Chapter-1

Introduction

The sexual act is not for the depositing of seed. It is for leaping off into the unknown, as from the cliffs edge, like Sappho into the sea.¹

D.H. Lawrence, “a mystical materialist,”² was born at a time when the synthesis of the values which marks the Victorian era was disintegrating. The circumstances which were shattering faith in the social, economic, religious and moral creed of the age were building up to the breaking point of World War I. An explosive release from the Victorian repression of sexuality began to occur in the 1890’s; the taboo on the subject and the activity was openly assaulted and sex became a topic of acknowledged significance culminating in the discoveries of Freud and the new freedom of 1920’s. Belief in the Christian religion and with it moral and social convention had been seriously undermined by evidence derived from the physical sciences and Biblical textual criticism. The Victorian optimism and complacency about the worth of unlimited material progress was seriously shaken. Lawrence wrote in the midst of this shake-up of human values, attempting to provide the insight into the necessity and problem of getting free of the old
values and contributing towards deeper understanding of the significance of sex and its place in human life:

There is a great change coming, bound to come. The whole money arrangement will undergo a change, what I don’t know. The whole industrial system will undergo a change. Work will be different, class will be different, and human relation will be modified and perhaps simplified. If we are intelligent, alert, and undaunted, then life will be much better, more generous, more spontaneous, more vital, less basely materialistic. If we fall into a state of funk, impotence, and persecution, then things may be very much worse than they are now.

After this brief historical perspective let us come to the main issue of our discussion. Libido refers to a person's sex drive or desire for sexual activity. The desire for sex is an aspect of a person's sexuality. The concept of libido was first introduced by Sigmund Freud as the instinct energy or force, contained in what Freud called the id, the largely unconscious structure of the psyche.
I would like, at the very outset, to make it clear that my inquiry has nothing to do with psychoanalysis. Lawrence himself was a pungent critic of Freudian idea of sex and sexuality. Thus, I propose the study of ‘libido’ that is, to great extent, based on Lawrence’s own idea of sexuality. But, at the same time it is enormously difficult task to have any clear and stable vision of Lawrence’s philosophy on the matter of sex partly because of ambiguity and inconsistency of his writings and partly because of his unstable and ambivalent personality. Yet, these drawbacks would not mar his genius and after all ‘truth’ is multidimensional and cannot be comprehended with finite mind so there are always possibilities of such defects.

Both Lawrence and Freud attempted to liberate sex from the shackles of pseudo morality. In fact, sexual desire (libido) and the unconscious play a dominant role in the thinking of both Freud and Lawrence, but they mean very different things by the unconscious, and these differences in turn shape their very different notions of the nature and function of sexual instinct.

To understand Lawrence’s view on sex instinct and human psyche and differentiate it from that of Freud, it would be helpful to go through, in brief, Freud’s concept on this issue. For Freud, the unconscious is the most important element in a tripartite structure of
the psyche, the other two parts of which are the preconscious and the conscious. The **unconscious is extremely selfish** and utterly ruthless in its blind desire to satisfy the ‘Pleasure Principle’. Its desires are basically sexual and primitive and are such as the conscious moral or aesthetic sensibility of the individual would regard with abhorrence. The need for man's anarchic, self-gratifying desires to be subordinated to external reality, which of course includes the reality of other people, has created through evolutionary adaptation the preconscious part of the psyche which acts as a kind of intermediary between the unconscious and conscious activity. Thus where the unconscious is dangerous and disruptive, programmed to seek its own gratification and heedless of all else, the preconscious adapts the former's impulses according to the demands of reality. In fact, cultural and moral activity (civilization) is a result of this adaptation.

As the unconscious is both the most primitive and most powerful element of the psyche and seeks nothing but its own satisfaction, its suppression or control becomes a condition of civilization. But suppressed unconscious impulses do not disappear; they are indestructible. The individual must cope with these suppressions by becoming aware of them and so gaining greater control over them, which is the object of Freudian therapy. But the
need to suppress or otherwise control the insatiable urges of the subconscious remains the necessary foundation of society. The degree to which these subconscious impulses have been suppressed is an index to the level of a civilization.

The chief source of the satisfaction of unconscious impulses is sexual activity and it begins in infancy with the autoerotic phase—suckling phase. It then passes through the anal-sadistic and into the phallic phase. It is in this last phase that the child experiences the Oedipal relationship when his experiences of the mother crystallize into desire for her and consequent hatred of the father as rival. But the demands of social reality inhibit the expression of these desires which are 'latent' until puberty, when the individual adapts himself to adult sexual needs, repressing and internalizing his infantile sexual impulses. The mother as focus of sexual desire returns in this later phase of adult sexual consciousness. Liberation from the mother and reconciliation with the father becomes the major task of adult life, a task in which our ideas of guilt, responsibility, conscience and so forth are awakened and developed. Those who fail to come to terms with the need to abandon the wish-fulfilling desire for the mother and make their peace with the reality of the father suffer a regression to an earlier stage of development. The neuroses which the individual suffers are
at once the discontents of civilization and the condition of its development. So neurosis and civilization are two sides of the same coin.

Here, we notice that this is extremely simplified summary even though we can see that Freud's is essentially a tragic view of life, with man forever crucified between reality and desire. In fact, it is a view based on Freud’s clinical experience and on a profound regard for evolutionary ideas of Darwin.

On the other hand Lawrence's views on the psyche, consciousness and the unconscious and related subjects were the result of sustained reflection on his own individual case, brought to white heat by his experiences in wartime England and tempered by battling his way through to new notions about human nature and morality.

As has been said earlier, the principal disagreement which Lawrence had with Freudian theory centres on the nature of the unconscious. For Lawrence, it was at once a much vaster and a much more positive element than it was for Freud. In a brilliantly evocative sentence in *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious* Lawrence writes that “The Freudian unconscious is the cellar in which the mind keeps its own bastard spawn”, while “The true
unconscious is the well-head, the fountain of real motivity.” Lawrence found support for his critique in the views of the American psychologist Trigant Burrow whose book *The Social Basis of Consciousness* (which Lawrence reviewed) argued that the Freudian unconscious “was merely the representation of conscious sexual life as it exists in a state of repression.” Burrow also lent support to another important Lawrentian idea, namely that it was not sex itself that was the original sin, but mental consciousness of sex. It was repressed ideas of sex that the Freudian unconscious contained and it was for this reason that Lawrence denied its claim to be 'the pristine unconscious in man'. It was essentially backward looking, always cluttered and clogged up with the debris and detritus of infantile sexuality. For Lawrence, on the contrary, the unconscious was nothing less than the source of the principle of new creativity.

What then is the true unconscious? It is not a shadow cast from the mind. It is the spontaneous life motive in every organism. Where does it begin? It begins where life begins. Lawrence locates the unconscious as a precise genetic-biological principle, as he later locates non-mental centres of consciousness in various parts of the human anatomy:
Where the individual begins, life begins. The two are inseparable, life and individuality. And also, where the individual begins the unconscious which is the specific life-motive, also begins. We are trying to trace the unconscious to its source. And we find that this source in all the higher organisms is the first ovule cell from which an individual organism arises. At the moment of conception, when a procreative male nucleus fuses with the nucleus of the female germ, at that moment does a new unit of life, of consciousness arise in the universe. Is it not obvious? The unconscious has no other source than this, this first fused nucleus of the ovule.¹⁰

This idea of the unconscious as the principle of individuality and potentiality for the genuinely new in life is crucial to Lawrence's thinking. It explains along with other things the radical difference between his account of the incest taboo and Freud's. Lawrence denies categorically Freud's theory that the incest taboo derives from some primal crime of patricide and the
subsequent need of the sons to live in peace together, all this myth-
history being re-enacted in the individual psyche as the Oedipus
complex. Far from being a stage of the normal parent-child
relationship, sexuality enters that relationship only through the
interference of the mind in the form of an idealization of the mother
figure prolonged beyond its normal period. A man who does this
finds it impossible to achieve true fulfilment in marriage and the
emotional, and even passional regard which is greater for the
mother than for the wife forces a terrible choice between incest,
insanity and death. The important point is that **the incest motive
appears not as part of the normal development of sex but as a
result of idealizing the parental relationship or through
premature stimulation of the sexual urge, both examples of
mental interference.** The fact that sexuality in a strict sense existed
before, puberty, was strongly denied by Lawrence and this is a
perfectly tenable view insofar as most of Freud's evidence for
infantile sexuality seems to be only in a retrospective sense, that is,
from the point of view of adult sexuality as a basic, indeed **the**
basic, impulse developed. As Lawrence put it:

> Sex - that is to say, maleness and femaleness-
is present from the moment of birth, and in
every act or deed of every child. But sex in
the real sense of dynamic sexual relationship, this does not exist in a child, and cannot exist until puberty or after.\textsuperscript{11}

It is because he placed so high a value on the adult sexual relationship as a sign of a mature, responsible and moral experience that Lawrence denied the existence of infantile sexuality except as an incidental and meaningless aberration.

The idea of the unconscious as the source of genuine individuality and newness meant that the individual was never merely the product of whatever was contributed by his parents. The emphasis is always on individuality as the 'only one supreme quality' with an intrinsic capacity for going beyond itself. It is the primal life force, never found in the abstract but always realized concretely. The unconscious, as life itself, is prior to cause and effect and prior to any form of mental consciousness. \textit{Lawrence had felt that Freud's notions of sex were too limited and mechanistic} and that ‘the root was deeper'. The root, according to Lawrence, was pre-mental unconscious life. \textit{Psychoanalysis as he saw it was a means of imposing mental consciousness on this active, unique life-principle, of attempting to bind it in the shackles of cause and effect} It was also an insidious erosion of the individual's moral responsibility under the guise of therapy, since in
the Freudian view repression of unconscious desires lay at the root of moral behaviour.

Thus Lawrence's objections to Freudian psychology and analysis were in the wide sense religious, as he himself realised. He denied the validity of mechanistic procedures in psychoanalytic explanation on the basis of an intuitive conviction, tested in his own experience, of the uniqueness and individuality of living organisms, human or otherwise. And 'mechanistic' in this context comes to the same thing as 'ideal', meaning derived from fixed mental concepts. It is obvious that the ideal becomes a mechanical principle if it be applied to the affective soul as a fixed motive, he writes. And he was not afraid to use the vocabulary of religion in arguing his case:

This causeless created nature of the individual being is the same as the old mystery of the divine nature of the soul. Religion was right and science is wrong. Every individual creature has a soul, a specific individual nature the origin of which cannot be found in any cause-and-effect process whatsoever. Cause-and-effect will not explain even the individuality of a single dandelion. There is no assignable cause, and
no logical reason, for individuality. On the contrary, it appears in defiance of all scientific law, in defiance even of reason.\textsuperscript{12}

The problem for human beings, according to Lawrence, is not to become consciously aware of their unconscious impulses, for that is merely to force them into a cause and effect straitjacket and to distort their nature and their essentially beneficent power. The real difficulty is to live from the unconscious centres which are the true source not only of individuality but of relatedness, between man and man, man and woman, man and the cosmos. The knowledge we should have of the unconscious is always a matter of whole experience, and never a matter of mental conception merely.

Lawrence's account of the workings of the unconscious, or rather of the non-mental centres of consciousness and their interrelations is probably that part of his psycho-physiological theory which many Western readers will find least sympathetic, though perhaps less so now than in his own lifetime. According to Lawrence the unconscious, in its totality, transcends all laws of cause and effect in its processes of self-realization. Rejecting the vocabulary of science as totally unsuited for his purpose because it was tainted with 'ideal' notions repugnant to him; he was
nevertheless convinced of the reality of non-mental consciousness as part of individual experience and therefore necessarily related to the life of the body.

It should be noted that one of the most vital beliefs of Lawrence is that we should live with our whole beings—that body, mind, soul, spirit all form one being. In *Why the Novel Matters*, he writes:

> We have curious ideas of ourselves. We think of ourselves as a body with a spirit in it, or a body with a soul in it, or a body with a mind in it... Why should I look at my hand, as it so cleverly writes these words, and decide that it is a mere nothing compared to the mind that directs it? Is there really any huge difference between my hand and my brain? Or my mind? My hand is alive...and is just as much *me* as is my brain, my mind, or my soul.

Illustrating the point further, he goes on to say:

> I absolutely flatly deny that I am a soul, or a body, or a mind, or an intelligence, or a
brain, or a nervous system, or a bunch of glands, or any of the rest of these bits of me. The whole is greater than the part. And therefore, I, who am man alive, am greater than my soul, or spirit, or body, or mind, or consciousness, or anything else that is merely a part of me. I am a man, and alive. I am man alive, and as long as I can, I intend to go on being man alive. ¹⁴

Unfortunately—according to Lawrence—too people live only with the mind. There is therefore no vital connection between their mind and body. But a life purely of mind is barren. For instance, note the life of Clifford Chatterley and his friends in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. Within the novel, it is as though Clifford Chatterley has made himself impotent by denying the life of his body and thereby denying the wholeness of his being. It is this barren, empty life of Clifford Chatterley and his friends that causes the wasting away of Connie’s life—until she meets Mellors. She does not leave Clifford merely because of his sexual impotency, many of us generally assume.
At the other extreme, we have people who live only with their bodies. The relationship between Anna and Will Brangwan first falls apart and then develops into the merely physical:

“He would say during the daytime: ‘Tonight I shall know the little hollow under her ankle, where the blue vein crosses.’ And the thought of it, and the desire for it, made a thick darkness of anticipation… . . . “This is what their love had became, a sensuality violent and extreme as death. They had no conscious intimacy, no tenderness of love. It was all the lust and the infinite, maddening intoxication of the senses, a passion of death.”

Most people assume that Lawrence advocates this kind of purely physical sensuous relationship. This is far from the truth. It is obvious in The Rainbow that Lawrence is against this kind of relationship.

In fact living with only a part of one’s being leads to frustration and not to fulfillment. Therefore, living with the ‘whole being’ means first of all we should accept the whole body as
beautiful, mysterious, and sacred. This is deeper beauty than merely superficial. ‘The whole body is beautiful’ and it is this that Connie Chatterley discovers as she ‘awakens’ in her relationship with Mellors. (She did not discover this with Clifford or Michaelis because they had no ‘respect for the body’.

In fact, Lawrence makes a distinction between people who actually live with their whole beings and people who form this idea in their mind and proceed to carry it out mechanically. For instance, Hermione Roddice’s consciousness of wholeness in Women in Love is purely mental. Hermione, a member of the rich, cosmopolitan gentry recognizes that it is the deliberating mind, the ego that destroys all our spontaneity and creative instincts. She says to Birkin:

Do you think the children are better, richer, happier, for all this knowledge; . . . Or is it better to leave them untouched, spontaneous. . . . Hadn't they better be animals, simple animals, crude, violent, anything, rather than this self-consciousness, this incapacity to be spontaneous?16

However, Hermione, in spite of her pretense to mindlessness, is exalting the experience of passion and instinct in
the mind. To Lawrence, her fixed mind which fails to transcend the intellect is the most decadent form of consciousness. Birkin replies to her that the young people are dead because they have not too much mind, but too little—they fail to go beyond the intellect. Birkin in condemnation of Hermione says;

> You don't want to be an animal; you want to observe your own animal functions, to get a mental thrill out of them . . . , what is it but the worst and last form of intellectualism, this love of yours for passion and the animal instincts?

Her self was all in her head, she did not know what it was spontaneously to run or move, like a fish in the water, or a weasel on the grass.

She must always know.¹⁷

Thus, according to Lawrence, by accepting the body as part of the whole being we must live sensually—but not ‘sensually’ in a manner of Will and Anna Brangwen. **Lawrence believes in sensuality with tenderness.** He believes that we become aware through touch, through the ‘blood’. In 1913, he wrote, “My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We may go wrong in our minds. But what the blood feels,
and believes, and says, is always true.” This does not mean that Lawrence is all for the unbridled passions (libido); it means that he is against excessive intellectualism. And this touch, this sensuality does not mean that Lawrence believes only in the ‘physical’. He believes, if we put it crudely, that one lives spiritually by living physically. According to Aldous Huxley, “Lawrence’s dislike of abstract knowledge and pure spirituality made him a kind of mystical materialist.”

In fact, Lawrence harshly denounced pure materialism in all its gross manifestations—capitalism, industrialism, rationalism, and animality or licentious sexuality:

If there is one thing, I don't like, it is cheap and promiscuous sex. If there is one thing I insist on it is that sex is a delicate, vulnerable, vital thing. . . .If there is one thing I deplore it is heartless sex. Sex must be a real flow, a real flow of sympathy, generous and warm, and not a trick thing, or a moment's excitation, or a mere bit of bullying. . . .
Huxley wrote that Lawrence had a horror of Don Juans, sensualists, and libertines. Rather the significance of the sexual experience for Lawrence was symbolic of the "sense of otherness" - that feeling of identity with the "unknown modes of being," with woman and the mysterious cosmos.²¹

Earl Brewster, an American Buddhist, wrote in his book, *D.H. Lawrence: Reminiscences and Correspondence*, that Lawrence tried to show that sensuousness free of mental tampering is part of the divine life.²² He described Lawrence as a very spiritually aware person who made others in his presence seem trivial and worldly.²³ Huxley commented similarly that Lawrence was intensely aware of the, divine mystery of the world.²⁴ He recalled that Lawrence could never forget the dark presence of the otherness that lies beyond the "boundaries of man’s conscious mind. Frederick Carter, Lawrence’s astrologer-friend, expressed the view that Lawrence strongly desired to know the roads and means for that inward experiment called the mystical Journey towards God.²⁵

However, Lawrence believed that any form of pure spirituality or metaphysical detachment was a deterrent to
acceptance of life in all its natural manifestations. Hence, Huxley described him as a "mystical materialist,"

It should be noted that Lawrence did not come into close contact with Yoga philosophy until the last few years of his life, but he was able intuitively to grasp the profound significance of the chakras and reconstruct the complex psychological systems of Yoga from the hints he received from theosophists, and other occultists.

Carter wrote that all Lawrence's philosophy was deeply affected by the idea of the "mystical body," the idea very similar to Yoga philosophy, that man as a microcosm held the pattern of the universe within himself. For Lawrence, the body had a deep spiritual significance as a "seven-sealed mystery," the seven seals being seven centres (or chakras) of spiritual consciousness:

His body was a mystically sealed document, seven-sealed by fate, stamped with the superscriptions of the powers of bondage in the world,...Urgent to find release, he fumbled at the seals. He sought release for the power that swept through him . . . Ardently he sought it, his key to unlock the sevenfold bond,. . .
Lawrence, like the Yogis, desired to unlock the seven centres and to liberate the "life-force" and "the inner gods." It should be noted that Lawrence has been aptly described by Sri Aurobindo as a philosopher, poet and saint, “Yogi who had missed his way and come into a Europian body to work out his difficulties.”

We must note here that Hinduism is based firmly on the premise that an exchange of psychic energy is constantly going on between all things in the universe. Accordingly, the flow of cosmic energy through the chakras in the body, developed through concentration, can produce startling and inexplicable psychic phenomena. Lawrence similarly asserts that:

There certainly does exist a subtle and complex sympathy, correspondence between the plasm of the human body, which is identical with the primary human psyche, and the material elements outside. The primary human psyche is a complex plasm, which quivers, sense-conscious, in contact with the circumambient cosmos.
In *Psychoanalysis of the Unconscious*, Lawrence adopted four of the seven principle chakras, and as in Kundalini Yoga, he identified these astral centers with the ganglia of the sympathetic nervous system. He divided the unconscious into four principle carts, the upper level including the thoracic and cardiac regions and the lower including the solar plexus and the lumbar ganglion. He refers to the upper body—the breast, throat, and face—as the spiritual body or that state of being where the Self is conscious of its oneness with all things. In his essay entitled “The Two Principles” Lawrence defines the spiritual being or soul as,

> . . . that blissful consciousness which glows upon the flowers and trees and sky, so that I am sky and flowers, I, who am myself. It is that movement towards a state of Infinitude wherein I experience my living oneness with all things.³¹

The spiritual body seeks the revelation of the unknown mysteries outside the Self in a new sympathetic and dynamic mode of consciousness. The solar plexus is the centre of this sympathetic system; it is the deepest centre of consciousness which gives one the clue to the unity of the cosmos.
The lower body is the sensual being where the self is the centre of life; herein lies the knowledge that I am I--and these others are not as I am.” It is the centre of separate identity which gives us the strongest self-knowledge. In “The Two Principles” Lawrence refers to the sensual being as a “magnificent central positivity, wherein the being sleeps upon the strength of its own reality, as a wheel sleeps in speed on its positive hub.” The lower body or the voluntary system (symbolized in the demon-lovers in the novels) is the seat of blood-consciousness—the dark sex mystery. The loins or the lumbar ganglion and the sacral plexus are the great centres of passionate will and pride which seeks self-mastery.

In this way Lawrence’s ‘scheme of four centres’ allowed him to account for experience in ways which mechanistic explanations of human behaviour did not. It offered him an interpretation of experience that was at once religious and materialist; located in the body but in touch with the cosmos. For the unconscious, because it is ‘never in any sense selfish' (unlike the Freudian unconscious), formed the only basis of a genuine morality. In fact, the idea of different centres of consciousness, and their continual interconnections allowed Lawrence to explore areas of experience which he made peculiarly his own, such as the ebb and
flow of emotions and especially the rhythm of love and hate. Where the Freudian view of the psych saw man as perpetually self-divided, Lawrence saw the possibility of the breach being healed.

In fact Lawrence's theory differs from Kundalini Yoga in a sense that he changed the flow of energy from upward to outward in terms of positive and negative polarities. The idea of positive and negative electrical currents running through the "body and awakening the chakras was probably adapted from Madame Blavatsky's idea of Fohat, 'the electrical life-force’ in The Secret Doctrine. The upper body is positively charged and thus unites man with others. The lower "body which establishes individuality is negatively charged. Between the poles on each plane and between the planes, as between the poles of a magnet, there flows a "lovely polarized vitalism." The highest state of the soul or full-consciousness of mind exists when all the eight polarities are balanced—when four-fold consciousness between the breast, belly, face, and loins is established within the body. At the end of "Two Principles" Lawrence says:

Any man who is perfect and fulfilled lives in four-fold activity. He knows the sweet spiritual communion, and he is at the same time a sword to enforce the spiritual level; he
knows the tender unspeakable sensual communion, but he is a tiger against anyone who would abate his pride and his liberty.\textsuperscript{36}

One of the major criticisms of Yoga by Western scholars has been the emphasis on ascetism, celibacy, and the disregard for the phenomenal world. Likewise Lawrence was a vehement critic of the "pure spirit" and the extreme forms of mysticism. Tantra Yoga, on the other hand, certainly would have been very appealing to Lawrence because it rejects the ascetic path to ‘\textit{moksha}’ (actualization of the true self), regards the present as meaningful, and comes to grip with love and sexuality in human experience.\textsuperscript{37}

Tantrism or Shaktism, as it is sometimes called, based on ancient Hindu and Buddhist texts, holds that the world is not maya (illusion) but real; real flesh experience is the extension of the soul's purpose.\textsuperscript{38} The aim of sexual union in Tantrism is very close to Lawrence's goal in uniting sexually with a woman: the development of the soul through the harmonious union of opposing forces (flesh and spirit) within one's body and ultimately, the divine union with God (moksha)—the mystical marriage of God and man.\textsuperscript{39} In this state of non-duality, all differences vanish and the couple is able to apprehend the mystery of the whole cosmos. For the practitioners of Tantra as well as for Lawrence, the transcendent
bliss that proceeds from ritual sexuality is believed to be the height of religious experience.

Lawrence’s attempt to reconcile the spiritual with the physical realities by affirming the “divinity of the flesh” through a harmonious sexual union was probably his most successful path to "unity of being" and the realization of the ‘true self’. Lawrence's mystical view of the love union, as expressed most confidently in Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928), is one of the most striking parallels to Tantrik Yoga.

According to ‘Tantra’ philosophy, only by laying hold of the power inherent in love and the sex force (libido) can we find the creative energy to ascend to spiritual liberation. This belief is based on the foundation that everything in the universe came into being through the, union of opposite forces, only on a cosmic scale. The Tantrik "Myth of Creation" assumes that all creation is the result of the sexual union of Shiva, the masculine deity of nature who possesses the “pure” and “unmanifested consciousness,” and Shakti, the female deity who possesses latent in her womb the supreme, primal energy of the universe. According to the myth, when Lord Shiva and Shakti united, the great cosmic power in Shakti’s womb was generated and all things in the universe were created; the great primordial power of the universe was released in
the union of the complementary opposites. These opposites are two aspects of the same reality, neither of which can exist without the other.41

A noteworthy point, here, is that there is no such thing as sex energy. Energy is one and the same. Sex is one outlet for it, one direction for it; it is one of the applications of the energy. Life energy is one, but it can manifest in many directions. Sex is one of them. When life energy becomes biological, it becomes sex energy. Sex is just an application of the life energy. Sex is the natural, biological flow of life energy, and the lowest application of it. It is natural because life cannot exist without it, and the lowest because it is the foundation not the peak. When sex becomes the totality, the whole life is just a waste.

On the human level, the ecstasy experienced symbolically recapitulates the cosmic union of Shiva and Shakti. Through the union of two opposites the Yogi transcends the human state, and the two become a single principle of pure being they return to the condition of oneness or Brahman. All intercourse is thus regarded as sacramental in nature. The love union is an expression of each lover's indwelling identity with the other; each perceives the divine perfection and infinity of the other, the same perfection and infinity
that is present in every grain of sand or blade of grass. The least intrusion of the ego, however, involves a return to the illusion of duality.\textsuperscript{42}

Like the practitioner of Tantra, Lawrence viewed woman as an instrument for awakening the deep powers of consciousness. Her womb (Shakti principle) is a mysterious source of creation which holds the key to the divine powers. In the essay “The Crown,” Lawrence refers to the "consummation in the darkness" which will lead back to the womb, the source of life and to the discovery of the true nature of being:

\begin{quote}
What way is it that leads me on to the Source, to the Beginning? It is the way of the blood, the way of power.... I can become one with God, consummated into eternity, by taking the road down the senses into the utter darkness of power, till I am one with the darkness of initial power, beyond knowledge of any opposite. It is thus, seeking consummation in the utter darkness, that I come to the woman in desire.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

According to Lawrence the highest relationship between male and female as a "delicate union," a "fusing into oneness,"
culminates in the birth of a harmonious soul. The lesser relationship according to Lawrence, tend to be continual processes of reduction; as the two lovers or "polarities" become more and more antagonistic towards one another, they tend to become more mechanical and isolated until finally the balance and connection between the two is broken entirely;

The coming-together of the sexes may be the soft, delicate union of pure creation, or it may be the tremendous conjunction of opposition....From either of these consummations birth takes place. But in the first case it is the birth of a softly rising and budding soul, wherein the two principles commune in gentle union, so that the soul is harmonious and at one with itself. In the second case it is the birth of a disintegrative soul, wherein the two principles wrestle in their eternal opposition... a way of psychic disintegration.⁴⁴

This point gets illustrated in love between Birkin and Ursula in *Women in Love*; it is a vital love of "pure, mystical communion," a "fusing into oneness." Together, they contemplate
the mysteries of nature and seek to submit their intellectualizing egos and wills to achieve a higher ascension into single being beyond the love union. Birkln remarks to Ursula:

I do think….that the world is only held together by the mystic conjunction, the ultimate unison between people—(man and woman)….Love is a direction which excludes all other directions. It's a freedom together. . . . There is, . . . a final me which is stark and impersonal and beyond responsibility. 45

On the other hand, the love between Gudrun and Gerald is depicted as a destructive love-- experienced in the mind and ego. They both turn to the material world outside for knowledge rather than seek the true reality within themselves. Gerald seeks an outside connection in industry and views life and people in terms of their functions as "instruments" rather than their individual qualities. Gudrun as an artist cultivates the finished perfections of the past, denying the spontaneous, creative life in the present. Their love is one of "psychic disintegration" or "reduction," which culminates in Gerald's icy death in the Alps and Gudrun's emotional despair.

In “Apropos of Lady Chatterley's Lover,” Lawrence says:
Two rivers of blood, are man and wife, two distinct eternal streams, . . . And the phallus is the connecting-link between the two rivers, that establishes the two streams in a oneness, and gives out of their duality a single circuit, forever. . . . And all we know of the will of God is that He wishes this, this oneness, to take place, . . . within the great dual blood-stream of humanity.  

Through the intimate relationship of man and woman, through veneration of the sex mystery, Lawrence sought to develop his innermost soul, the divine soul that transcends the physical world.  

Lawrence’s approach to sex and sexual desire (libido) is finally expounded in and corroborated by *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Here, he attempted to elevate sex which had been reduced to a mere biological, mechanical function by Freud and the psychoanalysts, to a sacred and holy act. He condemns sex as pure animality or as an overtly willful or mental act. Sex only "becomes meaningful to Connie, a modern woman deprived of the "vital" life, when she accepts it "religiously" as a harmonious union with man and cosmos, when she dances naked in the sanctifying rain with
Mellors, a gamekeeper who possesses a "primitive potency."
Connie dances to express her new freedom and initiation into the sexual mysteries. She loses herself in the dance and is reborn into the fullness of womanhood. Their rhythmic fertility dance purifies them and together they are reborn into a new life of greater consciousness.

Unfortunately, it is also a fact that despite the obsession with sex that characterizes much modern experience, genuine sexual feeling, capable of providing real satisfaction and the actualization of ‘the self’, seems generally lacking. It may be that this is due to an incapacity on the part of the average person to feel the deep, elemental force of sexual desire. The following passage from the novel The Virgin and the Gypsy may be quoted:

"I think," said the major, taking his pipe from his mouth, "that desire is the most wonderful thing in life. Anybody who can really feel it, is a king, and I envy nobody else!..."

"But Charles!' she cried. "Every common low man in Halifax feels nothing else!"

"That's merely appetite," he said.47
Therefore, if the depth of sexual functioning is expressed in the force of desire, it is also true that the meaning of sex, for human beings, is found in love, which is an expression of the need for closeness. This is true because human beings are social animals who undergo a long dependency period during which the need for intimacy is fostered and nurtured. For humans, sex, desire, and love are a fundamental part of life, reaching down into the core of one's being. We love life, and in sex we find an expression of both our love and our life. Likewise, our life was conceived in sex, and the sexual act in human beings is most meaningful as an expression of love. Indeed, for human beings, sex, love, and life -- at the deepest level--are functionally identical.
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