Robinson Jeffers’s Inhumanism vs. Tao’s Unconcern*

Abstract
The aim of this paper is to show and explain the similarities that can be identified between the early Taoists philosophy of Lao-Chuang and the poetry of the American poet Robinson Jeffers along with his doctrine of inhumanism. In the books of Tao Te Ching and Chuang Tzu, Tao has been depicted as a natural force (or even nature itself) that creates but then leaves its creation alone for good or bad. A Taoist sage accepts such natural manifestations of violence as death or suffering, for it is the way things work in the world. Jeffers’s attitude toward nature and society resembles that of Tao and Taoist sages. Jeffers, however, goes a step further: not only does he accept violence and suffering as part and parcel of life, but he praises them, as a classical poet would praise beauty and love.
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Introduction
Robinson Jeffers (1887–1962) was a poet who did not shy away from the actual nature of brutality in life, and who accepted the universe as it stood, with all its stark naked cruelty and disgusting realities. He praised nature for what it was, and he refrained from castigating the phenomena he observed, for he had no intention to blame the agents of those commonplace atrocities. He even went as far as to praise natural violence and the misery it incurred: “Jeffers with his contempt for artistry that is as pervasive as his contempt for man delivers his parables of violence and his hymns to hopelessness with a one-dimensional straightforwardness that is almost Homeric”.

Jeffers’s praise of violence may be exemplified by his poem The Bloody Sire:

---

* All the translations from Classical Chinese in this article are mine. Chinese texts have been quoted in traditional characters, and the romanization system used in the main body of the article is Wade-Giles. In citations, the romanization system used by the original authors has been preserved.

1 S. Rodman, Knife in the Flowers, “Poetry” 1954, Vol. 84, No. 4, pp. 226–227.
It is not bad. Let them play.
Let the guns bark and the bombing-plane
Speak his prodigious blasphemies.

(...)

What but the wolf’s tooth whittled so fine
The fleet limbs of the antelope?

(...)

Who would remember Helen’s face
Lacking the terrible halo of spears?
Who formed Christ but Herod and Caesar,
The cruel and bloody victories of Caesar?
Violence, the bloody sire of all the world’s values.

Never weep, let them play,
Old violence is not too old to beget new values.²

His blunt straightforwardness was not the only quality that distinguished Jeffer-
s from the mainstream of American literature and society. In 1919, he and his
wife moved into stone buildings known as Tor House and Hawk Tower, which he
himself helped to build and then expanded on his own. Located in Monterey Pen-
insula right by the ocean in Carmel-by-the-Sea, the residence was almost a place
of seclusion.

It was there, far from the bustling city life, where he wrote *Tamar and Other
Poems*, a poetry collection that, though not his first, brought him much attention
in the literary circles, although the attention he received was often negative:

Indeed, more than any other poet of the modernist or post-modernist periods, Jeffer
has served as a whipping boy to a variety of well placed poets and critics who have found it
stimulating to deal with him exclusively on their terms, though never on his.³

Most notably, Kenneth Rexroth, a poet himself and a literary critic as well, de-
\*d* Jeffer’s poetry as “high flown statements indulged in for their melodrama
alone”.⁴ On the other extreme of the spectrum of literary criticism was a different
poet and critic Mark Van Doren, who in the foreword to *Jeffer’s Selected Letters*,
wrote: “Homer and Shakespeare. In what more fitting company could we leave
\*d*”⁵

---

² *R. Jeffer* s, *The Collected Poetry of Robinson Jeffer* s: 1939–1962, ed. T. Hunt, Vol. 3, Stanford
CA 1991, p. 25.
³ *R. Boyers*, *A Sovereign Voice: The Poetry of Robinson Jeffer*, “The Sewanee Review” 1969,
No. 77(3), pp. 487–507.
⁴ *K. Rexroth*, *Assays*, New York City 1961, p. 215.
⁵ *R. Jeffer* s, *The Selected Letters of Robinson Jeffer*, 1897–1962, ed. A.N. Ridgeway, Baltimore
MD 1968, p. ix.
Similarities and differences

Reading Jeffers’s poetry, one may easily notice that there are conspicuous similarities between the natural cruelness of Jeffers’s inhumanism (of which more will be said further in this article) and the indifferent attitude that Tao, the inanimate first mover, shows toward its own creation. Jeffers does not link his idea of inhumanism directly to the concept of Tao, and such a similarity might, for that reason, seem a coincidence if it were not for the fact that the poet had been acquainted with the philosophy of ancient China. A short glance at his *Theory of Truth* manifests Jeffers’s familiarity with Lao Tzu7 and Confucius:

> I think of Lao-tze⁸ [...] 

> Here was a man who envied the chiefs of the provinces of China their power and pride, 
> And envied Confucius his fame for wisdom.⁹

It has also been shown that not only did Jeffers know about Lao Tzu, but he also made his own poetry resemble, occasionally, the passages found in *The Book of the Way and Virtue*, known as *Tao Te Ching*¹⁰ and acclaimed as the “Bible of Taoism”.

Ron Peevey finds intellectual connections between Chapter Five of the Lao Tzu’s book and several poems by Jeffers. Peevey claims that Orestes from *The Tower beyond Tragedy* and the old man¹¹ from *The Inhumanist* possess the features of a sage not unlike a Taoist sage.¹² The very fact that both protagonists identify with nature as a whole, rather than with their individual existence, makes them resemble Taoist sages, who treat people like straw dogs,¹³ i.e. they are not concerned with their fate:

> Heaven and Earth are inhumane; they treat Ten Thousand Things¹⁴ like straw dogs. A sage is inhumane; he treats all people like straw dogs.

---

⁶ Tao is the mystic force that creates the world; it is something that might be called the laws of physics or an impersonal and inanimate god. Interestingly, in some Chinese translations of the Gospel of John, the opening phrase: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος ("In the beginning, there was Logos") is sometimes rendered as 太初有道 (“In the great beginning, there was Tao”). Cf. Yueh-Han Fu-Yin [約翰福音] (Gospel of John), https://www.bible.com/zh-CN/bible/312/JHN.1.csbt (access: 10.12.2017).

⁷ For the ease of reference, I will, in this article, assume that Lao Tzu actually existed.

⁸ There are various romanization systems for transcribing Chinese characters. The nickname of the greatest Taoist master can be thus written in more than one way; some possibilities include (several of which are results of sloppy use of a given system): Lao Tzu, Lao-tzu, Lao-tze, Lao-tse, Lao Tze, Laozi, Lao Zi or Lau-dz.

⁹ R. Jeffers, *The Collected Poetry of Robinson Jeffers: 1928–1938*, ed. T. Hunt, Vol. 2, Stanford CA 1989, pp. 608–609.

¹⁰ Again, many other spelling variants exist (Daodejing, Tao Te King, etc.) due to the reason explained in footnote 8.

¹¹ Accidentally or not, the very term lao tzu stands for “old master”.

¹² R. Peevey, *Jeffers and the Tao-Te Ching*, “Robinson Jeffers Newsletter” 1979, No. 55(1), p. 33.

¹³ Cf. footnote 43 for further comments on this term.

¹⁴ This numerical term is a widely used metonymy for “all beings”. The number “ten thousand” often stands for “all” in Chinese.
Before being put on display, straw dogs are squeezed into a small box and wrapped in an embroidered piece of cloth, and the sacrificial priests must keep their fast while offering them. When they are taken off display, passers-by trample on their heads and backs, and grass-cutters take them and burn them. That is all there is to it.

Similarly, the meaning of the maxim: “numerous words are devoid of art, it would be better to stay balanced” has been voiced by Orestes: “What fills men’s mouth is nothing”. In The Treasure, the words: “before the man spoke, it was there”, which refer to the treasure, also testify to the worthlessness of speech, as does the man’s almost inarticulate reaction to the discovery of the treasure: the man says simply “Ah!”

Peevey observed that Jeffers was “influenced by Eastern philosophy if only secondhand, via the writings of Jung, Spengler and Emerson”. Another step would be to investigate some of the instances of that influence in more detail, so as to depict not only the similarities but also the differences within those similarities.

In this article, I will try to present parallels existing between Jeffers’s inhumanism and the Tao’s lack of concern for the world. More importantly, however, some significant dissimilarities, within those parallels, will be brought to light.

The idea of inhumanism was first defined by Jeffers in the preface to The Double Axe & Other Poems as: “a shifting of emphasis and significance from man to notman; the rejection of human solipsism and recognition of the transhuman magnificence”. Also in his letters, a more detailed exposition of this philosophy can be found:

First: Man also is a part of nature, not a miraculous intrusion. And he is a very small part of a very big universe, that was here before he appeared, and will be here long after he has totally ceased to exist.

Second: Man would be better, more sane and more happy, if he devoted less attention and less passion (love, hate, etc.) to his own species, and more to non-human nature. Extreme
introversion in any single person is a kind of insanity; so it is in a race; and race has always and increasingly spent too much thought on itself and too little on the world outside.\(^{22}\)

Jeffers seems to be deeply dissatisfied with the high status of human beings in this world. He would rather that people become equal to other beings and objects in the realm of life and death, instead of remaining the aristocracy that they are.

In the opening of *Carmel Point*, Jeffers offers the reader a classic depiction of the beautiful coast where he lived:

The extraordinary patience of things!
This beautiful place defaced with a crop of suburban houses –
How beautiful when we first beheld it,
Unbroken field of poppy and lupine walled with clean cliffs;\(^{23}\)

But, as the reader learns later on, this beauty was only meant to set the stage for the presentation of the speaker’s real attitude toward nature:

Meanwhile the image of the pristine beauty
Lives in the very grain of the granite,
Safe as the endless ocean that climbs our cliff.-As for us:
We must uncenter our minds from ourselves;
We must unhumanize our views a little, and become confident
As the rock and ocean that we were made from.\(^{24}\)

In Jeffers’s philosophy, human beings are no longer the kings of nature but the pawns on the check board of the universe, where the unchanging laws of nature make all beings move back and forth, be they living, dead or inanimate.

This lack of distinction between humans and the rest of nature, which may seem quite odd to a modern Westerner, had been accepted as a fact of life by the ancient Chinese forefathers of Taoism: “Heaven and Earth have been born with me, and Ten Thousand Things are one with me. [天地與我並生，而萬物與我為一]”.\(^{25}\)

The denial of human supremacy over the rest of nature, a supremacy so vital to our civilization in the era of great scientific discoveries, conforms to the Taoist cosmology, in which “Human adheres to Earth, Earth adheres to Heaven, Heaven adheres to Tao and Tao adheres naturally to Itself [人法地，地法天，天法道，道法自然]”\(^{26}\).

According to Taoism, all matter (animate or inanimate) is created equal:

Tao gives birth to One, One gives birth to Two, Two gives birth to Three and Three gives birth to Ten Thousand Things. Ten Thousand Things carry the *yin* and embrace the *yang*.

---

\(^{22}\) R. Jeffers, *The Selected Letters of Robinson Jeffers*, ed. A.N. Ridgeway, Baltimore MD 1968, p. 291.

\(^{23}\) Idem, *The Collected Poetry of Robinson Jeffers: 1939–1962*, ed. T. Hunt, Vol. 3, Stanford CA 1991, p. 339.

\(^{24}\) Ibid.

\(^{25}\) Chuang Tzŭ [庄子], op. cit., p. 29.

\(^{26}\) Lao Tzŭ [老子], op. cit., p. 61.
The forces of *ch'i*\(^{27}\) collide giving rise to harmony. [道生一，一生二，二生三，
三生萬物。萬物負陰而抱陽，沖氣以為和]\(^{28}\).

The emphasis, in the above mentioned explications, is not on the perfection
and harmony of nature, but on the non-uniqueness of humans in the world. The
perfect oneness of nature gets to be praised, however, in Jeffers’s poetry:

Integrity is wholeness, the greatest beauty is

Organic wholeness, the wholeness of life and things, the divine beauty of the uni-

verse.\(^{29}\)

Jeffers, in his poetry, goes a step further than the Taoists. In addition to pro-
claiming non-supremacy of humans, he finds the non-human nature (including
still life) more interesting and more beautiful than his own species. In *Inscription
for a Gravestone*, we find the following lines:

I admired the beauty
While I was human, now I am part of the beauty.
I wander in the air,
Being mostly gas and water, and flow in the ocean;
Touch you and Asia
At the same moment; have a hand in the sunrises
And the glow of this grass.\(^{30}\)

Jeffers eulogizes death in *The Cruel Falcon* and *Suicide’s Stone*:

a man who knows death by heart is the man for that life.\(^{31}\)

Let the trumpets roar when a man dies
And rockets fly up, he has found his fortune.\(^{32}\)

The event of death is not a reason for mourning as many people have been ac-
customed to view it, but, to the reader’s bewilderment, Jeffers considers death to
be a reason for rejoicing.

The image of trumpets roaring for someone’s death brings to mind the drum-
mimg on a bowl performed by Chuang Tzŭ\(^{33}\) after his wife’s death.

---

\(^{27}\) The word *ch'i* (also transcribed as *qi* or *ki*) originally means „air“, but as a philosophical term
it stands for matter and the principle of life. A brilliant but anachronistic definition of this term has
been suggested by Edmund Ryden in his introduction to the chapter on *ch'i* in Zhang Dainian’s *Key
Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*, a book Ryden has translated: “Perhaps the best translation of the
Chinese word *qi* is provided by Einstein’s equation *e* = *m*\(^{2}\). According to this equation matter and
energy are convertible. In places the material element may be to the fore, in others, what we term
energy”. Cf. Zhang Dainian, *Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*, trans. E. Ryden, Beijing 2002, p. 45.

\(^{28}\) Lao Tzŭ [*老子*], op. cit., p. 100.

\(^{29}\) R. Jeffers, *The Collected Poetry of Robinson Jeffers: 1928–1938*, ed. T. Hunt, Vol. 2, Stanford
CA 1989, p. 536.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., p. 125.

\(^{31}\) Ibid., p. 412.

\(^{32}\) R. Jeffers, *The Collected Poetry of Robinson Jeffers: 1903–1920*, ed. T. Hunt, Vol. 4, Stanford
CA 2000, p. 306.

\(^{33}\) Or Zhuang Zi in a different romanization system.
When Chuang Tzŭ’s wife died, Hui Tzŭ was sorry for him, but he found Chuang Tzŭ squatting and drumming on a bowl. Hui Tzŭ said: “You lived together and brought up children, now the old woman is dead. It would already be enough if you simply did not mourn, but drumming on a bowl and singing, that is too much”. Chuang Tzŭ answered: “It is not so. When she died, how could I not despair? But then I started to think, and I realized that, at the very beginning, she had had no life, not only had she had no life but no form either, and not only had she had no form, but she did not have any ch’i either. All had been blended together into one mass. This mass then turned into ch’i, and ch’i turned into form and form turned into life, and now it has turned into death again. It is like the cycle of the four seasons: spring, fall, summer and winter. When people feel like they need a rest, they go to sleep in the Large Room. If I were to weep for that, I would be in conflict with what is inevitable, so I stopped.



[莊子妻死，惠子弔之，莊子則方箕踞鼓盆而歌。惠子曰：“與人居長子，老身死，不哭亦足矣，又鼓盆而歌，不亦甚乎！”莊子曰：“不然。是其始死也，我獨何能無概然！察其始而本無生，非徒無生也，而本無形，非徒無形也，而本無氣。雑乎芒芴之間，變而有氣，氣變而有形，形變而有生，今又變而之死，是相與為春夏秋冬四時行也。人且偃然寢於巨室，而我噭噭然隨而哭之，自以為不通乎命，故止也。] 34

For the Taoist thinker, this was not a manifestation of joy (as it would be for Jeffers), but a way of voicing his contention that nothing has actually changed: first his wife did not exist, then she existed and now she does not exist again, so the state of affairs has simply returned to its original condition.

The extolment of death, conforming to the laws of nature, is also the core concept of the poem entitled Birds and Fishes, where the act of eating the fish by the birds is called “the beauty of God”. 35

Jeffers does not only acquiesce to the most intimidating laws of nature (as a Taoist would do), but he also positively admires them, and the speaker of his poem Vulture wants the laws applied to himself:

I saw through half-shut eyelids a vulture wheeling high up in heaven

(…)

To be eaten by that beak and become part of him, to share those wings and those eyes – What a sublime end of one’s body, what an enskyment; what a life after death.36

The speaker of the poem wants to return to the non-human nature as soon as possible. No such urgent need can be found in Lao Tzŭ’s book. According to the tenets of Taoism, everything runs its natural course. The speaker in Vulture is impatient, truly a modern man of the western civilization.

In Jeffers’s poetry, contrary to the Taoist views, humans are not an equally important component of the natural world; for the speakers of Jeffers’s poems, humans are often inferior to all other creation, as in De Rerum Virtute:

34 Chuang Tzŭ [庄子], op. cit., p. 257.
35 R. Jeffers, op. cit., 1988, p. 426.
36 Ibid., p. 462.
One light is left us: the beauty of things, not men;
The immense beauty of the world, not the human world.
Look—and without imagination, desire nor dream—directly
At the mountains and the sea. Are they not beautiful?
…is the earth not beautiful?37

In one of his longer epic poems, namely Roan Stallion, it might seem at first glance that Jeffers positions humans on a higher echelon of the natural hierarchy, as it is California, a woman, who kills the horse. Right after the deed, however, “she turned then on her little daughter the mask of a woman | Who has killed God”38. Thus, even though the animal fell from a woman’s hand, it was not triumph but hubris (in the sense the ancient Greeks understood the term), i.e. an offence against nature or a sin against gods, which must eventually lead to a harsh punishment.

There is yet one more difference between Jeffers and Lao Tzū. For the Chinese philosopher, what he propounds is obvious and needs no investigation or research. Lao Tzū, actually, discourages his readers from learning and teaching:

Forsake learning, and there shall be no worriment.

[絕學，無憂。]39

The rule of the sages consists in emptying the hearts and filling the bellies, weakening the will and strengthening the bones. Forever shall it make the people know nothing and desire nothing.

[聖人之治，虛其心，實其腹，弱其志，強其骨。常使民無知無欲。]40

In Dear Judas, Jeffers, on the other hand, encourages the reader to actively look for truth:

there is only one pathway to peace for a great passion. Truth is the way, take the truth
Against your breast and endure its horns.
So life will at last be conquered. After some thousands of years
The smoky unserviceable remainders of love and desire will be dissolved and be still.41

In Theory of Truth, as already mentioned, Jeffers accuses Lao Tzū himself of envying Confucius’ wisdom, something Lao Tzū would never do if he practiced what he preached.

It has been shown, in this article and in Peevey’s, that there are undeniable similarities between the concept of inhumanism and the Taoist idea of inhumane nature, expressed by the opening lines of the fifth chapter:

37 Ibid., p. 403.
38 R. Jeffers, op. cit., 1988, p. 198.
39 Chuang Tzū [庄子], op. cit., p. 172.
40 Ibid., p. 20.
41 R. Jeffers, op. cit., 1988, p. 39.
Heaven and Earth are inhumane; they treat Ten Thousand Things like straw dogs.\textsuperscript{42} 

[天地不仁，以萬物為芻狗。]\textsuperscript{43}

For the Taoists, this is however an inevitable and natural course of life, something that should neither be frowned upon nor admired. The laws of nature must be adhered to, as there is no way around them. We should approach them with neither joy nor sadness. It is how things really are, and there is nothing more to it. We should not try to learn why and how things work, only accept that they work the way they do.

Jeffers, on the other hand, is looking for answers and discovers the truth that consists in renouncing humanity for the sake of the non-human part of nature. In his view, seas and mountains are more valuable than human beings, which distinguishes his inhumanism from Taoism significantly. In Taoism, all the world is one and returns to one. All creatures are equal; there are no betters in the Taoist view of nature.

Another striking difference between Jeffers and the Taoists is his extolment of the destructive forces of nature. For the Taoists, these forces are worthy of neither admiration nor disgust. They are simply there and should not be a cause for bewilderment, anxiety or admiration. They are no different from the creative forces of nature. Both types of forces complete each other in compliance with the theory of \textit{yin} and \textit{yang}.

The theory of \textit{yin} and \textit{yang} is an age-old model of changes, and it precedes the \textit{Tao Te Ching}. The words \textit{yin} and \textit{yang} had originally stood for the northern and the southern slopes of a hill, respectively. The northern slope (\textit{yin}) remains always in the shadow as it gets no sunshine; therefore it is called the dark slope. The southern one (\textit{yang}), on the other hand, receives sunlight in daytime; therefore it is called the bright slope. Over time, these words came to be used as philosophical terms denoting two extremes of a given property or two opposite specimens of a certain type of entities: negative and positive, cold and warm, night and day, female and male, dark and bright, etc. This theory was further developed and made use of by the theory of changes, which states that nature is ceaselessly undergoing transformations, and all beings and all phenomena are in flux, while the only thing that never changes is the incessantness of changes.

The \textit{yin} and \textit{yang} are the two extremes that are ever transforming themselves one into the other: days change into nights, life changes into death, cold winter changes into warm summer, etc. In every \textit{yin} there resides a seed from which the \textit{yang} will develop, and the larger the \textit{yin} grows (e.g. a night), the nearer the \textit{yang} is (e.g. the dawn), and then the process of change runs in the opposite direction. For this reason, nothing gets really destroyed, for one thing becomes another, e.g. when a landslide destroys a mountain slope, the rocks that have fallen off the slope pile up on the ground and create a hill at the foot of the mountain; or when a mouse gets eaten by a cat, the mouse dies, but its death allows the cat to sustain life.

\textsuperscript{42} Staw dogs were used for sacrifices, but people neither loathed nor pitied them.

\textsuperscript{43} Lao Tzü [老子], op. cit., p. 22.
Jeffers is satisfied with the violent destruction that nature brings and he ignores further development or silently denies the validity of any aftermath. In the philosophy of Tao, nothing ever ends, but everything changes constantly: whatever is born must die, and whatever dies must be reborn, even though in a different form.

Conclusions

It would be more than an oversimplification if we were to consider Jeffers to be a follower of Lao Tzŭ or Chuang Tzŭ. There are, however, in Jeffers’s philosophy numerous ideas that were, or could be, derived from the teachings of the Chinese Taoists: equaling humans to all other beings might be an example of an idea borrowed from Taoism.

At the same time, the apparently malevolent aspects of nature, most predominately death, have been depicted by Jeffers as objects of beauty to be contemplated, adored and wished for. The classical objects of poetic admiration like flowing rivulets, floating clouds, dancing butterflies, lovers’ get-togethers, etc. have been replaced with death, killing, eating flesh, inflicting pain, etc.

This attitude has distanced Jeffers from the mainstream of the western worldview, where pain and suffering are very often shunned, and it has pushed him in the direction of the Chinese Taoism, which regards all natural phenomena as neither good or bad. The pushing, however, has gone much further than getting him to the point of neutral stance taken by the Taoists: it pushed him over the gunwale and into the ocean of admiration for violence and pain.

Although Jeffers makes an attempt at freeing himself from the western civilization viewpoint that obliges us to overestimate the position and importance of humans in the world, he just cannot get rid of the western compulsion to choose between the alternatives of good and evil. He is not capable of choosing both at the same time, so he chooses the one that most people regard as evil, and he calls it good. The Taoists can live with both, as they do not feel obliged to make the choice at all.
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