The Aristotelian concept of man as a social animal is now a truism. Though he is distinguished from the animals in ever so many respects, in his gregariousness he is like the elephant, the lion and the honeybee. Except in very strange cases in very strange circumstances, in all human beings, from the infant in swaddling clothes to the old who have already one foot in the grave, there is the need and longing for human company. “Circumscribed by the boundless ocean, cut off from mankind, and condemned to [. . .] silent life,” Robinson Crusoe feels that the mere sight of one of his species would have seemed to him “a raising from death to life” (Defoe 164). And, as Arnold J. Toynbee observes, “mankind could not have become human except in a social environment” (2:68).

As Georg Lukacs points out, in all great realistic literature the human significance and individuality of the characters cannot be separated from their social and historical environment. The “ontological view” of man held by those authors is based on their strong belief in man’s connections with the others in the context in which he is created. A Fielding or a Tolstoy would never have foreseen the modernists’ view that solitariness is “a universal condition humaine,” and “man [. . .] is by nature solitary, asocial, unable to enter into relationships with other human beings.” Though very modern in his creativity and thinking, Lawrence, in his belief in human relationships, belongs to the realistic tradition, and not to the modernist school, which drew inspiration from Martin Heidegger, who described human existence as a “thrownness-into-being.” The German existentialist philosopher’s ideas imply that, “not merely that man is constitutionally unable to establish relationships with things or persons outside
himself, but also that it is impossible to determine theoretically the origin and goal of human existence” (Lukacs 476-77). Contrary to this, the realists believe in man’s position and nature as a historical and social being, and Lawrence has kinship with them.

Toynbee, in *A Study of History*, makes an interesting analysis of the existing social theories regarding “the relation in which societies and individuals stand to each other.” At the outset, two “stock” descriptions are examined and rejected. “One is that the individual is a reality which is capable of existing and of being apprehended by itself and that a society is nothing but an aggregate of atomic individuals.” This description is not accepted because “man is essentially a social animal in as much as social life is a condition which the evolution of man out of sub-man pre-supposes and without which that evolution could not conceivably have taken shape.” The other description is “that the reality is the society; that a society is a perfect and intelligible whole, while the individual is simply a part of this whole which cannot exist or be conceived as existing in any other capacity or setting.” Toynbee rejects this, saying that the individual is more than “a cell in the body social,” more than a cellule in the vaster body of what J. S. Huxley in *The Individual in the Animal Kingdom* describes as “a single great individual” constituted by “the whole organic world” (qtd. in Toynbee 1: 248).

G. D. H. Cole in his *Social Theory* lists the different analogies through which the social theorists have attempted to express “the facts and values of society”: “On the analogy of the physical sciences they have striven to analyze and explain society as mechanism, on the analogy of biology they have insisted on regarding it as an organism, on the analogy of mental science or philosophy they have persisted in treating it as a person, sometimes on the religious analogy they have come near to confusing it with a
God” (qtd. in Toynbee 249). Disagreeing with these analogies Toynbee goes on to present “the right way of describing the relation between human societies and individuals.” He describes human society as “a system of relationships between human beings who are not only individuals but are also social animals in the sense that they could not exist at all without being in this relationship to one another.” In his stress on the independence and interdependence of individuals Toynbee is very close to Lawrence. Toynbee further defines society as “a product of the relations between individuals,” arising from “the coincidence of their individual fields of action.” He calls society “a common ground,” of individual fields combined by this coincidence (249-50).

Psychology also gives importance to the individual’s place in society and his relations with the other members of the society. As Michael Ryan says, one of the concerns of psychoanalysis is “the dynamics of interpersonal relations” and “the way the self is formed through interactions with its familial and sociocultural environment” (35). As Coveney points out, Freud’s psycho-analysis lays stress on the fine adjustment achieved by the ego between the individual’s libidinal energy and the superego representing social codes. The strong plea of psycho-analysis is that “the individual’s adjustment to society should not be imposed so harshly during childhood as to prevent his development towards a stable, self-fulfilling relation between his instinctive satisfactions and the demands of social necessity in adulthood.” Freud warns that all repressions of the libidinal and aggressive instincts “could at best only lead to a fitful and unproductive accommodation between the individual and society and at worst could frequently lead to chronic instability, delinquency and mental breakdown.” However, in Jung’s analytical psychology, the emphasis is shifted away from the Freudian centre of analysis of the unconscious of the child to “a central interest in the conscious adult
himself.” The conflict of the Conscious with the Collective Unconscious is considered the origin of neurosis (297).

As Coveney observes, it is the “combination of his intense psychological insight with his social grasp” that has made Lawrence the very great novelist that he is. And it is really major significance when, as in Lawrence, the two qualities coexist and nourish one another. Like Dickens before him, Lawrence is “intensely concerned with the psychic relation between the individual and his society” and the ‘message’ or the central ‘wisdom’ that his works seek to establish is the sense of individuality arising from “the disentanglement of the individual from the deadening influences of false emotional values in a society” (321).

Industrialism

(a) The Greatest Good and the Greatest Number

The principles of political economy on which the industrial society was based reduced the importance of the individual and placed the ‘welfare’ of society as a whole far above the individual. Adam Smith in his *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776) considered the labour of the people as the true wealth of a nation and propounded the theory of economic liberalism or laissez faire, according to which the government should adopt the policy of non-intervention in the economic affairs of the individual and enable the rising merchants and business leaders to operate in freedom and use the labour most effectively “for the benefit of all.” Smith held that “the drive of self-interest” in individuals would be translated into “a unified mass” and would result in “the common social good.” The book did contain “pleas for the poor, downtrodden, and oppressed, especially farmers and workers” (Greene 288-89). But little did Smith anticipate the disastrous consequences of the theory of liberalism in the industrial society where the self interest of a few would lead to the exploitation and
dehumanization of the workers. Strongly critical of laissez faire, which became “almost a semi-divine theory,” the Indian statesman, Jawaharlal Nehru, in his Glimpses of World History, asks a bitter rhetorical question: “Each man and woman was to fight the rest of the world to go ahead, and if many fell in the struggle, what did it matter?” According to Nehru, the upholders of the philosophy of laissez faire, which Carlyle called “pig philosophy,” objected to even the basic needs of the poor in the name of their “foolish” sentiments about liberty and rights of property (353).

An outgrowth of Smith’s theory of economic liberalism was ‘the principle of utility’ honoured by Jeremy Bentham. The utilitarian principle aimed at achieving “the greatest good of the greatest number.” The ‘good’ was ‘happiness’ defined in terms of “a preponderance of pleasure and the absence of pain”. Bentham extended the liberal theory of laissez faire with the premise that each individual knows his own interest best and the government’s interference is “both needless and pernicious.” In his essay “Utilitarianism” (1863), John Stuart Mill qualified the utilitarian concept of “good of the greatest number” with “qualitative differences” between different kinds of pleasures such as spiritual, mental and physical (Greene 386).

Like Dickens before him, who exposed the dehumanizing aspect of laissez faire and utilitarianism in Hard Times, Lawrence finds in The Rainbow a suitable occasion to criticise Benthamism. He presents the discussion of the greatest happiness principle of the utilitarians in the immediate dramatic context of the young lover leaving his girl for the war in South Africa. Lawrence is not Joyce and Ursula is not Stephen Dedalus, and there is no stream of consciousness technique here. Yet the power of his presentation lies mostly in the point of view. If in Sons and Lovers, Lawrence is the young hero Paul Morel, in The Rainbow, there is “the substitution of the other sex for the author’s” (Leavis137). There is a fine transmutation of Lawrence’s experiences and points of
view into those of young Ursula in every phase of her growth. The adult world of ‘greatest good’ unfolds as it is encountered by the consciousness of the teen age girl, who gets a brief glimpse of the wide world of war and strife for the first time through an experience which is otherwise romantic. The young girl’s (as well as the author’s) concept of the individual coming into conflict with the utilitarian concept of the nation is brought into sharp focus in a dialogue between the lovers. Ursula asks for “a real answer” from Skrebensky to her question about his vocation as a soldier.

‘[. . .] I hate soldiers, they are stiff and wooden. What do you fight for, really?’

‘I would fight for the nation.’

‘For all that, you aren’t the nation. What would you do for yourself?’

‘I belong to the nation and must do my duty by the nation.’

‘But when it didn’t need your services in particular – when there is no fighting? What would you do then?’

He was irritated.

‘I would do what everybody else does.’

‘What?’

‘Nothing. I would be in readiness for when I was needed.’

The answer came in exasperation.

‘It seems to me,’ she answered, ‘as if you weren’t anybody – as if there weren’t anybody there, where you are. Are you anybody, really? You seem like nothing to me.’(311)

Like Gradgrind in Hard Times, who wanted ‘Facts and nothing but facts,’ Skrebensky closed his self to everything other than the Benthamite concept of ‘nation.’ He left Ursula and went to serve his nation as a soldier, as he was “dead” to “his own intrinsic
life” and “could not rise again from the dead” (328).

The kind of life Skrebensky represented comes under scathing attack by Lawrence. He writes: “His soul lay in the tomb. His life lay in the established order of things. He had his five senses too. They were to be gratified. Apart from this, he represented the great, established, extant Idea of life, and as this he was important and beyond question” (328). The extant “idea” that governed his life was the Benthamite philosophy of “the good of the greatest number” and it was all that mattered for him. “One had to fill one’s place in the Whole, the great scheme of man’s elaborate civilization, that was all. The whole mattered — but the unit, the person, had no importance, except as he represented the Whole.” As discussed earlier in this chapter, this is one of those concepts of individual-society relation which Toynbee rejects. Skrebensky knew that no “highest good of the community” would give him “the vital fulfilment of his soul,” but “he did not consider the soul of the individual sufficiently important.” It is interesting to see how the concept of the wholeness of the individual is given the go-by by those who seem to be concerned with the wholeness of humanity. Lawrence pricks the bubble of utilitarian belief that the greatest good for the community as a whole would be the greatest good for the individual.

He [Skrebensky] could not see, it was not born in him to see, that the highest good of the community as it stands is no longer the highest good of even the average individual. He thought that, because the community represents millions of people, therefore it must be millions of times more important than any individual, forgetting that the community is an abstraction from the many, and is not the many themselves. (329) As Lawrence sees it, the utilitarian concept of ‘common good’ is nothing but “vulgar, conservative materialism at a low level.” As Jacob Oser observes, widely held
explanations of human behaviour dispute the hedonistic view of the utilitarians “that men are motivated solely by the desire to maximize pleasure and minimize pain.” He points out that “our value judgments in aesthetics and our philosophy of the good life aim at more than happiness” and quotes from Mill’s “Utilitarianism”: “It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied” (113). There came over Skrebensky “a sort of nullity,” “which more and more terrified Ursula,” as he could not really convince himself of any meaning in sacrificing one’s life for the sake of the material welfare of one’s own self, let alone that of the community. The utilitarian philosophy did not take him beyond the material welfare of the community. What the community wanted was “something solid,” “good wages, equal opportunities, good conditions of living”; it wanted nothing “subtle or difficult” (329).

(b) Industrial England, Old and New

Lawrence lived in and wrote about an England that was going through the second phase of the Industrial Revolution. His concern with the life of the English people in the industrial society, especially with that of the working classes under the factory system, is a very important aspect of his novels and short stories. Even while he is preoccupied with other aspects of human life, the industrial world creeps into his fiction, at least in the form of a casual description. Himself the son of a butty in a coal mine in the industrial Midlands, Lawrence was in direct contact with the lives of the workers of the coal mines, which were then in the throes of a critical, dehumanising process of mechanization.

The first phase of the Industrial Revolution, sometimes called the First Industrial Revolution, lasted for about a century, from the middle of the 17th to the middle of the 18th century and it took place largely in England, which was then known as “the
workshop of the world.” The first phase “was dominated by two developments in technology: the steam engine driven by coal and machines used to make textiles, or cloth.” The second phase, sometimes called the Second Industrial Revolution, lasted from about 1850 until about 1940. It “was dominated by two new sources of power: the internal combustion engine and electricity.” England reigned supreme as the “first industrial nation” until it was overtaken by Germany, Japan and the United States by the end of the 19th century. (*Industrial...; History Guide...*)

Industrialism delivered almost a death blow to the cottage industries that had been flourishing in old England for centuries. In those days, when factories were unheard of, the artisans or craftsmen worked in their own houses, usually with their apprentices. The relationship between the master craftsmen and their apprentices was almost like that between a father and his children. As Peter Laslett shows in *The World We have Lost*, in the England of the pre-industrial times “the family was not one society only but three societies fused together; the society of man and wife, of parents and children and of master and servant [the apprentice].” Unlike the paid servants, the apprentices were “extra sons or extra daughters (for girls could be apprenticed too), clothed as well as fed, obliged to obedience and forbidden to marry, often unpaid and dependent until after the age of twenty-one.” And in those days, “if apprentices were workers in the position of sons and daughters, the sons and daughters of the house were workers too.” Though the period before the coming of industry with its “patriarchal arrangements” and its own “economic oppression and exploitation” was “no paradise or golden age of equality,” there was a significant difference between human relationships in the pre-industrial domestic organization and in the industrial society that followed. In the old society, “in spite of all the subordination, the exploitation and the obliteration of those who were young, or feminine, or in service, everyone belonged to a group, a
family group. Everyone had his circle of affection: every relationship could be seen as a love-relationship.” Such relationships were absent in “our rich, leisurely, powerful, puzzled world of successful industrialization” (2-6).

What happened in the rural England was not different either. The “balanced” “healthy” life of the family group was once greatly felt in the English countryside, much as it is seen in the Marsh Farm in The Rainbow. “To every farm there was a family, which spread itself over its portion of the village lands as the family of the master-craftsman filled out his manufactory.” As the necessities of rural life required “recurrent groupings of households for economic purposes,” there was greater contact between families in the countryside than in the towns. However, the communality of English rural life was altogether destroyed by the economic transformation brought in by the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Laslett 11-12). The factory system and its power-driven machines, “which could produce goods in tremendous quantities,” replaced the domestic system and rendered hard labour less important. “Millions of people left their farms to work in city factories” (Platt and Drummond 406-07). “Loveliest” villages like Goldsmith’s “sweet Auburn” became “deserted,” with the coming of the enclosure movement in the countryside and the factories in the towns and the cities.

One of the gravest concerns of Lawrence as a writer was what industrialism had done to the beauty of England’s countryside. With the use of steam in the factories there was a great demand for coal and the factories sprang up mostly in areas where coal was available. The whole face of England changed. “Instead of the green and pleasant countryside, there grew up in many places these new factories with their long chimneys belching forth smoke and darkening the neighbourhood.” Around the factories “surrounded by mountains of coal and heaps of refuse,” there came into existence new
but ugly and dirty manufacturing towns. “The starving workers had to put up with these as well as with the terribly unwholesome conditions in the factories” (Nehru, Glimpses . . 350).

It is with Sons and Lovers Lawrence’s representative criticism of industrialization begins. In the opening paragraphs of the novel, he presents a picture of the changes that had come over a mining village in the Midlands with the process of industrialization. Originally, the colliers of the village of Bestwood lived in ‘Hell’ Row, “a block of thatched, bulging cottages that stood by the brookside on Greenhill Lane. They had not yet gone (down) to the ‘Bottoms’. The colliers worked in “the little gin-pits two fields away,” where the brook, like the Erewash in The Rainbow (“which twisted sluggishly through the alder trees”), “ran under the alder-trees, scarcely soiled by these small mines, whose coal was drawn to the surface by donkeys that plodded wearily (unlike Gray’s ploughman, who “plods his weary way” “homeward”) in a circle round a gin. Those pits, some of which belonged to the time of Charles, had spread all over the countryside. The colliers and the donkeys burrowed down “like ants into the earth, making queer mounds and little black places among the corn-fields and the meadows.” Though it was not a romantic or a very bright picture, what followed it was a sudden change into sordidness. “The gin-pits were elbowed aside by the large mines of the financiers. The coal and iron field of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire was discovered. Carston, Waite and Co appeared.” New pits were sunk “down the valleys of the brooks” and “among cornfields.” The railway ran past “the ruined priory of the Carthusians” and “Robin Hood’s well” and across “the farm lands of the valley side” and “linked by a loop of fine chain,” “six mines like black studs on the countryside” (7-8). It was an onslaught of industry on nature leading to the disfigurement of English countryside. The railway, which marred the beauty of the countryside, was symbolically
a rude intruder into the cultural past.

*The Rainbow* traces, in the background of the lives of the Brangwens, the whole movement of the industrial civilization in nineteenth century England. In the expository pages of the novel Lawrence presents how there is a "trespass" and an "invasion" by the industrial world outside into an almost idyllic picture of the life-pulsating Marsh Farm with its meadows, alder trees and the Erewash. The canal "connecting the newly-opened collieries of the Erewash Valley," the high embankment "travelling along the fields to carry the canal" and the new colliery "sunk on the other side of the canal" all trespass into the land of the Brangwens, with the Midland Railway "coming down the valley at the foot of the Ilkeston hill" making the invasion complete. The Marsh homestead lies "just on the safe side of civilization," but all around there is the commotion of industrial life. As they drive home from town, the farmers meet "the blackened colliers trooping from the pit-mouth." And as they gather the harvest in the fields, the west wind brings "a faint, sulphurous smell of pit-refuse burning" (12).

With Ursula, the representative of the third generation of Brangwens, the novel enters the contemporary world of total mechanization of industries, especially the coal mines. It is during her brief stay at Wiggiston, where her uncle Tom Brangwen is the manager of a big, new colliery, that Ursula is exposed for the first time to the ugliness of modern industrial life. In a short period of seven years, what was once "a hamlet of eleven houses on the edge of heathy, half-agricultural country," has become a place marked with a great mass of "thin, unreal dwellings" and streets that are like "visions of pure ugliness." Here is a description of one of those typical colliery villages Lawrence is to dwell on most obsessively in most of his novels and short stories, like Goldsmith on the "decay" of the deserted village:

The place had a strange desolation of a ruin. Colliers hanging about in
gangs and groups, or passing along the asphalt pavements heavily to work, seemed not like living people, but like spectres. The rigidity of the blank streets, the homogeneous amorphous sterility of the whole, suggested death rather than life. There was no meeting place, no centre, no artery, no organic formation. There it lay, like the new foundations of a red-brick confusion rapidly spreading, like a skin-disease. (345)

In *Women in Love*, seeing an old beautiful chair in the jumble market, Birkin is reminded of the contrast between the old Jane Austen’s England, which had “living thoughts to unfold and pure happiness in unfolding them,” and the contemporary England in which there is “only sordid and foul mechanicalness” (400-01). Refuting Eliot’s charge of ignorance against Lawrence, Leavis speaks of the advantageous consequences for English literature resulting from Lawrence’s intimate knowledge of life. He says, “Lawrence knew every day of his life in intimate experience the confrontation, the interpenetration, of the old agricultural England with the industrial; the contrast of the organic forms and rhythms and the old beauty of humane adaptation with what has supervened” (322).

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, the Tevershall village, which began almost at the park gates of Wragby Hall, “trailed in utter hopeless ugliness for a long and gruesome mile,” and the wind often brought to the house the stench of the “sulphureous combustion of the earth’s excrement” from the pit-banks. “Even on windless days, the air always smelled of something under-earth: sulphur, coal, iron, or acid. And even on Christmas roses the smuts settled persistently, incredible, like black manna from skies of doom” (13).

In the novel Lawrence takes a look at “the remnants of the old England” through Connie’s eyes and asks: “England my England! But which is *my* England?” The old
Stately homes are either abandoned or pulled down and the gentry are departing to pleasanter places. As "one meaning blots out another, the industrial England blots out the agricultural England; the new England blots out the old England." Even if there is continuity, as Lawrence points out, it is "not organic, but mechanical" (156). Connie was aware that the younger generation were utterly unconscious of the old England. "There was a gap in the continuity of consciousness," and she apprehended that there would be "no next" after industrialism (159).

Connie keenly felt how the new, gruesome industrial England was blotting out "Squire Winter's beloved Shipley." Like the Marsh Farm of the Brangwens, Shipley was being encroached upon by the colliery railway and the collieries, and when Squire Winter died, the heirs demolished the very pleasant stucco building of the eighteenth century, cut down the avenue of Yew trees and denuded the park of its timber. Within a span of twelve months, in the place where the stucco hall stood there came "an array of red-brick semi-detached 'villas' in new streets." Connie lamented that "the England of the Squire Winters and the Wragby Halls was gone, dead" (158-59).

(c) Working Conditions in the Factories

Lawrence was acutely aware of the physical working conditions in the industries that threw man into a kind of mean existence totally deprived of human dignity. Historians record with regret how 'evil' the conditions were in the early factories. They point out how the worker who could, in the domestic system, "break the monotony of his work by pulling weeds in his garden or drinking a cup of tea with his wife," was, under the factory system, "subject to iron discipline." "Long lists of rules were posted in factories, and workers were fined for disobeying them. A spinner who whistled, for example, might be fined a shilling. Since even a minor interruption by one worker might hold up the work of all the others, foremen were hired to watch workers."
(Incidentally, as Aldington records, Lawrence's father himself was a “butty,” “a kind of foreman or liaison-man between the company and the other miners” Portrait . . . 4) Platt and Drummond ask what kind of feeling the craftsman, who could once take pride in his finished product, would now have when his only job was “to tighten a given bolt on hundreds of bicycles.” “Monotony and nervous strain, coupled with long hours and low pay, drove many unhappy workers to drunkenness and immorality” (419-20).

However, the conditions in the industries improved considerably in the nineteenth century. Robert Owen, through his New Lanark Mills showed to the world “how the new industrial system could be made the instrument of standardized improvement in sanitation, welfare, hours, wages and education, raising the conditions of working-class life to an average level that could never have been attained under the domestic system” (Trevelyan 484). Though the world refused to imitate Owen’s model and accept the modern doctrine which Owen first clearly grasped and taught “that environment makes character and that environment is under human control,” at the end of the nineteenth century, “partly by successive Factory Acts and partly by Trade Union action, factory life had proved a means of raising standards.” But, as Trevelyan points out, the total picture of the life of the factory workers was still not bright. For many “the amenities and values of life were less than those enjoyed by their rural brethren” (485).

In The Rainbow, Ursula hears from her uncle Tom Brangwen himself, who shares the class-feeling of Gerald in Women in Love, the sad story of the life of the colliers: “Yes, they are pretty bad. The pits are very deep, and hot, and in some places wet. The men die of consumption fairly often.” However, Tom feels that “they earn good wages.” Ursula learns from the talk Winifred has with Tom how the servant Mrs Smith’s husband died very gradually of consumption. Mrs Smith got “used to” the death of her husband as she had had her father and two brothers “go off just the same” (348).
Little would Lawrence have anticipated when he wrote this how a similar fate awaited him some fifteen years hence.

In *Sons and Lovers*, Walter Morel once suggested he could take his girl Gertrude down the pit, but he did not, saying it would dirty her. But, Alvina Houghton in *The Lost Girl* “wound down in the iron bucket to the little workings underneath” accompanied by her father. Then she saw the miners standing “grey and ghostly, in the candle-light” with “the roof and the timbered sides of the way” seeming to press on as if it were “a tomb.” “When she was upon the earth again she felt that the workers were “absolutely blind to conventional ugliness” because they were “enslaved” in “the underworld.” Like Gudrun, and perhaps like Lawrence too, Alvina felt coming over her, “the nostalgia of the repulsive, heavy-footed Midlands,” when she saw the colliers “streaming past her home from work – grey from head to foot, distorted in shape, cramped, with curious faces that come out pallid from under their dirt” (65-66).

**(d) Man and the Machine**

Historians like H. G. Wells make a distinction between the Industrial Revolution and the Mechanical Revolution. While the latter was “an entirely new thing in human experience arising out of the development of organized science,” the former was “a social and financial development” (262). But the two movements were closely connected. As T. S. Ashton puts it, even without the inventions industry might have continued — “firms becoming larger, trade more widespread, division of labour more minute, and transport and finance more specialized and efficient” – but it would have been only “a slow-footed progress.” And without the new resources made possible by the Industrial Revolution the inventions and their applications would not have been possible at all (94).

Nehru describes the machine as “a big tool” or an “extension of the tool,” which
is already an extension man’s hands, his “third hand.” Even as he appreciates the freedom from “the bondage of Nature” and the creative leisure that have been offered by the big machine, he notes with regret the irony of the industrial civilization that what was meant to be “the tool and servant of man” became his “master” (346). An important problem of the mechanized society was what leisure meant to the working class people. As Toynbee perceives it, while all great achievements of human beings in the arts and the sciences had always been “the fruits of the profitably employed leisure” by “a creative minority,” the Industrial Revolution in several ways upset that fine relation between leisure and life. The mechanized world set up in the minds of the industrial workers “a tension between his feelings towards his work and his feelings towards his leisure.” While in the pre-industrial times the peasantry and their rulers caught in “the perpetually recurring cycles of day and night and summer and winter” considered each phase a relief from the other, in the life of the industrial workers, the old “interdependence and parity of work and leisure” was deranged as the work was “transformed into a tender of machines which could go on working, day and night, all the year round.” “The chronic industrial warfare,” which the worker was waging “to prevent the machines and their masters from working him to death,” impregnated his mind with “a hostility to the life of toil that his peasant forebears had taken as a matter of course” and his “new attitude towards work” brought with it “a new attitude towards leisure.” “If work was intrinsically evil, then leisure must have an absolute value in itself.” For the workers, who could not make use of their leisure as “the creative minority” (“the salt of the Earth in all ages of history”) did, the only change for them in the new world was from “a monotony of mechanical work” to “a monotony of insipid leisure” and vice versa (2:379-82).

To Gerald, the God of the machine (Deus ex Machina), who ushers in the
dehumanizing process of mechanization, the world of Matter itself is a field of adventure. It is, in fact, a war-field for him, because he is involved in a “fight with Matter” with the help of a mechanism that has the “inhuman principle” of “relentless repetition of given movement.” It is a war between human will and “the resistant Matter of the underground”. With a note of regret Lawrence points out that mankind has been “mystically contradistinguished against inanimate Matter,” and the history of mankind is “just the history of the conquest of the one by the other” (256-57).

Gudrun knew Gerald had “a fine, independent will” and if he, who worked a revolution in the mines, laid hold of any idea, he would carry it through. In a moment of self-deception, she imagines her marriage with him, his going into Parliament in the Conservative interest, and his clearing up “the great muddle of labour and industry.” He would work out every problem in life “as in geometry.” “He would be a Napoleon of peace, or a Bismarck – and she the woman behind him.” His “pure inhuman, almost superhuman” instrumentality appealed to her. “She wished she were God, to use him as a tool.” But there came “the ironical question: ‘What for?’”. In her thought of the lives of the colliers and others, she, though young, “touched the whole pulse of social England.” She despised both the rich and the poor for their struggle “to rise in the world” (469-70). Gudrun knew how organic life was reduced to mechanistic principle in the coal industry, which had turned both the mine owner and the colliers into mere wheels turning “in perpetual repetition.” in the machines of production. From the wheel-barrow with its one wheel, the cart with two wheels, the truck with four, the donkey engine with eight, and so on, the number of wheels increased till it became a thousand with the miner, three thousand with the electrician, twenty thousand with the underground manager and a hundred thousand with the general manager, and finally there was Gerald “with a million wheels and cogs and axles” (525).
With the process of mechanization, "everything was run on the most accurate and delicate scientific method" and "the miners were reduced to mere mechanical instruments." The work becoming "terrible and heart-breaking in its mechanicalness," "the joy went out of their lives." But, "the men were satisfied to belong to the great and wonderful machine, even whilst it destroyed them." The worst harm done to humankind by Gerald's industrial revolution was that the system "subjected life to pure mathematical principles." "It was pure organic disintegration and pure mechanical organization" and it was "the first and finest state of chaos" (259-60). The greatest irony of the process that Gerald set in motion was that "the whole system was now so perfect that Gerald was hardly necessary any more. Despite his calmness and good health, he experienced a "final sterile horror." He sought the company of women for relief; but he felt that "his mind needed acute stimulation, before he could be physically roused" (262). In the chapter "Gladiatorial" Birkin finds his friend "completely and emptily restless, utterly hollow." "He was suspended motionless, in agony of inertia, like a machine that is without power" (300).

(e) Industrialism and Capitalism

A concomitant factor of the Industrial Revolution was the growth of capitalism. The seeds of modern capitalism, known as "industrial capitalism", were sown in the Commercial Revolution, which came as an inevitable offshoot of the Industrial Revolution. The captains of industry, who made use of the many opportunities opened up by the Industrial Revolution, "not only owned their factories but managed them."

While the master workmen of the guild system in pre-industrial England, who despite being capitalists themselves, "had worked side by side with their employees," the modern capitalists (like Gerald in Women in Love) did not share the work with their workmen and, "as capitalism expanded in modern times, the relationship between
owners and workers became less and less personal” (Platt and Drummond 425-26).

As a true child of industrial capitalism, Gerald has only “the plausible ethics of productivity” (62). Birkin introduces him to Minette, as “a soldier, and an explorer, and a Napoleon of industry” (70). As there is nothing personal about his relationship with work or the workers, he is a perfect antithesis of Tolstoy’s landowner Levin, who enjoys tilling the land in the happy company of his moujiks. In his conception, the human self is divided into the personal and the social. He says, “Between me and a woman, the social question does not enter. It is my own affair.” (114).

Even Gerald’s father Thomas Crich, who wanted to be a benevolent Christian in his position as an industrialist, was “trapped between two half-truths” by his idealism. One was his concept of equality as a Christian. The other was his belief in keeping his goods and his authority as “a great promoter of industry.” And his son, the new master, did not care about the first half-truth, equality. For him, “the whole Christian attitude of love and self-sacrifice was old hat,” and “the whole democratic-equality problem” was “a problem of silliness.” He acted on the second half-truth; “he knew that position and authority were the right thing in the world.” In the great machine of industry, he believed, “he happened to be the controlling central part, the masses of men were the parts variously controlled.” He was excited “because a central hub drives a hundred outer wheels – or because the whole universe wheels round the sun” (255).

The Entrepreneurs and the Industrial Workers: The Class Division

The Industrial Revolution, as Nehru points out, was “not a political revolution changing kings and rulers at the top. It was a revolution affecting all the various classes, and indeed everybody.” In all societies it is the class that owns the means of production that rules. In the feudal times the means of production was the land, and the landlords wielded power. When wealth other than land appeared, the landowning classes shared
their power with the owners of the new means of production. With the coming of the big machine the classes that controlled it came to the front and slowly began to gain power (Glimpses . . . 347). And the craftsmen and the artisans of the cottage industries were “for no fault of theirs” thrown at the mercy of the factory owners. Being unable to compete with the big industries “they had to shut up their little shops” and join “the army of the unemployed” and starve. Hunger, which is often believed to be “the drill-sergeant of the factory owner,” ultimately drove them to the new factories to seek employment. The mechanical processes of production had a tremendous effect not only on economics but also on social dynamics. As the artisan class became the wage-earning class in the factory, new, moneyed classes came to the front and gained power (352).

The factory system made it easier than before for the powerful to exploit the weak. The factory owners in “their mad desire to increase their business and make more money,” “crushed the poor workers whose labour produced the sources of their wealth” (352). The starving worker became a slave, a “wage-slave of the factory.” Neither law nor religion came to his rescue. Religion told the poor “to put up with their miserable lot here in this world and expect a heavenly compensation in the next.” “Indeed, the governing classes developed quite a convenient philosophy that the poor were necessary for society, and that therefore it was quite virtuous to pay low wages” (352).

Unlike the present world, which has seen the failure of revolutionary ideals, the emergence of a complacent middle class and the ‘chaos’ of theories including postmodernism, the industrial society of England and the Continent with its clear polarization into entrepreneurs and workers offered itself as the proper field for the evolution and application of Marxist ideology. As Marx saw it, society in early human history was marked by “basic human relations” that were dictated by the necessity to
produce and exchange goods that could satisfy the wide range of human needs. Those “productive relations,” were necessary for the effective handling of the “productive forces” (“human labour, their acquired practical skills, and implements or machines made to help them extract and transform the raw materials”). In Marx’s view, this cooperative relationship was broken when some people gained control over the forces of production, and society was divided into “two fundamental antagonistic classes — the exploiters and the exploited.” It is with this idea that the Communist Manifesto (1848) begins: “The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of the class struggle.” When the society based on slavery collapsed “under the weight of its own contradictions,” it was replaced with feudalism. When feudalism decayed, it was replaced with capitalism, which was a “bourgeois revolution” in which “the merchants and manufacturers in the growing towns seized power from the aristocracy and forced their cooperation.” Marx saw only antagonism in the relationship between the two classes. (Woodfin and Zarate 36-41). D. H. Lawrence was very much aware of the historical processes shaping British industrial society. But, he would not subscribe to the Marxian theory of an antagonistic polarization of classes and the class struggle.

After the famous chapter “The Industrial Magnate” in Women in Love Lawrence, once again examines the process of mechanization of industry and the parallel process of sterilization of the human mind, in his discussion of Sir Clifford Chatterley’s connections with the Tevershall pits in Lady Chatterley’s Lover. Under the loquacious Mrs Bolton’s influence, Sir Clifford, who had been entertaining “the populace of pleasure” with his stories, turned to “the grimmer business” of dealing with “the populace of work” (106-07). As Tevershall was “going to the wall,” Clifford sought “to capture the bitch-goddess by brute means of industrial production.” Like Gerald, he made use of “the ingenuity and the almost uncanny cleverness of the modern
technical mind" and employed new managers and engineers, all in an effort to pull Tevershall out of the hole. Again like Gerald, "he felt a new sense of power flowing through him: power over all these men, over the hundreds and hundreds of colliers."

“He simply felt life rush out into him out of the coal, out of the pit. The very stale air of the colliery was better than oxygen to him.” It was “a man’s victory, over the coal, over the very dirt of Tevershall pit” (107-08). He became “an amazingly astute and powerful” practical man, but “was an idiot when left alone to his own emotional life” (111).

**Personal and Social Life**

Though Lawrence’s fictional works deal with people from all classes of life, there seems to be in him an identification with the working classes, to whom he belongs as the son of a coal-miner. He is not one with any class-feeling, but he is conscious of the flow of life across the social classes. And his novels and short stories are the best sources of the personal and social life of the colliers.

**(a) The Worker’s Home**

The story “Odour of Chrysanthemums,” presents a collier home in the worst crisis to be faced single-handedly by the collier woman. The collier dies in a pit accident. The men, who bring the dead man home leave him in the parlour to be washed and cleaned by the wife and the old mother, and go away with the stretcher. The woman, hardened in her will by the trials of her life with the poor collier who “spent everything on drink,” asks the old woman not to cry and puts the children to sleep. She tells the daughter, who becomes curious about the noise below, that her father has just been brought in and he is ‘asleep’ (270, 282). The woman has lost not only her husband but also the bread-winner of the family; she wonders whether she would be able to manage on the little pension and what she could earn” (279). In her married life with the
man there had been no togetherness, no deep relationship. "They had been two isolated beings, far apart as now." However, she is determined to look after her children, who unlike the dead man, belong to life (284-85).

In stories like "The Miner at Home," "Strike-Pay" and "Her Turn," which deal with the life of the poor colliers, Lawrence draws "fully on the complexity of his Midlands life." These and Sons and Lovers "suggest his knowledge of the industry, and how he kept in touch with local affairs even after he left Eastwood" (Worthen, D. H. Lawrence . . . 23). In "The Miner at Home" Lawrence presents a domestic scene in which Gertie, a collier’s wife, expresses her disapproval of her husband’s signing the notice for the third strike. As in many other works, here too, the wife does the ‘back washing’ when Bower comes home from the pit. Gertie tells him: "It’s a union strike this is, not a men’s strike. You’re sharpenin’ th’ knife for your own throats." But Bower cannot listen. He says he is sick of a woman “as listens to every tale as is poured into her ears” and goes out determinedly, leaving his wife to her own “vexation and weariness” (127). Though he can be critical of both men and women, Lawrence is often sympathetic towards the women, the colliers’ wives, who are put to much suffering whenever something happens in the pit.

The short story "Strike-Pay" presents the gusto and humour the colliers have even under trying circumstances and the possibility for warmth and love in conjugal life amidst odds. When Sam Coutts comes to collect the strike-money, the other colliers shout that he should be given two more bobs as “he had twins a-Monday night.” When Ben Townshend, the Union agent postpones additional payment to the following week, one voice from the crowd says: "Pay on delivery – the goods is there right enough.” Townshend pays him an extra florin. Next comes Ephraim Wharmby, a lad whose wife is five months pregnant. Now a sly voice says, “Gi him sixpence for what’s on t’road.”
“Nay, nay,” replied Ben Townshend, “pay on delivery.” There is a roar of laughter from the miners, who are in high spirits (44-45).

Like Walter Morel “going for a ten-mile walk across the fields to Nottingham” with his friend Jerry Purdy, Ephraim with his friends walks nine miles to see a football match (Sons . . . 30). They drink at the pubs on the way, and in a field at Nuttall, they have fun with a troop of pit ponies, which were “unused to freedom.” While performing too clever a feat, Ephraim goes rolling from the mount, and only at Bulwell they discover that Ephraim’s strike-pay is missing. They walk back and search the field in vain. Then John and Sam give their friend two bobs each and they return home after drinking again at a pub and enjoying the football match.

On the way back home Ephraim is saddened by the death of a navvy caught under the deep deposit of mud from his upturned tip-cart. He reaches home “with a sense of death, and loss, and strife” (48). At home, he feels helpless before his mother-in-law, whom he fears. His wife Maud keeps her head bowed as her mother grills him with questions about where he had been and what he had done with the money. He places five-and-six pence on the table. She attributes all kinds of vices to him and says she cannot keep him and his wife in her house for the five-and-six pence. Ephraim thinks his wife is with her mother. As he asks Maud whether she is going to give him any “bloody” tea, the old woman is provoked further. She leaves the house instructing her daughter not to give him any tea. But Maud quietly gets the tea ready and asks him whether he will have his dinner warmed up. And the story ends with the author’s comment: “she attended to him. Not that she was really meek. But – he was her man, not her mother’s” (50). The faith and confidence born of intimacy of love which makes Maud easily forgive her frolicking husband is something the old woman could not understand. This kind of paradoxical coexistence, in a woman, of compassionate
attachment at the deeper level and resentment at the surface level is also seen in another short story, "Samson and Delilah."

In "Her Turn" Mrs. Radford plays a bold trick on her collier husband, who does not give her the union money during the strike but tells her, "Tha's got plenty o' money as tha can use." The next day Radford is shocked to see how his wife has used 'her' money. Alcock's men come and deliver quite a lot of things she has bought, including breakfast cups, a roll of linoleum and a mattress. She asks Radford to give the carter three pence. She says she has only two half-crowns, "that's every copper I've got i' th' world." As she has "a certain smug sense of satisfaction about her," "a cold wave of anger" comes over him. But the next week he hands her his strike-pay without a word. She gives him a shilling saying, "You'll want some for yourself," and he accepts it (41-42).

Though there are several works of Lawrence that deal with the family lives of the colliers, the picture of the collier home in *Sons and Lovers* is the most intimate because here Lawrence not only looks at things from inside as in the other works but presents wholly his own home with all the emotional attachment and trauma of his childhood and youth transmuted into art-stuff. His mother, to whom Lawrence had a life-long attachment is presented as Gertrude Morel, the wife of the collier Walter Morel, whom she "despised" but "was tied to him." Mrs. Morel was sick of "the struggle with poverty and ugliness and meanness" and bore with everything "for the children's sakes" (12-13). With one domestic incident after another, Lawrence plunges into the very core of family life, depicting "the battles between the husband and wife" and the mother's attachment to her sons to the exclusion of the father as an outsider.

In *Aaron's Rod* the collier-flautist Aaron lives with his wife and children in one of the colliers' dwellings. The reader is introduced to him as he comes home late from
work on Christmas Eve after attending a meeting of the Miners’ Union of which he is the secretary. He arranges the Christmas tree in a box, while his two daughters hover round in excitement. His wife, “who is sewing a child’s frock,” criticizes Aaron “breaking his heart over the union” and adds with a sting: “If you cared for your wife and children half what you cared about your Union, you’d be a lot better pleased in the end” (15). The children open the little packets of Christmas-tree ornaments, and Millicent, the elder girl, breaks the magnificent glass ball. Aaron washes himself and starts playing on the flute. When he steps out with his stick, his wife reminds him of the candles to buy and tells him not to be “so selfish” (22). In this wonderful presentment of the working-class home “by a great writer who was brought up in one like it,” Leavis draws attention to the “the power with which the peculiar domestic tone is evoked: the domesticity without warmth; the Christmas festivity that brings no sympathetic flow and does nothing to soften the suggestion of hostile will; the prevailing undersense of grudge” (34).

(b) Social Life of the Industrial Worker

In the first novel The White Peacock itself there are instances of Lawrence’s heart going out to the colliers. On Christmas Eve, when the celebrations are on and the air is filled with “the cruel yelling of pigs” and the scent of pork-pies, two collier boys alone are going to work. Cyril wishes them “Merry Christmas” and in the morning, when the boys return from the pit, “they shout merrily their good wishes” to Cyril and Lettie (120-23). Here too, as in the early stories “Strike-Pay” and “Her Turn,” Lawrence perceives with sympathy the sordid plight of the collier families during the strike. During the strike in the mines of the Tempests on the question of the rearranging of the working system in the pits, “everywhere, along the lanes and in the streets, loitered gangs of men, unoccupied and spiritless.” “Schools gave breakfast, chapels gave soup,
well-to-do people gave tea – the children enjoyed it.” “But we,” Cyril the narrator says, “who knew the faces of the old men and the privations of the women, breathed a cold, disheartening atmosphere of sorrow and trouble” (149).

It is Lawrence’s complaint that the factory system reduces men to sub-human stereotypes. In *The Rainbow*, talking about poor Mrs Smith’s collier-husband, Ursula’s uncle, who is a colliery manager, says, “Her husband was John Smith, loader. We reckoned him as a loader, he reckoned himself as a loader, and she knew he represented his job.” Man’s self-identity seems to be reckoned not by what he is or what he feels or thinks or remembers, but only by what he does at the pit or the factory. Ursula becomes acutely aware of the meaningless, inescapable tie-up man has with the monotonous work in the pit. Looking out of the window, she sees “the proud, demon-like colliery with her wheels twinkling in the heavens.” To her, the formless, squalid mass of the town appears as “the squalid heap of side-shows” and the pit as “the main show, the *raison d’etre* of all” (348-49). For the first time in her life, there dawns upon her the terrible knowledge of “human bodies and lives subjected in slavery to that symmetric monster of the colliery.” Now she becomes, through the subtle means of Lawrence’s art, the perceptive eye and the feeling heart of the reader. So, when she determines, “No more would she subscribe to the great colliery, to the great machine which has taken us all captives,” the reader has the feeling that there is a young but kindred soul perceiving things rightly. But her uncle Tom and her mistress, despite their cynical criticism of the state of affairs, still wanted “the great machine”. As Ursula perceived it, “his real mistress was the machine, and the real mistress of Winifred was the machine.” Ursula hated it so much that she wanted to smash the machine. “If she could destroy the colliery, and make all the men of Wiggiston out of work, she would do it” (350).

What underlies his presentment of Tom and Winifred’s criticism of the state of
things in the lives of the colliers and their women folk is Lawrence’s own protest against the system perpetuated by people like Tom, which is responsible for the colliers’ monotonous toil in the coal mines that ruins the lives of the colliers and deprives them of their self-identity. So central to the lives of the poor workers is the pit that marriage and home become merely “a little side-show.” The pit owns every man; it takes all that really matters. Then man, when he is at home, is “a meaningless lump — a standing machine, a machine out of work” (349).

Lawrence’s quarrel with the industrial civilization is mainly about what it has done to the inner being of man and his humanness. In Lady Chatterley’s Lover, travelling in the car through “the long squalid straggle of Tevershall,” Connie sees a lorry full of steel-workers from Sheffield who are “weird distorted smallish beings like men,” and bewails: “Ah God, what has man done to man? What have the leaders of men been doing to their fellow men? They have reduced them to less than humanness, and there can be no fellowship anymore! It is just a nightmare.” The words echo the concluding lines of Wordsworth’s “Written in Early Spring”:

Have I not reason to lament
What Man has made of Man?

As she watches the industrial town, Connie is appalled by “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” (152-53). And Mellors expresses his indignation at “what’s been done to people these last hundred years: men turned into nothing but labour-insects, and all their manhood taken away, and all their real life.” He wants to “wipe the machine off the face of the earth again, and end the industrial epoch absolutely, like a black mistake,” but the impossibility of it makes him hold his peace and live his own life (220).
Class Consciousness

'Equality' has long been the keyword of all social reformation. But men in society have not been equal at all. They are unequal on several grounds: social status, monetary conditions, distribution of wealth, levels of awareness and understanding, education, possession and use of power, physical and mental health, sexual choice and satisfaction, opportunity for leisure and so on. However, inequality by itself is not so inimical to the progress and happiness of humanity as men insulating themselves into groups and becoming excessively conscious of their group-identity. Of the various groups and sub-groups into which humankind is divided on the basis of caste, colour, race, religion, nationality, economic disparity and so on, the most important division of the social fabric of Britain is the one based on class.

a) Lawrence and Class

Knowing fully well that absolute equality and perfect harmony in relationships are next to impossible, Lawrence wants all classes of people to live "more or less harmoniously together" and in private life men and women to live "more or less congenially" ("Men . . . 586). About class connections of his own parents Lawrence writes:

I was born among the working classes and brought up among them. My father was a collier, and only a collier, nothing praiseworthy about him. He wasn’t even respectable, in so far as he got drunk rather frequently, never went near a chapel, and was usually rather rude to his little immediate bosses at the pit. [. . .]

My mother was, I suppose, superior. She came from town, and belonged really to the lower bourgeoisie. She spoke King’s English, without an accent, and never in her life could even imitate a
sentence of the dialect which my father spoke, and which we children spoke out of doors. [...] 

But she was a working man’s wife and nothing else, in her shabby little black bonnet and her shrewd, clear, ‘different’ face. And she was very much respected, just as my father was not respected. Her nature was quick and sensitive, and perhaps really superior. But she was down, right down in the working class, among the mass of poorer colliers’ wives. (“Autobiographical Sketch” 17)

Lawrence’s attitude to class and class consciousness does not involve any absolute self-identification with any of the classes in Britain, though his sympathies for the working classes seem to have won him the right to be severely critical of their shortcomings.

Lawrence regrets that he has not had “any very cordial or fundamental contact” with society. As a man from the working class, he feels that the middle class cuts off some of his “vital vibration” when he is with them. He admits them “charming, and educated and good people often enough.” “But they just stop some part of me from working.” And he does not choose to live with the working class either, because he feels that “their vibration is limited in another direction.” According to him, “the working class is narrow in outlook, in prejudice, and narrow in intelligence.” But they are “still fairly deep and passionate, whereas the middle class is broad and shallow and passionless.” So he concludes: “One can belong absolutely to no class.” However, he also expresses his preference for the working class:

I cannot make the transfer from my own class into the middle class. I cannot, not for anything in the world, forfeit my passional consciousness and my old blood-affinity with my fellow men and the animals and the land, for that other thin, spurious mental conceit which is
all that is left of the mental consciousness once it has made itself exclusive. ("Autobiographical Sketch" 20-21)

Leavis reports, in his review of Tiverton’s book on Lawrence, T. S. Eliot’s observation in *After Strange Gods* that Lawrence, born and brought up in the midst of ignorance and uncouthness and spiritual barbarity and moral squalor, was disinherited of all the humaner achievements. He was an extreme case of the “crippling effect upon men of letters of not having been brought up in the environment of a living and central tradition” (qtd. in Leavis320). According to Leavis, the observation of Eliot betrays only “an astonishing feat of prejudice – and ignorance.” He asserts that “Lawrence was brought up in a living and central tradition”. And, “if he [Lawrence] had not been born into the working class he could not have known working-class life from the inside.” And, “gifted as he was” Lawrence could also get to know “life at other social levels.” In Leavis’s opinion, elitist critics like Eliot would not even be able to imagine the existence of “a family life beset by poverty and the day-to-day exigencies of breadwinning, yet quite finely civilized” (320-22).

Lawrence knows class as an “important human fact,” but he himself is never class-conscious. As Leavis puts it, people interest him first and last as human beings. His broad sympathies with the working-class people do not make him swerve from a true presentation of reality. He knows the working-people from the inside, “but his point of view and feeling [for them as human beings] are not any more than they are middle class – upper middle, middle-middle, or lower middle.” “Class is a major fact in “Daughters of the Vicar,” but Lawrence’s attention focuses on “the essential humanity this fact conditions,” and “the interest informing the attention remains pure and undeflected” (88).

The absence of class-feeling (in the sense of prejudice, in favour of or against a
particular class) in Lawrence’s art is illustrated by Leavis through an analysis of the story “Fanny and Annie”, in which the setting is the industrial Midlands and the ‘dramatis personae’ are from the working class. The story shows how Fanny, the beautiful girl, with full knowledge that her former lover Harry, the foundry-worker, had flirted with Annie, who is “always in an’ out o’ th’ pubs, wi’ th’ fellows,” decides to stick to Harry, to whom she has been really attracted, when Annie’s mother Mrs Nixon, the ‘notorious character,” stops Harry while he is singing in the chapel choir and blames it on him for her daughter’s pregnancy. And, as Leavis says, in choosing to marry him, Fanny has chosen “life” (93).

Though the tale makes the reader aware of the ugliness and the vulgarity in the life of the working people, the dominant attitude towards the characters and the events is “vitally positive.” The author has “profound sympathy” for them, though he is not at all affected by any “class-feeling.” As Leavis says, “life for him is everywhere life, and he treats it always with the same sensitiveness and the same fulness of imaginative responsibility” (89-93). Leavis and Draper point out that there is a comic element in the story. But they do not take note of the streak of pathos that enters the tale in the unfortunate life of Annie, the girl who is “always in an’ out o’ th’ pubs, wi’ th’ fellows” (438) and the touch of irresponsibility in Harry’s attitude towards that girl. Again, when Leavis refers to Lawrence seeing Fanny’s refinement as “a real thing” he seems to have ignored the underlying sarcasm in his presentment of the arrival of the lady’s maid at the wayside station.

In Kangaroo, Somers, who “is clearly and without disguise” Lawrence, the author, expresses his sympathies with the working class: “My father was a working man. I come from the working people. My sympathy is with them, when it’s with anybody, I assure you” (54). In the novel, Somers-Lawrence recalls how he felt “more
at one with them” when he happened to travel in a bus “full of young miners, more or less intoxicated,” to Derby in the nightmarish period during the war. He says with a feeling of nostalgia that they were the collier youth he had been to school with — approximately (255).

Lawrence, while being critical of the industrial masses, never failed to see the class-prejudice of the ruling classes. When Connie questions him about “the disparity” between the classes, Clifford says callously, “That’s fate.” He cannot accept Connie’s criticism of the boss-ship of those who ran the industries. To Clifford, the working masses were not men; they were animals one would not understand. He said, “The masses were always the same, and will always be the same. Nero’s slaves were extremely little different from our colliers or the Ford motor-car workmen” (181-82).

b) Physical Work and Class

As in the caste system in India, the hierarchy of class is determined by the relative relatedness of the members of the respective class to their physical body and the earth as part of their living. One who toils in the earth and helps humankind by the sweat of his brow is placed everywhere in the lowest rung of the social ladder. The greater the distance from elemental physical contact with nature in his work the higher is his position in society. As Lawrence presents it in The Lost Girl, in the social hierarchy of the small industrial town of Woodhouse in the Midlands, the workers form the lowest stratum. As he describes it, in the social cake there is

a vast substratum of colliers; a thick sprinkling of tradespeople intermingled with small employers of labour and diversified by elementary schoolmasters and nonconformist clergy; a higher layer of bank-managers, rich millers and well-to-do iron masters, episcopal clergy and the managers of collieries: then the rich and sticky cherry of
the local coal-owner glistening over all. (11)

The Tempests in *The White Peacock* are the first in the line of mine-owners Lawrence is going to present in his works. Leslie Tempest, who looks down on George’s occupation from the heights of class pride, expresses his displeasure at Lettie’s “trysting” with George and her “sentimentalizing over that milkman” (196). Later, when Lettie and Leslie took the wedding guests to the Strelley hayfields for a picnic, Cyril could feel “the inferiority” cast upon George’s father, whose “shoulders were rounded with work, and his trousers were much distorted.” Even Cyril tried to pull his trousers into shape within his belt as he saw the new comers dressed with “scrupulous care” (261). The women in the picnic party discriminated between George and the other men by their indulgence towards him: “I’m sorry, Mr Saxton – will you have some cake?”; “See Mr Saxton – try this peach, I’m sure it will be mellow right to the stone” (265-66).

In “Men Must Work and Women As Well,” Lawrence deplores the modern educated person’s attitude towards physical work. “For some mysterious or obvious reason, the modern woman and the modern man hate physical work [. . .]. There is still a certain thrill about ‘mental’ and purely mechanical work like attending a machine. But actual labour has become to us, with our education, abhorrent.” As he says, the modern workman wants to be “as nearly perfectly mechanical as possible.” The modern housewife, who demands an electric cooker, wants “a pure abstraction, a few switches, and no physical contact, no *dirt*, which is the inevitable result of physical contact” (583-84).

c) ‘Ideas’ and Class

Virginia Woolf wrote in her *Collected Essays* that Paul Morel (Lawrence), who was “not a member, like Proust, of a settled and satisfied society,” was “anxious to
leave his own class and to enter another.” According to her, Lawrence felt that the middle classes possessed what his own did not; it was either ideas or something else” (Andrews 39-40). As Leavis points out, Lawrence’s “imagination had undoubtedly been struck by the governing-class world of birth, breeding, and patrician distinction he had glimpsed,” but he himself was “notably” free from any “class-feeling” (59).

Graham Martin, who perceives class as “a fundamental issue in Lawrence’s work,” speaks of the binary opposition of ‘life’ / ‘ideas’ Paul Morel uses “to distinguish the common people from the middle class”: (41-42). Paul’s mother questions her son why he does not go to his “father’s pals,” as he says he finds “life itself, warmth” in the common people. She tells him that he is interested only in “those who exchange ideas, like the middle class.” But, as Martin points out, Paul rejects Miriam, who, though not belonging to the middle class, is “central to Paul’s response to ‘ideas’.” And despite his “contrary feelings about his father,” “which have their own social dimension,” he does not go away from his people like his brother William, “whose career involves becoming ‘a gentleman’.” He “remains in his own class, amongst ‘the common people’ whom he likes best” (38-39).

In spite of her total disapproval of the attitude of Tom and Winifred, in the growing consciousness of Ursula, there is much that can be called elitist. When the Brangwens left Cossethay and settled in “a fairly large house in the new, red-brick part of Beldover,” Ursula was happy to know that they would be among “the elite of Beldover.” “As there was no one of higher social importance than the doctors, the colliery managers, and chemists, they would shine, with their Della Robbia beautiful Madonna, their lovely reliefs from Donatello, their reproductions from Botticelli.” She felt that their display of artworks “would make dumb the mouth of Beldover.” “And, after all, it is better to be princess in Beldover than a vulgar nobody in the country”
In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* class is a central issue. Once again there is the ‘ideas’-‘life’ opposition within the “opposing class formations.” While Clifford and his friends are the site of ‘ideas’, ‘life’ is located within the mining community, though with “severe qualification.” Because of her “surviving passion for her dead collier-husband,” which can be seen as the source of her antagonism towards the Chatterley family and of her attempt to protect Connie in her ‘ignominious’ love-scandal, Mrs Bolton also represents ‘life’. Mellors is alienated from his own class, but he sustains in his being, in his work and in his spontaneous response to sex “the spirit of ‘life’.” And Connie’s is a “journey from the site of ‘ideas’ to that of ‘life’ represented by Mellors. While the miners’ ‘life’ is suppressed by the mechanistic, industrial world, “only Mellors, a child of these people, succeeds in affirming it in a new manifestation.” As Martin argues, Mellors and Connie are “fugitives from their respective classes,” hoping “to bring to birth the ‘life’ which in different ways each class denies.” “Mellors’ alienation from his class is conscious from the start, a frozen withdrawal from which he is revived by Connie, while the process of her alienation from her class is the story of the novel” (44-46).

d) Language and Class

Just as, in a multilingual society, group-identity is marked by the use of different languages, in a monolingual community, the varieties within the same language become the basis for group-identity and often the cause for social discrimination. As Wallwork puts it, “apart from our appraisal of the factual content of what is said or written, we tend to assess people and situations from the way language is used, and often our subsequent actions and attitudes are determined by such assessments. Often the regional or social dialect of the speaker “tells us where he comes from and what we judge to be
his position in the social hierarchy of the community.” And, regional and social dialects “play a much more important role in English society than in some others.” The question of someone’s speech being ‘good’ or ‘better’ is not linguistic; it is purely social (99-100). Lawrence, as many writers do, makes use of dialectal variations to mark social distinctions, especially, the common folk and the working class from the middle class and the elite.

In *Sons and Lovers*, Mrs. Morel, “a lady,” who “loved ideas, and was considered very intellectual,” has the first contact with colliery life and ambience before her marriage, when Walter tells her about going down the pit: “Tha niver seen such a way they get in. But tha mun let me ta’e thee down sometime, an’ tha can see for thysen.” Then he asks her tenderly: “shouldn’t ter like it? ‘Appen not, it ‘ud dirty thee.” Gertrude’s introduction to the working class is through their language. “She had never been ‘thee’d’ and ‘thou’d’ before” (19). As Aldington records, Mrs. Lydia Lawrence “never used the Derbyshire dialect like her husband and the other miners and their wives, and had very little contact with her neighbours” (*Portrait* . . . 5). And Worthen notes that “her Kent accent doubtless made Midlands people feel that she put on airs” (*Biography* . . .). Paul Morel, brought up by a mother who was conscious of her accent, finds the men who disbursed the colliers’ wages at the colliery office “hateful and common.” He complains to his mother that “Mr. Braithwaite drops his ‘h’s’, an’ Mr. Winterbottom says ‘You was’” (93). And to the Morels, Miss Western with her “glib London speech” and “her furs and London-made costume,” is a sort of “princess” (148-49).

In *The Rainbow*, Ursula, who comes back home after her exposure to the outside world, is ‘status-conscious,’ and something in her does not allow her to respond in the old way when ‘common’ people address her, “‘Ello Urs’ler, ’ow are yer goin’ on?” The
people “felt it there nevertheless, something beyond them, and they were injured. They said she was proud and conceited, that she was too big for her shoes nowadays.” Ursula felt ashamed as she felt “different from the people she had lived amongst” (419). As Burden points out, the conversation between Ursula and Gudrun in the first chapter of Women in Love is a “middle-class modish speech of the New Woman under the strain of ennui in the provincial working-class town” (172).

In Lady Chatterley’s Lover, Mellors, in spite of his education, his interest in reading and his sojourn in India and Egypt as a soldier, spoke the Derbyshire dialect, the workman’s language. Connie’s sister Hilda, shocked by his slipping into the vernacular from natural English, which he could use at great ease, thought that Mellors was “acting” as a common workman. Probably in using the dialect, Mellors was only asserting his working-class identity in defiance of the class-feeling of the ‘higher-ups.’ However, Connie got used to Mellors’ language as their love progressed. She even attempted, quite ludicrously, to imitate Mellors’ speech as part of their love-making.

e) Social Climbing

Lawrence is well aware of the fact that the members of each social class have the conscious or unconscious desire to go ‘beyond’ the confines of their own class and catch up with the classes which they have willy-nilly accepted as superior. This tendency is not peculiar to the British; it is something universal. In India the people of the so-called lower ‘castes’ often follow or imitate the life-style of their social higher-ups like the Brahmins.

In the novel The Rainbow, as early as the introductory pages, Lawrence brings out in concrete terms how the aspirations of the members of one class leap beyond to those of the higher class even in rural Midlands. To the Brangwen woman the life so near as at Cossethay brought “worlds beyond where her own menfolk existed.” Her
vision of the beyond was filled with the vicar who had "power over her husband" "as Brangwen had power over the cattle," the curate, who was poor enough, but whose children had "dominance" over her own, Mrs. Hardy, the squire's lady at the Hall, who was "like a winter rose, so fair and delicate" and the men at the Hall of whom the lady gossiped. She concluded that it was their knowledge, education and experience that placed them above "the common man." "She craved to achieve this higher being, if not in herself, then in her children." She wished to give her children "this education, this higher form of being" "so that they too could live the supreme life on earth," and "not be left behind obscure among the labourers" (9-11).

However, life on the Marsh Farm, for both the men and the women, as Leavis puts it, was "finally adequate" and there was "supreme fulfilment." But Leavis strongly opines that the theme of the novel is not exalting this order of things but "rather the transcending of it," "towards self-responsibility in the individual – self-responsibility and a wider scope, things which entail a freer play of intelligence and a direct part in the intellectual culture and finer civilization of the age, the finer contemporary human consciousness." But Leavis carefully notes that "the impulse to this development, as well as the vigour for it, comes from the life that is to be transcended" (109).

Here Leavis comes out to defend Lawrence against the charge that he is snobbish in his presentation of the Brangwen woman’s admiration of the vicar’s and the curate’s intellectual and cultural milieu. Considering the charge as absurd, Leavis says, "The imaginative values enjoyed by the women cannot be reduced to snobbery, and the superiorities they see, with substantial truth, as associated with class-differences are real." One wonders whether there is any need for Leavis to defend Lawrence here, for Lawrence does not seem to identify himself with the Brangwen woman in her adulatory attitude towards the upper classes. As Leavis himself says, Lawrence is only making a
study of “an actual civilization” (109-10). The question is whether the transcending of the life of Marsh Farm is an aspiration of the Brangwen woman or that of Lawrence himself. If it were Lawrence’s, it would appear as though the life of the vicar, the curate and the lady of the Hall itself were the supreme goal beyond the life of the peasants. In fact, the goal suggested by the novel is the life that would “enlarge their own scope and range and freedom” (9) and such a goal would take them not only beyond themselves, but also beyond the life of the upper classes as well.

Ronald P. Draper seems to make matters clear. As they sat by the fire in the house, the blood of the Brangwen men “flowed heavy with the heavy accumulation from the living day” but “their brains were inert”. They did not share with the women their attraction for the outside world. But, as Draper points out, the blood intimacy of the men and the conscious awareness and education of the women “balance one another”; they are “complementary to one another in a really satisfyingly human way of life”. “The male and the female in the Brangwens joined together constitute the implicit standard of The Rainbow”. However, Draper reads the novel as favouring “the intuitive integration of the earlier Brangwen men” as “a condition of vitality, a fundamental requirement of life in a way the female aspiration is not.” Holding the life of blood-intimacy at the Marsh Farm as Lawrence’s “pastoral ideal,” “a Golden Age – by comparison with which modern life is a fallen condition,” Draper interprets “the female desire to venture beyond the narrow bounds of the Marsh Farm” as a cause of “the Fall.” According to him, “the later struggle of Ursula, who, more than any other major character in The Rainbow, has the opportunity of wider knowledge and education, is to recover the lost blood-intimacy, to save herself from the overdeveloped consciousness that atrophies the old intuitive life. Through her Lawrence communicates his own horror of the ashy condition to which life can be reduced by insisting upon knowledge as the
chief end of man” (58-60).

In “Education of the People,” Lawrence speaks of the possibility of one transcending one’s own class. While denouncing ‘class’ as a social hierarchy created by “the accident of money” or “through heredity,” Lawrence expresses his belief in a different kind of class, which is also a hierarchy of men, from workers to supreme judges, “chosen to a class, or a caste,” because they are “exceptionally fitted” for the particular jobs (139). Lawrence’s scheme is akin to the Indian caste system in its ideal state, which, as Radhakrishnan points out, would facilitate even a *sudra*, a person of the lowest rung, to become a Brahmin, if he is virtuous (197).

In *John Thomas and Lady Jane*, Connie thwarts the existing hierarchy of class, at least in her own mind, by giving a new definition to the ‘proletariat’. She remembers “what the little man Archie Blood said: that the proletariat was a state of mind.” To her “Clifford, with his central insistence on the mines, and on his position as employer and boss, was really proletarian,” but Parkin (Mellors), with his hot-bloodedness and singleness was not a proletarian. She said class was “an anachronism.” To make Parkin of the lower class acceptable to her own self, which was conditioned by the existing order of class, she had to borrow a new definition of the proletariat and place him above Clifford and his lot (294).

In *Women in Love*, Gudrun’s nostalgic attitude towards the colliers resulting from the geographical and social proximity, is complicated by her acute awareness of the socio-cultural realities of the life of the colliers. To Gudrun, the colliers of Beldover appeared as “ghostly” and “ghoulish” as the colliers of Wiggston (in *The Rainbow*) appeared to Ursula (12). She got into a “violent and murderous” anger, when a collier jeered at her stockings. However, the throng of the colliers’ voices that “vibrated in the air like discordant machinery” “aroused a strange, nostalgic ache of desire” in her. She
wanted to be like the common lasses enjoying the company of the collier lads. And she
even flirted with Palmer, an electrician, who lived alone in a cottage in Willey Green
(129-30). But the fact remains that, despite all her nostalgia Gudrun was not entirely
without class consciousness; she was conscious that her lover was no ordinary collier,
but the richest man of the district. When Gerald “crushed her upon his breast” under the
bridge she remembered that under the very same bridge “the young colliers stood in the
darkness with their sweet hearts, in rainy weather” and pressed them to their breast. But
she knew Gerald was “the master of them all” and his love was “more concentrated and
supreme” and his embrace was “more powerful and terrible” than theirs (372-73).

No upper class, especially the aristocracy, would easily allow anybody into its
fold. Michaelis, the social-climber in Lady Chatterley's Lover “pined to be where he
didn’t belong – among the English upper classes.” The “Dublin mongrel” “travelled
with his manservant and his very neat car”; but the upper classes hated him and enjoyed
kicking him (22). However, to Connie, who was devoid of class-feeling when her
sympathy was awake, Michaelis could frankly open his “stray-dog’s soul” (25).

Mrs Bolton, the nurse hired to look after Sir Clifford, was the widow of a collier,
who died in an explosion down the pit. But she always felt very superior to the working-
men; she felt almost upper class. At the same time, she had a smouldering resentment
against “the owning class.” But, her grudge against the masters notwithstanding, she
was “thrilled” to serve at Wragby (81). When she guessed rightly that her-ladyship of
Wragby was in love with a lad born and bred in Tevershall, she was exhilarated. For,
“that was a slap back at the high-and-mighty Chatterleys” (145). And when Sir Clifford
clung to her with tears in his eyes on hearing from Connie about her decision to sever
her marital ties, Mrs Bolton consoled him like a mother, but said to herself with a class-
feeling tinged with revenge: “Oh Sir Clifford! Oh high and mighty Chatterleys! Is this
what you’ve come down to!” (290-91).

f) Prejudices and Conflicts

As between individuals, between different social groups also there are prejudices and conflicts, which mostly arise out of group-identity. While the ‘otherness’ of an individual is something to be recognized and honoured as a complementary factor in individual relationships, the recognition of another social group as the ‘other’ and the identification of ‘oneness’ among the members of one group, instead of assuring a complementary relationship, often lead to animosities, hatred, suspicion, prejudice and ugly conflicts. As Lawrence presents them, almost all classes have some prejudice or the other about the ‘other’ classes resulting in conflicts, but the personal culture of some individuals in a community, whether working class or aristocracy, always saves humanity from possible disintegration and maintains wholeness of social life.

As Leavis observes, “class-distinctions enter as a major element” into the theme of the early story “Daughters of the Vicar.” Lawrence registers them in the story “as facts that play an important part in human life,” and the story’s theme is “the triumph over them of life.” “The villain of the drama” is class, and it is “represented by the proud class-superiority of the impoverished vicar’s family” (75-76). In the story, while the vicar of Aldecross, Mr. Lindley and his wife stand for the “pride of class-superiority,” despite their isolation and poverty, their “plump and obstinate-looking second daughter Louisa and her working-class lover Alfred Durant represent the spontaneous fullness of being transcending class barriers” (77). While Louisa is drawn to the “fine jet of life” she discerns in Alfred, the former naval sailor now working in the coal pit, her elder sister Mary agrees to marry Mr. Massy, the “small” clergyman, in whom there is no spontaneity, but “a certain inhuman self-sureness” (135). His body, which is “almost unthinkable,” reminds one of Loerke in Women in Love. Mary herself
feels “as if her body would rise and fling him aside.” Yet, her will wants to be free from their “perpetual cold penury” and acquiesces to the domineering will of the little man, which they cannot “controvert.” In marrying him, Mary has “sold herself”; she has “sold a lower thing, her body, for a higher thing, her freedom from material things.” It is easy to perceive Lawrence’s irony which makes the real value of things topsy-turvy. However, the voice of the author is heard in what Louisa says about the man, to whom her sister has surrendered herself. Louisa says to herself that her own blood “would rise and exterminate the little man, if he came too near to her.” She would flip him out of the room. “But then Mary was Mary, and she was Louisa, and that also was inalterable” (142-43).

Criticising Mary, whose ideal and spirituality she now distrusts, Louisa understands that it is money that has ruled her parents and the whole affair. Finding that “there isn’t a grain of love in them anywhere,” she makes up her mind: “but I will have it. I will love – it is my birthright. I will love the man I marry – that is all I care about” (145). Like Kitty in Anna Karenina, whose love and dedication soothes the last days of Nicholas Levin, her brother-in-law, Louisa tends Alfred’s loving mother, who had a minor but fatal accident while she was pulling up cabbage in the garden. It is during this time Louisa obliges the dying woman by doing the “back washing” for her son, who comes back from the pit. While Lady Chatterley’s first rich experience of the white, delicate body of the gamekeeper washing himself is only visual (66), Louisa’s experience of the “beautiful, clear, male body” of the collier is both visual and tactile. She is fascinated as she finds the “living centre” in the touch of the body. She finds in him “all the livingness of life that the vicarage, with its dedication to the nothingness of class-pride, denies” (86). The will in Louisa represents “the wholeness of the being (in Louisa it is whole), in which the conscious mind does truly serve the life that transcends
As far as the breaking of the class barrier is concerned, Louisa is faced with problems both at home and with her lover himself. Louisa’s problem with the young man is somewhat similar to Connie’s with the gamekeeper before their relation began. When Connie delivered Mellors the message from Sir Clifford at the gamekeeper’s cottage, the man took the order and his whole self changed; he “glazed over with a certain hardness and distance” (67). Connie, back at the Hall, learnt that the man had come out of the army only a year before. In “Daughters of the Vicar,” when Louisa met Alfred for the second time, a few days after his father’s death, he treated her “as if she were some sort of will in command and he a separate, distinct will waiting in front of her.” As if by military discipline, which Louisa hated, he “ranked himself inferior, subordinate to her.” “She felt the cowardice of it, his calmly placing her in a superior class, and placing himself inaccessibly apart, in an inferior, as if she, the sentient woman who was fond of him, did not count” (140-41). She had ventured to stay at the cottage for the night to nurse his mother. But how to approach him was a problem for her. “For he would take not one step towards her.” But, despite his diffidence in taking the initiative, he was fully sensible of “the wonder of living” when she was there in the cottage. When he went to the vicarage with a note from Louisa, he “felt abashed and humbled by the big house, he felt again as if he were one of the rank and file. When Miss Mary spoke to him he almost saluted” (161-62). Paradoxically, when she met the “solitary young collier” at the cottage after his mother’s death, it is Louisa’s ‘lady-like’ heroism that helped him “overcome class in himself.” She drew him from behind the “cover of class-inferiority” by asking him helplessly, “don’t you want me?” It is then he put his arms round her and claimed her as his love. (168-69) It is not merely the triumph of love, but, as Leavis puts it, “the heroic triumph of life” itself (98). Unlike Louisa,
Mary was conscious of her station in life and she patronized Alfred. And the author says she was nothing if she did not have her position. “She could never have trusted herself outside a definite place, nor respected herself except as a woman of superior class” (162).

In the closing scene at the vicarage, outwardly Alfred still behaves in the subordinate manner of a sailor, but inwardly holds “firmly to his own independence and self-respect” (171). He performs his “highest duty” by talking to the vicar about his marriage with Louisa. “The scene is painful because of the force with which it presents the brutal class-consciousness, the utter lack of imaginative feeling, with which the Lindley parents treat the young collier” (Leavis 98). Mrs. Lindley insults Alfred by chiding her daughter for her wish to marry “a collier” and asking Alfred whether they are going to live in “that poky little house” of his. Mr. Lindley declares that he would not like them living there in a collier’s cottage under his nose. He says, “I have my position to maintain, and a position which may not be taken lightly,” and gets a promise from Alfred that they would go away to a remote place (172). The lovers, however, get through the painful ordeal and emerge triumphant with their firm resolve to get married soon at the registrar’s.

In *Women in Love*, Gudrun could understand Hermione’s class consciousness when, at the water party, the latter greeted her glancing slowly over Gudrun’s father and mother. “Hermione was really so strongly entrenched in her class superiority, she could come up and know people out of simple curiosity, as if they were creatures on exhibition.” But, as the author comments, Gudrun was no better. “Gudrun would do the same herself. But she resented being in the position when somebody might do it to her” (178).

In *The Lost Girl*, Alvina, who belongs to the class of tradespeople, becomes a
declassee once she associates herself with the artistes in her father's cinema as a pianist.

She becomes "somewhat vulgarized in her bearing" and "the other daughters of respectable tradesmen" avoid her now, or speak to her "only from a distance." But she does not care; she likes being a declassee, an outsider, and laughs when she knows all the Woodhouse youths look on her "as one of their inferior entertainers" (146).

In the short story "You Touched Me" there is a passage about the difficulty of Matilda and her sister Emmie in getting suitable matches in the Midlands. The sisters could not find suitable husbands in the industrial district, because there were "only colliers or pottery-hands, mere workmen." The two girls would get ten thousand pounds' worth of house-property each on their father death; they would not "sneeze away" such a fortune on "any mere member of the proletariat" (369). The irony is that Matilda had to finally marry Hadrian, whom their father had adopted out of a charity institution.

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Clifford "had little connection with people." "The miners were, in a sense his own men"; but like Gerald before him, this mine owner too "saw them as objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than as parts of life, and crude raw phenomena rather than human beings along with him." There was no communication between Wragby Hall and Tevershall village; there was a "gulf impassable, and a quiet sort of resentment on either side." It was as though Connie and Clifford "belonged to another species altogether from the colliers." When Connie went out, the colliers stared at the lady Chatterley "as if she were a walking wax figure" (14-16).

**g) Sex and Class**

The most powerful symbol of the breaking down of class barrier is the sexual relationship between a woman of the upper class and her lover from the lower sections
of society. The unwritten laws of class are so ingrained in the consciousness of women that, unless they are ready for a real battle with their class and to face ignominy, they do not entertain any thought of love-relationship with men outside their class. However, when such a presentment is by a male author belonging to the lower class, several questions are raised regarding the author’s intentions.

Constance Chatterley is one of those Lawrencean heroines who belong to a higher social position but fall in love with “an outsider of a lower class.” Louisa, Alvina, Matilda, and Yvette, all of them, reject class difference and follow their “instinctive desire.” As Michael Squires puts it, “the male body joins with (and empowers) the female’s in fulfilment, and the woman can be reborn into a new kind of life” (xvi). However, there is a question as to why Lawrence does not seem to be interested in breaking class-barriers through the love between an upper class man and a woman from the lower classes. If Lawrence had done so, perhaps it would have been simply tolerated as an upper class man (like Sir Clifford) taking a mistress (like Mrs Bolton) from the lower class or going to a low-born prostitute, and not as violating class ‘laws’.

Clifford came from the war “with the lower half of his body, from the hips down, paralysed for ever” (5). So it was impossible for Connie even to dream of getting sexual gratification from him and have children through him. But Sir Clifford had no qualms over suggesting that his wife have “a child by another man” provided she did not “let the wrong sort of fellow” touch her (44). Obviously “the wrong sort of fellow” meant any man below their social rank. It was Michaelis, the playwright, who came to Connie’s mind. But she had already had sex with him taking care not to hurt Sir Clifford by letting him know about it. And later, when Connie wondered what Clifford’s godfather Winter, the old wealthy coal-owner, would say if he knew that Clifford’s
gamekeeper had been having intercourse with her, she felt he would detest and despise her, because he hated the “shoving forward of the working classes.” “A man of her own class he would not mind” (128). Still later, when Hilda accompanied Connie to the cottage, she hoped her sister would leave Mellors. Despite “being always on the side of the working classes” as a socialist, Hilda loathed Connie “lowering” herself by carrying on with a gamekeeper. Hilda said she felt so, “not out of snobbery – but because the whole rhythm was different.” Lawrence remarks with sarcasm, “Hilda had lived among the real political intellectuals, so she was disastrously unanswerable” (241).

Connie finds her ideal lover in Clifford’s gamekeeper Mellors (‘Parkin’ in The First Lady Chatterley and John Thomas and Lady Jane, the first and the second versions of the novel respectively) who is drawn from Lawrence’s own class. Like Lawrence, Mellors was also the son of a collier. But, as in the case of Aaron, his education and knowledge of the world did not prevent him from going to the pit; he worked as a blacksmith at the pit-bank when he came back from the war.

For a lady like Connie to fall in love with a servant of her own cannot be accepted by a reader whose sympathies are with her, unless the author does something to improve the status of the man. Lawrence distinguishes Mellors from other ‘ordinary’ workmen. He is educated and is fond of reading books; he has been to the British colonies as a military officer; he can speak ‘natural English’ though he often chooses to speak the dialect; he has great pride and self-respect; and, above all, he is sexually attractive and powerful. On the first day Connie had her ‘visionary’ experience of the nudity of his male body, “he seemed so unlike a gamekeeper, so unlike a working-man anyhow; although he had something in common with the local people” (68). And Hilda on her first meeting itself could see that “he was acting”; “he was no simple working man.” At table manners “he was instinctively much more delicate and well-bred than
It is difficult to accept Kate Millett calling Mellors a snob. It is true he despises his own class. But he is equally critical of the upper classes. He is a neither a stooge nor a toadying social-climber. And, one wonders whether an insight into the true condition of one’s own class can be called snobbery. However, Millett is right in her observation that “the lovers have not so much bridged class as transcended it into an aristocracy based on sexual dynamism rather than wealth or position” (76). Perhaps it is this kind of dynamism Lawrence has in mind when he speaks of the ascendance of “the primal, spontaneous self” in “Democracy” (708).

An important charge Millett levels against Lawrence is that of covetousness connected with class-feeling. According to her, being “born outsiders” to the white man’s privileges and prerogatives, Mellors and Lawrence tend “to envy, imitate, and covet.” Rather in the manner of a black whose “grandest aspiration is sexual acceptance by the white woman, Lawrence’s dark outsiders, whether Mexican Indian or Derbyshire collier, focus their ambition on the ‘white man’s woman’ – the Lady.” Millett’s argument is that by suborning the lady-class female, Lawrence will get the courage to subordinate other males and install himself as a natural aristocrat (76-77). According to Millett, “immersed in the ancient fantasy that he had the wrong father, he [Lawrence] has converted his own father into a god [Mellors].” But, as it is impossible to gain artistic prestige or political power like the other Lawrencian heroes, Mellors seeks to achieve godhead by basing his entire claim upon ‘John Thomas’ (77).

As Daleski suggests, in The Ladybird, Lady Daphne’s achievement of a new self through her love and passion for Dionys should be distinguished from that of Connie Chatterley, “of whom she is evidently a prefigurement,” for, at Thoresway she could not go ahead with her love for the gamekeeper on account of her isolation “beyond the
breach of his birth, her culture, her consciousness” (“Aphrodite . . . 150). “Her consciousness seemed to make a great gulf between her and the lower classes, the unconscious classes” (70).

In The Virgin and the Gipsy, while presenting Yvette’s first meeting with the gipsies, Lawrence uses the word ‘pariah’ several times to refer to the race of the gipsies, who were “outcasts” (188-89). But, each time he uses the word (which has its origin in the Tamil word parayar denoting one of the ‘outcastes’ in South India), he reinforces not only the general social attitude towards the gipsies but also his own predilection for such outcasts as Annable, Cicio and Mellors, in whom he finds real livingness.

**Education and Human Development**

As Raymond Williams points out, Lawrence is “one of the first English writers to have direct experience of ordinary teaching”; and also he is “one of the very first to have worked in our modern system of organized schooling for everyone” (7). Lawrence began his teaching career as a pupil-teacher in the British Schools in his native village Eastwood. “He received his own lessons from the headmaster, George Holderness, for an hour before school started; then spent most of the rest of his time teaching the collier lads who only a couple of years earlier would have jeered at him for being a softy” (Worthen). Then, at the age of twenty three, Lawrence joined as Assistant Master at the Davidson Road Boys’ School, in the south London suburb of Croydon. The collier lads he had taught at Eastwood had not been so poor and deprived as the boys at Croydon. Probably the bad discipline problems he had at Croydon in the beginning are reflected in the account of Ursula’s “horrendous” experiences at St. Philip’s in The Rainbow. Worthen suggests that Lawrence’s problems, like Ursula’s, might have been solved “by the eventual, self-brutalizing use of the cane.”

As Keith Cushman points out, it is “evidently the same schoolmaster” who
appears in the three “schoolmaster stories” “A Lesson on a Tortoise”, “Lessford’s Rabbits” and “The Fly in the Ointment”, written during Lawrence’s Croydon period (xvii). Though all these stories are in a way about a similar incident, theft, only the first two deal with the narrator’s experience at school. “A Lesson on a Tortoise” offers a beautiful commentary on the teacher’s role as an educational manager in the class-room. Though begun well with the good intention of providing his children a direct experience of a live tortoise inside the class-room, the teacher’s strategy is thwarted as he loses his balance and equanimity in his enquiry into the missing erasers. Joey, the tortoise, who had, at the beginning, stretched his skinny neck and looked with “indifferent eyes” at the boys, had, by now, withdrawn into its shell, forgotten (16). At last, when the teacher “turned out the last light, tried the cupboards, and went home,” he “felt very tired, and very sick” (20).

In “Lessford’s Rabbits” the teacher conducts an informal enquiry with Lessford, one of his own boys, who used to push under his jersey pieces of the ‘free’ bread given at school, to fatten his rabbits with. This story is not so much about education as about the poor background of the children at school. As shown in the previous story the class included “charity boys” from the Gordon Home and boys from a home for the orphans and illegitimate children of actors and actresses. In the present story, Lessford comes from “a long line of unrelievedly poor people” (23). And there were also children of poor but self-conscious parents who would not “submit to the indignity of the officer’s inquiries,” and “boys, the most foolishly sensitive animals in the world, would, many of them, prefer to go short rather than to partake of charity meals of which all their schoolmates were aware.” For the little Oliver Twists and their social background Lawrence had the same concern as Dickens before him.

In “The Fly in the Ointment”, as Cushman points out, “Lawrence is drawing on
his own situation in exploring the narrator's discontent as a schoolmaster in Croydon, his nostalgia for 'home' and Muriel (a recreation of Jessie), his sense that he is somehow unable to move on in his life" (xviii). The “mauve primroses,” the “timid hazel catkins” and the other flowers Muriel has sent in “a forlorn little cardboard box” have set the tone for the day. In his “dreamy and reluctant” mood, the school and the sound of the boys are “unreal” and “unsubstantial” to him. He feels that the boys would consider him “a vacant fool,” and he regards them as “a punishment” upon him. And, in his lodging house, as night comes on, his mind escapes into memories of “all the beautiful things we had done, Muriel and I, at home in the midlands, of all the beautiful ways she had looked at me, of all the beautiful things I had said to her – or had meant to say” (49-50). But there is a fly in the ointment. Late at night, as he goes into the kitchen to get a glass of water, he has a disturbing experience with a young fellow of “a low breed”, who has intruded into the kitchen with the intention of stealing something. The encounter with the “slum-rat” with “dirty clothes” and “nasty skin” is of no physical consequence. But, as the narrator shuts the door and turns in after watching the fellow shamble down the path, he is confronted with his own wretchedness and his failure to realize his dreams of the world of primroses and hazel catkins.

Lawrence writes in “Men Must Work and Women As Well” that one of the fatal flaws of modern education, especially education in the board-schools, is the revulsion it creates against “physical effort, physical labour and physical contact” (584). Physical work is considered unclean. They said to the boys at the Board-school of a mining district, ninety percent of whom were children of colliers: “Work is noble, but what you want is to get on, you don’t want to stick down a coal-mine all your life. Rise up, and do clean work! become a school-teacher or a clerk, not a common collier.” Such an attitude from the preceptors created only “malcontents” among the working-class people. People
are taught to despise themselves for being “a common collier, a low labourer” and, as Lawrence sees it, the mischief has developed so rapidly. But he says, his father, who never went to a Board-school, quite liked his job (586-87).

In *The Rainbow*, one of Ursula’s dreams was to become an ideal teacher. Having had a bitter taste of the common children of Ilkeston, Ursula dreamt how in her job as a teacher, “she would make the little, ugly children love her.” “She would make them so happy, and they would prefer her to any teacher on the face of the earth” (367). But, the situation at the school where she was going to work would teach her how different reality was.

In his presentation of Ursula’s experience at St. Philip’s, Lawrence not only gives a picture of the elementary schools in England in the beginning of the twentieth century but also a dramatic interpretation of the philosophy of education itself. The very description of the school, which is Dickensian in character, is meant to present the grim picture of a prison. When she was inside the class room as the teacher of Std. Five, she felt “the prison round her” (369). Yet, sitting on the high chair at her teacher’s desk with her feet not reaching the ground, Ursula once again entered her world of dreams. She would be “the beloved teacher bringing light and joy to her children.” “But the desks before had an abstract angularity that bruised her sentiment and made her shrink” (372-73).

There were more than fifty boys and girls in Ursula’s class, who had to share one huge room with two other classes each of the same number. While Mr Brunt went on with his teaching “like a machine,” always in the same “inhuman voice,” “oblivious of everything.” Ursula in her class of fifty colliery children, who resented her command, felt that “she could not speak as she would to the child, because they were not individual children, they were a collective inhuman thing” (376). Like the other teachers,
Ursula also hated and despised Mr Harby, the head-master. “For he was the master of them and the children, he stood like a wheel to make absolute his authority over the herd.”

Ursula understood that in the methods the teachers adopted in that school, there was a total rejection of the sense of ‘wonder’ Lawrence would expect to be encouraged in the child in the process of learning. “They [the teachers] were drudging unwillingly at the graceless task of compelling many children into one disciplined, mechanical set, reducing the whole set to an automatic state of obedience and attention, and then of commanding their acceptance of various pieces of knowledge.” So “the first great task was to reduce sixty children to one state of mind, or being.” And this could be done by a teacher in a large class only by bringing the will of the children into accordance with his own will. And this necessarily involved “the abnegation of his personal self.” This went contrary to what Ursula believed in. She had thought “she was going to be the first wise teacher by making the whole business personal, and using no compulsion.” The harsh reality of the situation made her realize “the ghastly necessity” to put away her personal self and become “an instrument, an abstraction, working upon a certain material, the class, to achieve a set purpose of making them know so much each day” (382-83).

Ursula knew that there was no use protesting that she was infinitely superior to Miss Harby, while the latter was proving herself successful as a teacher. “Miss Harby was a splendid teacher. She could keep order and inflict knowledge on a class with remarkable efficiency.” As Beal points out, “the irony of this is Dickensian, and indeed the schoolroom is in the same utilitarian tradition as the schoolroom in Hard Times, where the little pitchers waited to have knowledge poured into them” (37). Ursula was now confronted with the question whether she should withdraw from a class in which she was feeling “less and less secure” and go home accepting defeat. ”Her very life was
at test.”

Obviously Lawrence is making his young heroine choose a path which no educational psychologist would approve. Ursula was going to act expeditiously and exercise her will over fifty unruly children. She was going to emerge as ‘Ursula victrix’; she would not let school overcome her. She would shut her personal self in prison and subjugate herself to “a bad, destructive will.” She would forget that she was Ursula Brangwen and identify herself only as Standard Five teacher. In her fight with the class she used brute force and brought it under control. She punished the boy, Williams, who was “a match even for Mr Harby,” by severely thrashing him with the cane in front of the whole class and brought discipline into the class (384-400). Thereafter she used the cane whenever she was driven wild. “And at length they were afraid of her, she had them in order” (405).

To do what she did Ursula had paid great price out of her own soul. “She, who shrank from the thought of physical suffering in any form, had been forced to fight and beat with a cane and rouse all her instincts to hurt.” She repented bitterly “having got beside herself, and having tackled the boy she had beaten.” She wondered why she had “leagued herself to this evil system where she must brutalize herself to live.” But she did not want to be considered incompetent to do what she had been called upon to do in the man’s world (405-06). With all her occupation in her work as a teacher Ursula still had the vital question nagging her: “Why should the children learn, and why should she teach them?” (409).

Robert Burden finds “a marked coincidence” in terms of reference between the chapter, “The Man’s World,” and Michel Foucault’s Discipline and Punish (1975). In Foucault’s view, the school as an institution is “an apparatus of the State, which, like any such institution, has an immediate hold over the body.” In the school “the pupils are
subjected to the system by being turned into objects of pedagogic knowledge from above. Supervising, punishing and constraining children to prepare them for citizenship in the disciplinary society is reinforced by the family. These mechanics of power produce docile bodies, useful to the economy and obedient to the political State (Burden 138). According to Burden, the children of St. Philip’s School are being prepared for the colliery or the factory. What they learn is not so important as discipline.

With its detailed time table and the cellular arrangement of rooms in the building, “the school becomes a mechanism of learning, a precise instrumentality of power, and especially the primary school because it has the task of disciplining the pupils at an early age by teaching absolute obedience to the authority of the teacher.” Burden points out that Mr Harby’s pedagogy is exactly this, and it is this which Ursula is to learn, if she is to survive. Explaining Foucault’s notion of power, D. C. Hoy says, “the dominated are as much a part of the network of power relations and the particular social matrix as the dominating” (qtd. in Burden 139). “While Ursula finally succumbs to the disciplinary regime of the school and punishes the boy, Williams, with a beating, she is herself implicated in a relation of power which has her in its grip.” In Burden’s opinion, Ursula goes too far; she loses her self-discipline and becomes the “mirror-image of the violent children she is supposed to control.” Ursula becomes a teacher only to prove her independence from the authority of her parents, but, ironically enough, she becomes more subject to power relations (139).

If St. Philip’s was a prison, the college at Nottingham, where she was enrolled for Intermediate and B. A., was equally claustrophobic. In the first year “the cloistered quiet of the college began to close around her,” and she felt as if she were in a convent. “She wanted all the students to have a high, pure spirit” and their faces “to be still and liminous as the nuns’ and the monks’ faces.” The professors were “the black-gowned
priests of knowledge, serving for ever in a remote, hushed temple” (430-31). Ursula’s fantasy, as Burden points out, implicitly reminds us “of her namesake, St. Ursula (the legendary patron of educational institutions and founder of the Ursuline Order of Teaching Sisters)” (142). However, in the second year, for Ursula, “the glamour began to depart from college. The professors were not priests initiated into the deep mysteries of life and knowledge. After all, they were only middle-men handling wares they had become so accustomed to that they were oblivious of them.” Gradually she perceived that the college was “no religious retreat, no seclusion of pure learning.” “It was a little apprentice-shop where one was further equipped for making money. The college itself was a little, slovenly laboratory for the factory.” “The religious virtue of knowledge was become a flunkey to the god of material success.” It is surprising to note how relevant Lawrence’s criticism of collegiate education is even today, after nearly a hundred years.

After her bitter experience at St. Philip’s School in _The Rainbow_, Ursula is once again seen in a class-room as teacher in _Women in Love_. She is now a class mistress at the Grammar School where her sister is the art mistress and her father the handicraft instructor. Contrary to the failure of the schoolmaster in “A Lesson on a Tortoise” to accomplish his ‘lesson plan’ for the day, Ursula achieves, as Leavis points out, a “self-forgetful intentness on the botany lesson.” Leavis also says that Ursula’s concentration in the subject “gives us Lawrence’s own capacity for absorption, and conveys too the delighted and reverent wonder associated for him – so characteristically – with the study of botany” (D. H. Lawrence . . . 184-85). To Ursula the activity of teaching had been “like a trance.” When the school inspector Birkin looked into the scholars’ books, he too was in “another concentrated world.” The subject under discussion was also one of the greatest wonders of nature: pollination. Birkin made some suggestions for the children to highlight, in their drawing, the natural “fact” with different colours: “the red
little spiky stigmas of the female flower, dangling yellow male catkin, yellow pollen flying from one to the other” (Women . . . 39-40). Lawrence’s great interest in the life sciences, especially botany, began as early as his career as a teacher. As Harry T. Moore records, Lawrence “knew flowers so well and studied and taught the subject with enthusiasm” (103)

Speaking of the sense of wonder in the child’s consciousness, Lawrence says, “The sheer delight of a child’s apperception is based on wonder.” “Knowledge and wonder counteract one another”: “as knowledge increases wonder decreases.” According to him, “all our wonderful education and learning is producing a grand sumtotal of boredom,” because the educational systems insist on knowledge but fail to see that “even the real scientist works in the sense of wonder” (“Hymns . . . 157-59). Lawrence’s concept of education is very much connected with his concept of the individual and his direct relationship with life. As Raymond Williams says, “his arguments about education are inseparable from his arguments about life and society.” For Lawrence, education is “a set of active decisions about how we shall live” (7).

Democracy, Socialism and Fascism

Lawrence is not able to accept the popular notions of democracy because he has a very high conception of the individual human being. In “Democracy”, written in 1923, he takes note of the two bases, the Average and Individualism, on which Whitman establishes his notion of “true Democracy,” and argues that the common conceptions of democracy, socialism, the nation and the state are “dead ideals” because they do not go beyond the average man (702). According to him, “the Average Man,” the “little standardized invention of ours,” is “a pure abstraction,” “the reduction of the human being to a mathematical unit” (699-700). Calling the idea of the Average Man “the image and effigy” of equality, Lawrence asserts that “men are not equal, and never
were, and never will be, save by the arbitrary determination of some ridiculous human ideal.” In his view, the Average Man can represent only “the material need in the human being” and he cannot have anything to do with the “spiritual and mystical needs.” “In the free, spontaneous self, one man’s meat is truly another man’s poison”; so equality cannot be applied to anything beyond the Average self. Lawrence avers that “Society, or Democracy, or any Political State or Community exists not for the sake of the individual, but simply to establish the Average, in order to make living together possible.” And “everything beyond that common necessity depends on himself alone” (701).

Lawrence wants governments to be left to the Average to govern, and asks the individuals to keep the “very self integral, greater than any having or knowing, centrally alive and quick” (707-08). In his conception, “the actual living quick itself is alone the creative reality.” He says, “the living self is not the spirit,” and in his view, trying to postulate the living self is like the moon trying to postulate the sun or the child hanging on to his mother’s skirt trying to postulate his mother’s existence. “The quick of the self is there. You needn’t try to get behind it” (712-13).

As Lawrence conceives it, each “living self” has the sole purpose of blossoming into “a full, spontaneous being.” In the new Democracy “the whole soul of man” must be free to have this blossoming, resisting the temptations to “fall from spontaneous, single, pure being, into what we call materialism or automatism or mechanism of the self.” However, “there is no pulling open the buds to see what the blossom will be. Leaves must unroll, buds swell and open, and then the blossom” (714-15). Raymond Williams points out that Lawrence’s emphasis here is the same as Coleridge’s: “an emphasis, felt towards in metaphor, on the preservation of the ‘spontaneous life-activity’ against those rigidities of category and abstraction, of which the industrial
system was so powerful a particular embodiment" ("Lawrence’s . . . 169-70).

Lawrence has great reverence for Whitman’s ideal of Democracy in that he attempts “to conceive a new way of life, to establish new values” and struggles “to liberate human beings from the fixed, arbitrary control of ideals, into free spontaneity.” However, he sets aside Whitman’s ideal of “Oneness, the unification of all mankind into the homogenous whole,” saying that in “the new Democracy” people will not be “melted into a oneness” (713). Instead, they will be “released into their single, starry identity, each one distinct and incommutable” (703). He speaks of the uniqueness of “each man’s primal original soul or self” and “the fact of otherness” of one individual in respect of another, upon which alone “any great scheme of social life must be based” (714).

On the question of equality, Lawrence says, “We cannot say that all men are equal. We cannot say A = B. Nor can we say that men are unequal. We may not declare that A = B + C.” “When I stand with another man, who is himself, and when I am truly myself, then I am only aware of a Presence and of the strange reality of Otherness. There is me and there is another being.” So, in Lawrence’s conception of Democracy, each person will be spontaneously himself or herself “without any question of equality or inequality entering in at all.” And “no man shall try to determine the being of any other man, or of any other woman” (715-16). As Raymond Williams says, a denial of this principle leads to failure of any movement, “whether such determination of human beings is given title by the abstraction of production, or service, of the glory of the race or good citizenship” ("Lawrence’s . . . 170).

In Lawrence’s view, laws and governments do not relate to “the spontaneous integrity of being” but “only to the material world: to property, the possession of property and the means of life, and to the material-mechanical nature of man.” The
horrible truth “of modern democracy – socialism, conservatism, bolshevism, liberalism, republicanism, communism” is that all these isms are governed by the selfsame “principle of the idealized unit, the possessor of property.” And Lawrence is very clear about his views on property. He says, “even property, that most substantial of realities, evaporates once man loses his integral nature.” He has a hope that “sometime, somewhere, man will wake up and realize that property is only there to be used, not to be possessed. He will realize that possession is a kind of illness of the spirit, and a hopeless burden upon the spontaneous self. The little pronouns ‘my’ and ‘our’ will lose all their mystic spell.” However, in contemporary society, “all discussion and idealizing of the possession of the property, whether individual or group or State possession, amounts now to no more than a fatal betrayal of the spontaneous self.” He says, “if we are to keep our backs unbroken [by the burden of possession], we must deposit all property on the ground, and learn to walk without it” (716-18).

In The Rainbow, Ursula says she hates democracy. According to her, “only greedy and ugly people come to the top in a democracy, because they’re the only people who will push themselves there.” Going by the experience of world’s popular democracies, it is easy to see Ursula’s point of view. But it is difficult to agree with her alternative to democracy. Ursula says she wants an aristocracy, “an aristocracy of birth than of money.” She does not want the present aristocrats to rule, as they have only “money-brains,” and “they are ruling in the name of money” (461). It is around the time when he wrote The Rainbow that Lawrence also wrote to Lady Ottoline Morrell about his ideal community “Rananim”: “It is communism based, not on poverty but on riches, not on humility but on pride, not on sacrifice but upon complete fulfilment in the flesh of all strong desire, not in Heaven but on earth. We will be Sons of God who walk here on earth, not bent on getting and having, because we know we inherit all things” (The
In *Women in Love*, Birkin says apart from equality in the abstract or mathematical sense that “every man has hunger, and thirst, two eyes, one nose and two legs,” there are only differences, social and spiritual. He says, “Your democracy is an absolute lie – your brotherhood of man is a pure falsity, if you apply it further than the mathematical abstraction.” As Leavis says, “difference is the essential fact and it is not a matter of inequality or ‘underprivilege’; difference without which there could be no completely human humanity.” (Thought . . .142). In Birkin’s view, a state can be established on the idea of “otherness.” “One man isn’t any better than another, not because they are equal, but because they are intrinsically other, that there is no term of comparison.” Birkin expresses his view in a characteristic violence: “I want every man to have his share in the world’s goods, so that I am rid of his importunity, so that I can tell him: ‘Now you’ve got what you want – you’ve got your fair share of the world’s gear. Now, you one-mouthed fool, mind yourself and don’t obstruct me’” (115-16).

With all his sympathy for the working-classes, Lawrence never believed in socialism or communism. In *The White Peacock*, along with the sympathetic description of the poor people of London, there is also a glimpse into the socialist movement of the time, which evokes varied responses from Cyril and George. While George was “very much moved” by the speech of the “little socialist flaring under a plane tree” in the park, Cyril, who is the author’s *alter ego*, “felt a great terror of the little man, lest he should make me see all mud, as I had seen before” (322). Though George had “frightful battles” “over the nationalization of industries” with Leslie, the industrialist who advocated mechanization of industry, he too fell out of the socialist movement as he disliked a “wordy, humorous, shallow leader of the movement” (337). In *The Plumed Serpent* the Lawrencean leader Ramon was convinced that “the real Christ” could not
save Mexico, and there was the danger of “the white Anti-Christ of charity, and socialism, and politics, and reform” succeeding in destroying Mexico. According to him the politicians and socialists were really surcharged with hate – the hate of materialist have-nots for the materialist haves; they were the Anti-Christs (247).

To Somers, who is Lawrence himself in Kangaroo, “Communism was a bubble that would never even float free and iridescent from the nasty pipe of the theorist” (168). Somers accepted Jack’s invitation to join the “Diggers,” of which Jack was an important office-holder. The aim of the secret diggers clubs, which together formed a pyramidal structure in Australia, was “a sort of revolution and a seizing of political power.” “Somers felt there was his chance, if he wanted to be a leader of men” (103-05). The political scenario in Australia provided him two options. One was to accept the leadership of the Diggers leader Benjamin Cooley, a lawyer known as Kangaroo, and the other was to become an active member of the socialist movement under the leadership of Willie Struthers and work for a red revolution. Somers chose neither the Bolshevism of Struthers nor Kangaroo’s policy, which overemphasized ‘love’.

Somers had his own concept of power and leadership, which is Lawrence’s obsession in all the leadership novels. Somers-Lawrence believed in the isolation of one’s being and the dark God “who gives man passion and the dark, unexplained blood tenderness that is deeper than love.” But, along with the “stirring of dark blood-tenderness,” there is also “a strange, soft iron of ruthlessness” (360-61). In The Ladybird, Count Dionys also has his conviction in the doctrine of power. He speaks of the time when “the men who are really living” will “put their lives into the hands of the greater men among them, beseeching the greater men to take the sacred responsibility of power.” He says that by greater man he does not mean any “hereditary autocrat” but “the man whose soul is born single, able to be alone, to choose and to command” (59).
In *Kangaroo* Somers says that only a person “who is not selfish, who has some natural

gift for it and some reverence for the sacredness of it should have power” (112). But the

question remains how a system could be evolved to choose such a man without falling

prey to bogus men who would pretend to possess those qualities.

Leavis considers *Kangaroo* as an exploration “in a kind of fictional experiment

the possibility for Lawrence of political action” (*D. H. Lawrence* . . . 45). It is “a day-
dream” but not in a discreditable sense. He is putting the idea of becoming a leader in

political action to a full test of reality (55-56). Somers tells Harriet: “I want to do

something with living people, somewhere, somehow, while I live on the earth. I write,

but I write alone. And I live alone. Without any connexion whatever with the rest of

men” (79). But, even as he asserts the singleness of the individual, he speaks of vital

connections with others. He says: It is the individual alone who can save humanity

alive. But the greatest of great individuals must have deep, throbbing roots down in the
dark red soul of the living flesh of humanity.” “Even the greatest man does not live only

by his spirit and his pure contact with the Godhead – for example, Nirvana. [. . .] He is

*forced* to live in vivid rapport with the mass of men” (*Kangaroo* 332).

Lawrence speaks of “a dual polarity” in all men. There are two outward flows,

“the sympathetic flow or flow of love” towards the weak, who become “the positive

pole” and “the flow of power, might, majesty, glory” towards one individual or one

grand centre (Emperor, Pope, Tyrant, King). And human stability depends on “the

balance of these two flows.” Lawrence conceives the great man as one who recognizes

“the life-mystery” and rejects “the dreariness of money-making, money-having, and

money-spending.” He will have “the innate majesty of the purest *individual*, not the

strongest instrument, like Napoleon.” His will be “the single soul that stands between

the dark God and the dark-blooded masses of men.” (333-34).
Despite Lawrence's life-long affinity with the poor classes, his views on the domineering power of a single great individual drew the charge of fascism against Lawrence. The most famous of this charge is that of Bertrand Russell, who wrote in his autobiography that Lawrence's "a mystical philosophy of blood" led straight to Auschwitz; he believed that Lawrence was "a suitable exponent" of the "cult of insanity" called Nazism (qtd. in Burden 90 f.n.12). Moore refers to Russell's remarks as the philosopher-mathematician's celebration of "his delayed revenge against a plain-speaking man," who was his former friend (640).

**Nations and Races**

As a creative writer, Lawrence's thoughts begin with the individual self and go beyond national, racial and geographical boundaries. He looks at world history, especially the history of nations, with his interest in man both as an individual and as one belonging to a vast historical process. Speaking of the world divided into nations and races, Radhakrishnan says, "things happening in the civilized world today [. . .] recall the worst phase of the dark ages. New gods of race and nation are set up in the place of God who is dethroned." "The few who have the perception of the unity of mankind and feel the happiness and misery of neighbouring people as though it were their own are swamped by the millions who are taught to accustom themselves to the idea of humanity as an assemblage of combatant communities whose strength is tested through war." In Leavis's view, what is applicable to Lawrence's view of class is also applicable to his attitude to nationality and race. His interest in them is never touched by "condescension, animus, or egotistic deflection of any kind". It is marked by a "fundamental reverence," a radical, positive attitude to life (D. H. Lawrence . . 88, 77).

a) War

In *Aaron's Rod*, both Aaron and Lilly, both spokesmen of Lawrence, were
seriously concerned about war and humanity. To Lilly war was “a lie” and would go on being a lie till somebody bust it; wars were the “bad dreams” humanity had. Lilly had no inhibition about killing an enemy; what he was averse to was becoming a bit of “the huge machine” called war. He said he would not become so, even if he “died ten deaths and had eleven mothers violated.” He was against all masses and groups including the League of Nations. He said there was no man really “awake”; all men had become “completely base and obscene” because they had been overcome by “the ghastly mob-sleep, the helplessness of the mass-psyche” (144-46). Speaking of the beastliness of the men at war, Lilly tells Jim Bricknell that in the Russo-Japanese war, the Japanese soldiers who reached the Russian soldiers in a trench mangled their throats and tore their faces, and there were dead Japs with flesh between their teeth.

In the story “The Thorn in the Flesh,” Lawrence shows how military authority ignores individual’s differences or problems and seeks to bring the individual under subjection. Bachmann, the “fair, long, limber youth,” “involuntarily” delivers a blow, which sends the sergeant crashing into the water below from the high earthworks, when the sergeant humiliates him for failing to complete the exercise of climbing the scaling-ladder and reaching the heights owing to the acrophobia the young man suffers from. With immediate instinctive decision he walks away from the spot with a feeling that “he is leaving it all, the military world, the shame” (113). He finds “sanctuary” in the bedroom of the girl he has contact with in the home of the baron, where she has been a servant for seven years (117). He finds immense satisfaction in his sexual union with Emilie’s virgin body, only to be discovered by the military men and marched off to the barracks again.

The army life is the negation of all that the young soldier stands for. Like the orderly in “The Prussian Officer,” he is also of the peasant stock. Even as the soldiers
march in obedience to the "brutal, barking shouts" of the sergeant, the young man enjoys the beautiful objects of nature, which symbolize his free spirit under suppression by army rules and discipline. The small vines are "dusty" by the roadside, and the poppies are "blown to pieces" among the tares. But "the distant spaces of sky and fields" are "free with air and sunshine" (110). The authoritarian discipline and vigour tend to destroy natural instincts and feelings of men like Bachmann.

In an authorial exposition in *The Lost Girl* Lawrence refers to "the fatal year of 1914," when "there was quite a stir in the town over the declaration of war" (311). Alvina wondered how the war affected the Natchas, who belonged to different nationalities. "Poor Geoffrey was a French man – he would have to go to France to fight. Max and Louis were Swiss, it would not affect them: nor Cicio, who was Italian." When she was at the station, she could see what the war was doing to personal relationships. "When the train drew away, the young men waving, the women cried aloud and sobbed after them" (315). As Aldington writes, "it was in November 1919 that Lawrence left England, self-exiled and in grief. During the war, through a bureaucratic mix-up, he had been expelled from Cornwall under suspicion of espionage – to his heart-broken indignation." Lawrence could not forgive it when his own people accused him of espionage. So, when Alvina on the Channel boat looks back at England rising, beyond the water, "with ash-grey, corpse-grey cliffs" and sees her country slowly submerging "like a long, ash-grey coffin," the heart which broke in outraged love and repudiation was Lawrence’s (Aldington, Introd. 9). Lawrence recalls this painful experience again in *Kangaroo* and expresses it once again in the same images: the snow on the Downs looked "like a shroud" and the cliffs appeared "dead grey" while England was sinking in the sea "like a grey, dreary-grey coffin" (286).

Lady Beveridge’s in *The Ladybird* is a war-ravaged family. In the years 1916
and 1917, "her boys and her brother were killed in the war." Her son-in-law Major Apsley, who was missing in the East, comes back at the end of the war defaced with a big scar on his cheek. Looking at the prisoners of war, her 'enemies', she reflects that the men are enemies "through no choice of their own" (9). And Count Dionys, who was wounded in the war, speaks with an aversion to the war machinery: "More trenches? More Big Berthas, more shells and poison-gas, more machine-drilled science-manoeuvred so-called armies? Never, Never" (32). According to him there was no victory for anybody; it was "suicide" for all the European powers. "America and Japan did not enter vitally. They only helped the Europeans to commit suicide" (66). But, Lawrence did not live to see the worldwide devastation caused when America and Japan entered "vitally" in the Second World War.

Lawrence devotes the whole of the chapter "The Nightmare" in Kangaroo to relive the memory of his war time experience in Cornwall, which was like "a volcanic eruption in his consciousness" (287). Somers - Lawrence could not be untrue to himself and accept what the mob expected of him during wartime. He could not "identify himself with the criminal mob, sink his sense of truth, of justice, and of human honour, and bay like some horrible unclean hound." He could not acquiesce in the "the whole spirit of the war" and lose his "inward, individual integrity." His "deepest self" made him "abide by his own feelings, come what may." He felt that during the war "the industrialism and commercialism of England, with which patriotism and democracy became identified," insulted a man and "hit him pleasantly across the mouth" (235-37).

Somers recalls how London "perished from being a heart of the world, and became a vortex of broken passions, lusts, hopes, fears, and horrors" (240). As A. J. P. Taylor writes in English History: 1914-1945, there was "an exaggerated hatred of the Germans, and equally exaggerated hopes of the better world which would follow"
victory” (20). Harriet felt how the frenzy of war alienated people from each other. When she looked up at the far-off Zeppelin, the German woman told Somers: “Think, some of the boys I played with when I was a child are probably in it.” What hurt Somers most was the humiliation meted out to him by his own country, his own people. Because of his isolation, his separateness and his German wife, he was marked out as a spy, and the man who “still believed in the constitutional liberty of an Englishman” cried: “I am not a spy. I am myself” (240-41). Lawrence did not have any ‘moral’ objection to fighting in which men remain as men with all their animal passions; but he is against the submission of men to the war-machine. He denounced the trench and machine warfare as “a blasphemy against life itself” and felt “a dreary misery, knowing how many brave, generous men were being put through this slaughter-machine of human devilishness” (246). Somers tells Jack Callcott how the war changed his idea of humanity: “Since the war burst the bubble of humanity I’m a pessimist, a black pessimist about the present human world” (48).

In “England, My England,” Egbert’s wife and father-in-law agree to his joining the army mainly out of their resentment towards the man who is incapable of leading a life as a responsible husband and a responsible father. Egbert’s “ghost-like vitality cannot lead to anything positive, but a drift towards death, in the great machine of the war” (Pritchard 107). Despite his contempt for this ineffectual man, Lawrence seems to share the man’s attitude towards war. His “whole instinct was against it: against war. He had not the faintest desire to overcome any foreigners or to help in their death. He had no conception of Imperial England, and Rule Britannia was just a joke to him.” “It was merely unnatural to him to hate a nation en bloc” and “he recoiled inevitably from having his feelings dictated to him by the mass feeling” (307-08).
b) Nationalism

In a discussion at the wedding party in Women in Love, Gerald expresses his view that “nationality roughly corresponds to race.” Birkin agrees with him and says “race is the essential element in nationality” (31). Lawrence has had a love-hate relationship with his native country. In The Boy in the Bush, Jack, who represents Lawrence in the novel about colonial life in Australia, fondly recalls England and feels proud of “his own old, well-bred country behind him” (68). But in the chapter “Continental” in Women in Love, Birkin expresses his dissatisfaction with England. He says, “I’m an Englishman, and I’ve paid the price of it.” When Gerald says he will come back to England, Birkin says, “They say the lice crawl off a dying body. [. . .] So I leave England.” Then Gudrun calls him “a patriot” “with something like a sneer” (446).

The important problem with St. Mawr is that Lawrence puts his thoughts and criticism of the modern western world, especially England, into the mouth of Lou and her mother Mrs Witt, who are, as Draper opines, “two women among Lawrence’s most unpleasant characters” (131). Interestingly, as Aldington puts it, Lawrence himself “fiercely hates Mrs Witt for her American impudence in daring to hate and criticise his England” (Introd. 7). In his view, “even before he has got her and St. Mawr out of England he humiliates her by making her propose to her Welsh groom – and be haughtily rejected by him” (8).

In the chapter “The Nightmare” in Kangaroo Lawrence expresses not only his bitter reaction to humanity’s submission to the war machine but also his intense pain when his own country treats him as an outsider and suspects him of espionage. The rejection at the medical examination for conscription at Bodmin barracks, the Foreign Office withholding their passports, the constant watch and frequent questioning by governmental and military authorities often intruding upon their privacy, his being put
in class C3 on re-examination at the barracks, the police raids of their house and finally the military order that he and Harriet should leave Cornwall immediately sink deep into the heart of "one of the most intensely English little men England ever produced, with a passion for his country, even if it were often a passion of hatred" (247).

In the second part of *Mr Noon*, which draws heavily on his own personal life, Lawrence describes his feelings towards England and the Continent through Gilbert's consciousness ('Gilbert' is 'Herbert') when he is out in Bavaria watching the great Alps in the company of Alfred Kramer. England is seen once again "from the outside" as in *The Lost Girl* and *Kangaroo*. He felt England's "marvellous truths and standards and ideals were just local, not universal." "The enormous meanderings of the Danube" and "the white road" leading to Russia – all made him feel "unEnglished." "He loved the world in its multiplicity, not its horrible oneness, uniformity, homogeneity. He loved the rich and free variegation of Europe, the manyness." "There were so many, many lands and peoples besides himself and his own land," and he was happy "to be one among many, to feel the horrible imprisoning oneness and insularity collapsed" (107-08).

c) Racism and Colonialism

Lawrence is not only a much travelled person but also a writer with a world view of humanity. By itself humankind's division into different races and nations does not cause any problem to the peace and happiness of the world. It is the domination of one race or nation over another in terms of racism or colonialism that causes grave concern. Lawrence is aware of his identity as a white man belonging to modern European civilization, but he has an earnest urge in him to understand, as a man and as an artist, other cultures, both ancient and modern, in the right perspective in relation to his own. Kinkead-Weekes, who begins his discussion of Lawrence's oscillations in his responses to racial and colonial issues, with Doris Lessing's definition of racism as an
"atrophy of the imagination," lists some of the factors that "combine to block our responsiveness to people of other races and cultures": attitudes imbibed at home, peer-group pressures, the limitations of what we learn, and the conditionings of the post-colonial and racist societies. The important question is, if imagination is antipathetic to racism, can a writer decolonise his vision? Can a writer like Lawrence come out of his conventional self and achieve freedom in his imaginative self to see things without racial and colonial prejudices? (Kinkead-Weekes 67).

In *The Rainbow*, Ursula is strongly critical of British colonialism. As Skrebensky invites her to join him while he is going to take up his appointment as a servant of the empire in India, Ursula expresses her strong "anti-Raj sentiments." She disapproves of his choice to be there in India as "one of the governing class, superimposed upon an old civilization, lord and master of a clumsier civilization than his own." Young Ursula is led to call a civilization older than her own by at least a millennium "clumsier" probably by the fact that India is a huge country with a "complicated history and mixed culture" (Nehru, *Discovery* . . . 238). But Ursula hits the nail on the head when she accuses the Englishman in India of becoming again "an aristocrat, invested with authority and responsibility, having a great populace beneath him" (443-44). As Nehru says:

The feudal landlords and their kind who came from England to rule over India had the landlord’s view of the world. To them India was a vast estate belonging to the East India Company, and the landlord was the best and the natural representative of his estate and his tenants. That view continued even after the East India Company handed over its estate of India to the British Crown, being paid very handsome compensation at India’s cost. (240)
Ursula again expresses her anti-colonial attitude when she accuses Skrebensky of trying to become “one of the somebodies” in India and enjoy “being a lord over them.” She pours out her anger when she refers to his feeling of righteousness: “Who are you, to feel righteous? What are you righteous about, in your governing? Your governing stinks. What do you govern for, but to make things there as dead and mean as they are here!” (462). But Ursula too believes that India needed the modern achievements of her civilization like the “roads and bridges.” She would not have known that the railways and the steam engine were introduced in the colony only “to consolidate their [the coloniser’s] rule and facilitate the exploitation, for their own benefit, of the interior of the country” (Nehru 240). And in Aaron’s Rod, when Aaron has a conversation with an Indian doctor at the pub, he becomes angry at the landlady who speaks of the British government as something good for the people of India. He asks most pertinently, “How can any people be responsible for another race, for a race which is even older than they are, and not at all children?” (34).

In The Lost Girl, in her choice of Cicio as her husband, Alvina breaks the bonds of both class and race. One of the ruses by which, Madame, the Magna Mater of the “exasperatingly foolish” Natcha-Kee-Tawaras, tries to dissuade Alvina from entertaining thoughts of marrying Cicio is to remind her that he is a foreigner from a lower class. She asks her: “Can you live in England as the wife of a labouring man, a dirty Eyetalian, as they all say?” But Alvina expresses her willingness to go and live with Cicio in “the sunny atmosphere of Italy” (220).

Going by Somers’ views in Kangaroo, Lawrence, though annoyed by it, seems to be non-committal about British colonialism. Somers tells Jaz, “But personally, I’d say to India and Australia and all of them the same – if you want to stay in the Empire, stay; if you want to go out, go” (71). Again Somers seems to exhibit a gross
misunderstanding of the momentous struggle for independence then going on in India. He says: “What is Indian Nationalism but a strong bid for power – for tyranny. The Brahmins want their old absolute caste-power – the most absolute tyranny – back again, and the Mohammedans want their military tyranny. That’s what they are lusting for – to wield the rod again. Slavery for millions” (102).

That Lawrence is not totally free from racial prejudice is seen in Jack-Somers discussion of political issues in *Kangaroo*. On the question of allowing the immigration of “coloured labour” into Australia, both Jack and Somers are of the view that Australia cannot “risk” coloured labour. They think, given a chance, the coloured races would “swallow” the whites and “drive the whites to work in gangs” because “all the other colours hate the white.” Somers is of the opinion that neither the Japs nor the Chinese nor the niggers have “any feeling for liberty,” and “the real sense of liberty only goes with the white blood” (101-02).

In *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence recognizes the undying spirit of resistance to the imposed culture of the colonizer in Mexico. Kate notices in the old country the collapse of the Whiteman, who had tried “to bring the soul of the dark man of Mexico into final clinched being.” Cortes, the Spanish conquistador, the architect of the Conquest of Mexico, “came with his iron heel and his iron will,” but what happened finally was that the continent asserted its “dark negation” and the race of the conquerors became “soft and boneless” (111-12). As Walker says, in *The Plumed Serpent*, Lawrence did not want to make the same mistake committed by Cortes and Columbus. He would not “impose his European consciousness on to it”; he would not “deny the aboriginal spirit of place.” “Instead he would find some way to ‘take up life where the Red Indian, the Aztec, the Maya, the Inca left it off [. . . and] pick up the life-thread where the mysterious Red race let it fall’ during the conquest” (Introd. *The Plumed . . .
In the novel, Kate Leslie, annoyed by the Indian women displaying their hunting in each other’s hair for lice in public, thought of the gulf out of which “the dark races” had never been able to climb. She, and perhaps Lawrence too, felt that they would never be able to climb on to “the peculiar Whiteman’s levels,” and they would only be able to “follow as servants.” At the same time Kate could not identify herself with “rich people, white people, superior people”; she “cherished a deep malevolent grudge against them” (181-82).

As Kinkead-Weekes suggests, more than The Plumed Serpent, its early version ‘Quetzalcoatl’ remarkably “anticipates anti-colonial writers like Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka and Ngugi wa Thiong’o, three decades and more ahead.” In the early version, in the growth of the movement led by Ramon Carrasco and Cipriano, Lawrence imagines “many of the ways in which the later African writers would seek imaginatively to undermine colonialism, set native consciousness free from feelings of inferiority, and liberate a new sense of dignity and identity” (71).