

Eco- Anxiety and “The Myth of Apathy”
in Albert Camus’s The Stranger (1942)

القلق البيئي وأسطورة اللامبالاة في رواية " الغريب "
لألبيير كامو (١٩٤٢)

Dr. Nermin Ahmed Gomaa
Associate Professor, English Language Department
Faculty of Arts, Delta University

د. نرمين أحمد جمعة
أستاذ مساعد بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية
كلية الآداب، جامعة الدلتا

Eco- Anxiety and "The Myth of Apathy" in Albert Camus's *The Stranger* (1942)

Abstract:

The paper deals with the way man psychologically receives the ecological crisis and its Psychoterratic disorders spotting on eco-anxiety as the most overwhelming. It traces man's related defensive attitude of apathy that is backed up with an obsession with human mortality and guilt feeling. The paper proposes an interdisciplinary approach based on Freud's primal horde myth, notions of Deep Ecology and Felix Guattari's Three Ecologies of mind, society and nature. Its objective is to suggest a therapeutic strategy that pursues the suggested methodology to overcome man's apathetic attitude and help him to better response to environmental crisis. The paper's suggested approach is to be applied on Albert Camus's *The Stranger* to highlight whether Camus's protagonists have successfully overcome apathy in light of the varied concepts of potential hope suggested by Freud's psychoanalysis, Deep Ecology and Guattari's theory of Three Ecologies.

Key words: Eco-anxiety; apathy; Deep Ecology; primal horde myth; Three ecologies.

القلق البيئي وأسطورة اللامبالاة في رواية "الغريب" لألبير كامو (١٩٤٢)

ملخص:

يتناول البحث تأثير أزمة التغيير البيئي على الانسان وكيفية استقبله له والاضطرابات النفسية المرتبطة بالبيئة ملقيا الضوء على اضطراب البيئة باعتباره أكثرهم شيوعا. كما يتضمن البحث حيل الانسان الدفاعية كرد فعل لاضطراب البيئة متبلورة في اللامبالاة، ويزيد من حدة الاضطراب شعور الانسان بحتمية الموت علاوة على شعوره بالذنب تجاه البيئة باعتباره سببا في تدهور أحواله. هدف البحث يكمن في تقديم سياسة ذات أثر علاجي من شأنها تخليص الانسان من اللامبالاة. ولهذا يقترح البحث منهاجا متعدد الرؤى يعتمد على نظرية فرويد "أسطورة الأب البدائي ونظرية الإيكولوجية العميقة وكذلك نظرية فيليكس جاتاري" الإيكولوجيات الثلاثة: العقل والمجتمع والطبيعة" وحاجة الانسان لبناء هوية بطريقة إيكولوجية. ويطبق البحث هذا الإطار النظري على رواية الغريب لألبير كامو موضحا ما إذا كان بطل رواية كامو استطاع أن يقهر اللامبالاة في ضوء الأمل الذي تسعى هذه النظريات لطرح سبل الوصول إليه

الكلمات المفتاحية: القلق البيئي، اللامبالاة، الإيكولوجية العميقة، أسطورة الأب البدائي، الإيكولوجيات الثلاثة.

Eco- Anxiety and “The Myth of Apathy” in Albert Camus’s *The Stranger* (1942)

Man-nature antagonistic relationship and the obsessive guilt about environmental crisis are held responsible for the creation of existential anxieties and Psychoterratic (Psyche-Earth) disorders such eco-anxiety and grief that negatively affect man’s psychic wellbeing and subjectivity. (Pihkala, 2018, p.548-550). What is needed is to develop a different ecological mentality that is able to comprehend the prerequisites of survival (Louw, 2016, p.7). Panu Pihkala (2018) defines Eco-anxiety as the troublesome emotional and mental consequences caused by terrors of the ecological system’s unexpected threatening changes. People also grieve over the loss of their environmental belongings. However, not giving grief its due concern nor providing an outlet for it, create troubled states of mind that need a mutual custom of grief expression that Pihkala calls “rituals of grief” (p. 550-551).

Psychoanalyst Harold F Searles (1972) argues that being greatly concerned with the environmental crisis, human beings develop unconscious psychological and social defensive reactions like those aroused by nuclear war (p.361). This is manifested in an unconscious state of apathy stimulated by man’s double obsession with his mortal nature and guilt feelings (Searles, 1972, p. 363). Pihkala (2018) proposes that the individual’s eco-anxiety is widely reflected in “socially constructed silence”, “anticipatory mourning”, “psychic numbing”, “apathy”, etc... p. 549). Highlighting Eco anxiety as a provocative element that creates a defensive state of apathy and denial, Pihkala (2018) writes “If and when people find it too difficult to process the emotions and existential questions related to environmental problems, they have a tendency to resort to various defenses (and coping mechanisms). Full-scale denial is only one of these responses” (p.548-49)

Accordingly, the paper proposes apathy as its major point of interest, calling it, as coined by psychoanalysts Renée Lertzman and Mary Pipher, “the myth of apathy” (Pihkala, 2018, p.548). To further define apathy, Pihkala (2018) argues that whenever an action is disturbing, a sort of implicit deal of silence is made among people where the problem itself

is not discussed or talked about (p.549). This state of emotional breakdown is described by Pihkala (2018) as “anticipatory mourning” (p.549) where individuals seek to mourn in advance the loss of precious things to avoid a future suffering over their disappearance (p.549). On another level, apathy could be psychologically explained in terms of class distinction aggression and the poor’s seeking pleasure in the rich’s suffering from pollution, that the poor are partially responsible for (Searles, 1972, p. 365). On a similar, yet wider ground, those who live in the undeveloped countries extol in the fact that the ecological collapse influencing them is equally threatening technologically developed countries (Searles, 1972, p. 365). Apathy could also be the outcome of man’s awareness that pollution can never be made up for just as childhood, as a non-polluted pure period, can never be restored (Searles, 1972, p. 366).

The myth of apathy is backed up with two major stimuli: the obsession with man’s mortality together with feeling guilty about being complicit in the ecological crisis. Being obsessed with his mortality, man is disturbed with existential questions concerning death, sustainability, the existence of a deity and the fear of human annihilation that culminates in a devastating state of apathy (Pihkala, 2018, p. 548). Highlighting man’s obsession with his mortal nature as a major apathy- provoking stimulus M.J. Rust (2008) writes: “‘We’re completely fucked’ . . . If many people are secretly thinking this, and I suspect they are, their motivation for taking action in the face of climate change will be zero” (p. 10-11).

Associating guilt feelings with the ecological crisis, Psychologists represent different versions of man’s feeling of complicity that starts as early as the original sin. When man breached God’s commands and ate the fruit of the forbidden tree, the world original balance is lost and “the earth is cursed and is in rebellion against man” (Marsh, 1994, p. 138). To resume balance and stop the earth’s curse, God allows himself to be born as a man (Jesus) who offers humans a chance for repentance (Marsh, 1994, p.139). On another level, Searles (1972) suggests that believing themselves to have raped mother earth, human beings feel guilty and have to receive the wrath of a “ruthless Jehovah” (p. 364). Dodds (2013) suggests that man’s dreads of being guilt-ridden are far greater than his

fears of annihilation. He is more preoccupied with guilt denial than with compensating for the fault. He first denies the existence of an environmental crisis then, he claims that he was born to find it like that, and he finally hopelessly admits that nothing could be done (p.3). Failing to overcome the double obsession of mortality and guilt feelings, the apathetic attitude has become Man's last unconscious choice. However, this can only help to increase anxiety and stress (Pikhala, 2018, p. 549). Hence, a much better therapeutic strategy is still needed. However, being oriented with the crisis's true causes is a prerequisite of the much needed step of suggesting solutions.

Gert Petrus Benjamin Louw (2016) has initiatively identified the environmental crisis, as one of the individuals' inability to grasp the real meaning of their being in an ecological way. Humans have distorted their ecological self by mistakenly defining themselves in an anthropocentric manner (p. vi). What is needed is a process of self-realization where the self becomes a more comprehensive ecocentric entity that incorporates human and non-human world; it is a self beyond the individual ego that regards the environment as "sacred, holy and precious, rather than as normal, everyday and familiar" (Louw, 2016, p. 99).

According to Louw (2016), man's reasoning of his own self is also distorted by the misinterpretation of the concepts and teachings of religion and philosophy (p.vii). Accordingly, an effective self-reconsideration process could be achieved through the rethinking of the joint ecocentric role of religion and philosophy (Louw, 2016, p. vii). The crisis is also given a social dimension by Messersmith-Glavin who calls for a remedy for social as well as psychological and environmental calamities regarding all as interrelated. This, according to him, together with a reconceptualization of the hierarchical bond with non-human ecology, that supposes man's superiority, is the required way out (Louw, 2016, p. 5). The needed ecological identity could, therefore, be defined as the way human beings perceive their value, position and contextual meaning in nature and how they relate to living/nonliving organisms as well as to fellow human beings (Dalton, 2010, p. 39).

What is needed is a specific ecosophy that is a mix of relevant disciplines, including psychology, philosophy and religion with a constructive ecocentric touch. This represents a call against anthropocentrism and hierarchies of species. In this concern, a comprehensive community with a special ecological code that keeps humans and non-humans together is built. This is roughly called by Aldo Leopold the “land of ethics” (Louw , 2016, p. 94-97). This new built land can, accordingly, reconstruct humans’ distorted selves in an ecological manner and put an end to man’s exploitation of nature and, therefore, to guilt feelings (Louw, 2016, p. 94-97).

This highly suggests the paper’s proposed approach that identifies Freud’s psychoanalysis of guilt with its threefold design of guilt-sacrifice-atonement as its first inspiration. Freud highlights two major unconscious psyche-tormenting sins calling for atonement: the murder of the father of the primal horde and the killing of Moses by the Jews. In *Totem and Taboo*, Freud (1919) refers to the father of the primal horde as an aggressive, selfish man who denies his sons’ sexual rights and regards all females as a personal possession of him. Consequently, his grown up male descendants murder and cannibalize him; however, they gradually feel guilty (p. 233-236). Thus, a sacrifice is needed since, “...a murder can be atoned only by the sacrifice of another life” (Freud, 1919, p. 99).

The paper’s second inspiration is that of Deep Ecology that is basically a departure from Shallow anthropocentric ecology to a more relevant ecocentric one that prompts a hermeneutic rethinking of conceptions of a variety of cultures, religions and philosophies (Louw, 2016, p.59). This ecocentric as well as hermeneutic tendency underscores Deep Ecology’s potential ability to effect a self-reconceptualization and a reconstruction of human consciousness (Louw, 2016, p. 100). It is also a means of reuniting human beings with nature as well as with other fellow humans while dismantling the anthropocentric line of thought responsible for their estrangement. Louw (2016) writes “Deep Ecology is a platform that can contribute to the development of eco-philosophy, eco-psychology and intellectual discussions, thereby helping people to articulate and develop their own ecosophy both individually and as part of a community” (p. 96).

Deep Ecology significantly calls for a hermeneutic dealing with misconceptions that held Christianity responsible for the environmental crisis and a resurrection of Christian dogmas that can rather stimulate a much more positive therapeutic response to environmental crisis. The first mistaken issue to be considered is “the biblical mandate of dominion” (Marsh, 1994, Preface) or rather the hierarchical concept that non-human ecology is created for man’s own benefit. The authority given to man by the biblical mandate of dominion is mistakenly taken to be a human privilege, yet what is meant is that man “cares for creation on God’s behalf” (Marsh, 1994, p. 138). Joseph Sittler argues that caring for the earth and building an ecological subjectivity are among a Christian’s duties and obligations (Dalton, 2010, p. 43-44). Besides, Christian ecology gives nature a sacred value since “every leaf shimmers with a glimmer of the glory of God” (Haecker, 2021, p. 2). Enhancing this sacred value, Sittler suggests the reconsideration of “Christian grace” that regards nature as “a theatre of grace” where everything is “graced” by God (Pikhala, 2018, p. 562). Besides, the resurrection of the notion of Christian hope is a further significant requirement. This implies the belief in an “eternal life for those who have been faithful to God” (O’Callaghan, 2011, p.Vii). Carrying a promise for rejuvenation, Christian hope can fundamentally dismantle obsession with human mortality as well as with guilt and their consequent apathy.

A third inspiration of the paper is that of psychotherapist and philosopher Felix Guattari’s *Three Ecologies*. Guattari’s philosophy evidently dismantles the classical idea of ecology identified by Dodds(2012) as, “the science of relationships, and the relation of these relationships to a particular environment. . . these included the relationships between organisms and their environments, including other organisms” (p.2). The definition implies that ecology is commonly regarded as exclusively denoting nature (humans-non-human). In this way, the danger and risk placed upon the environment have been minimized and reduced to be simply a technocratic hazard exemplified in industrial pollution (Gattari, 2000, p. 27-28). In *The Three Ecologies*, Guattari could see the environmental crisis from a different perspective; he proposes three comparably deteriorated ecologies: the ecology of self/

mind, nature and society (Spencer& Fitzgerald, 2013, p. 213). Defining every individual ecology of Guattari’s, Dale C. Spencer and Amy Fitzgerald (2013) write, “Environmental ecology refers to the biospherical, social ecology to the socius or social relations, and mental ecology refers to human subjectivity” (p.213). Therefore, Guattari believes the ecological crisis to be a crisis of the three ecologies regarding them as so intricately linked that a malevolent or rather benevolent change in one of them is inevitably reflected in the other. This is replicated in his argument that “the suffering of the earth is evident in the suffering of self, society and nature” (Grange, 2005, p. 36).

Guattari’s social ecology is a troubled one that suffers from a lack of communication among people. Guattari (2000) writes, “It is not only species that are becoming extinct but also the words, phrases, and gestures of human solidarity” (p. 44). Similarly, to Guattari, human “singularity” is facing the same threat of annihilation just as non-human types (Grange, 2005, p. 36). Subjectivity degeneration, roughly called by him “the deterioration of mental ecology”, is one significant aspect of the ecological crisis that negatively affects the other two ecologies: nature and society. Guattari (2000) could ascribe such distortion of human subjectivity to the way it is standardized and stereotyped by Integrated World Capitalism and globalization that helps to create homogenized subjectivities (p.9). He seeks a departure from a homogeneous to a heterogeneous subjectivity where everyone proves to be different from his fellowmen (Guattari, 2000, p. 9). Guattari (2000) could find a clear relationship between the two ecologies of mind and society as he writes, “*social ecology requires* the collective production of unpredictable and untamed 'dissident subjectivities' rather than a mass movement of like-minded people” (p. 14). He also believes in the stimulation of blocked singularities by a particular “singular event” (Guattari, 2000, p. 10) which is an accidental initiative turning point that might be indiscernible just like “the little word which sets the world a-fighting” (Guattari,2000, p. 11). However, once benefited from, it carries a potentiality for dissociating apathy and pushes man forward to a different path (Guattari, 2000, p. 11-13). This highlights the crisis as one of a nature spoiled by man, of a damaged human subjectivity and of human communication as

well. What is needed, then, is an *ecosophy* that combines the three ecologies and gives a much greater concern to subjectivity (Grange, 2005, p. 37).

Animals, according to Guattari are of specific significance for the three ecologies of mind, nature and society. Like nature ecology, the ecology of self/mind is inhabited with animals reflected in sleep phantasy, legends and different forms of arts; they represent what is hidden in human psyche and manipulate humans 'contact with nature (Dodds, 2012, p.2). Deleuze and Guattari divide animals into three categories that Dodds identifies with Guattari's three ecologies. He rather identifies "Oedipal family pets" with mental ecology, "mythic (State) animals" with social ecology and "wild, nomadic, pack animals" with natural ecology (Dodds 2012, p.3). Guattari's *ecosophy*, then, highlights mental ecology, as a parallel area of self-expression, where environmental grief and eco-anxiety can be released through dreams crowded with animals. This provides an example of the required "mutual custom of grief expression" suggested by Pihkala as crucial to undermine man's apathetic tendency.

Hope for Guattari could be found in "notions of transversality and (re) singularisation, in new ways of living that are not configured by Integrated World Capitalism but rather in an ecological praxis that affirm the three ecologies" (Grange, 2005, p.37). This suggested resingularisation could be attained through "an expanded view of ecological niche" (Grange, 2005, p. 38) where the relationship between humans and non-human ecology could be reconsidered (Grange, 2005, p41). Transversality, in Guattari's thought, means going beyond borders and achieving wide-ranging communication in all fields, levels and areas and between "the different levels of organization or ecologies" (Spencer & Fitzgerald, 2013, p. 214). Besides, Guattari's hope strategy suggests a discarding of scientific prototypes and a going back to artistic ones that help people to comprehend human nature, life and existence (Guattari, 2000, p. 12) and "forge new paradigms that are instead ethico-aesthetic in inspiration" (Guattari, 2000, p. 37).

Having established the paper’s approach, a close reading of Camus’s *The Stranger* would identify the novel as a typical reflection of it. Camus has from the very beginning alerted the reader to the fact that the novel is meant to be an allegory of man-nature relationship and his apathetic attitude towards the environmental crisis. The novel opens with the sudden death of Meursault’s mother at a Home for the aged. The mother figure should inevitably conjure up the term “Mother Nature” that identifies nature with mother and, in Dodds’s words, brings to mind the idea that “our experience with the planet relates to our experience with our(m)other” (Dodds, 2011, p.58). Accordingly, Meursault’s mother is obviously meant to be a replica of Mother Nature and her death is nothing if not the death of nature.

Camus presents manifestations of man-nature alienation highlighted in the mother’s move to the home of elderly people and Meursault’s ignorance of his mother’s age beside other personal details of hers. This is typical to the fact that we are so alienated from nature that “we do not really know or haven’t met the types of trees from which we may have furniture. That we only know the commodities not the nature” (Searles, 1960, p.378). Besides, the protagonist’s giving his mother up might comply with Pihkala’s concept of “anticipatory mourning” (Pihkala, 2018, p.549) that prepares him to face the most painful events of life (mother’s departure) unconcernedly.

Camus has further reinforced the allusion to nature by referring to man’s apathetic attitude towards it reflected in the protagonist’s reaction towards his mother’s death. He puts in parallel the two crimes, the metaphorical death of the mother and that of nature showing Meursault as apathetic to both crimes. He indifferently declares the death of his mother in a manner that highlights his lack of interest. He says, “MOTHER died today. Or, maybe, yesterday; I can’t be sure” (Camus, 1942, p.4). Showing no signs of grief, he refuses to see his dead mother for the last time and he indifferently offers the keeper of the Home a cigarette and smokes with him (Camus, 1942, p. 7). This highlights his indifferent attitude towards his mother’s death together with his anthropocentric polluting attitude towards nature.

When the protagonist surprisingly and illogically kills an Arab man, the murder charge in the trial has turned out to be a condemnation of an apathetic son who has never been faithful to his mother both in life and death. According to the judge, Meursault gives his mother up when he left her in a home for elderly people claiming that he was unable neither to afford her living with him nor to give her the due care. Noticing that the trial has gone off point, the lawyer asks “Is my client on trial for having buried his mother, or for killing a man?” (Camus, 1942, p. 60), a question that sets the novel as a replica of a trial where all human beings are convicted of disintegrating Mother Nature.

Camus has skillfully presented man’s obsession with his mortal nature and his guilt feelings. Commenting on the shocking nature of death’s suddenness, the Doorkeeper says, “things have to go with a rush, like. You’ve hardly time to get used to the idea that someone’s dead, before you’re hauled off to the funeral.” (Camus, 1942, p.7). Obsession with human mortality is also highlighted in The warden’s reference to the way the inmates of the Home receive the news of death as they become anxious for some days (Camus, 1942, p. 5). The idea is also illustrated in Meursault’s waiting every night for dawn to come as it is commonly known to be the time of execution. He says: “I have never liked being taken by surprise” (Camus, 1942, p. 70). Camus has further highlighted the idea in Meursault’s words as he expresses the fact that all humans are destined to die and “his turn, too, would come like the others’. And what difference could it make if, after being charged with murder, he was executed because he didn’t weep at his mother’s funeral, since it all came to the same thing in the end?” (Camus, 1942, p.75). After his mother’s death, Meursault’s going with his mistress to the swimming pool, spending a matinee at the movie with her where they watch a comic movie and have a sexual affair, represent what Pihkala (2018) calls seeking a temporal outlet for man’s dread of death in distracting activities such as practicing sex and drinking (p. 553).

Meursault stands for human race that feels guilty about being complicit in the climate crisis. He feels guilty about his mother’s death (nature’s). This is reflected in his words of defense as he says to his employer, “Sorry, sir, but it’s not my fault, you know” (Camus, 1942, p.

4). Similarly, when asked by Maria whether he was in mourning he said that his mother died the day before and whispered to himself that “one can’t help feeling a bit guilty” (Camus, 1942, p. 14). Salamano likewise feels guilty and responsible for nature’s decline. This is made clear in the hidden correlation between his dog and nature implied in his description of the deteriorated state of the dog that carries a clear resemblance to nature’s decay. Salamano says that his dog has once had marvelous fur. He says, “in fact, that was his best point, really. I tried hard to cure him; every mortal night after he got that skin disease I rubbed an ointment in. But his real trouble was old age, and there’s no curing that.” (Camus, 1942, p.30). Salamano has done his best to cure the dog (nature); however, everything should necessarily grow old and perish.

Haunted with guilt, Salamano follows the scapegoating technique that is “about finding somewhere to put something we don't want, and of forcing the container to accept the projection, often violently. Perhaps there are other ways to achieve this goal, dealing with unintegrated, unwanted aspects of the self, without resorting to violence?” (Dodds,2012,p.9).This scapegoating technique is apparent in the projection of his self-loathing onto the dog reflected in the unjustified aggression against the dog reflected, for example, in calling him “a bastard, a lousy mongrel ”(Camus, 1942, p.19). Salamano astonishingly shows signs of anxiety because of the loss of his dog; however, no signs of apathy in Salamano’s case could be traced. Unlike Meursault, he manages to release his eco-anxiety and could find an outlet through his direct relationship with nature (the dog). This should be read in Camus’s putting in sharp contrast Meursault’s apathy towards the loss of his mother and Salamano’s weeping and grieving over his lost dog that makes Meursault illogically think of his mother (Camus, 1942, p. 27).

Camus builds on Freud’s psychoanalysis of guilt in light of its two chief unconscious disturbing sins: the murder of the father of the primal horde and the killing of Moses by the Jews. Both crimes are highly suggested when the Prosecutor argues that Meursault is also held guilty of the parricide crime that is to be judged next day (Camus, 1942, p. 64). The crime also suggests a killing of God since god according to Freud (1919) is “nothing but an exalted father” (p. 242). Reading the novel in

terms of the myth of the Primal Horde crime, the protagonist's murder of the Arab man is meant to be a totem sacrifice rather than a crime. Being complicit in the ecological crisis, human beings are haunted with guilt feelings and, to atone for the sin, a sacrifice of a totem animal is required. This is highly suggested in the meal the characters had at Masson's bungalow; it suggests a sacrifice-sacrament (a totem meal / a Eucharist) (Camus, 1942, p. 43). When the Magistrate asks, "But why, *why* did you go on firing at a prostrate man?" (Camus, 1942, p.43), the word prostrate suggests a sacrifice ritual. The theological argument between the chaplain and Meursault about God's existence should have been a step towards the initiation of religion that follows the murder of the father of the primal horde and more importantly towards hope. However, Meursault's denial of God's existence signifies a failure in the imitation of the primal horde paradigm that should set forth "social organization, moral restrictions and religion" (Freud, 1919, p.234). The sacrifice is not accepted as it signifies what Pihkala (2018) refers to as environmental racism that replicates the oppression received by ethnic people, a further disturbance of social ecology (p. 558). A further and greater sacrifice is still needed, that of a Christ-like figure.

Camus has resurrected the Christian notion of sacrifice and Christ's crucifixion to atone for humanity's sins in the Magistrate's words as he says, "I, anyhow, am a Christian. And I pray Him to forgive you for your sins. My poor young man, how can you not believe that He suffered for your sake?" (Camus, 1942, p.44). Consequently, Meursault describes his expected execution day as a ritual of sacrifice attended by audiences. He says ". . . on the day of my execution there should be a huge crowd of spectators" who welcome him with "howls of execration" (Camus, 1942, p.76). This suggests a mutual custom of grief expression. Meursault is a Christ-like figure and a sacrificed totem animal at the same time whose sacrifice carries hope. This echoes the belief that God is sacrificed "first as god, and secondly as the totem-animal sacrifice" (Freud, 1919, p. 243).

Camus's novel is a middle ground where atheism, Christianity, philosophical and psychological conceptions come together to be critically reconsidered. This heavily suggests the hermeneutic scheme of Deep Ecology and its prospective hope. Meursault's refusal to receive the

Chaplain in his cell three times together with his later confession that he believes not in God signify the absence of the therapeutic influence of Christian dogmas and the urgent need for a hermeneutic resurrection of them as suggested by Deep Ecology (Camus, 1942, p. 72). Camus alludes to a pre-theology stage and then brings forth Christian hope symbolized in the idea of repentance. This is reflected in the Magistrate’s words to Meursault that “even the worst of sinners could obtain forgiveness of Him. But first he must repent, and become like a little child, with a simple, trustful heart, open to conviction” (Camus, 1942, p. 43). The theological conversation between the Chaplain and Meursault about belief and disbelief suggests that life is intolerable without theological hope. Camus (1942) writes:

Have you no hope at all? Do you really think that when you die you die outright, and nothing remains?

I said: “Yes.”

He dropped his eyes and sat down again. He was truly sorry for me, he said. It must make life unbearable for a man, to think as I did (p. 73).

Both the Magistrate and the Chaplain call upon man to summon up hope to be a source of rejuvenation. At the end of the novel, Camus suggestively highlights the Christian sacrifice/atonement scheme as a source of hope as Meursault is portrayed as a Christ-like figure that can bring up hope by being sacrificed to atone for humans’ sin to help them live an eternal life.

Following Deep Ecology on a wider scale, Camus’s novel surveys different levels of anthropocentrism condemned as responsible for the environmental crisis. The meal issue alludes to the anthropocentric hierarchy of nature’s organism and how human beings believe other species to be created for their own convenience. The group feed upon fish, animals and plants and enjoy nature to the full. Yet, after the meal during which no single word is uttered (a parallel disturbed ecology of society), Meursault excessively practices a further anthropocentric behavior, smoking (Camus, 1942, p. 34). This attitude is earlier reflected

in the novel in Meursault's insistence on the pointless use of means of conveniences despite their negative polluting effect on nature. Meursault says, "we decided to take the bus. The beach was within easy walking distance, but the sooner we got there the better" (Camus, 1942, p. 32).

Old Salamano's dog issue is a further manifestation of man's anthropocentric attitude. Aggression against animals is psychoanalytically defined as aggression against the mother "displaced onto animals" (Heiman, 1956, p. 579). Freud (1919), in addition, argues in *Totem and Taboos* that the god often metamorphoses into the shape of an animal (p.243); this sets Old Salamano's aggressive attitude towards his dog as a hidden reference to Man's antagonistic relationship to mother-nature as well as to God. On the other hand, Dodds (2012) argues that the implied symbolic functional meaning of animals in literary texts is sometimes easy to grasp through contemplating the attributes that are commonly associated with the employed animal (p. 8). The direct and immediate attribute evoked by the image of the dog is loyalty and obedience. However, in the novel, man-dog relationship is one of resentment and alienation; this highlights the fact that human beings are neither loyal to nature nor to God. The dog's disappearance should be pragmatically understood as an inference to the prospective animal extinction and man's consequent agony due to his being complicit in the issue.

Randomly at different stages in the novel, Camus builds heavily on Guattari's notion of subjectivity and the ecology of mind/self. Both Meursault and his mother show a considerable change in subjectivity. The protagonist starts up as an apathetic figure whose behavior seems to be manipulated by the Psychoterratic disorders caused by the climate's extremes. His apathetic responses do never fit with the most shocking ongoing situations. Meursault's subjectivity development starts, in Guattarian terms, with a singular event (heat). Heat has a traumatic effect upon him as it calls to his mind the very memory of his mother's funeral. His description of the burning heat sets it as a "singular event" that is a turning point that gets him to kill the Arab fellow. Meursault says, "It was just the same sort of heat as at my mother's funeral, and I had the same disagreeable sensations— especially in my forehead, where all the veins seemed to be bursting through the skin. I couldn't stand it any longer, and

took another step forward” (Camus, 1942, p. 38). Hence, when asked by the Judge about the motives behind his committed crime, Meursault said that he did not plan to kill the Arab but “it was because of the sun” (Camus, 1942, p. 64). Heat, therefore, reactivates his latent singularity and consequently his apathetic attitude is dismantled and he takes it upon himself to do something to atone for human being’s guilt in a pre-Christian manner (a totem sacrifice/the Arab man). Giving a benevolent sacrifice, Meursault believes not himself to be a criminal (Camus, 1942, p. 44).

Camus’s suggested notion of sacrifice develops into a Christian one when Meursault’s subjectivity undergoes a second stage of development and he becomes a sacrificial Christ-like figure that can bring about hope. At this moment, he manages to build a homogeneous subjectivity rather than a heterogeneous one. A further phase of Meursault’s subjectivity development takes place at prison as well as at the court. This goes well with Guattari’s notion of the institution as “a unit of production’ of subjectivity” (Goffey, 2016, p. 41). During his first days in prison, Meursault was upset because smoking is forbidden; however, he later on gets used to not smoking. Highlighting further the influence of the institution upon his subjectivity, Meursault describes a positive development in the ecology of society (the court), where he started to enjoy everything that “went so smoothly, so amiably” so that he “had an absurd impression of being ‘one of the family’” (Camus, 1942, p. 44).

Likewise, Meursault’s mother has her own “singular event” highlighted in Meursault’s much symbolic word “the dusk” that is his mother’s turning, restarting point (Camus, 1942, p. 75). Her subjectivity has undergone a clear development during her stay at the Home of Elderly people when she transcends man’s preoccupation with the ecology of nature to that of the ecology of society and mind and when both ecologies are positively developed (Goffey, 2016, p.41). She is first depicted as a watching, silent apathetic fellow living with her son. She then has her apathy forcefully shaken off when she first moves to the aging house and kept on crying all nights and days. Later on, according to the warden, she has got a fiancé and a lot of nice caring friends of the

same age who make her life a better one and “she’d have cried if she’d been told to leave the Home” (Camus, 1942, p. 5).

She also develops a theological identity and has gradually become a Christian who would prefer to be buried according to Christian custom. Being astonished with his mother’s change of attitude, Meursault says, “my mother, though not a professed atheist had ever given a thought to religion in her life” (Camus, 1942, p.5). She, therefore, has successfully built a heterogeneous subjectivity symbolized in gaining both a social and a Christian identity. Meursault explains such change of heart in philosophical terms as he says, “There, too, in that Home where lives were flickering out, the dusk came as a mournful solace. With death so near, Mother must have felt like someone on the brink of freedom, ready to start life all over again” (Camus, 1942, p. 75)

Suggesting a new start when man reaches the end, as reflected in Meursault’s words, Camus alludes to Nietzsche’s theory of the eternal return of the same that carries a hope for immortality. According to Nietzsche, whenever man’s life reaches its doom, it starts over and everything is repeated with every minute detail (Williams, 2001, p. 341). Nietzsche writes:

This life as you now live it and have lived it you will have to live once again and innumerable times again; and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and sigh and everything unspeakably small or great in your life must return to you, all in the same succession and sequence. (Williams, 2001, p. 341)

This notion of Nietzsche’s is a source of hope that weakens the threatening apocalyptic effect of the environmental crisis and the related apathetic attitude of man.

Conclusion

The paper comes to the conclusion that Camus’s novel proves to be a representative text for its major arguments: eco-anxiety and man’s apathetic attitude towards the environmental crisis caused by man’s obsession with human mortality and guilt feelings. The text is obviously

stunned with clear psychological, ecological and theological references to the paper’s suggested theoretical framework built on Freud’s primal horde myth, notions of Deep Ecology and Felix Guattari’s Three Ecologies highlighting the concept of hope proposed by each of them. The novel juxtaposes two different attitudes, the anthropocentric and the ecocentric, showing those who follow the first (Meursault and Salamano) as psychologically disturbed. However, the ecocentric attitude is only set at the background, yet no particular character is seen as ecocentric in mind or attitude. The anthropocentric inferences throughout the novel brings to mind the need for “a land of ethics” with all humans and non-humans interrelated in a unified community. However, “the land of ethics” never exists.

In light of Guattari’s theory, the novel highlights the environmental crisis as one of the three ecologies of mind, society and nature. It inherently shows the crisis as one of diseased subjectivity whose reconstruction is crucially hindered by the characters’ stubborn anthropocentric attitude. But as the actions proceed, every character has undergone a singular event that is a turning point in his/her life after which a new homogeneous subjectivity is gradually born.

The paper recommends the threefold strategy of guilt- sacrifice- atonement as a source of hope either in Pagan or in Christian terms. The sacrificial figure might be a Totem animal or a Christ-like figure that atone for man’s complicity in the environmental crisis. Meursault who believes not in God could find it first in a Pagan manner and, therefore, purposefully killed the Arab man to be a sacrificial Totem animal. However, obsessed with the same sacrificial desire that seeks atonement, the Magistrate and the Judge, who believe in God, have selected Meursault to be a Christ-like figure that is sacrificed, in Christian terms, to liberate humanity from their haunting devastating guilt. The paper, therefore, highlights the vulnerability of the myth of apathy and presents a therapeutic aspect that lies in the different suggested notions of hope.

The paper highlights the need for self-definition in ecological terms and a resurrection of means of attaining hope required for the destruction of the myth of apathy.

Works Cited

- Camus, A. (1942). *The Stranger*. (S.Gilbert, Trans.) Vintage.
- Dalton, A. M & Simmons, H. C. (2010). *Ecotheology and The Practice of Hope*. State University of New York.
- Dodds, J. (2011). *Psychoanalysis and Ecology at the Edge of Chaos: Complexity Theory ,Deluze/ Guattari and Psychoanalysis for a Climate in Crisis* . Routledge.
- Dodds, J. (2012, March). Animal Totem and Taboos: An Ecopsychanalytic Perspective". 1-15. Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/animal-totems-taboos-ecopsychanalysis/docview/1403747029/se-2?accountid=178282>
- Dodds, J. (2013, March). Minding the Ecological body: Neuropsychanalysis and Ecopsychanalysis. 25, 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00125>
- Freud, S. (1919). *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances between the Psychic Lives of*. (A. Brill, Trans.) Moffat Yard and Company.
- Freud, S. (1939). *Moses and Monotheism*. (K.Jones, Trans.) The Hogarth press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Gattari, f. (2000). *The Three Ecologies*. (T. (I. Pindar & P. Sutton, Trans.) The Athlone.
- Goffey, A. (2016). "Guattari and transversality Institutions, analysis and Experimentation". *Radical Philosophy*, 38-47.
- Grange, L. (2005, December). "Guattari's Philosophy of Environment and its Implicationsfor Environmental Education in (Post) Colonial Africa. *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education*, 35-45.
- Haecker, R. (2021). "The Light of the Leaf: A Theological Critique of Timothy Morton's 'Dark Ecology'". *12*, 755. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12090755>
- Heiman, M. (1956). "The Relationship between Man and Dog". *The*, 25, 568–585.
- Louw, G. B. (2016). *Deep Ecology: Should We Embrace This Philosophy*. Dissertation. University of South Africa.
- Marsh, B. (1994). *Towards a Theology of Ecology*. Dissertation. Pamplona University.
- O'Callaghan, P. (2011). *Christ Our Hope:An Introduction to Eschatology*. The Catholic University of America Press.
- Pihkala, P. (2018). "Eco-Anxiety, Tragedy, and Hope: Psychological andSpiritual Dimensions of Climate"Change. *53*, 545– 569. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/z>
- Rust, M. J. (2008, October). "Climate on the couch: Unconscious processesin relation toour environmental crisis.Psychotherapy and Politics International". *6*, 157-170. doi:DOI:10.1002/ppi.174
- Searles, H. F. (1960). *The Nonhuman Environment in Normal Development andin Schizophrenia*. International University Press.
- Searles, H. F. (1972). "Unconscious Processes in Relation to the Environmental Crisis". *59*(3), 361-374.
- Spencer, D. C& Fitzgerald, A. (2013, February). "Three ecologies, transversality andvictimization: the case of the British Petroleum oil spill". *13*, 209–223. doi:DOI 10.1007/s10611-013-9422-5
- Williams, B. (Ed.). (2001). *The Gay Science with a Prelude in German Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs*. (J. Nauckhoff, Trans.) Cambridge UP.