**African Performance Review**
**Vol. 3, No. 1, 2009**
**pp 100-112**

# Progress and Utopia in Bode Sowande's Babylon Trilogy

Osita Okagbue
*Goldsmiths, University of London, UK*

**Abstract**

Bode Sowande belongs to a second generation of Nigerian dramatists, which includes others such as Femi Osofisan, Kole Omotoso, Nasiru Akanji, Olu Obafemi, Tess Onwueme and Tunde Fatunde, who advocate a radical aesthetic for the theatre, different from the relatively conservative dramaturgy of the older generation of playwrights such as Wole Soyinka, J. P Clark-Bekederemo, Ola Rotimi and Zulu Sofola. Unlike the first generation dramatists who saw theatre as a medium for recording or articulating individual perceptions of communal or personal tensions and crises - see plays such as Soyinka's *The Strong Breed*, *Kongi's Harvest* and *Death and the King's Horseman*, Clark-Bekederemo's *Song of a Goat*, *Masquerade* and *The Raft*, Sofola's *Wedlock of the Gods* and *King Emene*, and Rotimi's *Kurunmi* and *The Gods Are Not To Blame* - the new generation are more concerned with utilising the theatre to articulate and/or search for a more egalitarian social order. For them, the theatre when skilfully employed can be a useful context and tool for interrogating social systems and processes, as well as for exploring possibilities for initiating and achieving radical social change. For the new generation, the subject of their plays is the society and not the individuals or personalities caught up in its social throes; the result is that, unlike the first generation dramatists, their theatre is usually neither concerned with individual consciousness and psychology, nor with personal tragedies and joys, but rather with opening up for scrutiny and analysis, the dynamics and tensions of social processes and systems. What they advocate is not that the theatre can, by itself, change society, but rather that it can be a site as well as a medium or language for myth and ideological deconstruction, contestations of histories, to allow for

new and perhaps alternative readings and meanings. This means that the theatre, while it is not change or revolutionary itself, can be converted into a rehearsal for change or revolution.[1]

While Sowande may lack Soyinka's verbal fireworks and finesse, Osofisan's creative audacity and control of form, his progressive vision places him in between the former's cyclic tragic vision and the latter's unresolved dilemma tales. What he has in common with his group, and which again separates them from the first group, is a dialectical view of society and history in which man is both subject and object of history, and not just the 'passive creature who struggles hopelessly against a fate he or she can hardly influence, let alone change', [2] as is the case with characters in plays by Clark-Bekederemo, Sofola and some of Soyinka and Rotimi. Sowande, in his trilogy- *The Night Before*, *Farewell to Babylon* [3] and *Flamingo* [4] - explores this view of man and a universe in which he is both a maker and product of history and he uses the metaphor of Babylon and Utopia as the organising framework within which the action in the plays is developed. The three plays can be read as one long journey from the nightmare of Babylon to a Utopian happiness, with each play representing a stage in the journey. The central metaphor employed in the trilogy is the antithesis between Babylon and Utopia - where the former represents oppression, injustice and dictatorship which has to be destroyed and the latter is the ideal which all should strive to establish. The concept of Babylon as deployed by Sowande is very similar to that of the Jamaican Rastafarian Movement. For this group, Babylon is oppression, exploitation and poverty; it is any social order that denies human freedom, especially oppression and denial of freedom to Black people by a capitalist establishment controlled by whites. However, Sowande transforms the pessimism and inertia of the Rastafarians into an optimistic call for action to dismantle the oppressive and exploitative social system. So while the Rastafarians seek to escape from Babylon without any attempt to confront it as they do in Derek Walcott's play, *O Babylon!*,[5] Sowande's heroes confront and try to change the reality of Babylon into an ideal society to bring fulfilment to the oppressed and exploited. And part of the dramatic tensions and tragic ironies that one finds in the three plays arise from the different views and paths which the central characters such as Moniran and Onita adopt in their quest for social change.

Throughout the trilogy there is the recurring image of Babylon burning and fire is the central symbol of the destruction and purification necessary before Babylon can transform into the Utopia dreamed of by

the protagonists. Fire is a destructive, as well as a cleansing agent and the characters recognise it as such. Onita, for instance, sees it as an essence with a life of its own and throughout *The Night Before* he is consistently poking the bonfire as if trying to keep it alive to ensure it would be ready when the moment of use arrives. For Moniran, being near fire means one runs the risk of getting burnt, but it is a risk worth taking to achieve the ultimate goal of doing away with the unjust social system:

> Moniran: I am in hell and I know it, but it is only to fetch fire and burn Babylon. . . . What would you do, should you dream of an illumination? A bright lamp that you held in your dream from youth, and now you find your feet lead you to the gates of hell.[6]

Thus for him, Babylon contains the fire with which to burn it and he elects to work within the structures of Babylon so as to destroy it from within. But this proves a fatal miscalculation, a mistake which in the end undoes all his life's work as Babylon defies and finally destroys him instead. But for Dabira, who shared dreams of Utopia with the rest, burning his academic gown and refusing to take part in the graduation ceremony as a reaction to his betrayal by Onita and Ibilola, his fiancée, represents not purification but a destruction of the youthful ideal:

> Dabira: The fire still burns and it is good. . . . Let no one move near that fire. . . . Stay where you are and witness the final shedding of my skin! Witness the burning in the crucible and tell it to the vice-chancellor when he makes his speech, because I won't be there. . . . Witness my own rebirth in the fire. Here in the fire I moult and witness it. . . . Tell him the fire baptised me. . . . I have shed the old skin. Be the witnesses of my rebirth! [7]

The rebirth he talks about is not the rebirth into an apostle of change and salvation which was the dream they all held and hoped to pursue on graduation, but rather into an agent of Babylon like their college mate, Nibidi, who re-appears in *Flamingo*, the last play of the trilogy, to orchestrate the murder of their erstwhile friend, Moniran.

What one finds stimulating in the three plays is the subtle manner in which Sowande organises the ideological narrative of the trilogy as a linear continuum of movement from Babylon to Utopia. The underlying optimism of this utopian ideal is thus pushed on by this sense of a continuous movement forward, a striving towards a perfect society. The dramatist's humanist vision is one of eternal hope, for, in spite of disappointments and treachery, the plays suggest that it is still possible to

transform an unjust social system into that "alternative society" in which everyone can find freedom and fulfilment. Each play in the trilogy is thus a stage in the journey to Utopia which begins in *The Night Before* and ends in *Flamingo* - *The Night Before* marked the birth of the dream and the setting out on the road to social freedom and progress; *A Farewell to Babylon* marks the first challenge to Babylon and is also significant for, while it records the first victory for the forces of change, it also reveals the difficulties and contradictions which can stymie progress; *Flamingo* represents the final stage but with further encounters because the Utopia of *A Farewell* is revealed as a new form of oppression and exploitation. Seen from this perspective of linear progression, the three plays represent Sowande's social vision as he figuratively charts the progress of his floundering Nigerian society as it groped towards an elusive egalitarian social order.

**Notions of Progress and Utopia**

The idea of society progressing through better and better states underpins Sowande's notion of Utopia in the trilogy. And Oscar Wilde's argument is that:

> A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the only country at which Humanity is always landing. And when Humanity lands there, it looks out, and, seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realisation of Utopias.[8]

In many respects, this corresponds to Sowande's idea of a new social order as explored in the three plays. For both of them, Utopia may be a wish, a near impossible one perhaps, but its existence and fascination for the human imagination is positive since it constantly directs human effort towards progress and an improvement on a contemporary reality. In effect from this point of view human and society's development involves a progression through a series of utopias. Ideationally therefore, Utopia involves denouncing and announcing, a judgement and a hope; it involves judging and denouncing the present and hoping for and announcing the future. Utopia is a very old notion in human history and imagination, and it is much more than a mere fantasy of paradise. What it does, in fact, is portray a better world whose virtues stand in sharp contrast to the vices of the present one. And in this respect, the notion is a vehicle for social criticism. This is the sense in which I think Sowande employs the concept in his trilogy - for each play is more or less a

criticism and rejection of a particular social system and a call for the creation of a better one in its place.

For Sowande, the opposite of Utopia is Babylon and the task for the socially and radically conscious in the society is the dismantling of the latter so that the former can become possible. Thus the plays in the trilogy seem to be informed and propelled by one dynamic, that of a continuous movement away from Babylonian oppression toward Utopian freedom and contentment. Sowande's vision of hope is born of a belief in the eventual triumph of human good over evil. His theatre accordingly is one in which hopelessness is seen as,

> a form of silence, denying the world and fleeing from it. The dehumanisation resulting from an unjust social order is not a cause for despair, but for hope leading to incessant pursuit of the humanity denied by injustice. [9]

An understanding and acceptance of this vision makes it easier to understand, and perhaps more sympathetically, Sowande's central character, the patient Moniran, who obviously is his ideal leader in the quest for an alternative social order to replace the nightmare that Babylon is. And even when this hero loses hope and gives in to despair in the last play, Sowande's hope in the possibility of Utopia remains intact. Other champions like Teriba emerge to take up the fight from where Moniran and Onita left off. What one feels therefore at the demise of champions of freedom such as Onita and Moniran is a sense of tragic joy because though they suffer greatly, their goodness and heroism shine forth from the grave and in dying they achieve immortal glory. Onita's greatness becomes fully proclaimed in death by Moniran, the very person responsible for his imprisonment and exposure to the danger posed by the unstable junkie, Cookie, who strangles him in the prison cell which they share. And the latter's selfless sacrifice and love of humanity is for the first time acknowledged by Teriba, the new leader, but only after he had been poisoned to death:

> Only a true history can be the best memorial for the hero we murdered. . . . For Moniran who died in place of frauds, for him a memorial of gold. . . . For us who obeyed orders without thinking, let our regrets be as deep as an ocean, and let our memories teach us never again to destroy such men as this patriot. [10]

This testament to the dead Moniran is almost like consecrating him into the spirit of the new nation which is being born, and it is the greatest

testament to the heroes because it proclaims eloquently that those like them who died fighting for the cause of good did not die in vain. But whether or not Moniran merits this mini-apotheosis, given his role in crushing the revolution of the farmers and considering also the non-radical kind of social change which he sought to bring about is debatable. What seems clear however is Sowande's whole-hearted endorsement of Moniran's tactics which, unlike Onita's, stops short of a clean break with and a commitment to the total destruction of the present system. This ideological ambivalence - which one suspects Sowande shares with his central character - is responsible for the weak structure and unsatisfactoriness about the final outcomes in the plays. One is not so sure what Sowande's true views are - whether he sanctions the incessant coup style changes that happen but which do not involve actual changes to the social structure; and it is difficult to identify a concealed irony since Sowande seems quite close to and fascinated by Moniran; in fact, he has consistently played the role of Moniran in all his productions of the three plays which clearly indicates the close identification which is being suggested. And much as he tries to idealise and infuse him with energy, Moniran remains static and too cerebral about events and people around him with the result that he is unable to carry with vigour the enormous responsibility foisted upon him. He is neither exciting nor inspiring. Besides, he lacks Onita's infectious passion, decisive will and commitment which enable the latter to make a clean break with the social system in order to attack it, while the former elects to stay and fight the system from within.

**Between Dream and Reality**

In Moniran, Sowande has created a humanist who believes in the essential goodness of human beings. This belief that lodged within every human soul is a well-spring of good and a willingness to contribute in the creation of a more egalitarian society leads him to try to accommodate and harmonise all the contending interests and tendencies in his society. Moniran believes that everyone has a positive role to play and a place in his new society. However, events in the second and final plays in the trilogy prove this belief to be both misguided and risky because it leads him to ignore, even to deny the existence of evil, and to attempt to tame instead of destroy it. And the outcome of his endeavour is that, on the one hand, Onita, his friend and fellow apostle of change is killed and, on the other, Kasa, his co-coup plotter, reveals his evil side in *Flamingo*. Thus his blanket belief in human goodness and his assumption that given the

right environment and guidance, all can contribute towards the realisation of Utopia are his greatest mistakes or errors of judgement. He saw his task as being mainly two-fold; first to dismantle Babylon and then to invite everyone to contribute to the new society, including also the main beneficiaries and agents of the previous system. But this is even more naive than his hope of building a new society on the structures of the old as events in the final play amply demonstrate.

But in propping Moniran up as the ideal hero and leader, ideologically flawed and compromised as he is, Sowande betrays the middle-class wish to be seen as the class best equipped to save society from the yoke of the oppressive and exploitative upper class. Much as Moniran protests against the adoption of messianic postures, he ends up acting like one, and this contradiction makes him blind to the impossibility of reconciling the opposition and tensions between the peasant and the ruling/urban elite, and between the countryside and the city. Caught in between these two opposing groups, the middle class usually ends up fighting for both sides and in the end completely ineffectual.[11] This is precisely what happens in *A Farewell to Babylon* and *Flamingo* , as Moniran ends up having neither the support nor the trust of either side.

His withdrawal from participating any further in society in *Flamingo* is a result of his realisation that he had failed in his attempt to bring about real change in society. And he failed for the simple reason that he chose the wrong method and companions in his quest for the new society. He helped kill the farmer's revolution which seemed the only one that could have destroyed Babylon properly. And this is the difference between him and Onita, for the latter saw the farmers as the true guides to Utopia and so threw his lot in with them. For this choice, he is imprisoned and eventually dies. In these two characters Sowande, knowingly or unknowingly, puts forward the two possible roles which middle class intellectuals can play in the process of social change. They can either become revolutionaries, or they can try and reform the existing social order without radically altering the social structure. Onita represents the first, and Moniran the second. The ideal for Sowande is to be found in between these two - a moderate middle ground between Onita's radical theorising and extremity, and Moniran's patient and pragmatic reformism. However, both seem to have some of the playwright's support. Onita in fact appears to be the trilogy's theorist of an alternative truth to Babylon, a truth articulated very clearly in his book about the "lease of the earth". He provides the intellectual underpinning to the

farmer's collective action for change which alone can provide the true alternative to Babylon. And for this he opts out of his ivory tower position to become part of the farmer's revolt, something that Moniran is unable to do. Onita, for me, is the real agent of change in the trilogy because in his theory he advocates a complete overhaul of the means and relations of production as a way of achieving an egalitarian social structure. He also has life, feelings and failings, plus a zest and conviction which compel one to share in his dream because he is truly human in a way that Moniran is not. His vision of Utopia is uncontaminated by the seductive trappings of Babylon. His hope of an alternative society is to be realised in companionship with and struggle alongside the farmers who judge and denounce oppressive Babylon. For him therefore, Babylon and Utopia are mutually exclusive social realities and so the destruction of one and the attainment of the other involve a single definitive act, and not the gradual dis-entanglement and dismantling which Moniran opts for. It is hardly surprising therefore that Onita saw Moniran as a traitor to their mutual dream of creating a better society:

> Onita: We shared dreams, to destroy Babylon! And you went and joined them. . . .Your eyes, my eyes, our eyes held the vision of a nation. Our tongues sang of protests and hope. But tell me, will you save this nation with this mirage in your eyes? [12]

Onita is both baffled and dismayed by Moniran's apparent abandonment of their dream to smash Babylon, but one senses Sowande's reservations about Onita's more radical but unrealistic, though well-intentioned approach. Both Onita and Moniran pursue their dream of creating Utopia, but they do so in ways that appear to be completely opposed to one another. Onita believes that only a direct assault like the farmers' can bring Babylon down. Fighting the system therefore meant rejecting it altogether, and declaring direct war on it. Moniran, on the other hand, is the realist who perceives a conflictual gap between revolutionary enthusiasm and real possibilities, and between the infinite ideals of revolutionaries and the limited means at their disposal to achieve those ideals.[13] For the latter, therefore, there is the dream and there is the reality, and in between the two is a minefield of unavoidable compromises. And because he sees Babylon as very strong, he also sees no sense in confronting it head-on He thus argues that,

> Moniran: The only way to foil the siege of the earth, when it rises against you, is to capture its rhythm. The only way to topple a giant is to use the impetus of his on-rush, an ancient technique of wrestling. [14]

And in his desire to achieve a compromise, he employs this "ancient technique" to neutralise the forces of the two classes that battle each other. He infiltrates and immobilises the farmers' camp through the security network which he heads. He also worms his way into the power-base of the Field Marshal. However, in achieving the latter he plays into the hands of another group of oppressors. And in the end he achieves and changes nothing. His "double existence" and ambivalence is incomprehensible to, and in the end leads to the death of his friend. It is obvious that Sowande endorses Moniran's moderate liberal view and approach to change. While Onita and the farmers strive for a radical transformation of the society, Moniran seeks a harmony of its disparate and contending parts. But what he seems not to realise is that a truly free society can only emerge after and from the ruins of Babylon. *Flamingo*, the final play in the trilogy, confirms his mistake because the agents of Babylon reappear in the new society which he thinks he has created after the overthrow of the Field Marshal in *A Farewell to Babylon*. It is clear that Sowande uses this trilogy to make a powerful statement about his Nigerian society in which nothing has changed despite of the numerous *coups d'etat*. He sees this lack of change as a fate of "tragic history" since the new generals come into power and within a short time become as bad as or sometimes worse than the ones they replaced. But it is surprising that in spite of the failure of the coups to right wrongs, Sowande still advocates them in place of a sound revolution sprung from the masses. *Flamingo* ends in yet another *coup d'etat* which definitely is not Utopia. What guarantee is there that the new group under Teriba would be any better than Kasa and Brigadier Mowambe who held out so much promise in *A Farewell to Babylon* when together with Moniran they rid society of the Field Marshal?

**A Journey without End**

Two possible explanations can be put forward for the idea of a continuing journey without a final arrival which underpins dramatic action in the trilogy? The first is that Sowande's vision becomes blurred because his notion of Utopia is insufficiently conceived. What kind of society it is likely to be is only vaguely outlined, although it hopes to be anything that Babylon is not. Beyond that, its contours are unclear and those like Moniran who lead the way to it are unsure about what they are striving for. But the second and more significant reason is the fact that in Moniran, Sowande has chosen a leader who is reluctant to sever the umbilical cord which ties him to Babylon, the very society he hopes to

change or destroy. Unlike Onita who turns his back completely on the system, Moniran is caught in a love-hate relationship with Babylon. He is a part of Babylon, as the head of Octopus, the country's security service, and so he fears its destruction since he too must have to go with it unless he renounced his privileged position. His dilemma therefore is that he wants and yet does not want Babylon to be destroyed and so he seeks an impossible harmony of the contesting socio-political interests found within the system.

One fact which emerges from the coups and counter-coups which feature in the plays is that only a genuine revolution can guarantee the realisation of Utopia. But Moniran is not seeking a revolution; he is a mere reformer and because of his compromised vision, the ideal society which he sought to bring about remains an illusion. However, the positive and optimistic note to emerge from the three plays is that in keeping with the theme of progress and Utopia, there is no space for complacency in human action. But by not dismantling the social structure which he inherited from the Field Marshal, Moniran made it possible for the agents of Babylon such as Nibidi and Mowambe to re-appear and scupper all his efforts bring about social change. So, in spite of his genuine desire to help bring about an egalitarian social order, his middle class ambivalence and desire to share in both worlds encumbers and enervates him. He ends up fighting on both sides, and ultimately he becomes a threat and a liability that had to be removed.

But having said that, it is also possible to explain both Moniran's failure to create a new viable social order and his collaboration in the defeat of the revolution of the peasants as indicating Sowande's way showing that Utopia is never really realisable. However, he is not in any way saying that it is not necessary. All evidence suggest that he agrees with Wilde that it could and should become a beacon that draws radical minds along the road toward the achievement of a better and more humane social order. Whether or not Utopia is possible is therefore not the point. What matters is that each stage along the way represents a progression towards the ideal society, in which case, each stage invariably is an improvement on the one preceding it. That is to say that Major Kasa's rule is a better one than that of the Field Marshal, while Teriba's which *Flamingo* ushers in should be better than both. Sowande carefully avoids suggesting that Teriba's coming to power is the end of the journey. He, in fact, could be saying that *coups d'etat* are not the answer, not the proper way of changing society as they neither address nor do away with the underlying problems responsible for social

injustice, deprivation and oppression in society. The two coups illustrate this very clearly. And given the Nigerian experience and context within and about which he was writing, Sowande is right.

Perhaps the failures to achieve the attempted changes are a result of Sowande's preoccupation with the notion of "cyclic fate and tragic history" - one is here reminded of Soyinka's well-known pessimistic notion of a tragic cycle of human stupidity and error - a notion which is completely anti-change. With such a view, it is impossible to see how any meaningful change could have occurred in the trilogy. The Sowande of *The Night Before* - the youthful stage - is a firm believer in the Utopian notion of human goodness. And up to a point in the second play, *A Farewell to Babylon*, he still does, as well as believing in the desirability and possibility of an ideal society in which all can find fulfilment. But somehow, this idealism - for Sowande, either because of events in Nigeria leading to pogroms in the North and the civil war which followed in its wake, and for Moniran, the eruptions of evil tendencies in individuals around him and with whom he had been closely associated in quest for change - completely gives way to a new dystopian view which now perceives human beings as "an everlasting and inseparable blend of good and evil" and as creatures governed by impulses over which they had no control. [15]

This shift in perception seems to reflect a more mature and a somewhat more sober view of human nature and society. It suggests the realisation and calm acceptance of the fact that no matter how good intentioned human beings may be in their actions, the contradictions arising from the unending feud between their innate good and the evil impulses would always surface to affect whatever good or bad they intend. This may well explain the many faces that some of the characters wear from play to play. Kasa is a good example - the evil dictator in *Flamingo* was an angel of change in *A Farewell to Babylon*. Even Moniran himself changes from play to play, as does Nibidi. Sowande uses Major Kasa especially to put across the dystopian view that man as ruler is inevitably corrupted by power, and that society can be planned as good, but that it unforeseeably but ultimately gets perverted into a cruel and unjust monster that devours its own. The nightmare in which Moniran finds himself in *Flamingo*, he could not have foreseen for it is in every respect as terrible as the hell of *The Night Before* and *A Farewell to Babylon*. And so for Sowande, the 'island of Utopia' constantly recedes, not because it is unattainable, but because the quest to reach it helps keep

history and human society in constant motion. And it also infuses human action with an ever-burning optimism. But one needs to point out that part of the reason why the ideal state sought after in the trilogy is not realised is because of a failure of leadership. The farmer's revolt which could have succeeded was completely put down by Moniran because he did not credit the farmers with enough intelligence to organise, confront and destroy Babylon. And for as long as middle class intellectuals like him see themselves as the 'chosen' messiahs of change, for that long will the ideal society remain a never-never land, almost within reach, but always receding like the tips of the arching rainbow on the distant skyline.

**Conclusion**

Sowande's Babylon trilogy embodies a sustained theory of movement, a progress towards Utopia which, even if elusive as a result of contending impulses in humans or the pursuit of it under compromised or misguided leadership, is still worth striving for because it is better in every respect than stagnating in Babylon. The three plays represent various stages in the journey away from the harsh and unjust realities of Babylon. *A Night Before* marked the birth of the dream of an alternative society. It was the youthful phase in which there were no limits set on dreams and all obstacles could easily be wished away by the often short-sighted enthusiasm and idealism of youth. *A Farewell to Babylon* was the setting out from Babylon towards Utopia. Each group in the play rejected Babylon while proposing an alternative that could be realised. Intimations of Utopia are had in *A Farewell*, but the questers set sail again because the new society brought into being by the *coup d'etat* staged by Moniran and Kasa proves to be only a false dawn. And at the end of Flamingo, another *coup d'etat* suggests another dawn, another arrival at the ideal society. Sowande refrains from suggesting an end to the journey, for in truth it could be just another beginning. Perhaps, for the playwright, Utopia must remain some place that human society has to continue looking out for because in the search for the ideal, society must inevitably progress to better and better states. Utopia it appears from this view is a challenge, a desire which, though elusive, is always within reach. And it is in this sense that Sowande's dialectical sense of history becomes evident, that is, despite his lapses into the notion of "tragic cycles of fate". The plays show that human society and history are never static, that they keep changing all the time.

**Notes**

1. Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed* (London: Pluto Press, 1979 & rpn. 1998) p.122

2. Osita Okagbue, 'Bode Sowande' in Brian Cox, ed. *African Writers Vol.II,* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1997)p. 800

3. Bode Sowande, *A Farewell to Babylon and Other Plays* (London: Longman Drumbeat, 1979)

4. Bode Sowande, *Flamingo and Other Plays* (London: Longman African Writers, 1986)

5. Derek Walcott, *O Babylon* in *Joker of Seville, O Babylon!: Two Plays*.( London: Jonathan Cape, 1979)

6. *A Farewell to Babylon and Other Plays*, p, 65

7. ibid., p.49.

8. Oscar Wilde, 'The Soul of Man under Socialism' in *Complete Works* (London and Glasgow: Collins, 1966) p. 1089.

9. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1972) p, 64.

10. Sowande, *Flamingo and Other Plays.* Pp, 51-2

11. Georg Lukacs, *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics.* (London: Merlin Press, 1971) p, 60

12. Sowande, *A Farewell*, pp.67-8

13 Adolfo Sanchez Vazquez, *Art and Society: Essays in Marxist Aesthetics* (London: Merlin Press, 1973) pp.127-8

14. Sowande, *Farewell,* p. 69.

15. Edward Surtz, 'Introduction' to *St Thomas More's Utopia* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964) p. xxviii.