

The Philosophies behind Revolutionary and Evolutionary Ways towards Social Justice in the Works of Jack London and Upton Sinclair

George SHADURI*

Abstract

Two prominent American writers of the Progressive Era, Jack London and Upton Sinclair, wrote their landmark works on the topic of social justice. Setting socialism as the ultimate goal of the development of society, their visions differed in terms of the ways and methods of achieving this goal. London advocated revolutionary ways of political struggle, while Sinclair preferred more democratic methods (elections). This difference in the visions was reflected in the personalities of the protagonists of their novels as well as the philosophies of the latter. The article explores how these philosophies are linked to the idols of the writers' youth: Friedrich Nietzsche (London's) and Jesus Christ (Sinclair's) and shows that for them the ideas of these idols are a matter of belief, rather than that of reason.

Keywords: revolution, socialism, Nietzscheanism, Jesus Christ, 'the red beast', 'the socialist of heart'

Introduction

Social justice has always been one of the important themes in American literature. Rapid development of capitalism in the antebellum USA changed the society, opening new prospects both for individuals and the state. At the same, the problem of social inequality exacerbated at the turn of the 19th-20th centuries. The business fever of the Gilded Age increased social discrepancy between, on the one hand, well-off classes, and, on the other hand, lower strata of society, resulting in demands for social reforms in the Progressive Era. The latter were stirred up by popularity of newly fledged socialist theories, especially that of Marx. Although in the USA Marxism was not as influential as in Europe, its ideas penetrated into the minds of working class, having boosted socialist movement in form of trade-unionism, workers associations and following the popular leaders.

This process influenced a lot of men of letters. Many realist and naturalist writers became carried away with the ideas of social justice, introducing this theme into their plots, being not unanimous regarding the ways of achieving social equality. American Edward Bellamy and English William Morris 'exchanged' the novels about the socialist future, the first one having proposed the evolutionary, and the second the revolutionary way of achieving social justice (Spiller, et.al., 1979). The debate regarding evolution and revolution became more and more acute, both sides suggesting their arguments with regard to success of the cause. Jack London (1876-1916) and Upton Sinclair (1878-1968) are the writers of the same generation who believed in the same thing, but whose outlook on the ways and methods of political struggle largely differed. In his writing, London suggested revolutionary way of achieving the desirable goal, while Sinclair, experiencing not less antipathy towards capitalism than London, still favored the path of participating in democratic elections.

* Affiliated Assoc. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Education, International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia. E-mail: gshaduri@ibsu.edu.ge

Both London's and Sinclair's positions are rooted in their personalities, affiliations to a social class, and life experience. Both of them being socialists, neither of them were very close to a 'scientific' understanding of potential success of socialism. In fact, they were quite far from the theory of socialism (Samarin, 1961; Dell, 1927). Being fully dedicated to the idea, they drew inspiration from philosophical sources other than those of the classics of 'scientific' socialism. At the same time, their philosophies represent the opposite polarities, being grounded on well-known philosophic doctrines of our age and era (in London's case it is Friedrich Nietzsche, in Sinclair's case it is Jesus Christ). Investigating the essence of these polarities on the example of some of their works considering the character and mindset of their protagonists represents the subject of the present article.

London's and Sinclair's Protagonists and their Characters

One of the important themes in London's works is the striving for winning of woman by the protagonist. Let us consider from this standpoint three works of London's: a Klondike short story "The Son of the Wolf" (1900); a semi-autobiographical novel *Martin Eden* (1909); and a dystopian novel *The Iron Heel* (1908). While *Martin Eden* was referred by the writer himself as a novel with a Nietzschean protagonist being under delusion (Sciambra, 1996), in *The Iron Heel*, this flaw of protagonist's personality had ostensibly been corrected. Our task is to demonstrate here that in this novel London could not manage to escape Nietzscheanism anyway.

In "The Son of the Wolf" Scruff McKenzie wins Zarinska by courage and deftness from a tribe of Native Americans; in *Martin Eden*, Martin wins Ruth by proving his capacity of fulfilling unimaginable objectives; in *The Iron Heel*, Avis Cunningham is quite soon conquered by Earnest Everhard's talent, charm, and physical strength. Interestingly, physical strength is integral part of London's male protagonists even if they aspire for purely intellectual aims. In *Martin Eden*, Ruth beholds her worshipper's exceptional physical power as well as ability to fight for life or death:

...Under that muscular body of his he was a mass of quivering sensibilities... (TCWs, Vol. 7, p. 3)

...the wrinkling of the coat across the shoulders, and series of wrinkles in the sleeves that advertised bulging biceps muscles... (Ibid., p. 4)
... "You have such a scar on your neck, Mr. Eden," the girl was saying. "How did it happen?" <...> "A Mexican with a knife, miss".. (Ibid., p. 4)

Literally the same is expressed in *The Iron Heel* by Avis when she beholds Earnest:

...And on this site, as always, the cloth bulged with his muscles, with the coat between the shoulders, what of the heavy shoulder-development, was a maze of wrinkles. His neck was the neck of a prize-fighter, thick and strong (Iron Heel, pp. 9-10).

Whether in "The Son of the Wolf", or in *Martin Eden* and *The Iron Heel*, young women to be won are being attracted by their lovers physically and emotionally:

...she felt drawn to him. She was surprised by a wanton thought that rushed into her mind. It seemed to her that if she could lay her two hands upon that neck that all its strength and vigor would flow out to her. She was shocked by this thought (TCWs, Vol. 7, p. 8).

...it was the man himself. I had never met a man like him. <...> I liked him; I had to confess it to myself. And my liking for him was founded on things beyond intellect and argument (The Iron Heel, p. 21).

And all this happens contrary to the fact that both those to win and those to be won belong to different ethnical or social class. McKenzie is a white American, while Zarinska is a redskin Native; both Martin Eden and Earnest Everhard come from the working class, while Ruth and Avis are from the high class elite.

"The Son of the Wolf" is the most naturalistic of the three works; *The Iron Heel* is the most social-justice-oriented; *Martin Eden* lies somewhere in between. But in all the three, the male protagonists are somehow similar. What unites them together is their masculinity, their will of iron. In all the three cases their female lovers submit to them sooner or later⁽¹⁾. If Scruff McKenzie is a 'wolfish' predator admired by Zarinska, and Martin Eden is considered 'savage' by Ruth's family, whom Ruth actually likes, Ernest Everhard is superman in the eyes of Avis:

I had always heard that the strength of men was an irresistible attraction to women; but he was too strong... I wanted to see him mastering men in discussion, the war-note in his voice; to see him in all his certitude and strength, shattering their complacency, shaking them out of their ruts of thinking (The Iron Heel, p. 23)

Such a portrayal of men, bordering super-humans, followed by admiration from the side of their women in London's works matches perfectly the ideas expressed in section XVIII called "Old and Young Women" from Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, one of London's favorite books (Sciambra, 1996).

Comparing the mentioned motif with that of Upton Sinclair's, let us note that sometimes the protagonists of Sinclair's novels match those of London's by strength of body and character. The closest to those is *The Jungle's* Jurgis Rudkus, who has great physical strength, no fear for difficulties, and deep love for his wife Ona. However, what differentiates him from both Martin Eden and Ernest Everhard is absence of individualistic spirit, of the willingness of self-assertion. It is true, Jurgis works hard, combats unbearable challenges, does what other person would probably not be able to do, but his motives are different. Jurgis's incentive is domestic, it is to provide secure life to his wife and children. Of course, he deeply loves his wife. At some point of the novel, however, when he realizes that he failed, he even regrets that he had got married, concluding that it is marriage that brought him to fail. Just like Martin and Earnest, Jurgis is of great physical strength. However, in difference to Martin and Earnest, Jurgis lacks not only self-assertion, but also education. Either to win woman, or to conquer society is not an objective in itself for Jurgis. That is where the difference in their approach to their private life lies. And the difference in their attitude to social life is of the same root as well.

London vs. Sinclair: Views on the Methods of Political Struggle

Let us now refer to differences in London's and Sinclair's outlook on the ways and methods of socio-political struggle. The ultimate objective of both is clear: it is socialism. However, they view differently the ways towards socialism. London does not believe in reforms, in evolutionary means for achieving social justice, for him Revolution is the only acceptable and accomplishable path. In contrast to him, Sinclair rejects violent forms of achieving social justice, for him social reforms achieved through elections are the only means for success, he rejects Revolution, putting Evolution

instead. Let us refer to their journalistic works, reflecting their views on the issue.

In the essay "How I Became a Socialist" (1903), London explains his reason for becoming the one. In this work, he states that only after he had met the exhausted and ailing workers from Eastern states, he understood that his fate would be the same. In his words, before that he, being extremely fit, strong, and proud of his muscles, had always viewed himself as Nietzsche's 'blond beast', roaming the country, "lustfully roving and conquering by sheer superiority and strength" (TCWs, Vol. 6, p. 35). He reiterates the term 'blond beast' two more times in his essay underlining what a desperate lad he was while traveling around, and the reader can feel how obsessed he was by Nietzsche's ideas in his youth. As he admits by himself, his ardor cooled down having witnessed the plight of workers from the East Coast. He even converted from Nietzscheanism and Spenserianism to socialism. Still, having converted, he maintained bellicose spirit of the thinker who guided him through his youth. Rationally, he evolved from Nietzscheanism and Spenserianism towards Marxism, having framed his worldview, in a more, using philosophic terminology, materialistic cover. However, the essence of his outlook, the core of his mindset had been maintained. Another of his essays, "Revolution" came out in 1906, the next year after the Russian revolution of 1905. In this essay, the former 'blond beast' becomes the 'red beast'. Denouncing fairly the faults and filth of capitalism of his time, he both reviews the general situation of workers and gives illustrative and horrible examples of personal life tragedies. At one point he states:

This red banner, by the way, symbolizes the brotherhood of man, and does not symbolize the incendiarism that instantly connects itself with the red banner in the affrighted bourgeois mind (TCWs, Vol.6, p. 72).

It is true that the red proletarian banner symbolizes the brotherhood of man, and the writer, being a worker by birth, believed in such brotherhood, which is quite American (let alone Walt Whitman be recalled with this regard as one of his great predecessors, for example). It seems, though, that for London this red banner means also something else.

This 'something else' should, again, be action, individualism (within collectivism though), ability of overcoming challenges, striving and will for fighting, and doing this constantly and desperately, as he had been doing for the whole of his life. As a result, there comes Revolution as a means for achieving such brotherhood with 7,000,000 pairs of hands ready for rebellion:

This is revolution. And, further, these 7,000,000 men are not an army on paper. Their fighting strength in the field is 7,000,000... And they are fighters... They are unafraid of war... They meet violence with violence...

(TCWs, Vol.6, p. 74)

Soviet critics, always welcoming London's revolutionary spirit, would often make a reservation that he still lacked the understanding of 'scientific socialism'. The Communist party had always considered *individual* terrorism (assassinations) as a *mistake* of certain revolutionary circles. It is not the case with London, though. Truly in Nietzschean spirit, he is both individualist and anti-Christian (with his allusion to Tolstoy's non-violence below) to the core:

I am a revolutionist. Yet I am a fairly sane and normal individual. I speak, and I *think*, of these assassins in Russia as "my comrades." So do all the comrades in America, and all the 7,000,000 comrades in the world. Of what worth an organized, international, revolutionary movement if our comrades are not backed up the world over! The worth is shown by the fact that we do back up the assassinations by our comrades in Russia. They are not disciples of Tolstoy, nor are we. We are revolutionists.

(TCWs, Vol.6, p.74)

Transformation of London's personality from the 'blond beast' to the 'red beast' meant the re-evaluation of the values together with preservation of individualistic warlike spirit, as expressed in the shift of his mindset from denunciation of the 'revolt of slaves' to deification of the revolution to be done by 'the people of the abyss'⁽²⁾.

Upton Sinclair's position with regard to establishment of social justice is different. If London is radical, Sinclair is moderate. Having other motives than romantic seeking for adventure, Sinclair started his creative passage as a muckraker and proceeded as an

intellectual social rebel. His landmark novel *The Jungle* is at the same time the bridge between his purely muckraking start and further continuation as a proletarian writer⁽³⁾. Despite tremendous drama penetrating the whole novel, illustrating the plight of industrial proletariat of Chicago, the novel's ultimate goal of struggle is not an organized revolution. Instead, novel's pages contain the ideas about seizing the power by proletariat through elections. When Jurgis has finally been converted into socialism by joining the ideologically charged group of people, the novel finishes with the ardent words of a socialist orator, who predicts the impending victory of workingmen to be mobilized to win the votes:

And we shall organize them, we shall drill them, we shall marshal them for the victory! We shall bear down the opposition, we shall sweep it before us – and Chicago will be ours!

(*The Jungle*, p. 341)

Being as devoted socialist as London, Sinclair nevertheless believed in the "velvet" transformation of capitalist system existing in USA into a socialist one. His essay *The Industrial Republic*, which was written and published in 1907, i.e. right after the success of *The Jungle*, contains the below words about writer's socio-political creed:

What do I mean by an Industrial Republic? I mean an organization for the production and distribution of wealth, whose members are established upon a basis of equality; who elect representatives to govern the organization; and who receive the full value of what their labour produces.

(*An Industrial Republic*, p. X)

In other words, what is meant is a purely socialist state being called "industrial" owing to those who run it – common people, workers, or, proletariat. The means for achieving equality and equal distribution of wealth are through reforms though, and there is even the exact date given when this objective can be accomplished:

...I look to see the most essential features of the great transformation accomplished in America within one year after the Presidential election of 1912.

(*An Industrial Republic*, p. X)

In other words, socialism is achievable through reforms and not revolution. Thus, Sinclair is a

rebel and reformer at the same time. What Sinclair preaches is action and patience, changes and moderation, revolt and meekness. And there is a particular ground for such controversy. Unlike London, who came from lower classes, Sinclair was a descendant of a middle-class impoverished aristocratic Southern family. As he admits by himself in his *Autobiography*, the complex of a 'poor relation' led him to think about the problem of difference between the rich and the poor, being one of the reasons of his 'revolt' (*Autobiography*, p. 99). On the other hand, aristocracy in had traditionally been married with religion in Anglo-American world. So was Sinclair's family, which was Episcopalian in true aristocratic spirit. Christianity had a profound effect on him, and, as he says

I really took the words of Jesus seriously... I thought I was helping to glorify the rebel carpenter, the friend of the poor and lowly, the symbol of human brotherhood.
(*Autobiography*, p. 99)

Thus, for Sinclair, Jesus is both a 'rebel' and, at the same time, a 'friend of the poor and lowly', 'the symbol of human brotherhood'. Apparently, Sinclair's and London's understanding of 'human brotherhood' is identical – that is brotherhood based on social equality and justice, i.e. socialism. The link between Jesus and socialism is obvious – there are slaves existing in both ages, those oppressed, who rebel against their oppressors, the antique elite and his contemporaneous capitalists respectively. This link between antique Christianity and socialism of our times has been explored by a lot of works – Karl Kautsky's *Der Ursprung der Christentumus*, Walter Rauschenbusch's article "Economic of Jesus", or Howard Pyle's *Rejected of Men* to name but the few (Ball, 2019). However, Sinclair's idol with regard to the path towards this brotherhood is different. Indeed, it is useful to remember why Jesus, being a 'friend of the poor and lowly' and an adversary of the elite, was still not accepted by the community in which he lived. Being viewed a King of Israel, a Messiah, he was expected to lead the oppressed from Roman yoke towards liberty, to rebel, which a true political leader would do. Instead, Jesus offered what Jack London reproachfully labeled as 'discipline of Tolstoy' – rejection of force, non-violence, 'love of neighbor'. Who knows how Jesus would have acted had he lived in the society with

democratic institutions like that of Hellas, whether he would have chosen the way of Socrates or that of Plato⁽⁴⁾. Anyway, Sinclair's idea of struggle was closer to that followed later by Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi, whose personalities are more associated to Tolstoy than to Knut Hamsun⁽⁵⁾.

The Ways of Political Struggle Confessed by London's and Sinclair's Protagonists

In terms of methods of struggle confessed by the heroes of our authors, protagonists of their novels reflect the writers' personalities. Indeed, Scruff McKenzie is Jack London himself in his romantic search for adventures in Klondike, Martin Eden is, again, London halfway towards his creative and social success, while Earnest Everhard is still London after the changes in his mindset. As expressed in first two examples, Nietzsche is an icon kept in their bosom. They are London's 'blond-beasts', the image he worshipped in his younger years, his favorite heroes, expressing the writer's point of view and largely coinciding with his image. As far as Earnest Everhard is concerned, this character possesses certain duality proceeding both from his socio-political beliefs and individualistic personality. Earnest Everhard is London's personal hero again, but the one already 'converted' into socialism. His charm and attractiveness as a physically and psychologically strong 'stud' was already discussed above. This is Martin Eden enriched by 'scientific socialism', but having neither lost his physical strength, nor neglected his iron will. Earnest comes from working class, first he worked at the mills, and later became a horseshoer. He is self-educated, speaks German and French, and makes his 'meagre' living through translations of scientific and philosophical works for a socialist publishing house in Chicago (*The Iron Heel*, p. 22). At his first debate at his future wife Avis's house with oligarchs, he attacks the system under which they flourish and through which they exploit the working class, calling the capitalist system a system based on "pig-ethics" (p. 27). One cannot help recalling famous lines:

Hog Butcher of the World,

Tool Maker, Stacker of Wheat,
Player with Railroads and the
Nation's Freight Handler;
Stormy, husky, brawling...⁽⁶⁾

Earnest is intellectual and romantic at the same time. He is a horseshoer, with horseshoe representing a metaphysical symbol of good luck (Hornby, 1995). At some point he even compares the struggle of his comrades with that of 'rescuing' and 'saving' of 'the Holy Grail' (p. 58). At the same time, this medieval allusion speaks not so of his Christianity, as of his soul of a knight, 'sweetness of unselfishness, renunciation, and martyrdom' (p. 58). On the pages of *The Iron Heel*, Everhard shows extreme erudition, education, knowledge of Marxist sociology, and great capacity for defeating an opponent in discussion. For Avis Cunningham, he is not just an attractive 'stud' and intellectual, he is her 'oracle' with 'his gaze and his hand-clasp growing firmer and steadier, if that were possible'. Earnest smashes all his opponents' arguments with his knowledge of Marxist political economy – here he reasons dialectically, not 'metaphysically' as he jocularly refers to the way of thinking of his future wife. He describes and grounds inevitability of perish of the middle class, occurring as a result of the antagonism between capitalists and proletarians, and having done so, he culminates in prediction about the power to be seized by the working class. At first, he describes how the power will be taken 'by the power of their ballots on election day', and when his opponent asks him what they will do if they are still deprived of the power, his answer is:

That day also, have we considered... in that day, I say, we shall answer you; and in roar of shell and shrapnel and in whine of machine-guns shall our answer be couched.
(*The Iron Heel*, p.71)

In this famous monologue of his in Chapter V ("Philomaths") Earnest uses the word "power" ten times. However, for Earnest, power is not just a mundane means for political rule, it is the end justified by the means. That is why in the monologue about power he always capitalizes this word. Being a dialectician in Marxist terms, when reasoning about and grounding the inevitability of destruction of capitalism, Earnest becomes a true metaphysician speaking about Power. For him, the chain Revolution–Power is not a material "cause-effect", it is the mean and the end itself. That is why Earnest not only aims

at, but also truly worships power: "Power. It is what we of the working class preach." "So we have preached power". "Power. It is a kingly word" (pp. 70-71). Earnest ascribes to power sacred, almost religious meaning. And his glorification of power matched with his physical strength, great intellect, and iron will – all that directed towards the cause being called Revolution – makes him again a Nietzschean type intellectual. During Avis's first encounter of Earnest's argument with his bourgeois opponents, these latter perfectly well catch the essence of his philosophy:

"You seem to worship at the shrine of fact", Dr. Hammerfield taunted him.
"There is no God but Fact, and Mr. Everhard is its prophet," Dr. Ballingford paraphrased.
(*The Iron Heel*, p. 16)

To draw the complete picture of Earnest's character, Avis brings an example of a poem, whose fragments Earnest liked to quote. She gives a fragment from the poem, stating that she does this "not alone because he loved it, but because it epitomized the paradox that he was in, the spirit of him, and his conception of his spirit" (p. 127). Here is a meaningful fragment from her quote:

Packed with the pulse of an unborn race,
Torn with a world's desire.
The surging flood of my wild young blood
Would quench the judgment fire.
I am Man, Man, Man, from the tingling flesh
To the dust of earthly goal,
From the nestling-gloom of the pregnant womb
To the sheen of my naked soul.
Bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh
The whole world leaps to my will,
And the unslacked thirst of an Eden cursed
Shall harrow the earth to its fill
(*The Iron Heel*, p. 128)

Having not specified, what Earnest's paradox is, Avis by intuition of the female detected who Earnest actually was. His paradox was that of being a metaphysician in the coat of a dialectician, idealist disguised as materialist, a Nietzscheanist under the shell of Marxism. "An unborn race" alluding to Nietzsche's race of hyperboreans, 'blond beasts', transforms it in Earnest's perception of that of 'red beasts'; a reader can juxtapose individualistic masculinity of being a Man by the capital letter to socialist humanism of being a Human by the capital letter; the whole world "leaping to his will" is, again, the manifestation of Nietzschean cult of will, called to conquer the world. Earnest Everhard's personality combines two philosophies – those of Nietzsche and

Marx, the first being of leading, and the second of subordinate nature.

Just like Jack London's, Earnest Everhard's revolutionary, Marxist, nature is derived from his Nietzschean will for power. Writing about Nietzsche, a well-known Marxist critic Sydney Finkelstein states that "he considered himself a revolutionary", that the philosopher thought that "it was exactly an individual personality called to reform the society. He viewed in this role a hero – 'super-human' or 'over-human', a true aristocrat, who combines the qualities of an artist, prophet, philosopher, and leader" to "breed a new caste (an unborn race – *G.Sh.*) dominating over Europe... However, he does not do that for self-profit. His mission is being the leader of the world, which he is to liberate" (Finkelstein, p. 81).

With regard to all above-mentioned, the words of Avis Cunningham are very unambiguous, when she describes her perception of Earnest's personality in the beginning of her story:

I have said that he was afraid of nothing. He was a natural aristocrat – and this in spite of the fact that he was in the camp of the non-aristocrats. He was a superman, a blond beast such as Nietzsche has described, and in addition he was aflame with democracy.
(*The Iron Heel*, p. 10)

As far as Upton Sinclair's respective creed is concerned, it proceeds from the nature of the figure, who had had an influence over him from his very childhood. In his 1922 novel *They Call Me Carpenter*, he narrates about the contemporary coming of Christ occurring in the city of New York. Told from the person of a 'rich young man' who personally gets acquainted with the God, the evangelical story of Christ's mission is transposed to the reality of the 1921. Rome is replaced by America, Roman oppressors are converted into capitalists, slaves turn into contemporaneous proletariat, and the evangelical message, although remaining an authentic Christian teaching, becomes linked with the need of social justice, i.e. socialism. Just like London's hero, Sinclair's hero steps out as an adept of social justice. At the same time, if London's hero preaches active action transformed into revolution, Sinclair's hero, mingling with proletariat, rejects violence, preaching compassion towards the lowly and needy. For this he is being called by newspapers 'the Red Prophet'. The plot climaxes at the point when the hostile mob gets

hold of him and smears him with red paint to imitate the blood of martyrdom, shouting 'Hi! Hi! The Bolsheviki Prophet! Hi! Hi! The Bolsheviki Prophet!', and there is irony in this phrase, linked to the author's point of view, as Jesus's message is interpreted by the mob as the call for revolution. Just like London's hero (Earnest), Sinclair's idol (Jesus) preaches social justice, but this preaching, unlike that of Earnest's, comes not from his willingness to seize power, rather it comes just from his heart. If both London's and his heroes' motives are dictated by their will, those of Sinclair's and his heroes' are done so by their heart. What is common, though, between them, is the nature of their motives, which is idealistic, based on the will and the heart respectively. Lenin used to call Sinclair "a socialist of feeling", accentuating his remoteness from 'scientific socialism', which is actually true, considering Sinclair's sentiments prevailing over reasoning in regard with social justice. The term 'feeling', though, is very peculiar to Lenin, being of materialistic nature and linked to human brain and nervous system, whereas Sinclair's interpretation of Jesus's message is linked with soul, which, in its turn, is linked with heart in terms of religion⁽⁷⁾.

Conclusion

The philosophies lying behind Jack London's and Upton Sinclair's views on the ways towards social justice represent opposite polarities. If the former is a proponent of achieving social equality by means of social revolution, the latter, experiencing as much contempt towards capitalism, still supports the evolutionary, democracy-based method of political struggle. At the same time, confessing socialism, both of the writers stay aloof from 'scientific' understanding of mechanisms leading towards the achievement of social equality and justice. This stems from their personalities, as well as their social background and life passage. London's character shaped under the influence of Nietzsche, while Sinclair's chief authority had always been Christ. After conversion to socialism, London abandoned his obsession with Nietzsche's 'blond beast', the dominant image of many of his earlier works. However, in spite of his conversion, both London and his literary hero maintained Nietzschean spirit of the 'super-human', evolving from the

pugnacious 'blond beast' to the bellicose 'red beast', the protagonist, applying his individualistic 'will for power' to lead the army of his comrades through revolution towards the victorious resolution of the cause. As for Sinclair, he had remained an advocate of non-violent forms of struggle. Sinclair's compassion towards 'the lowly and poor' matched his dedication to the teaching of Christ, whose martyrdom was based on the very rejection of achieving justice by force. Christ's heart proved stronger than cold reasoning of the writer's contemporaneous socialist theorists, and Sinclair remained 'the socialist of heart' despite and possibly because of the fact that socialist utopias are successfully established by those for whom the ends justify the means.

Notes

⁽¹⁾ For this reason, we do not consider here another novel of London's with a protagonist of Nietzschean character, *The Sea-Wolf* (1904). Like Martin Eden, being the protagonist, Wolf Larsen is the anti-hero at the same time, failing to win a desirable woman.

⁽²⁾ "Re-evaluation of the values" is one of Nietzsche's main calls; the "revolt of slaves" is one of his key objects of his criticism; *The People of the Abyss* is London's 1903 documentary book, in which he described the miserable life of the inhabitants of East End of London.

⁽³⁾ It is notable that contemporaneous reader appreciated exactly the muckraking side of *The Jungle*, having neglected its proletarian side, which disappointed Sinclair greatly. He once said about the effect of the novel on the society: "I aimed at the public's heart, and by accident I hit it in its stomach".

⁽⁴⁾ Socrates (5th-4thc. BC) challenged the ways of Athenian democracy and was executed. His student, Plato wrote the treatise called *Republic*, which many experts consider as one of the first attempts in European culture to describe a communist society.

⁽⁵⁾ Tolstoy was an authority for both Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King. Knut Hamsun (1859-1952) is famous for his neo-romantic works as well as notorious for his ultra-right political sympathies. According to Thomas Mann, Nietzsche was one of his strongest influencers.

⁽⁶⁾ The quote from *Chicago* by Carl Sandburg (1878-1967), known for his pro-socialist political orientation.

⁽⁷⁾ We would like here to challenge the term offered by Lenin and call Sinclair not "a socialist of feeling", but rather "a socialist of heart". With this regard, Sinclair's famous phrase about his novel *The Jungle* (see Note (3) is quite meaningful.

References

Literary sources

Jack London. *The Collection of Works* (in 14 Volumes). Pravda Publishers, Moscow, 1961.

Jack London. *The Iron Heel*. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1943.

Upton Sinclair. *The Autobiography of Upton Sinclair*. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., New York, 1962.

Upton Sinclair. *The Jungle*. Frederick Ellis's New Hardbacks. La Vergne, TN, 2011.

Upton Sinclair. *They Call Me Carpenter: A Tale of the Second Coming*. Moscow, 1924.

Upton Sinclair. *An Industrial Republic: A Study of the America of Ten Years Hence*. New York, Doubleday, Page & Co., 1907.

Critical Sources:

Dell, Floyd (1927). *Upton Sinclair: A Study in Social Protest*. The State Publishing House, Moscow, (1928).

Finkelstein, Sydney (1965). *Existentialism and Alienation in American Literature*. Progress Publishers, Moscow (1967).

Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press.

Samarin, R. (1961). *Jack London* (A Preface to Collection of Works). Pravda Publishers, Moscow.

Internet Sources

Ball, Andrew (2019). "*The True Path to Salvation*": *Conversion to the Religion of Socialism in the Work of Jack London and Upton Sinclair*. Studies in American Fiction. Retrieved on 6.01.2020 from https://www.academia.edu/38198850/The_true_path_to_salvation_Conversion_to_the_Religion_of_Socialism_in_the_Work_of_Jack_London_and_Upton_Sinclair

Sciambra, Joseph (1996). *The Philosophy of Jack London*. Sono ma State University database Retrieved on 2.01.2020 from <http://london.sonoma.edu/Essays/philosophy.html>