While writing to Ernest Collings on 17th January 1913, Lawrence asserted:

"My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says is always true." 1

By 1913, Lawrence was the author of three novels, *The White Peacock*, *The Trespasser* and *Sons and Lovers*. He had also completed about eighty pages of a new novel. 2 He was not, however, in a position to argue his belief in clearer terms; further, it was a belief rather than a rationalisation. Eight years later, in 1921, when he had completed *The Rainbow*, *Women in Love* and *Aaron's Rod*, Lawrence wrote *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, which contains some interesting conclusions drawn from his creative writings.

"This Pseudo-philosophy of mine - "pollyanalytics", as one of respected critics might say - is deduced from the novels and poems, not the reverse. The novels and poems come unwatched out of one's pen. And then, the absolute need which one has for some sort of satisfactory mental attitude towards oneself and things in general makes one try to abstract some definite conclusions from the experience as a writer and as a man. The novels and poems are pure passionate experience. These pollyanalytics are inferences made afterwards, from the experience." 3

Lawrence is misunderstood, specially in regard to his views on sex. It is partly true that the world sees what it wishes to see; hence, it is no surprise that Lawrence has admirers as well as detractors. The book Fantasia of the Unconscious has many drawbacks, but it contains a few explanations, which a critic should not ignore. Lawrence here makes certain statements which should leave no scope for any misunderstanding. He states, for example, that Freud was going too far in attributing a sexual motive to every human activity. Lawrence admits, however:

"What Freud says is always partly true and half a loaf is better than no bread.

But really, there is no other half of the loaf.

All is not sex. And a sexual motive is not to be attributed to all human activities...

Sex means the being divided into male and female, and the magnetic desire or impulses which puts the male apart from the female, in a negative or sundering magnetism, but which also draws male and female together in a long and infinitely varied approach towards the critical act of coition. Sex without the consummating act of coition is never quite sex, in human relationship, just as a cumanch is never quite a man. In one direction, all life works up to the one supreme moment of coition. Let us admit it sincerely.

But we are not confined to one direction only, or to the exclusive consummation. Was the building of the cathedrals a working up towards the act of coition? Was the dynamic impulse sexual? No. Sexual element was present, and important. But not predominant."

"And what is the other, greater impulse? It is the desire of the human male to build a world, not "to build a world for you dear"; but to build up out of his own self and his own belief and his own effort something wonderful. Not merely something useful, something wonderful. This is the prime motivity. And the motivity of sex is subsidiary to this, often directly antagonistic.

That is, the essentially religious or creative motive is the first motive for all human activity. The sexual motive comes second. And there is a great conflict between the interests of the two, at all times.

What we want to do is to create the creative or religious motive to its source in the human being, keeping in mind always the near relationship between the religious motive and the sexual. The two great sexual impulses are like man and wife or father and son. It is no use putting one under the feet of the other.

The great desire to-day is to deny the religious impulse altogether, or else to assert its absolute alienity from the sexual impulse." 5

And there, Lawrence points out, is the rub.

After asserting that sex is not the only motive of human activity, Lawrence goes deeper and explains the "holy family" that is the human body. For the sake of clarity, Lawrence's ideas and explanations may be put in a diagram:

1a Upper solar plexus or cardiac plexus (located near the breast) tries to know things outside itself, and "the unknown." It is the source of Hope, Aspirations and Great Uplift.

2a Upper lumbar ganglion or thoracic ganglion (located near the spine end by the wall of the shoulders) tends to engender Power, Will, Masterfulness Bullying Smashing Lustiness

1b Lower solar plexus (located behind the stomach); It is primal, precognitive, and dynamic consciousness; it is aware of the common blood stream.

2b Lower lumbar ganglion (located near the liver); It tends to be aware of its separate entity; I am different from others.

These four plexuses together form the dynamic individual being.

"This is the great centre, where in the womb, your life first sparkled in individuality. This is the centre that drew the gestating maternal blood stream upon you, in the nine months lurking, drew it on you for your increase. This is the centre whence the navel string broke, but where the invisible dynamic consciousness will never break .... And because the male nucleus which derived from the father, still lies sparkling and potential within the solar plexus, therefore, that great nerve-centre or you, still has immediate knowledge of your father, a subtler but still vital connection. We can call it the tie of blood." 6

He further explains:

"It is blood connection. For the fecundating nuclei are the very spark-essence of the blood, so that every individual has father and mother both sparkling within himself." 7

This explanation may mislead one to believe that the new being is only derivative. It is not so. In the words of Lawrence:

"The intrinsic truth of every individual is the new unit of unique individuality which emanates from the fusion of the parent nuclei. This is the incalculable and intangible Holy Ghost each time - each individual his own Holy Ghost. He (every individual) is something undervived and utterly unprecedented, unique, a new soul ... And only at his maximum does an individual surpass all his derivative elements, and become purely himself ... Most men are half-born slaves." 8

This is, according to Lawrence, how the individual comes into being. But the constant problem is the problem of keeping an equilibrium between these (shown in the diagram) four parts of the individual. The modern tragedy, according to Lawrence, is that the equilibrium is lost when the upper cardiac plexus is emphasized at the expense of the other plexus. The tendency is to live at the mental consciousness, which is static. The "primary consciousness" in men is pre-mental, and has nothing to do with cognition.

"Our deepest lower consciousness is blood-consciousness. The blood-consciousness is the first and last knowledge of the living soul; its depths." 9

"The blood also thinks, inside a man darkly and ponderously. It thinks in desires and revulsions and it makes strange conclusions." 10

Lawrence believes that this primary (blood) consciousness should not be sacrificed on any altar, religious, political or Platonic, and he has clearly worked out the implications of the belief in Fantasia of the Unconscious.

It is interesting to study how some of these ideas and beliefs have evolved themselves through his novels. Lawrence could unhesitatingly declare:

"I cannot for anything in the world, forfeit my passionate consciousness and old blood affinity with my fellowmen and the animals of the land, for that thin spurious mental concept." 11

Harry T. Moore in his summing up says:

"Lawrence was not a great creative philosopher. He had a few central thoughts, not precisely new thoughts, that he continually tried to get across to his reader. Sometimes, he let

11. Selected Literary Criticism, Heinemann, 1956, p.5."
them hamper his stories. Often his ideas were common sense given exalted utterance, often they were muddled in his own brand of mysticism.

Essentially Lawrence was trying to say one thing all his life. He had been saying it even before he was altogether aware of what it was, though he formulated it fairly early in his career: "My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says is always true.

Virtually all statements he made on all topics and virtually all stories he told were elaborations of that idea: his Figure in the Carpet." 12

Eliseo Vivas expresses a similar idea in a different way:

"One of the meanings of the religion of the blood and for Lawrence, the sacramental approach to life, the preservation of the mystery of existence, which the modern man is blind or ignores, has at its roots the need for integration." 13
