Introduction

D.H.Lawrence's novels have been a highly controversial subject. After reading the manuscript of his first novel, *The White Peacock* (1911), Ford Madox Hueffer had said to him: "You've got GENIUS". But in Hueffer's opinion the novel had "every fault that the English novel can have". *The Trespasser* (1912) was called 'erotic' and 'bad art' by Hueffer. *Women and Lovers* (1913) was by and large well received by reviewers. But the next novel, *The Rainbow*, was suppressed in 1915 on the charge of obscenity. Lawrence's treatment of sex in the novel was regarded as unhealthy. The novel was described by G.W. De Tunzelmann as "hopeless failure" as a work of art. He accused Lawrence of salaciousness. In 1921, Middleton Murry, who had been, an admirer of Lawrence's sensitive and impassioned apprehension of natural beauty and "understanding of the strange blood bonds that unite human beings", described *Women in Love* (1920) as "five hundred pages of passionate vehemence". He described the experiences which Lawrence presents in the novel as "sub-human and bestial", but Murry had unreserved praise for *Aaron's Rod* (1922). "To read *Aaron's Rod* is to drink of the fountain of life", he wrote in 1922. The next novel, *Kangaroo* (1923), was described by J.D. Beresford as a search for the soul of humanity.


That was in 1925. And in 1926, Edwin Muir praised Lawrence's great inspiration in The Plumed Serpent (1926), though he called the book 'garrulous'. Lady Chatterley's Lover (1928) was banned in England and America immediately after its publication. The novel was declared obscene.

Lawrence died on March 2, 1930. A number of biographies appeared on him immediately after his death in which his reputation as man and artist suffered severely. His detractors denounced him vehemently. Even the praise that he received from his admirers distorted his image as a writer. As Mark Spilka has observed, at the hands of these "possessive memorialists, sex cultists, hostile liberals and religious purists", Lawrence emerged "a sex-mad homosexual fascist, a mindless and misguided genius scarcely worthy of attention". After these hastily written critical biographies, his works were almost neglected by critics for a decade. There was, however, a revival of interest in his novels during the fifties. This critical revival of Lawrence began simultaneously in England, America and other parts of the world where English literature is read and studied in colleges and universities. Among the English scholars, F.R. Leavis is his most sympathetic critic. He successfully refuted the charge of T.S. Eliot that Lawrence lacked "intellectual and social training". He also ridiculed Eliot's view that Lawrence lacked tradition. While stressing the moral value of fiction, Leavis placed Lawrence in the tradition of great English

novelists, like Jane Austen, George Eliot, Henry James and Joseph
Conrad. Graham Hough made a comprehensive survey of his works.
Critical biographers, Harry T. Moore, Richard Aldington and Edward
Mehls, helped greatly in the revival of interest in Lawrence. His
genius was acclaimed by various scholars and critics of literature.
Dorothy Van Ghent stressed the importance of innovations that
he made in the novel and the profundity of his vision of modern
life. Mark Spilka illuminated the Lawrenceian idea of responsibility
for the quality of one's being. Spilka held that in his important
novels Lawrence had developed a concrete vision of experience with
normative value for his readers. Raymond Williams highlighted his
conception of close spontaneous living as opposed to the sterile
living in the industrialized societies. Marvin Mudrick described
The Rainbow as a great novel having an original and revolutionary theme.
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Eliseo Vivas, in his *The Failure and the Triumph of Art*, defined the symbolic form in Lawrence's novels. Julian Hooynah has acclaimed his major works as great works of art. Keith Sagar, in his *The Art of D.H. Lawrence*, demonstrated how Lawrence's vision strips away appearances and penetrates to being. Frank Kermode defined the grace that attended the writing of his major novels. R.K. Sinha, in *Literary Influences on D.H. Lawrence*, traced the growth of Lawrence's genius by placing him against the artistic and intellectual background of his times.

Though Lawrence has been, thus, more than rehabilitated, yet his novels remain controversial to this day. Even among the New Critics, he has his sympathetic admirers and hostile detractors. Many problems implicit in his work have not been settled yet. As a novelist he continues to perplex and disturb the readers. His views on sex, Christianity and modern civilization remain the subject matter of bitter criticism. In his book, *D.H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art*, Vivas calls Lawrence a victim of inferiority complex.

and accuses him of "yearning for a homosexual relationship". According to Vivas, he disregards artistic distancing in his novels. Other critics have also criticized him for lack of objectivity. Even his sympathetic critics, like H.T. Moore and F.R. Leavis, criticize his later novels on artistic grounds. Leavis opines that the later novels are marred by the 'direct involvement' of the author in them. Kingsley Widmer regards his art as satanic. Lawrence's thought is "the philosophy of any thug or moron", "disgusting" and "dangerous", according to John Carey.

Some critics even refuse to treat Lawrence as an artist.

Echoing the view held by Middleton Murry earlier, Anthony West holds that art was not Lawrence's aim and that primarily he was a moral teacher. These are extreme views. But the fact remains that though Lawrence's involvement with his art was total, he was not interested in art for arts sake. His main concern was human life. Expressing his views on the function of art, he wrote in Studies in Classic American Literature: "The essential function of art is moral. Not aesthetic, not decorative, not pastime and recreation.
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But novel. The essential function of art is moral." Apart from giving delight, surely the purpose of art is to reveal to man his true self. Lawrence believed that novel could perform this function well. It is only in the novel that man's whole consciousness — bodily, mental and spiritual — is given full play. And "out of the full play of all things emerges the only thing that is anything, the wholeness of a man, the wholeness of a woman, the man alive and live woman." Critics are agreed that Lawrence put his best efforts into his novels. These novels form a consistent whole. They are a continuous search for the truth of human life, and deserve to be studied as such.

Though it is futile to deny Lawrence the English tradition, yet there is some truth in the observation of Cecil Day Lewis that Lawrence's "voice seems to come out of the blue, reminding us of nothing we have heard before." Lawrence stands by himself among all the English novelists in his approach to human life. While other English novelists view human actions in the light of Christian values or social desirability or inexorable fate or as mere absurdities, Lawrence views them in relation to the whole cosmos, thus examining their potential for making man's life happy. In the cosmos man's little ideals do not count. It does not, however, mean that Lawrence had no moral vision. A close study of his novels reveals a morality based on the author's vision of the universe. In his book, 

of the novel, E.M. Forster aptly places Lawrence alongside with the

Russian Novelist, Dostoevsky, and the American novelist, Herman Melville, whom he calls the prophetic novelists. Forster's 'prophecy' has nothing to do with "fortealing the future" or "an appeal for righteousness". According to Forster, the theme of the prophetic novelist is "the universe". Lawrence's theme is the relation between man and the universe.

But, what is of supreme importance in the world is life. Man's life is of greatest importance to him. All material and non-material things have value only in relation to human life. Manners, morals, ethics, values, are all for human life. However, merely to exist is not life. What matters for Lawrence is to be the 'whole man alive'. You may eat, drink or make love to a woman and yet be a dead man in life. In the essay "Why the Novel Matters", he writes: "You may love a woman as a man alive, and you may be making love to a woman as sheer dead man in life. You may eat your dinner as man alive, or as a mere masticating corpse".

Just as there may be death in life, there is life in death too. To be truly alive man must continually renew himself. Renewal demands the death of something in us that has become stale and irrelevant to the living present. What is good for life is moral and what is death to life is immoral. Right and wrong are to be faced all the time in life. There is no ideal right or ideal wrong. Right and wrong are related to the person, place and time. What is right in a particular case may be wrong in another case. The joy of life may be destroyed by so-called
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goodness or a man may become a dead man in life due to so-called wickedness. But, what is it that makes us aware of death in life and life in death? What is it that gives us our morality? One's own inner self is the only guide on which one can rely. Man must follow the promptings of his own soul. But to interpret the promptings of the soul is a very difficult task. Lawrence realized this fact very well. Man, according to Lawrence, "just doesn't know how to interpret his own soul-promptings, and therefore, he sets up a complicated arrangement of ideas and ideals and works himself automatically till he works himself into the grave or the lunatic-asylum." Man's desires and impulses tend to fall into "mechanical automatism". It is the fall from "spontaneous reality into dead or material reality". Through mental intervention, desires automatise into "functional appetites" or mental lusts, and impulses degenerate into "fixed aspirations" or ideals. Lawrence, thus, recognizes the dualism of material reality and spontaneous reality. 

According to Lawrence, 'the unconscious soul' by its 'polarized connection' with the external universe brings forth its incarnation and 'self manifestation'. The unconscious brings forth the tissues, organs, and consciousness by its connection with the external universe. He was keenly aware of the dualism of matter and soul in the nature of man. However, he conceded primacy to the soul. In Democracy, he
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writes:

"Man's nature is balanced between spontaneous creativity and mechanical-material activity. Spontaneous being is subject to no law. But mechanical-material existence is subject to all the laws of the mechanical-physical world. His spontaneous nature just takes precedence." 46

Spontaneous being stands for the soul. Lawrence also uses the term 'self' for soul. But he distinguishes between the self and the spirit:

"You can't make an idea of the living self; hence it can never become an ideal. Thank heaven for that. There it is, an inscrutable, undefinable, vivid quick, giving us off as a life-issued. It is not spirit. Spirit is merely our mental consciousness, a finished essence extracted from our life-being, just as alcohol, spirits of wine, is the material, finished essence extracted from the living grape." 47

Lawrence also differentiates between the self and the ego. The ego is the "spurious self". He calls it a "horrible incubus". The individual receives it from the preceding generation. The worst part of this 'incubus' is "the mill-stone" of "handed on ideals." Every individual, according to Lawrence, is born with a mill-stone of ideals round his neck and spends his days either in trying to get rid of this mill-stone or in decorating it "with fantastic colours". 51

Thus, according to Lawrence, the soul is not spirit, or mind, or intellect, or ego — the elements that the soul is practically composed of in the Western sense.
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Lawrence's concept of the dualism of material reality and spontaneous reality bears striking similarity to the dualism of soul and matter in the Sānkhya school of Hindu philosophy. According to the Sānkhya system, the living being comes into existence by the spontaneous action of the soul on matter. Neither matter nor the soul by itself is conscious in the usual sense of the word. It is only when the two get connected that a physical organism becomes conscious. A physical organism connected with a soul becomes a living being. The soul is the vitalizing element which makes life possible. However, the soul is not subject to the laws of cause and effect. It does not evolve. It is not bound, nor is it liberated. It is matter that evolves. The matter in its different forms is bound or liberated. The Sānkhya distinguishes between 'Purusha' or the soul and the 'lingśārīra' or the subtle body. The 'lingśārīra' or the subtle body is composed of 'Buddhi' or intellect, 'Ahaṃkāra' or the ego, 'Manas' or mind and other elements of similar nature. The Sānkhya regards these elements as material in nature, however subtle they may be. In the Sānkhya, the external universe is termed as 'Maya', which may be translated as 'matter'. 'Purusha' or 'Atman' stands for the soul which is non-material and incommutable, whereas 'Prakriti' is material and commutable. The dualism of Sānkhya is not the dualism of good and evil. It is the dualism of the unchangeable (the soul) and the constantly changing (the matter). The 'lingśārīra', which is composed of mind, ego, intellect and other elements of the same nature, practically corresponds to what is known as the soul in

52. Explaining the Sānkhya theory, Sir Charles Eliot observes: "... physical organism becomes a living being when it is connected with a soul(Purusha) and consciousness depends upon this connection, for neither is matter when isolated conscious, nor is the soul, at least not in our(i.e.,western) sense of the word"—Hindusim and Buddhism Vol.II, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London,1957, p.306. All future references to the book are to this edition.

53. Ibid., p.302.
the Western sense, but it is totally distinct from 'purusha' (the self) or soul in the Sāńkhya sense. Thus Lawrence's concept of the soul or 'the spontaneous self' is very much similar to the Sāńkhya concept of the 'purusha', which is entirely different from the usual Western concept of the soul.

The Sāńkhya regards souls as innumerable and distinct from one another. These souls exist from all eternity. The soul, according to Lawrence, is unique, distinct and primal in every living creature. He calls it the 'Central Mystery'. "Our being", according to him, depends upon "the inscrutable issue from the Central Mystery into indefinable presence". The Central Mystery stand for "the primal original soul or self" within man and the 'presence' is the 'actual man present'.

Intelect, mind, ego, and such other elements belong to the realm of the material reality and are therefore, subject to the material laws of the universe. The soul or the spontaneous reality, according to Lawrence, is subject to no law. It, however, uses the material laws for creative purpose.

54. In Hinduism and Buddhism (Vol. II, p. 300), Sir Charles Eliot writes:

"The Sāńkhya distinguishes between the gross and the subtle body. The latter called lingsārina is defined in more than one way, but it is expressly stated in the kārikās that it is composed of 'buddhi (intelect) and the rest (mind, ego, etc.) down to the subtle elements'. It practically corresponds to what we call soul, though totally distinct from purusha or soul in the Sāńkhya sense".
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In *Democracy* Lawrence writes:

"Every single living creature is a single creative unit, a unique incomparable self. Primarily in its own spontaneous reality, it knows no law. It is a law unto itself. Secondly, in its material reality, it submits to all the laws of the universe. But the primal spontaneous self in any creature has ascendance, truly, over the material laws of the universe; it uses these laws and converts them in the mystery of creation." 60

Lawrence has not defined the soul, because it is indefinable. He, like the Upanishads, seems to say, "not this, not this". He has used many words and expressions for the soul. Sometimes he calls it "the unknown", sometimes "the primal self", sometimes "the spontaneous reality". These words and expressions are inadequate for defining the soul. No words can do it. It simply means that we cannot know what it is. "It is the fountain-head of everything". It is not "a Logos". It precedes all knowing. We can only know it is there. We cannot deny it. Men have been aware of it. Man can be aware of it. Man must be aware of this deeper self within him. Earlier this awareness arises and deeper it is, brighter are the prospects for the fulfilment of life. This awareness is not something to be attained by ascetics alone, it is almost a precondition for blissful day to day living. It is this awareness which frees man from the tyranny of mental self-consciousness. Lawrence was aware of this blissful state of non-self-consciousness. Only in this state is man truly himself. He has described this state in the following words:
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"Paradoxical as it may sound, the individual is only truly himself when he is unconscious of his own individuality, when he is unaware of his own isolation, when he is not split into subjective and objective, when there is no *me* or *you*, no *me* or *it* in his consciousness, but the *me* and *you*, the *me* and *it* is a living continuum as if all were connected by a living membrane". 63

The European mind is baffled by such a view of the true self, but we find precisely the same view expressed in almost all Hindu scriptures.


64. Writing about the Hindu Darsanas, Sir Charles Eliot observes:

"--- they all share a conviction which presents difficulties to Europeans. It is that the state in which the mind ceases to think discursively and is concentrated on itself is not only desirable but the summum bonum. The European is inclined to say that such a state is distinguished from non-existence only by not being permanent, but the Hindu will have none of this. He holds that mind and thought are material though composed of the sublimest matter and that when thought ceases, the immaterial soul (purusha or atman) far from being practically non-existent is more truly existent than before and enjoys untroubled its own existence and its own nature". --Hinduism and Hinduism, Vol.II, p. 296.
In his novels, Lawrence has attempted to examine the possibility of happiness in the life of man. The quest for happiness is the thread that runs through all his novels (Lawrence was concerned with the real problem of human suffering rather than any abstract concept of evil). In this quest he has glimpses of hope for humanity which he describes artistically. Men and women whose lives are not in tune with their souls and are entirely controlled by their minds cannot live happily. Such men and women are never aware of the inner self within them and are dominated by their minds. They are unhappy in life and unhappy in death. Men and Women, who are completely out of touch with the soul, generally remain static and never really grow. Some human beings become aware, at one stage or the other of their lives, of the deep unconscious self within them and seek contact with it. Men and Women, in whom such awareness has arisen, seek what the inner self likes to be done. Lawrence distinguishes between following impulsive thoughts and acting on the promptings of the deeper self. The man who seeks what the inner self likes to be done must have an awakened awareness of the deep buried self within him. In *Studies in Classic American Literature*, Lawrence writes:

"And there is getting down to the deepest self! It takes some diving. Because the deepest self is way down, and the conscious self is an obstinate monkey. But of one thing we may be sure. If one wants to be free, one has to give up the illusion of doing what one likes, and seek what it wishes done". 65

For authentic living man must listen to the voice of his soul. One can listen to the voice of one's soul when the mind is silent and the psyche remains still. The man who dives deep and gets into contact with his soul achieves real freedom. This freedom is the freedom to be one's own integral self. One's integral self is not one's mental consciousness or one's psyche or one's personality or one's public self or one's private self or one's ideal self. The integral self includes mental consciousness and the psyche, but it far surpasses them. The integral self is capable of listening to the voice of the soul and is guided only by it and not by any idea or tradition or custom. The consciousness of the self is total consciousness, and not merely mental consciousness. Lawrence writes in *Fantasia of the Unconscious*:

> Conscience is the being's consciousness, when the individual is conscious in toto, when he knows in full. It is something which includes and which far surpasses mental consciousness. Every man must live as far as he can by his own soul's conscience. But not according to any ideal. To submit the conscience to a creed, or an idea, or a tradition, or even an impulse, is our ruin.

Only by achieving freedom to be his own self can man really live happily. To be one's own self is "perfect knowledge". In this state of psychic freedom all actions are spontaneous and all actions are free from the cycle of cause and effect. Such a state is 'Nirvana' in this very life, where man acts but is not bound by his own actions. If it sounds like ancient Indian psychology and philosophy, it is not surprising. Commenting on

---
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the ancient Indian philosophy and psychology, Lawrence had observed in 1915: "That seems to me the true psychology, how shallow and grooping it makes Western psychology seem".

Lawrence views people and their relationships in terms of the essential self. This approach to the life of man is consistent with his views on money, materialism, forms of society, moral values, Christianity etc., etc. He warns man in his writings against showing too much reverence to the gods of money and materialism. He condemns industrialism because it compels human beings to use all their energies in the competition of acquisition. It leads to the debasement of human purpose to mechanical materialism. The unity that it creates among human beings is a mechanical unity. The integral self of the human being is lost in a mechanical unity of materialistic men and women: "— when pure mechanization or materialism sets in, the soul is automatically pivoted, and the most diverse of creatures fall into a common mechanical unison. This we see in America. It is not a homogeneous, spontaneous coherence so much as a disintegrated amorphousness, which lends itself to perfect mechanical unison". Indiscriminate industrialization turns free and spontaneous individuals into "trapped rats". It condemns men to ugliness and meanness: "The great crime which the moneyed classes and promoters of industry committed in the palmy Victorian days was the condemning of the workers to ugliness, ugliness, ugliness:
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neakers and formless and ugly surroundings, ugly ideals, ugly religion, ugly hope, ugly love, ugly clothes, ugly furniture, ugly houses, ugly relationship between workers and employers. The human soul needs actual beauty even more than bread."

Lawrence regarded the social systems important only so far as they helped the individual to be more free to be himself. He did not have a great respect for the State or the Nation. He regarded them as abstractions or ideals. He would have liked the Nation and the State to be viewed as large public contrivances for the adjustment of material means of existence. Political systems like Democracy and Socialism, for Lawrence, were also just contrivances for the supplying of the lowest material needs of a people. He laments that these material concerns have been idealised. Thus these ideal concerns "go to war, and slaughter indiscriminately with a feeling of exalted righteousness". The state, the Nation, and even the International organizations cannot best represent the material interests of people. They can never represent the human individuals: "There are two things to do. Strip off at once all the ideal drapery from nationality, from nations, peoples, states, empires, and even from Internationalism and Leagues of Nations. Leagues of Nations should be just flatly and simply committees where representatives of the various business houses, so-called Nations, meet and consult. Consultations, board-meetings of the State businessmen: no more. Representatives of Peoples — who can represent me? — I am myself."
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In the sense that every human being is a separate, distinct identity, the term 'equality' is almost meaningless for Lawrence. The principle of equality does not apply to the free spontaneous self. One man cannot be compared to another man. Comparison is possible only in the case of material-mechanical entities. One integral being cannot be compared to another integral being:

"One man is neither equal nor unequal to another man. When I stand in the presence of another man, and I am my own pure self, am I aware of the presence of an equal, or of an inferior, or of a superior? I am not. 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... There is no comparing or estimating. There is only this strange recognition of present otherness. I may be glad, angry, or sad, because of the presence of the other. But still no comparison enters in. Comparison enters only when one of us departs from his own integral being, and enters the material-mechanical world."

Lawrence disliked the idea of man being reduced to the average, even though he was not averse to the idea of economic democracy:

"Society means people living together. People must live together. And to live together, they must have some standard, some material standard. This is where the average comes in, and this is where socialism and modern democracy come in. For democracy and socialism rest upon the equality of man, which is the average. And this is sound enough, so long as the average represents the real basic material needs of mankind; basic material needs: we insist and
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insist again. For Society, or Democracy, or any political State or Community exists not for the sake of the individual, nor should ever exist for the sake of the individual, but simply to establish the average, in order to make living together possible: that is, to make proper facilities for every man's clothing, feeding, housing himself, working, sleeping, mating, playing, according to his necessity as a common unit, an average. Everything beyond that common necessity depends on himself alone*. The law of the average applies only to the 'stomach'.

Lawrence believed in the soul of man and not in the Supreme Being of Christianity. He rejected the Christian God because He is supposed to exist above and beyond humanity. Such God is at best an ideal God — a creation of mind. For Lawrence the soul is God and God is in every living creature. Commenting on Walt Whitman's concept of Identity, he writes: "It is all very well to talk about a Supreme Being, an Anima Mundi, an Oversoul, an Infinite but it is all just human invention. Come down to actuality. Where do you see Being? — In individual men and women. Where do you find on Anima? — In living individual creatures. Where would you look for a soul? — In man, in an animal, in a tree or flower. And all the rest, about Supreme Beings and Anima Mundis and Oversouls, is just abstractions. — — If we look for God, let us look in the bush where he sings. That is in living creatures." Lawrence wrote approvingly about the life of the Mexican Indians for whom there is no God overlooking his Creation. Their God is immersed in creation and inseparable from it: "The only god there is, is involved all the time in the dramatic wonder and inconsistency of creation. God is immersed, as it were, in
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creation, not to be separated or distinguished. There can be no Ideal God." For the Mexican Indians the mystery of creation is present in all the objects of Nature: "Yet the mystery of creation, the wonder and fascination of creation shimmers in every leaf and stone, in every thorn and bud, in the fangs of the rattlesnake, and the soft eyes of a fawn." Lawrence did not believe in any revelation or any supreme 'word'. On the other hand he believed that before the 'word' was growth and life: "I don't believe in any dazzling revelation, or in any Supreme Word. 'The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of the Lord shall stand for ever.' That's the kind of stuff we've drugged ourselves with. As a matter of fact, the grass withereth, but comes up all the greener for that reason, after the rains. The flower fadeth, and therefore, the bud opens. But the Word of the Lord, being man-uttered and a mere vibration on the ether, becomes staler and staler, more and more boring, till at last we turn a deaf ear and it ceases to exist, far more finally than any withered grass. It is grass that renews its youth like the eagle, not any Word." It is logical for a man with such a view of life and God to regard the physical aspect of life as holy as any other aspect. The life of the senses is an integral part of the life.
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of a living being. The senses, like the mind, are the creation of the immutable soul out of the stuff of matter for its own fulfillment. The life of the senses in tune with the soul is holy. But the senses directed by the mind almost invariably get corrupted. Of course, the mind has its uses for man. It helps man to adjust himself to the external universe. It provides means for "subduing the external, material-mechanical universe to our great end of creative life". Mind is "a great indicator and instrument".

But the mind should not be allowed to usurp the role of the director of life: "The mind as author and director of life is anathema". Soul is the author of life and man must learn to listen to its voice. This voice should not get drowned in the materialistic mechanical noise of the mind. Sex is natural to life. Sexual act in itself is no sin. Lawrence inferred from the Adam and Eve Creation myth that it is knowledge of the sexual act that constitutes the sin and not sex itself. In *psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*, he writes: "It is when the mind turns to consider and know the great affective-passional functions and emotions that sin enters. Adam and Eve fell not because they had sex, or even because they committed the sexual act, but because they became aware of their sex and of the possibility of the act. When sex became to them a mental object — that is, when they discovered that they could deliberately enter upon and enjoy and even provoke sexual activity in themselves, then they were cursed and cast out of Eden. Then man became self-responsible; he entered on his own career." Adam and Eve mated "vitality, in blood knowledge" before
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the fall. They fell when sex became a mental activity for them.

Man's true desires are the promptings of the soul. Love is the flow of subtle desire from one person to another person or from one creature to another creature. The stream of true desire is beyond the control of the ego. It springs from the deep silence of the soul and meets the stream of desire of another soul. Love is not meeting and mingling of the persons. It is the spontaneous meeting and mingling of the streams of their desire. Lawrence writes in *Love and the Little Fox*: "The individual has nothing, really to do with love. That is, his individuality hasn't. Out of the deep silence of his individuality runs the stream of desire, into the open squash-blossom of the world. And the stream of desire may meet and mingle with the stream from a woman. But it is never himself that meets and mingle with himself, any more than the waters meet to make one river, in the distance, meet in themselves."

True desire is spontaneous. It is a pure thing like rain or sunshine. The desire that flows from the soul can never mislead. For Lawrence, spontaneous desires are 'intimations of immortality'. They come from the soul of men and, therefore, from God.

---

86. *Phoenix, the Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, p. 453.

87. In his letter to Catherine Corwell, Lawrence wrote: "Because, you see, what intimation of immortality have we, save our spontaneous wishes? God works in me (if I use the term God) as my desire. He gives me the understanding to discriminate between my desires, to discern between greater and lesser desire; I can also frustrate or deny any desire; so much for me, I have a 'free will', in so far as I am an entity. But God in me is my desire. Suddenly, God moves aress in me, a new motion. It is a new desire. So a plant unfolds leaf after leaf, and then buds, till it blossoms. So do we, under the unknown impulse of desires, which arrive in us from the unknown". (Letter to Catherine Corwell, 14 July 1916, *The Collected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, Vol.1, ed. Harry T. Moore, Heinemann, 1962, p.167). It is important to note here that Lawrence often uses the term 'the unknown' for the soul.
However, mental desire is false desire. Mental desire can lead to perversion. Desire forced from the ego can be deadly. The so-called civilization has so conditioned man that he has lost touch with his deep self and approaches everything through his mind. Western civilization has never taught man 'to hold in reverence the true desire-stream'. That is why marriages often become licenced prostitution and love degenerates into promiscuity. Mostly men and women are dominated by their ego and therefore the sex they have is 'sex in the head'. A libertine cannot have a real sexual desire because he has already broken his integrity. Such a man's desire is only false desire. His false desires lead him to sexual perversion: "Don Juan was only Don Juan because he had no real desire. He had broken his own integrity, and was a mess to start with. No stream of desire with a course of its own, flowed from him. He was a marsh in himself. He mashed and trampled everything up, and desired no woman, and so he ran after every one of them, with an itch instead of a steady flame. And tortured by his own itch, he inflamed his itch more and more. That's Don Juan, the man who couldn't desire a woman. He shouldn't have tried. He should have gone into a monastery, at fifteen -- -- It's Don Juanery, sex-in-the-head, no real desire, which leads to profligacy or squalid promiscuity."

88. "--- Love Was Once A Little Boy", Phoenix, the Posthumous Papers of D.H.Lawrence, p.453.
The compulsion behind Lawrence's creative writing was his religious experience, as he has himself said: "But primarily I am a passionately religious man, and my novels must be written from the depth of my religious experience." However, religious experience in his case had nothing to do with faith in any organised religion like Christianity. Religious experience in his case meant the apprehension of reality through immediate intuition. Intuitions are the signals that the living being receives from his soul. Men and Women who have intuition are in some way in contact with their souls. One can establish true contact with one's soul only through Self Realization. For Self Realization one need not go to a forest or a hermitage. Relationships are the 'woods' in which the quest for self is carried on by human beings. Lawrence's view of man and his life is a religious view. According to him, the purpose of the living self is to come to its own fullness of being. Man can come to his own fullness of being through authentic relationships with fellow human beings and the living Universe around him. The deepest desires of man are prompted by his soul. And the deepest desire of man is "a wish for pure, unadulterated relationship with the


90. Aldous Huxley writes: "Most men live in a little puddle of light thrown by the stiff lamps of habit and their immediate interest; but there is also the pure and powerful illumination of the disinterested scientific intellect. To Lawrence, both lights were suspect, both seemed to falsify what was, for him, the immediate apprehended reality - the darkness of mystery". "Introduction" to The Letters of D.H.Lawrence, ed. Aldous Huxley, Heinemann, London 1932, p. xiv.
Universe." The individual lives in polarized relation to other individuals and the external universe. If man succeeds in accomplishing pure relationship between himself and the Universe around him, he achieves fulfillment of life. In Morality and the Novel, Lawrence writes:

"If we think about it, we find that our life consists in this achieving of a pure relationship between ourselves and the living universe about us. This is how I 'save my soul' by accomplishing a pure relationship between me and another person, me and other people, me and a nation, me and a race of men, me and the animals, me and the trees or flowers, me and the earth, me and the skies and sun and stars, me and the moon; an infinity of pure relations, big and little, like the stars of the sky; that makes our eternity, for each one of us, me and the timber I am sawing, the lines of force I follow: me and the dough I knead for bread, me and the very motion with which I write, me and the bit of gold I have got. This, if we knew it, is our life and our eternity: the subtle, perfected relation between me and my whole circumambient universe". 92

The fulfillment of life is what the soul desires. The failure to establish and maintain vital relationships is the cause of great misery in the life of modern man: "But woe betide us, the unspeakable agony we suffer from the failure to establish and maintain the vital circuits between ourselves and the effectual correspondent, the other human being, other human beings, and all the extraneous universe." 93 This failure is


92. Phoenix, the Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence, p. 528.

chiefly due to the intervention of the mental 'monkey'. Mind, which relies chiefly on ideas, ideals and conventions, thwarts the promptings of the soul and frustrates its attempts at establishing true relationships. The suppression and distortion of the promptings of the soul results in perversion and neurosis. Lawrence refers to this neurosis in the following words in his book, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*:

"Delicate, creative desire, sending forth its fine vibrations in search of the true pole of magnetic rest in another human being or beings, how it is thwarted, insulated by a whole set of india-rubber ideas and ideals and conventions, till every form of perversion and death-desire sets in!" 94

Relationships based merely on ideas, ideals, conventions and habits are mechanical relationships. All mechanical relationships are false. Mechanical relationships bring about the automatization of the human psyche. Man must struggle against this automatism. Lawrence views with great amazement the fact that the vital business of human relationship has been neglected by the modern man. Food sustains life, but man does not live by food alone. He lives "more essentially from the nourishing creative flow between himself and another or others." 95 In order to live authentically, man must destroy his false connections and re-establish his true connections with humanity and the universe.

Lawrence had great faith in the novel as art for the sake of life. He called it the bright book of life. He believed that

94. Ibid., p. 117. 95. Ibid., p. 120.
a great novel could be a better guide than a so-called holy book in the serious business of living. In *Why The Novel Matters*, he writes:

"In all this wild welter, we need some sort of guide. It's no good inventing Thou Shalt Nots! What then? Turn truly, honourably to the novel, and see wherein you are alive, and wherein you are dead man in life." 96

He calls the Bible 'a great confused novel' and the works of Homer and Shakespeare 'the supreme old novels'. The essential function of art, according to Lawrence, is to reveal the relation between man and his circumambient universe at the living moment. And the novel is supremely suited to reveal this relationship. The revelation of the relation between man and the living universe around him is, in fact, the revelation of man himself and his potentialities. This study, thus, seeks to examine man's vital relationships as depicted in the novels of D.H.Lawrence.

96. *Phoenix, the Posthumous Papers of D.H.Lawrence*, p. 537.
97. Ibid., p. 535.
98. Ibid., p. 536.