauty, then one may identify an individual who is integrated with the anima by a demonstration of these qualities in his or her behaviour and character. I assert that the beauty referred to as a quality of the anima is not the outward appearance of beauty (promulgated by the 'beauty industry'), but rather an inner wholeness that allows one to perceive beauty in balance and in unity. I find myself in agreement with a line from a song called *Day by Day* by Point of Grace, which says 'somebody told me I could travel the world to find beauty, but to behold it I would have to carry it within me' (WOW Hits, 2004). This understanding of beauty shows that it can be understood as something that is resident in, and stems from, the inner Self or the soul of a person, which then allows one to perceive it in the outside world. Therefore the capacity to perceive beauty is evidence

of anima integration, since possessing the function of beauty within allows one to perceive it without.

These qualities relate to the vulnerability to suffering demanded by anima integration in that they are qualities developed in the character of a person, and not simply innate from birth. Love, beauty and wisdom are goals towards which individuals choose to strive, since even a brief look at the behaviour of human beings in general shows that they do not naturally occur in everyone. They need to be desired and sought by one who wishes to possess them. They are priceless, rare treasures that one clings to once one has found them. A relationship or a friend that is always full of wisdom, beauty and love is a rare thing indeed, which most people desire, but few make the necessary effort to find, and fewer still keep. These qualities are, I believe, ‘...the prize which the hero wrests from the fight with the dragon’ (Jung 1972a: 212) of which Jung writes (discussed in Chapter 3). There is synchronicity in Jung’s use of the term ‘the dragon’ and the prominent role Le Guin gives dragons in her novels. Both writers invest dragons with great (if ambivalent) significance.

It is ‘the fight with the dragon’ that involves vulnerability and suffering, the same vulnerability and struggle involved in integrating the anima. I observe expressions of vulnerability and experiences of suffering in the stories of the three protagonists, and show how these lead the character to become more individuated and mature. Shevek is vulnerable to the faults of the members of his society as a child, and it is this vulnerability that allows him to be hurt by them, break his extreme identification with them, and subsequently choose a path that leads him away from them and their conventions/rules, although it is a path that he follows for their good.

His willingness to step into dangerous uncertainty in spite of their disapproval shows the depth of his concern for his own people: he risks losing their trust in order to improve their lives. Genly Ai is vulnerable to the androgyny of the Gethenians, which poses a threat to his fragile masculine sense of Self. His suffering as an alien in a harsh and mysterious environment leads him to question his prejudices, recognise his fear of difference, and finally accept the friendship and love of an alien, the Gethenian Estraven. Ged proves vulnerable to the loss of magery, which has defined his whole young life, and has been the foundation of his identity and fame in Earthsea. The loss of his gift causes him to suffer a crisis of identity that eventually leads him to seek solace in his relationship with Tenar, which allows him to experience deep, committed, intimate love with another person for the first time, and provides him with wisdom and an experience of beauty that goes beyond mere knowledge of the art magic. Frederick Beuchner says in *The Sacred Journey*:

To do for yourself the best that you have it in you to do – to grit your teeth and clench your fists in order to survive the world at its harshest and worst – is, by that very act, to be unable to let something be done for you and in you that is more wonderful still. The trouble with steeling yourself against the harshness of reality is that the same steel that secures your life against being destroyed secures your life also against being opened up and transformed. (cited in Eldredge 2005: 98)

The steel of a survival mentality is opposed to the vulnerability and willingness to suffer loss that accompanies anima integration, and an experience of wisdom, beauty and love. The word steel connotes stereotypes of patriarchy, masculine invincibility, soldiery, and armour. Examples of characters in the three novels who steel themselves and remain untransformed are the wizard Aspen in *Tehanu*, Shevek's mother Rulag in *The Dispossessed*, and Prime Minister Tibe in *Left Hand*. Because of their hardness and resistance to change, they become antagonists and obstacles in the path of the hero. The steel with which they protect themselves from change and harm leads them to focus only on themselves and their selfish needs, and blinds them to the reality and

needs of others. Their steely resistance to suffering and consequent selfishness thus prevents them from being able to perceive or possess the treasures of wisdom, beauty and love. By contrast, C. S. Lewis says in *The Four Loves* that:

[t]o love is to be vulnerable. Love anything, and your heart will certainly be wrung and possibly broken. If you want to make sure of keeping intact, you must give your heart to no one, not even to an animal. Wrap it up careful round with hobbies and little luxuries; avoid all entanglements; lock it up safe in the casket or coffin of your selfishness. But in the casket – safe, dark, motionless, airless – it will change. It will not be broken; it will become unbreakable, impenetrable, irredeemable. ... The only place outside of Heaven where you can be perfectly safe from all the dangers ... of love is Hell. (cited in Eldredge 2005: 182)

The dry land, or the land of the dead, in the Earthsea books is a fitting image of the Hell that results from loss of heart, loss of love, and loss of vulnerability to feeling pain and experiencing mortality and death. It is telling that the reason for the existence of the dry land is that certain wizards in Earthsea chose to deny their vulnerability to pain and death. All three of the novels under scrutiny illustrate the results of successful anima integration, and the consequences of a refusal to accept the anima and the concomitant sacrifices that need to be made.

But however much I conclude about the invisible workings of the archetype and its integration into the individual ego, these conclusions must remain speculations and inferences. No final answer can be given as to whether a particular character's anima integration is ever completed. The archetype, and the process by which it is discovered and integrated, finally remains a mystery. It is thus that Le Guin can claim to be a novelist who 'says in words what cannot be said in words' (1969: iv). For ultimately no mastery with words can suffice to describe the entire reality of the archetype and the way in which it functions in the realm of the equally mysterious human psyche. All one can do is appreciate the fact that there are 'billows/ That never shall break on the beach' (Ryan 2003: 241) of understanding.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Le Guin UK. 1969. *The Left Hand of Darkness*. London: Orbit.

Le Guin UK. 1979. *The Earthsea Trilogy*. London: Penguin.

Le Guin UK. 1990. *Tehanu: The Last Book of Earthsea*. New York: Bantam Books.

Le Guin UK. 1999 (1974). *The Dispossessed*. London: Gollancz.

Le Guin UK. 2001a (1990). *Tehanu*. New York: Aladdin Paperbacks/Simon & Schuster Children's Publishing Division.

Le Guin UK. 2003. *The Other Wind*. London: Orion Publishing Group.

Secondary Sources

Abrams MH. 1993. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Attwood M. 'The Queen of Quinkdom: review of *The Birthday of the World and Other Stories*.' *The New York Review of Books*. 26 September 2002. 18 April 2003.

Barry N., Prescott M. (ed. D. M. Hassler). 1992. 'Beyond Words: The Impact of Rhythm as Narrative Technique in *The Left Hand of Darkness*. *Extrapolation*. 33(2). Ohio: Kent State University Press. 154-165.

Baumann P. 1989. 'Beckoned by the Mother Tongue: Positive Appraisal of *Dancing at the Edge of the World*.' *Commonweal*. August 11: 411-31.

Beebe J. (eds. N. Schwartz-Salant & M. Stein). 1992. 'The Anima in Film.' *Gender and Soul in Psychotherapy*. Wilmette, Illinois: Chiron Publications. 241-268.

Bevere L. 2002. *Kissed the Girls and Made Them Cry*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Campbell J. 1949. *Hero With a Thousand Faces*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Campbell J. 1988. *The Power of Myth*. New York: Doubleday.

Clemens AV. 1986. 'Art, Myth and Ritual in Le Guin's *The Left Hand of Darkness*'. *Canadian Review of American Studies*. 17(4). 423 – 436.

Eldredge J. 2003. *Waking the Dead*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Eldredge J., Eldredge S. 2005. *Captivating*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Eliade M. (trans. Willard R. Trask). 1954. *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Or, Cosmos and History*. Bollingen Series XLVI. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Eliot TS. (ed. Tristan Fecit) *The Four Quartets*. [Online]. 2000. Available at: <http://www.tristan.icom43.net/quartets/index.html>. (Accessed 23 December 2005).

Female Serial Killers. [Online]. 2005. Available at: <http://faculty.ncwc.edu/toconnor/428/428lect11.htm>. (Accessed 20 October 2005)

Fuss D. 1989. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*. New York: Routledge.

Gordon A., Barendse N. & Attebery B. 2003. 'Ursula K. Le Guin.' *Literature Resource Centre – Author Resource Pages*. (Accessed 18 April 2003).

Guntrip H. 1969. *Schizoid Phenomena, Object Relations and the Self*. New York: International Universities Press.

Hayward J. 1956. *The Penguin Book of English Verse*. London: Penguin Books.

Hillman J. 1987. *Anima: An Anatomy of a Personified Notion*. Dallas: Spring Publications.

Jung CG. (trans. R. F. C. Hull). 1958. *The Undiscovered Self*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jung CG. (trans. Richard & Clara Winston). 1961. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. London and Glasgow: Collins Clear-Type Press.

Jung CG. (trans. R. F. C. Hull). 1966. *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. 2nd ed.. London: Routledge.

Jung, CG. 1972a. *Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, Vol. 8. 2nd ed., Princeton University Press.

Jung, CG. 1972a (1927). *Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, Vol. 10. 2nd ed., Princeton University Press.

Jung CG. (trans. R. F. C. Hull). 1972b. *Four Archetypes: Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Jung CG. (ed. Anthony Storr). 1983. *The Essential Jung*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jung E. 1957. *Animus and Anima: Two Essays*. New York: The Analytical Psychology Club.

Keats's Letter to George and Thomas Keats: 21 December 1817. [Online]. S.a. Available at: <http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/english/melani/cs6/keatsltr.html>. (Accessed 19 December 2005).

Klarer M. 1992. 'Gender and the 'Simultaneity Principle': Ursula Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*.' *Mosaic*. 25(2): 107-21.

Lacan J. 1979. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.

Lefanu S. 1988. *In the Chinks of the World Machine*. London : The Woman's Press Ltd.

Le Guin UK. 1971. *City of Illusions*. London: Gollancz.

Le Guin UK. 1972a. *Planet of Exile*. London: Tandem.

Le Guin UK. 1972b. *Rocannon's World*. London: Tandem.

Le Guin UK. 1972c. *The Lathe of Heaven*. London: Gollancz.

Le Guin UK. 1975. *Wild Angels*. Santa Barbara: Capra Press

Le Guin UK. 1983. *The Eye of the Heron*. London: Gollancz.

Le Guin UK. 1989. *Dancing at the Edge of the World: Thoughts on Words, Women, Places*. London: Gollancz.

Le Guin UK. 1993a. *The Language of the Night*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Le Guin UK. 1993b. *Earthsea Revisioned*. Cambridge: Children's Literature New England.

- Le Guin UK. 2001b. *Tales from Earthsea*. Florida: Harcourt.
- Little W., Fowler HW. & Coulson J. (ed. C. T. Onions). 1933. *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Littlefield H. 1995. 'Unlearning Patriarchy: Ursula Le Guin's Feminist Consciousness in *The Tombs of Atuan*.' *Extrapolation*. 36(3): 244-58.
- Murray AS. 1994. *Who's Who in Mythology: Classic Guide to the Ancient World*. Revised Edition. London: Bracken Books.
- New Jerusalem Bible*. 2002. Ed. H. Wansbrough. London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd.
- Pettifor E. 1995. 'Process of Individuation.' *Carl Jung: Individuation Process*. Available at: <http://www.wynja.com/personality/jungarchf.html> . (Accessed 20 November 2003).
- Rubenstein A. 1998. *Bearers of Dreams: A Study of the Archetypal Symbolism of Fantasy and Science Fiction*. Dlitt (English). Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Russ J. 1970. 'The Image of Women in Science Fiction'. *Images of Women in Fiction: Feminist Perspectives*. Ed. Susan Koppelman Cornillon. (Bowling Green, 1972). 79-94.
- Russ J. 1995. *To Write Like a Woman: Essays in Feminism and Science Fiction*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Ryan AJ. (ed. Joyce Kilmer) 2003. 'Song of the Mystic' *Anthology of Catholic Poets*. Amsterdam: Fredonia Books.
- Sanford JA., Lough G. 1988. *What Men Are Like*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Scholes R. 1974. 'The Good Witch of the West.' *The Hollins Critic*. XI(2) April: 2-12.

Scholes R. 1981. *Elements of Fiction: An Anthology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith RC. 1996. *The Wounded Jung: Effects of Jung's Relationships on His Life and Work*. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Suvin D. 1972. 'On the Poetics of the Science Fiction Genre.' *College English*. 34(73): 372-82.

The Big Secret. [Online]. S.a. Available at:

<http://www.menstuff.org/issues/byissue/childmaltreatment.html#secret>. (Accessed 12 September 2005).

Ulanov A. 1981. *Receiving Woman: Studies in the Psychology and Theology of the Feminine*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Ulanov A., Ulanov B. 1994. *Transforming Sexuality: The Archetypal World of Anima and Animus*. Boston: Shambala Publications.

Ulanov A., Ulanov B. 1999. *Healing Imagination*. Canada: Daimon Verlag.

Versveld M. 1972. *Persons*. Cape Town: Buren Publishers Ltd.

Watsky P. 'Anima.' *Jung Society of Atlanta*. Fall 2001. Available at:

<http://www.jungatlanta.com/anima.html>. (Accessed 20 November 2003).

Winnicott DW. 1975 'Primary Maternal Preoccupation' *Through Paediatrics to Psychoanalysis: Collected Papers*. Basic Books.

WOW Hits 2004: Day by Day. Point of Grace, Track 7. 2004. [cd]. USA: Emi Cmg Distribution.

Zhao Q. 1992. *A Study of Dragons, East and West*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.