Chapter five deals with the final phase of Lawrence’s creative genius starting from 1920 and ending in 1929. *Aaron’s Rod*, *The Plumed Serpent* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* are taken up for critical examination.

**AARON’S ROD**

In *Aaron’s Rod*, Lawrence slightly shifts the focus. He has just begun to realize that important as marriage is, it is not in itself a full time occupation, that there are other emotional needs that it does not satisfy. *Women in Love* ended with Birkin’s recognizing that the completed union with Ursula was not enough, that he needed “eternal union with a man, too; another kind of love.” Lilly, the successor of Birkin, is now exploring this possibility in company with Aaron. It seems far more as they are trying to find in each other a substitute for an unsatisfactory relation with women. Lilly’s attitude to Aaron is almost maternal, and they discuss marriage together with great bitterness. Lilly’s solicitous care for Aaron, his tending him in his sickness, his rubbing of his body with oil as woman does a child all this is strongly emphasized. But it is curiously connected with reflections about authority and power.

Fiona Becket writes: “of the post-war novels, *Aaron’s Rod*, in Lawrence’s own estimation of it, concluded some of the business of *The Rainbow* and *Women in Love*.” (Becket 66) It does so by challenging the centrality of both those books of different form of love relationship between men and women, giving rise to the emphasis in *Aaron’s Rod* the solitary male and the advantages of ‘singleness’ than about the movement towards individuation which characterizes *The Rainbow*. In *Aaron’s Rod* marriage is no longer seen as the defining relationship between man and woman and its limitations are spelled out in the character of Aaron Sisson and his wife. The
novel begins with Aaron’s decision to leave his wife and children and his work at the colliery, and to earn his living by his flute. He does, in short, what The Trespasser’s Siegmund is unable to do. For Lawrence the political reorganization of life would be valuable only as a procedure for liberating the sensual man from the bonds of an overly rationalistic culture. Aaron Sisson’s malaise is not the result of social or economic conditions; his emotional illness indicates a sensual failure within his private world of narrowly domestic experience. He feels that his soul has been broken into and violated by the possessiveness and dependency of his wife, whose idea of marriage is that “the highest her man could ever know or ever reach, was to be perfectly enveloped in her all beneficent love. This was her idea of marriage.” (AR 170) After Aaron leaves her, he comes to understand that he is rejecting the principle, the marriage relationship in which he was expected to repudiate his “intrinsic and central aloneness.” David Cavitch states: “This kind of threat against his integrity disrupts his marriage and more of such love saps his power to live.” (The New World 170)

As the book opens Aaron is shown as a good looking man, fair and pleasant about thirty two years old. It is Christmas time and the children are happy to make their Christmas tree. The war is over and Aaron feels that nothing is changed. Graham Hough comment that: “The theme that seems to be announced in the opening pages is Aaron’s attempt to find himself or more broadly, the situation of the established man who finds that what he has achieved means nothing to him, and i s irresistibly impelled to throw it all up and start again.” (The Dark Sun 95) Aaron is particularly successful member of the mining community, with money in the bank, a good home and a position of responsibility among his fellow workers. The picture of hou sehold has all the power and intimacy of Sons and Lovers, with a new recognition of the father’s point of view hitherto totally exchanged. The undertone of sour disapproval from the good wife, the wrangling competitiveness of the well brought up
children; leave of Aaron with only one domestic resource — his solitary flute playing in the back kitchen, and one outside distraction — the pub, with its atmosphere of masculine argument.

Aaron and his wife Lottie are imaginative projections of individuals who have to bear the burns of relation pushed to its extremities. Lottie complains about Aaron is that: “He kept himself back always kept himself back, wouldn’t give himself.” (AR 201) On the other hand Aaron feel “forced to love” whereas he wants “to have a bit of free room to round me — to loosen myself.” (AR 72) He tells Josephine: “I feel it I go back home now, I shall be forced — forced to love-or care-or something. She is made up her mind, she loves me, and she’s not going to let me off.” (AR 72) This bullying of love violates the sanctity of the sacred being. It amounts to a sin beyond redemption. As Lawrence writes in his essay “Morality and the Novel” that:

It is no use thinking that you can put a stamp on the relation between man and woman, to keep it in the status quo. You can’t … As for the bond of love, better put it off when it galls. It is an absurdity to say that men and women must love. Men and women will be forever subtly and changeingly related to one another, no need to yoke them with any ‘bond’ at all. (P 530)

But Aaron Lottie’s marital relation result in bullying of love. Lottie first accuses Aaron of cruelty and then makes a sentimental appeal to him to admit the change whereas “he himself had not the faintest feeling at the moment, of his own wrong.” (AR 139) Her bullying and sentimental blackmail make him sick with horror. She coldly horrified and repelled him. He could see himself as the fascinated victim, falling to his cayding, awful woman, the wife of his bosom. But as well he had a soul outside himself which looked on the whole scene with cold revulsion. His soul went black as “he looked at her.” (AR 137) He quietly discharges himself, “and in a black unconscious movement he was gone.” (AR 137) Like Ursula in The Rainbow, Aaron also suffers under his
partner’s terrible implacable, cunning will “that can press like a flat sheet of iron against a man.” (AR 169)

Lottie feels defeated but resolves never to yield and sacrifice “her terrible implacable cunning will.” (AR 169) Aaron also decides never to yield to this illusion of love “in which each party strove for the mastery of the others soul.” (AR 137) He determines to keep the mastery of his own soul and conscience and action. He looked at the sky and thanked the universe for the blessedness of being alone in the universe. “To be alone, to be oneself, not to be driven or violated into something which is not oneself, surely it is better than anything.” (AR 138) Before thinking about future action, Aaron would strive for “clean and pure division first, perfected singleness that is the only way to final living unison through sheer, finished singleness.” (AR 138) Aaron has better prospects of realizing his deepest being through unison with another being because he is essentially honest and straightforward. As Lawrence writes in his essay on morality that it needs courage and discipline. But Lottie neither has the courage nor the discipline. On the other hand Aaron, like Lilly, admits the reality: “of two people at a deadlock... there is not one only wholly at fault. Both must be at fault.” (AR 169) Regarding his affair with Lottie he is able to identify the real failure:

He and Lottie had loved one another and the love had developed almost at once into a kind of combat... both he and Lottie had been brought up to consider themselves the first in whatsoever company they found themselves... first and single he felt and as such he bore himself. It had taken him years to realize that Lottie, also felt herself first and single. (AR 169)

Lottie’s egocentrism makes her possessive: “all her instincts all her impulse, all her desire, and above all her will, was to possess her man is very fullness once, just once and once and for all.” (AR 172) In enrages Aaron. It is a familiar situation, a familiar land of life frustrating deadlock. What is wrong
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here? What laws of life have been ignored that there should be this situation, this dreadful deadlock, between a man and a woman? As Mark Spilka writes that for Lawrence, the source of life lies beyond love, and the individual soul, with its root in that source, takes precedence over love, it submit to the yoke and leash of love, but never forfeit its own proud “individual singleness, even while it loves and yields.” (The Love Ethic 126)

Ultimately Aaron walks out his wife and children on one Christmas Eve and becomes a flautist in the Covent Garden orchestra. He encounters with a metropolitan bohemian set in London that introduces him to Rawdon Lilly and his wife, Tanny. Their lives have reached a point of contemplation. He has Lilly couple in London. Both husband and wife tell him that love is life but it would also turn out to be a poison if not properly balanced. Lilly rejects Christianity because it tends to hide by love of all without loving an individual. There is a good deal of discussion on this point in the novel as what kind of morality should replace the Christian morality of “thou shalt.” Lawrence’s quarrel with the conventional Christian faith lay in the fact that he sees a significant connection between the idealism generated by Christian religion and the mechanical civilization that has developed in the Western world over the past twenty centuries. Christianity as Lawrence sees it is the attempt to live from the love motive alone and it is the worship of the love ideal which has thrown life out of gear. Therefore, Lawrence rejects it. Lawrence believed that “Christian venture is gone out of Christianity, and we must start on a new venture towards God.” (P 734)

Lawrence was not against Christianity. He rejected conventional Christian religion which is kept going by a barren effort of will. It has no connection with the deep sources of life. Christianity caused a split in the cosmos, for it saw nothing in the world but the soul of man, the love of Christ and sin. Christianity emphasizes on spiritual love and denial of the body. Lawrence also objected to conventional Christianity advocating the love of the
neighbor. In Christianity a man might never really forget his neighbor, for the very love of Christ is the love of the neighbor. Therefore, Lawrence states that in Christianity a man lost his “self” forever by reducing himself to be “a vessel of divine love.” (A 139)

Rawdon Lilly is Lawrence’s mouthpiece in Aaron’s Rod, which is his first attempt of a political novel. Rawdon Lilly and Tanny in their cottage, visited by Jim Bricknell are unmistakably, Lawrence and Frieda, and the chapter; we cannot doubt registers the actual living relations between them. In so for Aaron is the centre of interest he appears to be, Lilly’s functions is to help him to become duly conscious about what has gone wrong between him and his wife to arrive at a diagnosis. F.R.Leavis states “An invalid supremacy assigned to the love motive and the love idea; the taking of love as a goal; the assumption that it is, or could be the raison d’être of man or the woman to make the other happy; possessive or oppressively dependent — love the diagnosis which cannot be adequately summarized, has a convincing presentment that is not, of course, merely a matter of the direct general statement.”(Novelist 135) The correlated positive is stated by Lilly. The valid love and a permanent relation can be only between the persons of whom each one knows that being with another person is a secondary. Know that:

   In so far as I am I, and only I am I, and only I am only I, it is my last blessedness to know it and to accept it, and to live with this as the core of myself knowledge. (AR 258)

But “singleness” in the novel is not seen as an end, but only as a means towards fuller relationship. Aaron shows a remarkable facility for getting “tied up with others.”( The Dark Sun 101) His developing friendship with Lilly testifies this truth. Lawrence laid great emphasis on the need for friendship between men and the “faith in each other.” (P 665) Otherwise, he asserted, “humanity can never advance into the new regions of unexplored, futurity… Friendship should be a rare choice, immoral thing, sacred inviolable as
marriage.” (P 665) Aaron soon becomes aware that breaking of ties with others will lead him nowhere. By cutting himself off from all vital contacts, he can only arrive at “blank nothingness.” (AR 214) He runs away to London, then to Italy vaguely seeking Lilly who seems to offer the only hope of a meaningful relationship. Aaron’s rod is his only guide through this uncharted experience. It has a symbolic significance. Lawrence wrote: “Allons, there is no road yet, but we are all Aarons with rods of our own.” (FU 18) Keith Sagar has rightly pointed out that Aaron’s rod is not only a musical instrument, but it is Aaron’s “independent spirit, his self-sufficiency, his hope of fulfillment… which gives voice to the creative impulse foiled in its human contacts.” (The Art of D.H.L. 128) It is what offers release from the confinement of self-imposed ideas.

The world inhabited by Aaron Sisson reflects the social consequences of the First World War. Captain Herbertson has failed to wake up from the nightmare of the war. “Between his brows” there was still “tension like madness.” (AR 140) People were hurt not only physically, but “deeper than the brain,” (AR 142) so their souls could not heal. In London, Aaron feels that the town “got on his nerves” (AR 158). He saw the divesting effect of war everywhere in “the feeling of emptiness, of neglect, of lack of supplies.” He was distressed to see that “the accursed mechanical ideal gains day by day over the spontaneous life-dynamic so that Italy becomes as idea bound and as automatic as England: just a business proposition.” (AR 184) Wherever Aaron went he saw the disintegrating effect of war. Life in this chaotic world is artificially held together by makeup, alcohol, intellectual discussions and shreds of manners. It erupts repeatedly in violence and appears to be constantly on the verge of annihilation. In such an atmosphere of violence, Aaron’s rod is destroyed and Lilly consoles him: “It’ll grow again. It’s a reed, water plant. You can’t kill it.” (AR 331)
Throughout the novel, things break and people go asunder. The book presents a picture of total social disintegration. One is reminded of the lines from Yeats “The Second Coming”:

Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; more anarchy is loosed upon the world… The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity. (Yeats: *Selected Poetry* 99)

The war had revealed the total sterility of all the old ideals of love and sacrifice. Lilly rejected western ideals as dead and stinking. Like Birkin, Lilly believed in the “flux of disintegration and corruption.” (*P II* 392) The splitting of the world is good if it clears the world of dead humanity and frees the individual from the confusion of irrelevant ties and allegiances. The old ideals were like the dead leaves that must be shaken from the tree of life before it can put forth new shoots. The domination of ideas over the deeper, dark self has blocked the way for spontaneity to flow unhampered. This Aaron also realized for the first time in Novara, “All his life he had hated knowing what he felt, he had wilfully, if not consciously, kept a gulf between his passional soul and his open mind.” (*AR* 197) His “mask, his idea of himself dropped and was broken to bits.” He sat “invisible and undefined,” “knowing, but making no conceptions: knowing, but having no idea.” (*AR* 198) This is what Lawrence called instinctive awareness or knowing in one’s unconscious self which cannot be known by the mind.

Aaron’s continuous progress outside England is mainly concerned with “how to live as an individual outside the society.” (Worthen: *Idea of Novel* 128) In Florence, Aaron senses the end of the old world and the beginning of the new one. He saw that Florentine men possessed “the one manly quality, undying acrid fearlessness.” (*AR* 254) He feels a “new self, a new life urging rising inside himself.” (*AR* 254) Aaron feels free to get in touch with other human beings. His flute -playing which was a means of earning his living assumes phallic importance. It performs miracle by awakening a new woman in
Marchesa. It releases her from her inhibition to form intimate contact with a man. Aaron also has the strong desire to make one last attempt at relation with a woman. Aaron’s rod is going to blossom again: “The phoenix had risen in fire again, out of the ashes.” (AR 302) He had got back “the male godliness, the male godhead.” (AR 301) His soul had “come into being in the midst of life, just as the phoenix in her maturity becomes immortal flame.” (P II 384) But unlike the relationship of Birkin and Ursula, the contact between Aaron and Marchesa is based on “sheer sensuality.” (Leavis, Novelist 57) Aaron discovers that Marchesa does not care for him as an individual. Once again he fights for his liberation from women and love which appears deadly to him.

During latter half of the novel Aaron’s flute has been assuming greater and greater importance. It is in the first place his means of livelihood. It is by his talents as a performer that Aaron earns his living and is free to wander round Italy, so that the flute is not only the symbol but very instrument of his liberation. It was Lilly who called the flute Aaron’s Rod and associated it with Aaron personal vital force. And sure enough, it was the flute that had gained him the interest and sympathy of people; he had met on his travels. It was the flute that had released the frost bound Marchesa. Aaron’s flute playing draws directly on the spontaneous life below the level of ideas and mental consciousness. The flute represent that in him which know that he could no longer go on being made to love and made to male care and which prevailed in his act of desertion. For Lawrence music is the harmony between one and all.

In fact, Aaron’s greatest need is to stay alone, to preserve his “essential self” which women like Lottie and Marchesa threaten to destroy by their wilfulness. Lilly advises him to stay away from the “love-mode,” for he believed that before men and women come together they should learn to stand by themselves intrinsically. This is the state of “Nirvana,” but not as the Buddhists teach. It is Nirvana “without ceasing to love, or even to hate.” It is not a “negative Nirvana,” for “you learn to be quite alone, and possess your
own soul in isolation - and at the same time, to be perfectly with someone else.” (AR 128) That is the adjustment between Lilly and his wife Tanny. Both of them possess their souls in patience and peace. They understand each other — they are “together and apart at the same time, and free of each other, and eternally inseparable.” (AR 128) In the modern age, marriage has become only an “idée fixe” (200). Lawrence believed that “once we fall into the state of egoism, we cannot change.” (P II 396) He regrets that “we have forced the blood to submission” to the mental consciousness which has resulted in “disintegration,” (FU 175) Aaron’s complaint is that women do not consider men as individuals with their own integrity. Man’s own desires, instincts and his self is completely ignored for achieving the purpose of procreation. Lilly has some nasty words for pro -creation: “when a woman got her children by God, she’s a bitch in the manger. You can starve; white she sits on the hay. It’s useful to keep her puss warm.”(AR 108) Aaron who has been listening to him agreed with Lilly: “They looked on a man as if he was nothing but an instrument to get and rear children.” (AR 108) The whole concept of marriage is questioned in the discussion between Aaron and Lilly. Marriage does not mean procreation only, although this is one natural purpose of it. On the contrary, marriage is “eternal.” Lawrence affirmed that “the Church established marriage for life, for the fulfillment of the soul’s living life” in unison. (PhS 347) That is perhaps why throughout his life, Aaron feels that he is married to Lottie and cannot be married to another woman. But in the modern age, instead of the sacrament for the fulfillment of the soul, marriage has become an assertion of the self -important ego. It, therefore, needs “readjusting - or extending-to get men on their own legs once more, and to give them the adventure again.” (AR 108)

Lilly’s own life is an example of that perfected relationship flickering though here and there but never suffering breach of trust. They have been very much alone in various countries, she going to one country and he going to
another. But unlike Gerald they never doubted each other. Marriage for them was a self-conscious egoistic state, wherein two separate egos, neither clash nor fuse but harmonized. Again and again Lilly emphasizes the fact that one should learn to be “alone,” to be oneself. Lawrence also affirmed that “man must bravely stand by his own soul, his own responsibility as the creative vanguard of life,” (FU 109) for the assume “a sacred responsibility for the next purposive step into the future,” it is essential that man must attain “aloneness and singleness of being,” (FU 124) This is also affirmed by Somers who believed that “man’s isolation was always a supreme truth and fact, not to be forsworn.” (K 360)

Lilly’s words have a great influence on Aaron. He also starts subscribing to the view that there is “no goal outside you.” (AR 343) Man has got to develop his own self till he achieves singleness and learns to be himself. One can have passion, but love and passion are not the destination. They are only a means to attain fulfillment. Lilly believed that we have exhausted the “love-urge.” By insisting on only love-mode, we have hated the power-urge and now we have got to accept the very thing we have hated. But “we haven’t got to fix on any one of these modes, and say that’s the only mode.” (AR 345) It is such imbecility to say that love and love alone must rule. Now we must try to live from the “power-urge,” accepting it in deep responsibility, as “a great life motive”:

… It is a vast dark source of life and strength in us now, waiting either to issue into true action, or to burst into cataclysm. Power-the power urge. The will-to-power — but not in Nietzsche’s sense. Not intellectual power. Not mental power. Not conscious will-power. Not even wisdom, but dark, living fructifying power. (AR 345)

The power-urge is not conscious of its aims. This unconscious power-urge which comes from within can actually be attained by “putting aside our
will.” (P II 440) Lawrence’s essay “Blessed are the Powerful” deals with similar views. He wrote that the modern man has confused “will” and “power,” because “will” was “no more than an attribute of the ego.” And “will-to-power” seems to work out as “bullying,” (P II 436) and bullying is “most fatal, most hateful.” (FU 52) Real power which is the first and the greatest of all mysteries comes from beyond. The power urge is the principle of growth as it rises from the living centre without reference to God or to a goal outside. When man has achieved the singleness of the soul, he will turn to woman to achieve the “spontaneous -creative fullness of being.” When man will stay away from the “love-mode”, woman would submit to “something deep, deeper” in him. (AR 346) In this urge of power, man will be the asker and woman the answerer. This will not be slavery or “subservience” but “a deep unfathomable free submission” (AR 346) which will not be forced but spontaneous. Aaron expresses his doubt regarding this kind of submission. Although discussed in terms of relationship, the significance has to be seen in larger terms. Submission has to be interpreted as the condition which is achieved, after the inhibitions of the mind and ego are lifted. It is only then there can be participation in life and between the self and things surroundings, it can take place in a more spontaneous way. Regeneration will come about with submission which will remove the wilful assertion on the part of man which only spells disaster.

Lilly affirmed that if man starts living from the “power motive” or the dynamic centers and stands in possession of his own soul, women will not be able to resist him. “The central fullness of self -possession is our goal, if goal be any.” (FU 123) For the achievement of this goal, it is essential that man should come out of his private and personal fulfillment to form vital contact with other men. Having achieved his spontaneity with a woman, man must submit to the greater soul in another man for purposive activity. Man must be prepared to obey him through “body and soul.” (FU 84)
In the last chapter called “Words,” Lilly defines “love urge” as the harmful impulse to intervene the destiny of other. He says that there are two life modes—love and power. Aaron, like modern Western man in general, has tried to live by the love mode alone and he has exhausted its possibilities. Lawrence emphasizes individuality and the individual’s fulfillment above everything else. Besides the whole love mode is one-sided, inadequate: “Love is not the only dynamic, it is only the one half.” There is always the other “voluntary flow to reckon with the intense emotion of independence and singleness of self.” (FU 117) We try to force it to continue to work. What we get is “anarchy and murder” and it is no good. Lawrence insisted that “we’ve got to accept the power motive, accept it in deep responsibility.” (AR 145) Lawrence maintained that man is a creature of power as well as of love. But the pure individual tries either for power, like Alexander, or sheer love, like Christ. Whereas the fact is that mankind will always have dual nature—the old Adam of power, the new Adam of love. And there must be a balance between the two. Man will achieve his “highest achievements” only when he tries to get “a living balance between his nature of love and nature of power, without denying either.” (AR 128) The novel ends with following words the book ends. Lawrence is doing what he often does, ending a book with the foretaste of what is to come. Our next task is to pursue the theme of power and leaderships as they appear in the novels immediately succeeding Aaron’s rod. Lilly’s final advice is as follows:

I do believe that every man must fulfill his own soul, every woman must be herself, herself only, not some man’s instrument, or some embodied theory. But the mode of our being is such that we can only live and have our being whilst we are implicit is one of the great dynamic modes. We must either love or rule. And once the love mode changes as change is must, for we are worn out and becoming evil in its persistence, then the other mode will
take place in us. And there will be profound, profound obedience in place of this love crying, obedience to the inculpable power urge. (*AR 310*)

**THE PLUMED SERPENT**

*The Plumed Serpent* continues Lawrence’s struggle for the “wholeness of being.” In *Kangaroo*, the direction taken involved a movement away from contact with mankind, whereas *The Plumed Serpent* affirms that to restore balance, man’s need is not only to be livingly related to the dark God, but also to humanity and to the life of the universe around him. The movement towards achieving wholeness involves both ways. Sometimes the need is for greater communion, whereas at other times man has to stand alone like Lilly in possession of his own soul. The pattern given to the book by Kate’s oscillation toward and away from contact is the pattern formed in the process of actual living by men and women striving to come to their “spontaneous -creative fullness of being.”

One should not forget that although Ramon starts the political movement, he is not interested in politics. He is certain that the surest way to kill any living inspiration is to get it connected with a political party. He does not want to “acquire a political smell... unless I can stand uncontaminated, I had better abandon everything.” (*PS 260*) Ramon believed that politics, and all this social religion that Montes has got is like washing the outside of the egg, to make it look clean,” whereas he himself wants “to get inside the egg, right to the middle, to start it growing into a new bird.” (*PS 203*) Lawrence’s attempt to define the “dark gods” is the religious answer which replaces any merely social or political solution to the problem he is concerned with. He declares: “only religion will serve, not socialism, not education, nor anything .” (*PS 276*) Graham Hough rightly remarks that *The Plumed Serpent* “is an attempt to realize more fully the nature of the religion that Lawrence is looking for.”(*Dark
Sun 122-123) For this purpose Lawrence created the “myth of Quetzalcoatl”. He considered *The Plumed Serpent* “most important of all his novels.” (CL 868) Religion, for Lawrence, was never a set of rules to live by. He believed in a living religion, which is the religion of the flesh and the blood. It is the means to acquire fullness of being. Lawrence was pained to see the automatization of the vital life by the dead deals. People talk of change and the renewal of life, but they have no courage to “smash” the old idols. As Birkin put it in *Women in Love*:

> I think the people who say they want a new religion are the last to accept anything new. They want novelty right enough. But to stare straight at this life that we’ve brought upon ourselves, that we shall never do. You’ve got very badly to want to get rid of the old before anything new will appear – even in the self. (WL 59)

Lawrence believed that after the old forms of life are broken completely, the new form will emerge naturally. The new religion, according to him, will absorb the experience of life in its completeness. Lawrence had his faith in a religion which insists on living life spontaneously from the spiritual as well as sensual mode. Spontaneity is the symptom by which we may judge that one is religious or not. It means the sweeping away of all false ideals and ideas which only make us and our lives mechanical. The essence of life lies in achieving wholeness of being. Lawrence emphatically rejected the conventional religion which has caused a split in man’s self and created deadness in his life. Lawrence felt that the regeneration and rejuvenation can only be restored by abandoning the dead Christian ideals. Man will have to return to the dark gods of the ancient religion which involved living from the spontaneous centers.

In Central America, Christianity has become an obsolete religion without virtue. Like Anna Brangwen, Kate feels that its rituals have lost significance. Instead of bracing and enhancing life, Christianity merely makes men relaxed and sloppy. The bull-fight in the opening chapter symbolizes the decay of divinity, for a bull-fight has become the dead the revolting husk of something once sacred and awful. Kate had expected a gallant show, but “she
felt utterly humiliated, crushed by a sense of human indecency, cowardice of two-legged humanity.” (PS 21) The show was full of squalid cruelty. The chaos and degradation of life in Mexico filled her with rage. Sick of the life of mental consciousness, Kate comes to Mexico in search of some other mode of living. But in Mexico, she feels the contagion of a “crawling” evil. If she hated what she called the “mechanical cog -wheel people” (PS 113) of the civilized world, she equally hated the “degenerate men” (PS 83) of Mexico Valley. Their lives were limited to animal -like existence. She had gone there to find her soul’s fulfillment, but the place seemed to offer none. She feels that the longer she lives, the more loathsome human species become to her. She finds all personal contacts “disgusting” (PS 268). Throughout the novel, modern America stands for material and mechanized civilization on which has destroyed the soul of man. The mechanical world is so devoid of the sense of mystery. Her agonized cry is to her soul:

Give me the mystery and let the world live again for me! Kate cried to her own soul. And deliver me from man’s automatism. (PS 114)

It is characteristics that mystery is imperceptible and Kate swings back and forth between the two revulsions, that is, the degradation of life in Mexico on the one hand and the automatization of life by machine -ideas in the civilized western world on the other. But curious as it may sound, it is Mexico that “liberated her” from “the present era of civilization, the great era of material and mechanical development.” (P 142)

The point is that if the spirit of the place was so “cruel, down -dragging, destructive.” (PS 55) Why did Kate stay there? At forty, she no longer wanted “love, excitement and something to fill her life.” (PS 65) Mexico was heavy with “dark souled death.” (PS 56) Which she could not bear. She felt that “life” had lost any meaning for her. She was not longer in love with life. The only way to escape this barrenness is to bring about the death of her own conscious social self which no longer can hold her. “The thing called life” is just a “mistake in our own minds.” (PS 66) Life is no longer a “flow,” it has only
become a mental concept. We no longer live from our soul’s desires, but according to dictates of our consciousness. She had realized on her fortieth birthday that in “the rare dawn of maturity, the flower of her soul was opening” (PS 65) and she must “preserve herself from worldly contact.” (PS 66) Sick of her old way of life, she cried for the “unknown gods to put the magic back into her life and to save her from the dry -rot of the world’s sterility.” (PS 112) She felt that Don Ramon and Cipriano must have heard the “soulless calls across all the hideous -choking” (PS 66) of the death rattle in Mexico. Ramon and Cipriano believed that Mexico can meet the future only by means of some kind of projection of its psyche. Ramon had diagnosed the malaise and was trying to cure the city of it. He felt that the world had been guided by the ideals of goodness, love, benevolence and democracy too far and any step further in that direction present perversity. The attempts of Ramon and Cipriano to start a spiritual revolution in Mexico are organized around the ancient cult of Quetzalcoatl. Kate has an irresistible desire to see the revival of ancient gods at Sayula. She gets an opportunity to go away from all “mechanical connections” that “reversed her real life-flow.” (PS 113)

Kate’s journey to Sayula brings home to her the transforming “spirit of place” which is “appropriate to a new revelatory experience.” The crossing of the threshold is depicted by the “womb” on “rebirth” imagery. This marks the dying of her old self and the promise of rebirth. Unlike her American friend who were “widdershins” of a “cogwheel world,” (PS 113) she finds calm and dignity in the peasants who help her on her own journey. When she shared her lunch with them it was like a “communion” sharing the gift of grace. She finds this “communion” better than “love” she had known with Joachim. (PS 117) This carnal comparison of her dead husband with the two strangers appears to be strange, especially when we know that she had “loved” her husband “as much as a woman can love a man”; that is, to the very “bounds of human love.” (PS 65) It is possible that what she felt for Joachim was not love, but love – ideal which instead of giving her fulfillment made her feel dead and cut off from the “organic connections.” For the first time Kate realizes that the world
is full of split personalities. It was an illusion to believe that “each individual had a complete self, a complete soul, an accomplished I,” whereas the reality is just the reverse “Men and women had incomplete selves, made up is bits assembled together loosely and somewhat haphazard.” Their only aim appears to be “eating food and degrading the one mystery left to them” that is “sex.”

\[(PS 115)\]

The object of her quest becomes clear to Kate. She is seeking “wholeness of being.” And her first self-conscious commitment to the search for wholeness takes place upon this spectral Mexican lake. The lake is also the centre from which Mexico’s spiritual regeneration is beginning to emanate. Her prompt response to the drum — beat which marks the death of Jesus reveals her desire to be in contact with the mystery. By this insistence on the “spiritual” and selflessness Jesus was a dead God and no “Saviour to the Mexicans.” \[(PS 145)\] Christ, for Lawrence, was a symbol of what Christianity and in fact the whole modern, western civilization stood for. It was a symbol of man’s day – time self and a complete denial of the equally important “night – consummation” without which Lawrence believed “we are trees without roots.” \[(FU 185)\] Lawrence did not advocate living through the sensuous and passion lower centers alone, but in maintaining a balance between the spiritual and the dynamic centres. Lawrence wanted to “fight and to feel new Gods in the flesh,” \[(CL 681)\] for he believed that “God enters from below.” \[(CL 725)\] Ramon too realized that the church at any rate cannot help the Mexicans because it does not have “the keyword” \[(PS 276)\] to the Mexican soul. His own “clue word” \[(PS 277)\] is Quetzalcoatl, “a new saviour with a new vision” \[(PS 178)\] who he hopes will connect the Mexicans with the universe. The beating of the drum and the ritual dance mark the rebirth of the new god. As Kate participated in the dance, her individual will began to dissolve. T.E.Apter rightly remarks that the submission recommended as a cure for Kate’s depression is not to a specific male will or to someone else’s individuality. This is the “Submission to the mystery of the universe” which enables the woman to achieve that “vivid blood relation between man and woman” that forms “the clue to all present
living and future possibility.” (Apter 160) The process of abandoning the self involves not domination but reverence and submission:

Men and women alike danced with faces lowered and expressionless, abstract, gone in the deep absorption of men into the greater manhood, women into the great womanhood. It was sex, but the greater, not the lesser sex. The waters over the earth wheeling upon the waters under the earth, like an eagle silently wheeling above its own shadow. Kate felt her sex and her womanhood caught up and identified in the slowly revolving ocean of nascent life, the dark sky of the men lowering and wheeling above. She was not herself, she was gone, and her own desires were gone in the ocean of the great desire… (PS 140-141)

Joining in the dance, Kate suddenly comes into communion with cosmic forces beating even in “stones.” (PS 142) Lawrence believed that “cosmos is a vast living body” (A 23) and the contact can be established by worshipping it in terms of the “worship that is felt in the blood.” (A 25) With Ramon and Cipriano, Kate feels for the first time “in the presence of men.” (PS 73)

Therefore, Ramon’s campaign aims to restore to the Mexicans pride in their manhood replacing thereby a spurious liberty by a deep obedience, and an effeminate Jesus by a phallic Quetzalcoatl. The Quetzalcoatl, for Lawrence is just a “living word,” a symbol of dualism of spirit and earth, the joining of “above” and “below” for the Mexicans. The new religion was a means to make Mexican men and women “find the beginnings of the way to their own manhood, their own womanhood.” (PS 223) The realization of the greater manhood is to be complemented by the greater womanhood to achieve fulfillment. Lawrence held that womanhood is not merely realized by union with and in appreciation of manhood. It consists as an appreciation of a respect for manhood as Teresa has for Ramon. Kate exclaims: “what a subtle power inside her rather skinny body; she had the power to make him into a big, golden, full glory of man.” (PS 413) Unlike the power of will which tries to
make the other partner its captive, it is a power of her creative being which stems from her unknown self.

Ramon realized that the Mexicans are incomplete, lack wholeness and only the revival of Aztec gods can vivify and revitalize them. He declares: “I will serve the God that gives me my manhood. There is no liberty for a man apart from the God of his manhood.” (PS 80) Lawrence held that political liberation always leads to enslavement of one form or another. Ramon is disgusted with humanity and “human will.” He must abdicate from being god to his own machine and achieve his manhood. And for this he struggles against ideals, the exerting of human will, and the Christian religion which stands for outworn ideals. It is really ironical that the values against which Ramon is in revolt are partly presented in the novel by his wife Carlota. The married life of Don Ramon and Dona Carlota is a constant struggle of wills. Carlota is “an intensely religious nervous, spiritual woman.” She wills her husband to subscribe to the Christian ideal of a “good” human being. But Ramon perceives in it the insistence of a blind will. Hence he resists her strongly. He repulses her high expectations of him. He believes: “when man has nothing but his will to assert—even this good will it is always bullying … I have realized that my will, no matter how intelligent I am, is only another nuisance on the face of earth, once I start exerting it.” (PS 106) To Ramon, “it is a terrible burden, his wife’s quivering, absolute, blind opposition; take in conjunction with her helpless adoration.” (PS 194) She takes him as “a child, as all men are children.” (PS 200) She still loves her husband “but with a love that was now nearly all will.” (PS 191) In other words, she like Hermione wants to keep him as a love object, always at her service.

On the other hand, Ramon believes in a perfect reciprocity in human relationships: “I will not command you, nor serve you… And thus there is neither giving nor taking nor hand that proffers nor hand that receives, but the star between them is all.” (PS 215) His “pure sensuality, with a powerful purity of its own, is hostile to her sort of purity.” (PS 221) There has recently emerged in him a slow, blind imperative, urging him to cast his emotional and spiritual
and mental self into the slow furnace, and smelt them into a new, whole being.

He wants to meet people not on a merely human personal plane, but “on another plane, where the contact was different; intangible remote, and without intimacy.” (PS 289) He is of the view that neither complete submission nor domination is conductive to the ideal of reciprocity: “A woman who just wants to be taken and then to cling on, is a parasite. And a man who wants just to take, without giving, is a creature of prey.” (PS 302) According to him: “It’s no good a man ravishing a woman and it’s absolutely no good a woman ravishing a man it’s a sin.” (PS 307) But love for Carlota is not a spontaneous flow. She tends to view it as a fixed will: “She loved him now with her will.” (PS 245) Desiring absolute merging with Ramon, “She hated him and hated everything which she thought drew him away from this eternal close identification with herself.” (PS 289) The novelist rightly laments the ossification of an individual into the will: “Life had done its work on one more human being, quenched the spontaneous life and left only the will. Killed the god in the woman, or the goddess and left only charity with a will.” (PS 246)

That is why Ramon ignores Carlota’s tactics to make him a slave of her ideal love. He squarely refuses to serve her will. He accuses her: “You do not love, save with your will… it is an assertion of your own will. I dislike your insistence.” (PS 245) When she finds him escaping her clutches, she trembles with “a strange, hysterical anger, she, who had been married to him for years, and knew him, ah, knew him: and yet and yet, had not got him at all, none of him.” (PS 220) She is still “a torture” to him, a power that “lacerates him in his old, emotional, passional self.” (PS 244) Therefore, Ramon now takes her as his closest enemy and resists her claim on himself: “with Carlota he had failed absolutely. She claimed him and he restrained himself in resistance.” (PS 290) His heart is now quite dead in its connection with Carlota. Even on her deathbed, Carlota complains: “Ah, I never married Ramon … How could I? He was not what I would have him to be.” (PS 282) Cipriano tells her: “You were never married to Ramon. You were married to your own way.” He calls her a “stale virgin,” a “spinster,” a “born widow” and an “impeccable wife.” Charles
Rossman’s verdict is equally harsh: “Her death, like her cultures is internally caused, the inevitable result of a failure to change when passionate sources of energy have withered.”(You are the Call 301) Luckily, Don Ramon turns his soul towards more impersonal activities that may liberate his primal being and make him able for any future possibility of “star-equilibrium.” She acts as a foil to Kate. Even the call to which Kate answers, Carlota resists. Carlota symbolizes the veneer of Western civilization, which has been imposed on Mexico. For her the pride which Ramon has made the basis of his Quetzalcoatl cult is a sin. All her husband’s schemes appear to her only heretical madness, a lust for “power, just foolish, wicked power.” (PS 176) She is a Magna Mater who looks at men as wayward children. In fact, Carlota’s desperation stems from a sense that “she owes so little of her husband, and her quarrel with his beliefs does not involve religious matters as much as the separation of his interests from hers. Accordingly, her proclaimed concern for his soul is merely a cloak for her wish to keep his soul for herself, to murder that part of him which is independent of her.” (Apter 161-62)

At the opening of the Church of Quetzalcoatl in Sayula, Carlota is the only person who protests openly against Ramon. She literally collapses at the altar of the new religion and later dies. She is its first sacrifice. Carlota’s is a religion of love, but we are told that the spontaneity of this love is gone, leaving only a willed charitableness and piety. Christianity thwarts man’s natural impulse, denying the life of the body and insisting only on spiritual life. The problem of the modern man is that the “lines of communication between the conscious and the unconscious zones of the human psyche have all been cut, and we have been split in two.” The quest of the modern hero must be “to bring to light again the lost Atlantis of the co-ordinated soul.”(Campbell 35) The church in the modern secular state is hardly likely to help one bring together the spirit and the flesh, the conscious and the unconscious into a complete self and to relate that self to others in meaningful whole.

Lawrence’s opposition to the modern church does not mean that he is irreligious. Even Eliot recognized more clearly that Lawrence’s response to the
nightmare of the modern wasteland was essentially religious: “He wanted a world in which religion would be the real, not a world of church congresses and religious newspapers, but even a world in which religion could be believed, but a world in which life would be a kind of religious behaviorism.” (Quoted by Father Tiverton, *Human Existence* 97) Far from being irreligious, Lawrence attempts to counter the staleness of a worn-out religious tradition with the vitality of a dynamic religious experience. In fact, Lawrence believed in the Catholic Church which is “Universal” recognizing that “God is one God.” (PS 277) “The final mystery is one, but the manifestations are many.” (PS 375) Quetzalcoatl—the lord of both ways (PS 241) is only one such manifestation signifying the wholeness of being. It is “only the symbol of the best a man may be in the next days.” (PS 285) In Mexico, Kate experiences the “non-cerebral, but vertebrate” consciousness of the “pre-flood world” when the “mind and power of man was in his blood and backbone.” (PS 431) The Mexicans still had this mode of consciousness, but they had been subjected to the “mental-spiritual” world of the whites. So it is not only the Mexicans who have lost their souls and are disintegrated, even the white people are becoming soulless. The difference lies in their material success. The regeneration can be brought about by the “fusion of the old blood and vertebrate consciousness with the white man’s present mental spiritual consciousness. The sinking of both being into a new being,” (PS 431) both being necessary for wholeness.

The Quetzalcoatl myth, on which Lawrence’s new religion is founded, attracted him for a number of reasons. (Pinion, *Companion* 200) Quetzalcoatl is a God who is reborn after a long sleep of healing and the renewal of strength. Even Kate in her vague woman’s way has realized that “the gods must be born again.” (PS 65) As eagle and serpent, Quetzalcoatl unites sky and earth, the spiritual and the sensual. As “Lord of the two ways, he is associated with the Morning Star,” set between day and night. “The Morning Star” for Ramon represents the “unfathomable mystery at the centre of the universe,” (PS 285) “the Quick of all beings and existence.” (PS 266) Ramon’s godliness as the living Quetzalcoatl consists in his having succeeded in bringing the great
opposites of blood and spirit into unison with him: “Not in the blood, nor in the spirit lay his supremacy, his godhead,” but in “a star within him.” (PS 434) Criticizing Lawrence’s “dark god,” Hugh Kingsmill remarks that “the Dark Unconscious, the Dark God, the Dark otherness which he preached, was the prenatal state from which he had never fully emerged and into which he longed to be absorbed again.” (Bynner 260) Defending Lawrence, Witter Bynner writes: “Lawrence’s ‘dark god’ was no foetus in a cave but a full grown body in the universal shadow.” (Bynner 260) Unlike Jesus, Lawrence’s new god is the god of the body, justifying and glorifying whatever the body does naturally and without any direction of the mind or spirit. Ramon’s “fourfold is man” (PS 357) represents the “fourfold creative activity” (PU 241) which Lawrence frequently emphasized.

There is a continual conflict in Kate’s mind in her response to Mexico and the new religion. She is attracted by the Mexican Indians because she believes that they are still part of the “tree of life” (PS 87) and have roots which go down to the centre of the earth. But their opposition to the spiritual direction is repellent to her because this spirit is “superior” and the quality of our civilization. This clearly reveals that Lawrence was not against civilization or wanted us to be savages. He objected to the mechanicality of life which has killed the natural instinct in man. Similarly Kate hated the reversal to the old life mode where just and murder prevailed, and yet she is convinced that mankind lust go back in order to “pick up the old threads,” “the old broken impulse that will connect us with the mystery of the cosmos again.” (PS 147) Her doubts are nearly always followed by a renewed desire to be convinced.

Kate experiences the same conflicting feelings in her fascination for Cipriano. At one time she realizes that the contact with him has given her fulfillment and she has come back to her natural self, at another, she feels that Cipriano is exerting his will. She wonders “where was a woman in this terrible interchange of will?” Is she only a “subservient, instrument thing?” (PS 402) Kate is too much in love with her American self and asserts her individuality. The duality in her mind is the duality at the centre of all Lawrence’s works.
Fulfilment has become impossible, for modern men and women have become ravishers and the sexual relations have become the battle of wills. Fulfilment can only come when a man “sticks by the innermost soul” and meets the woman where the two souls coincide in the deepest desires. Then there is not “the horrible imbalance called ravishing.” (PS 286)

The relation between Don Ramon and his second wife Teresa comes within the definitional range of “freedom together” As a crusader, Ramon wants people “to find the beginnings of way to their own manhood, their own womanhood” (PS 249) which is essential for state of “star equilibrium” in interpersonal relationships. He also believes, like Birkin in Women in Love, that one must disentangle oneself from persons and personalities. There is only one way of escape: “to turn beyond them, to greater life.” (PS 288) Ramon and Teresa have intrinsic faith in each other. Kate Leslie resents their mutual passion though she herself has come to believe that a living blood relation between man and woman is the clue to all living. “It was the quick of the world… And togetherness needed a balance.” (PS 435) And yet she resents in Teresa “an air of independence and authority” and her loving Ramon “with a wild, virgin loyalty.” (PS 435) She thinks that Teresa has thrown herself “entirely into the male balance, so that all the weight was on the man’s side.” (PS 435) She thinks that “Ramon had got what he wanted —this back little creature, who was servile to him and so haughty in his own power.” (PS 438) She thinks that Teresa has sacrificed herself to Ramon who, in turn has submitted himself to Quetzalcoatl: “I don’t believe in a man’s sacrificing himself in this way.” (PS 444) In this way, a Kate Millett is already present in the text itself who doubts the sincerity of the novelist at every step. However, Teresa clarifies all such doubts of Kate:

He doesn’t sacrifice himself. He feels he must do as he does…. I am not sacrificing to Ramon. If I can give him sleep when he needs it—that is not sacrifice…It is not simply love…. I might have loved more than one man… My soul is with Ramon… He is my life. It is like seed. It is not good till it is given…. And it is his
soul that comes homes to me… If he goes to Sinaloa and West Coast, my soul goes with him and takes part in it all… And he does not forget that he has my soul with him… what I am to Ramon, I am. And what he is to me, he is. I do not care he does. (PS 444-46)

Kate secretly envies Teresa. “The secret, saving, indomitable pride in her own womanhood” that rises from “the comfort of a living man permanent in her womb” (PS 449) because she knows that all her “handsome, ruthless female power was second rate to Teresa compared with her own quiet, deep passion of connection with Ramon.” (PS 447) When Kate again says that Teresa has submitted herself to Ramon, Teresa again clarifies that there is a mutual passion and not a one-sided affair. If there is any submission, it is one of the parts of them: “He does not ask submission from me. He wants me to give myself gently to him. And then he gives himself back to far more gently than I give myself to him. Because a man like that is more gentle than a woman.” (PS 471) Clearly Mark Spilka’s allegation that in The Plumed Serpent, “women are denied sexual satisfaction and reduced to passive instruments of male pleasure and power” (Quoted by Anne Smith 197) appears to the based and devoid of any textual basis. The sexual relation between Cipriano and Kate furthers exposes the falsity of such an over-generalization.

Marriage plays an important part in achieving wholes of being. If there is no coming together of man with woman into wholeness, there is no marriage. The problem of life can be solved if each — man and woman are true to his, her soul and recognize the separateness in each other. The passivity which Lawrence recommends for the woman is the passivity he has described in Kate’s union with Cipriano:

It was strange, to be married to him. He made her go all vague and quiet, as if she sank away heavy and still, away from the surface of life, and lay deep in the under-life. The strange, heavy, positive passivity. For the first time in her life she felt absolutely at rest. And talk and thought, had become trivial,
superficial to her: as the ripples on the surface of the lake are as nothing, to the creatures that live away below in the unwavering deeps. (PS 438)

The contact at the impersonal level put Kate in touch with the mysterious unknown. In her soul, she was still proud. Whenever she was consciously voluptuous, Cipriano made her aware of this “frictional voluptuousness” and instinctively drew away from her. His denial of her makes her realize where she was wrong. Lawrence believed that there should be no conscious desire for “satisfaction” in sex, because it does not come from “within.” The desire from “without,” (PS 439) “the cat-like lustful enjoyment of its own isolated individuality” (PS 435) isolates rather than connects one with anything beyond oneself. This isolation, this assertion of individuality makes spontaneity something impossible to achieve. Kate is reluctant to surrender her individuality. She has been brought up to believe in “the intrinsic superiority of the hereditary aristocrat.” (PS 433) She rejects Cipriano’s offer to become Malintzi, the goddess, because a part of her mistrusts “all that other stuff” of gods and goddesses in the Quetzalcoatl Pantheon: “I would rather die than be mixed up in it anymore,” she asserts, “I was born Kate Forrester and I shall die Kate Forrester.” (PS 387) She suffered from a “duality” in herself. She could not commit herself either to the old way of life, or to the new one. The old way was a prison and she loathed it, but in the new way she was not her own mistress. But at the same time she realizes the regenerating effect of the contact with Ramon and Cipriano. She feels that they can save her from becoming “a horrible, elderly female.” (PS 457) Cipriano seems to offer her the possibility of fulfillment that other men normally do not. This can only be possible if she abandons her ego.

Her marriage to Cipriano brings something which is “forever virginal.” (PS 409) It was the mindless communion of the blood. The reciprocal relationship, “the primeval oneness” (PS 433) between them required a submission Kate has never made. It meant “the death of her individual self,” abandoning so much, “even her very foundation.” (PS 405) It does not appear
as if it will be an easy process. Kate constantly fluctuates between the old and new way of life. Her last words “You won’t let me go” (PS 462) clearly indicate the conflict. Her plans to leave the country are partly as assertion of herself, and partly an expression of her need to be wanted and protected from her ego. The decision to stay is her own soul’s desire and not an imposition of Cipriano’s will. She, however, continues to carry “conflicting feelings.” (PS 460)

The process of change which finally reconciled Kate to Mexico affected not only her spirit but “her body and the constitution of her very blood.” She could feel “the terrible catabolism and metabolism in her blood, changing her even as a creature, changing her to another creature.” (PS 438) Sex put her in contact with the greater mystery of the universe. The success of her quest lies in the spontaneous fulfillment which she achieves with Cipriano.

**LADY CHATTERLEY’S LOVER**

*Lady Chatterley’s Lover* was first published in Florence in 1928. It was not allowed to be published or distributed in the United States until the Grove Press edition of 1959, or in England until the Penguin edition of 1960. Both publishing events were followed by highly publicized court trials or charges that the book was obscene. Less than a year before he died Lawrence completed a long essay defending his moral intention in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. The separately issued pamphlet, “A Propos of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*,” is his best writing explanation of his views on sex, marriage and society. Lawrence states that in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* he purposely represents sex as it might be, not as it is; because our conscious attitudes made up of shame, guilt, boredom, or fear have made sex activity perverse. Given the catastrophe of our present sexual experience, Lawrence advises that ‘now our business is to realize sex. Lawrence states that the full conscious realization of sex is even more important that the act itself. *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is meant to awaken new thoughts about sex. And this is the real point of this book. Lawrence writes: “I
want men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly and cleanly. Even if we can’t act sexually to our complete satisfaction, let us at least think sexually, complete and clear.” (PII 489-90)

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, Lawrence presented two opposed orientations towards life, two distinct mode of human awareness: the one abstract, cerebral and invite, the other concrete, physical and organic. Lawrence writes in *A Propos* that, there are two ways of knowing, there are many sorts of knowledge, but the two ways of knowing, for man, are knowing in terms of apartness, which is mental, rational, scientific and knowing in terms of togetherness, which is religious and poetic. But relationship is three fold. First there is the relationship to the universe. Then comes the relationship of man to woman. Then comes the relationship of man to man. And each is a blood relationship, not mere spirit or mind. We have abstracted the universe into Matter and Force. We have abstracted men and women into separate personalities—personalities being isolated units, incapable of togetherness—so that all great relationships are bodiless, dead.

In *The Plumed Serpent*, although Kate could not convince herself fully that new religion was valid, she could convince herself of one thing that “the clue to all living and to all moving on, into new living lay in the vivid relation between man and woman.” (*PS* 414) This clue holds the key to the possibility of new life. It was “quick of the whole.” (*PS* 414) Lawrence exploited this theme more fully and finally in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. The new novel which Lawrence intended to name as “Tenderness,” aims at “some sort of tenderness, sensitiveness between men and men, and between men and women.” (*CL* 1045) It is true that *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is the story of personal regeneration amid both social and natural decay. Lawrence was heard to say that this novel was his “last long work of fiction, the last large attempt to tell men and women how to live.” (Nehls 274) And therefore, there can be no denying about moral intention of Lawrence. No religion or nothing else can be more moralistic than the thing that teaches men “how to live.” The novel “represents the final position, he had reached as a novelist with a phallic consciousness because he
averred that it was the source of all real beauty, and all real greatness.” And these two things “tenderness and beauty” will save us from “horrors.” It was “not cerebral sex -consciousness, but something really deeper.” (CL 1046) The insistence on tenderness, purity, gentleness, beauty, is clearly rejection of power principle which had dominated The Plumed Serpent.

Phallic consciousness for Lawrence was not only sexual activity, but “the warm blood sex that establishes the living, and revitalizing connection between men and woman.” (PhS 353) The mystery, the hidden fire, once symbolized by the rainbow and arched in the blood of men, “is now identified with phallus.” (Sagar, The Art 175) Lawrence has purposely dealt with sex in Lady Chatterley’s Lover because he wanted “to make an adjustment in consciousness to the basic physical realities.” (CL 111) He respected natural impulses but hated that pathological condition when the mind is absorbed in sex. In this phallic novel Lawrence wanted “to make sex relation valid and precious instead of the shameful” (CL 972) thing it had become. He insisted on realizing sex as a warm and spontaneous flow. Lawrence detested modern sex which is “a pure matter of nerves, cold and bloodless.” (PhS 35) In modern time, sex which was a “vital polarity” and “the dynamic magic of life” which rests on “otherness” (FU103) is reduced to mere sensation. Lawrence detested this degradation of sex. Lawrence writes: “It is in sex relation. There is threefold result. First, the flash of pure sensations and real electricity. Then there is the birth of an entirely new state of blood in each partner, and then there is the liberation.” (FU 141)

Mental consciousness, according to Lawrence, has given rise to the value of freedom, self-identity and assertion especially among modernized and liberated lot. This made them treat sex with a kind of contempt and flippancy. Modern men and women have become separate entities: “we are all individuals: we are all egoists.” We all want to be “absolute and sufficient into ourselves. And it is a great blow to our self-esteem that we simply need another human being.” (P 188) Man, to Lawrence, is an organic whole instinct,
intuition, reason, all united by “blood.” But organic wholes are converted into disjuncted thing and objects, matter and force. Lawrence held that fall of man starts with rational enquiry which is knowing in apartness. The two ways of knowing can be seen represented by two men Clifford and Mellors who represent the two different aspects of life.

Tommy Dukes, one of Clifford’s friends speaks for Lawrence. He stresses the malady caused by “mental consciousness.” According to him: “once you start the mental life you pluck the apple and severe the organic connection with the tree of life, and if you’ve got nothing in your life but the mental life, then you yourself are a plucked apple… you’ve fallen of the tree.” (LCL 326)

Wragby Halls and the industrial village of Tavershall are realized in themselves but come also to stand for entire industrial, social and spiritual orders dominant in modern world, more especially in twentieth century England. Sir Clifford Chatterley is “both physically as well as spiritually a barren fellow. He is a pure product of our mechanical civilization.” (PhS 359) He returns to Wragby Hall with Connie as a war cripple with the lower part of his body paralyzed forever. Clifford’s paralysis is “symbolic of paralysis of most men of his sort and class today.” (PhS 359) It also symbolizes his incapacity for genuine sympathy with other human beings. Clifford is an isolated man having no organic connection with anyone or anything. He is an industrial magnate in the tradition of Gerald, incapable of the naked realities of life. When Clifford got married, his marital intimacy was more personal and beyond sex: “sex was merely an accident or an adjunct, one of the curious obsolete, organic process which persisted in its own clumsiness, but was not really necessary.” (LCL 310) Clifford is bound within the hard shell of his ego. He “becomes a representative not only of class and ownership but of aesthetic sterling and the technological revolution.” (Haegert, Ways of Erose 217) He is bereft of passion, spontaneity or tenderness.

Clifford is apparently a powerful, influential man but intrinsically he is absolutely dependent on Connie — he needs her every moment. He worships
Connie and wants her “to swear not to leave him, not to give him away.” (LCL 111) When she married him, he seemed in some way “her matter beyond her.” (LCL 97) But now his amazing dependence on her horrifies her: “what man with a spark of honour would put his ghastly burden of all life responsibility upon a woman, and leaves her there in the void.” (LCL 212)

Sex, for Clifford, is a doggy business, necessary to be getting an heir. It is as we earlier quoted Schopenhauer. Coldly, in an impersonal way he suggests Connie to have a heir to Wragby provided she goes about in a discreet way. Clifford has often been seen as a decent fellow who did not behave meanly towards Connie and even gave her freedom in having her desire to have a child by someone else. His veneer of decency is a cover for pure animalism bred in the brain. He sees sex as a mere social function and merely a mean for composition of next generation. The success of marriage according to him depends on the intimacy of “habit of living together rather than on sex.” (LCL 335) The Christian contempt for the body appears in his belief that “the universe shows us two aspects: on one side, it is physically wasting, on the other it is spiritually ascending.” (LCL 458) He hopes that Connie could subordinate sex to intellectual life, as Mark Spilka writes: “Connie is perhaps the most lost of all of Lawrence’s girls.” (Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence 178)

Living a “vague life of absorption in her husband and his work, she was almost out of touch with real life. It appears as if she was living a life in the void.” (LCL 314) Connie lives in the dread of deadness that surrounds her. The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of the gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty, which every bird and beast has. “The utter death of the human intuitive faculty was most appalling to her.” (LCL 402) Her life was utterly blank and nothing. When roused, Clifford could talk brilliantly but to Connie, “brilliant words seemed like dead leaves meaning really nothing. They were not “the leafy words of an effective life,
young with energy and belonging to the tree. They were the hosts of fallen leaves of life that is effectual.” (LCL 334-35)

Connie feels fed up with her present life as Lawrence writes in “Morality and the Novel”: “By life we mean something that gleams, that has the fourth dimensional quality. If a man establishes a living relation, it is life.” (SLC 129) Contrary to Lawrence’s conception of vitality and perfected relations, Sir Clifford is a “hurt thing,” (P 14) a “lost thing” whose capacity to be involved in life has been destroyed by the war. He is able to think and to experience egoistic feeling but cannot get in touch. It seems to his wife, that at the core of him there is only “a negation of human contact.” (LCL 15) Actually, Clifford first great crime is that “he draws his wife into his orbit of nonexistence.” (Quoted by Spi Ika, Essays 78) The abstracted man who cannot live in himself leans with crushing weight on his partner. He slowly draws from her those vital energies which sustain her being, but can only waste what he absorbs since nothing can restore him to life. In this depiction of Clifford parasitism Lawrence is working once again with an assumption which is basic to all his works. It is that there is life in the vital sense and death in the sense of the unvital but no third thing, no possibility of an attitude of non-attachment — one which neither preys on vitality of others nor is based on the capacity of physical self-realization. Julian Moynahan writes: “In Lawrence generally the ground of all value is physical experience.” (Quoted by Spilka, Essays 79) This is both his characteristic limitation and the theme that unifies all his works — fiction poetry, essays and treatises. The only reality and the only marvel are to be alive in flesh. At the same time an individual can only experience his aliveness through direct relationship with another living thing. He can fuse himself in contemplation with the life of trees, flowers or animals but the crucial experience of relatedness is, appropriately enough, a sexual experience with a woman: appropriate because it informs to the order of nature, because for Lawrence touch is a more powerful mode of connectedness than
sight, because sex is, in sensory and emotional terms a stronger experience of connection than any other. All this can be put into a single doctrinal statement: to know and possess oneself is to have experienced a unity with living things and persons outside oneself.

Connie is living a death in life like modern wastelanders. What was the good of it all; what was the good of her sacrifice, her devoting her life to Clifford? What was she serving after all? “A cold spirit of vanity, that had no warm human contact.” (LCL 72) Connie is completely deprived of warmhearted intimacy, and she has no place among the cleverly talking, passionless men of her husband’s society. When Michaelis proposes to marry her, she feels absolutely nothing. “These men, they were all alike, they left everything out. They just went off from the top of their heads like squibs, and expected you to be carried heavenwards along with their own thin sticks.” (LCL 52) Connie feels hurt beyond belief when Michaelis blames her for his sexual inadequacy. She knows that “passive sort of giving himself was so obviously his only real mode of intercourse.” (LCL 54) For Clifford and his friends “the body is at the best the tool of the mind, and at the worst the toy.” (PHI 492) The modern mental lifers believe that “we are free to talk to anybody; so why shouldn’t we be free to make love to any woman who inclines us that way.” (LCL 323) It is only Tommy Dukes who speaks for Lawrence and presents the “democracy of touch.” (LCL 351) Like Lawrence, Duke affirms that “real knowledge comes out of the whole corpus of consciousness. Out of your belly and penis as much as out of your brain and mind.” (LCL 326) Although in his own words, he is a mental lifer.

The discussion sex as a sensation, “a sordid adjunct” or something trivial reduced to the same level, as talk exposes the sterility of modern life. Through these young intellectuals, Lawrence is describing what sex has become to the modern generation. “Blood sympathy” is something unknown to them. They all ignore sex as a “warm blood desire” (PHS 352) necessary for
vital life and indulge in cold sexual activity. Lawrence wrote *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* to fight this negative attitude and immorality in sexual relations. Connie feels that the “only reality left in her life seems to her nothingness covered up with hypocrisy of words.” (*LCL* 369) However, Clifford first pattern of abstraction is created with words. As a writer he spins verbal cobwebs and in his daily association with Connie, he invariably tries to reduce concrete experience to formulas. He attempts to fill the void between his wife and himself with phrases like “the habit of intimacy and our steadily lived life.” (*LCL* 51) But within this orbit the reality for Connie is “nothingness and over it a hypocrisy of words.” (*LCL* 57) By sharing the so called intellectual life with Clifford, she becomes aware of own emptiness. The failure makes her realize the “great nothingness of life, before she meets the gamekeeper.” (Pinion, *Companion* 207)

Clifford is an industrial magnate. In midcareer Clifford orients himself in a new pattern of abstraction. This time it is economic and industrial power that gives him the illusion of life. As an industrialist he draws men and women by the thousands into the orbit of nonexistence. He is described as becoming “almost a creature, with a hard, efficient shell of an exterior and a pulpy interior, one of amazing crabs and lobsters of the modern industrial and financial world, invertebrates of crustacean orders, with shells of steel, like machines and inner body of soft pulp.” (*LCL* 129) From the pulp of his inner life emanate just two vibrations and impulse of self-assertion and a contradictory impulse of terrified dependency. When Connie casts him off the transfers his dependency to Mrs. Boulton and in the end is left in strange state of equilibrium:

And they drew into a closer physical intimacy, an intimacy of perversity, when he was a child stricken with an apparent candour and an apparent wonderment, that looked almost like a religious exaltation: the perverse and literal rendering of ‘except ye become again as a little child’ —which she was the Magna Mater, full of
power and potency, having the great blond child man under her will and her stroke entirely. (LCL 352-53)

In the meantime, Connie’s mental life with Clifford begins to tell on her health. Her “crying need” like that of her generation was for tender love. She was living in a void when Mellors enters her life like “the sudden rush of a threat out of how here.”(332) The very description of the man is significant. He is a threat, in the sense that he is to destroy her dead past and present to give her a new rhythm of life. Lawrence presents Mellor as a whole man, polarized within him, and contrasts him to cerebral; “half” living that prevails in the modern world. Lawrence presents the gamekeeper, a kind of hermit, preserving his Garden of Eden. But the hermit figure is not wholly acceptable. “The hermit might be escaping to or from life.”(Sagar, The Art 176) The hermit life is a denial of relationship but one can’t deny relationship. As Lawrence states that morality lies in maintaining balanced relationships with the circumambient universe and not by living in isolation. Mellors, whose love changes Connie’s life, also suffers from a disastrous marriage. In his youth, he knew women who gave him their spirit of love but they never really wanted the physical act of sex, Mellors reacted from them by marrying Bertha Coutts whose aggression during intercourse finally demonstrated her fierce sexual hatred. Embittered against women and against modern industrial civilization, which he recognizes is anti-sexual, Mellors withdrew from the world to a hermit’s life as a gamekeeper on the Chatterley’s estate, but he, too is basically capable of tenderness and sensual love and apparently he could have loved a girl like Connie even before he met her.

In her deadness Connie suddenly confronts the gamekeeper taking bath behind the cottage. The sight of Mellors washing himself, nude to the waist was a “visionary” experience for her. Her deepest feelings and intuitive reactions begin to be connected with Mellors. Without knowing, she develops awareness for him which makes it impossible for her to keep her distance as
Lady Chatterley. This fascination leads on naturally to the scene at the hut with
the chicks and their first love making. The warmth of the chick on her hand
makes her aware of her own emptiness and she began to cry. Mellors response
to her plight was out of that sexual sympathy, which for Lawrence is “just a
form of warm-heartedness and the most natural life flow in the world.”(PIL
569) It is perhaps the most poignant scene in the novel and most frequently
alluded to. No wonder Kate Millett exploits the scene as indicative of the “pure
male mastery and female subjection, which Lawrence really wants.”(Sexual
Politics, 237) But to interpret the scene as “pure male mastery” is to miss the
real meaning of the word tenderness which Lawrence frequently emphasizes in
this novel. Their first encounter was in fact unwilled on either side. It seems to
be the result of the impersonal nature of their passion, of the overwhelming
energy of their unconscious drives, which compels them to break with their
former selves and start anew. Mellors taking her is “not felt as a sudden
grasping at an opportunity for sexual relief, but as an act that realizes the latent
bond between them.”(Draper, Life and Works 115) Unlike Kate, Connie does
not take long in transcending her conscious self. She is prompt in recognizing
Mellors wholesome and passionate warmth and also that.

He was kind to the female in her, which no man had ever been. Men
were very kind to the person she was, but rather cruel to the female, despising
her or ignoring her altogether. Men were awfully kind to Constance Reid or to
Lady Chatterley; but not to her womb they weren’t kind… (LCL 382)

This makes it clear that Mellors was in no way trying to have mastery
over her. The first love making at least gives her the peace she feels, the
relaxation of her own will. Both Mellors and Connie are capable of sensual
response without self-assertions and clash of personalities. The contact
revitalizes her. Julian Moyanna states: “Constance Chatterley’s trip into
Wragby Wood is, in the prophetic terms the novel establishes, a journey from
death into life and from the profoundly unreal into reality.”(Deed of Life 84)
Wragby is dominated by the word and as Lawrence remarks in a passage of “Apropos to Lady Chatterley's Lover,” the word is insufficient to establish that vivid and nourishing relation to the cosmos and the universe which is man’s only hope of sustaining himself fulfilled in the midst of life.

In Wragby Wood she could feel and admire the “life within life, the sheer warm, potent loveliness of all life including Mellors” and her own. She feels as if the unfolding beauty of the outer world were one with the renewed vitality of her own inner self. Mark Spilka perceptively observes: “Connie wakes to passion, beauty and human warmth through Mellors’ touch, and Mellors himself returns, from lonely isolation to life and warm hearted love.” (Love Ethic 190) As Charles Rossman view that: “Mellors treats Connie with tenderness, warm human sympathy and respect for her integrity.” (You are the Call 316) On the other hand Mellors feels that he will have to fight against the “Mammon of mechanized greed,” (LCL 380) if he wanted “to preserve tenderness.” But this could be possible when “other men also join in the fight to preserve the tenderness of life, the tenderness of woman, and the natural riches of desire.” (LCL 381) This was wishful thinking and the lovers were all alone in this struggle. Despite their identities as social beings, they reach for a way to get beyond the ego, beyond personality, to reach a sexual union purged of everyday accidents of birth, culture and social position. Connie’s longing for “the resurrection of body” (LCL 357) brings her closer to Mellors, for she is sick of mental intimacy with Clifford which was like a parasite on her tree of life. Lawrence has placed Mellors in precisely the same situation. He is an experienced man who has had affairs with young women drawn on the models of Helena and Miriam. They were romantic, willful and spiritual women who offended his manhood. Disillusioned he adopted the life of a hermit till Connie came into his life. Both of them were disillusioned in life and both believe that they were capable of a better experience.
The sexual candour of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is brilliantly vindicated as the core of the whole thematic structure of the novel. The basic logic is dryly outlined in chapter first. Disillusioned by their first love affair the sisters decided that what they really want is the beautiful pure freedom of a woman; their motive of being is emancipation to shake off the old and sordid connexions and subjections: But self-realization and egoism are very close; the female ideal of freedom turns into a demand for sexual domination. As Lawrence states that:

…a woman could yield to a man without yielding her inner, free self… A woman could take a man without really giving herself away. Certainly she could take him out without giving herself into his power. Rather she could use thing sex thing to have power over him… For she only had to hold herself back in sexual intercourse, and let him finish. (*LCL* 7)

However Lawrence suggested in his essays that “man should remain true to his manhood and woman to her womanhood and let the relationship work itself.” Mellors has tried to get his pleasure and satisfaction of a perfected relation but could not get it because it “takes two” (*LCL* 206) to do it. Similarly Connie too is completely deprived of warm hearted intimacy. David Cavitch writes “Connie and Mellors sexual relations are sweeter and simpler than for any earlier pair of Lawrence’s protagonists.”(*New World* 197) The descriptions of this intercourse are not dominated by images of aggression, resistance, violation or loss of identity, nor do the lovers struggle to orgasms of awesome intensity. In their rosy love the possible chances are few and unimportant, Connie is connected with the whole large world that is contrasted with the closed, shut in world of Wragby. The novel presents a complete contrast between the industrial world and the world of nature. Wragby and the industrial village, Tavershall, both are mechanical, hideous and dead. In the middle of these is the wood which Clifford wants to destroy with his will. The life in the
Wragby Hall is mechanical and devoid of any warmth. Living there, Connie feels like being inside an “enclosure.” (LCL 328) Only the woods beyond park stand for vitality, sap and mystery. Mellors wanted to keep it intact, inviolate, shut off from the world. Clifford and Mellors stand for two different ways of life. Clifford belonging to higher mechanical social order, representing the intellectual life is, cold, stride and almost dead. Clifford paralysis is symbolic of his incapacity for genuine sympathy with other beings. Lawrence writes: “He is a pure product of our civilization.”(PIL 513) The men who work for him are no human beings but ‘parts of the pit rather than parts of life “crude new phenomena.”(LCL 312) Clifford was not in actual touch with anybody. He depends on Connie like a child. He considers her the higher being and leaves the whole burden of his life responsibility or her. Like Skrebensky in The Rainbow, like Gerald in Women in Love, he is unable to maintain himself—to find purpose and direction—outside a woman’s orbit. And this game of submission and possession is quite contrary to Lawrence’s concept of morality in relations.

Lawrence believed that mischief is always played by flickering of balance within oneself and outside. Lawrence believed that freeing the mind from “fear of the body” (PhS 331) releases tender love. Lawrence’s explicit description of sexual meeting invited bitter criticism and a charge of obscenity was leveled against him for using four letter words. But Lawrence has done so not to arouse sexual feelings, but to purify every word and act of any “shameful associations.”(Draper 115) Mark Spilka along with a number of other critics defends Lawrence against the charge of pornography. He says: “The function of pornography is to arouse and explicit our sexual feeling by degrading them.”(Love Ethic 186) Lawrence himself wrote: “Pornography is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it.”(SLC 37) In “A Propos” he writes: “Obscenity only comes when the mind despises and fears the body, and the body hates and
resists the mind.” (PhS 331) In fact, Lawrence needed phallic language to describe phallic mystery so he used tabooed words.

A number of sexual meetings between the lovers can be looked as the process of educating Connie out of her sentimental and romantic love-ideals which she wants to impose on this relationship. Mellors senses behind Connie’s demands a devouring and essentially egocentric maternal possessiveness which is the enemy of human life and growth. Love has a resurrec ting effect on lovers and transforms them into new beings. Connie’s acceptance and worshipping of phallus restores, Mellors “wounded phallic life and phallic trust.” (Jackson 268) It marks their rebirth into a new world. They achieve freedom and abandon on all ties with English life and all that it represents. Such an undertaking requires courage as well as love. Mellors has what others men generally don’t have — the courage of his own tenderness. Lawrence insisted that for a life of fulfillment what one needs are tenderness and touch and bodily awareness. And “Sex is really only touch. The closest of all touch, and it is the touch we are afraid of.” (LCL 486)

Thus, “touch” which the modern world regards as mere sensation, is conceived here in its fullest and finest sense, as a mode of communion and a binding and regenerative force for love, friendship and creativity. This “democracy of touch” helps to restore old warmth, closeness and togetherness. Tenderness and touch even resolve the old dominance submission problem in marriage. Connie’s acceptance and submissiveness enables Mellors to yield to her urgent desire, something he had not been able to do earlier. By abandoning their egos and class-differences, they are able to achieve “spontaneous creative fullness of being,” Mellors comes into tender contact “without losing his pride or his dignity or his integrity as a man.” (LCL 482) With Connie as moral strength behind him, he could wage his war against “the money, the machine and the insentient ideal monkishness of the world.” (LCL 487) Mellors has a ray of hope:
All the bad times that ever have been, haven’t been able to blow the crocus out: not even the love of women, not even the little glow between you and me. The forked flame is all he cared about in his life. This forked flame which love has created in Connie and Mellors implies equilibrium in marriage and an oneness of spirit which separation cannot extinguish. (LCL 568)

Lawrence’s last novel bears detailed and striking resemblances to his first, *The White Peacock*. Each has a gamekeeper, a wood, a lady who must choose between an industrial magnate and a “natural” man. But the two books contrast sharply in the way they turn out. In the earlier book the lady chooses the magnate, while the vital man sickens and dies. As a matter of fact, this pessimistic conclusion is doubled since no less than two men identified with the woods and fields, the farmer George Saxton and the gamekeeper Frank Annabel, come to unhappy ends. But Mellors at the end of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is still on his feet and although gloomy enough about the future, can finds the energy to set about planning a new life for himself and Connie. H. T. Moore writes that: “The portrait of Mellors has the benefit of Lawrence’s nearly twenty years of experience between *The White Peacock* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.” (D. H. Lawrence 107) Even in the letter that closes Lawrence’s last novel, Mellors despite his predictions of doom for modern industrial man, greets Connie hopefully and sets out his absurd program of salvation for the masses with conviction if not with any idea that people are going to do what he suggests: … “If only they were educated to live instead of earn and spend, they could manage very happily on twenty five shillings… And amuse the women themselves and be amused by the women.” (LCL 362)

Had Connie rejected Mellors sexual urgency and asserted her “fixed deadly will,” (FU 80) their growing mutual trust would have been damaged if not destroyed. By rejecting the emotionally and physically crippled Clifford, Connie has affirmed Lawrence’s concern with wholeness of life. And this
concern with life “leads into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead.” *(LCL 368)* She has committed no sin in leaving Cliford. Rather living with him a sort of half life was a sin against life. Spilka writes that: “True enough when Connie leaves him, she sins against bourgeois morality —but Clifford sins against organic life.” *(Love Ethic 197)* Two moral systems clash, and yet we recognize at once that phallic marriage is creative and moral, above and beyond our vision of Clifford’s plight. Fiona Beckett writes that the focus is in *Lady Chatterley’s Lovers* in the regenerative aspects of sex. Connie with Mellor is reborn a woman. For Lawrence “the potential of sex to revivify the self is manifested only where modern ‘mental consciousness’ is shed for something more unconscious.” *(Beckett 36)* Lawrence believed life had to be established, first and foremost, on an organic basis since the old morality could only foster deadness. As Connie puts it:

> All the great words… were cancelled for her generation love, joy, happiness, home, mother, father, husband, all these great, dynamic words we’re half dead now, and dying from day to day. Home was a place you lived in, love was a thing you didn’t fool yourself about, joy was word you applied to a good Charleston… As for sex, the last of the great words, it was just cocktail term for an excitement that bucked up you for a while, and then left you more raggy than ever. Frayed! It was as if the very material you were made of was cheap stuff, and was fraying out to nothing. *(LCL71)*

But Connie pushes this deadness aside by rejecting Clifford as her husband. And therefore she asserts the priority of phallic marriage over the old half dead morality; for the new life morality now acts as the base, or better still, the fount from which the old morality of ideas can be regenerated; it comes before good and evil, as we know them. The genuine yet carefully restrained optimism of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is founded in a belief that the
world is alive and the aliveness is the only thing worth cherishing. In *The White Peacock* the gamekeeper had remarked, “Tell a woman not to come into the woods till she can look at natural things — she might see something.” Connie Chatterley unlike the heroine of *The White Peacock*, does come into the woods and lingers there until she sees something. More clearly and more persuasively than in any previous novel, Lawrence brings, the reader into touch with that vision, the mystery which as one suspected from the beginning, was only of life itself. Mellor’s chastity or fidelity at the end of the novel is a case in point — not a stringent imperative but “the peace that comes of loving.”