Industrialism and class consciousness in the novels of D. H. Lawrence: a study in realism

James, P. A.

ABSTRACT

Unlike other areas of sociology, the sociological study of literature has remained in a limbo between social science as simply the study of facts, and literature as an area which by its very nature cannot be scientifically analysed. This thesis is an attempt to bridge the gap between these two poles.

We begin by discussing the idea of literature as a social phenomenon, looking in particular at the work of Marx, Engels, George Lukacs and Lucien Goldmann, whilst at the same time pin-pointing various methodological problems. We end the first part by drawing together various elements from each writer, such as, 'world-view', 'mediation', and 'realism', including the more literary orientated work of Rene Girard, in an attempt to devise a method which is scientific but is also capable of discussing the text and aesthetic features of a novel in detail.

In the second chapter we look at intellectual influences which Lawrence was subject to, and also his own personal philosophy as expressed in his essays and letters.

In the third chapter, we examine the economic and political forces which were operating in England at the time he was writing, and try to relate these, and the elements discussed in the previous chapter, to the structure of his novels.

In the last chapter we discuss the novels themselves by using our methodology arrived at in chapter one. In this way we are able to examine the novels both generally, and in depth, and arrive at a conclusion which confirms the subjective analyses of literary critics such as F.R. Leavis, but provides a scientific basis for the judgement of literature as aesthetically good or bad. It is expected that this method can be applied to other writers, and therefore says something about the novel as a genre and not merely one particular writer.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> "The promised land, if it be anywhere, lies away beneath our feet. No more prancing upwards. No more uplift. No more little Excelsiors crying world-brotherhood and international love and Leagues of Nations. Idealism and materialism amount to the same thing on top of Pisgah, and the space is very crowded .... Brethren, let us go down. We will descend. The way to our precious Canaan lies obviously downhill." (1)

Lawrence's insistence on life and reality, against the limitations of ideal and abstract solutions to the human predicament, is well known. It is reminiscent of Stendhal's injunction; to correct the mistakes of abstract intelligence with experience.

> "And here lies the vast importance of the novel, properly handled. It can inform and lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness, and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead." (2)

We shall return later to these claims for the novel.

At first sight, sociology seems to have a straightforward answer to these claims: terms like 'experience', 'life', beg the question. On this basis sociology or political science might reject the claims from the novel that it asks questions and gives answers which do not arise from sociology and politics. This challenge if sustained might make a 'sociology of literature' a contradiction in terms - if sociology can find words to explain what the novel says or what music says, then why bother to write novels or music?

As yet, sociology seems to have done little to face up to these questions. To take one example, Talcott Parsons deals with creative arts in the following way. In "The Social System" he says that artistic creation is instrumental activity devoted to the creation of expressive symbols (i.e. socially accepted symbols allowing for the communication of desire.) All social action has, according to Parsons, cathectic aspects, and all men participate in the use of expressive symbols. But like every other aspect of social activity these can and do give rise to a differentiated, a specialised interest - artistic creation, a special section of the division of labour is devoted to:

> "creating new patterns of expressive symbolism. Artists are 'experts' with respect to a particular phase of the cultural tradition." (3)

From here it is a question of discussing facilities, rewards, disposal, and so on - in the Parsonian manner.

Artistic 'appreciation' and 'admiration' are the artist's rewards for giving the public what it wants and needs. The need for specialised techniques to differentiate the artist from others is the instrumental definition of his role. With this as a basis Parsons has a certain amount to say about literary men and their resemblances to, or differences from, other intellectuals. But he has nothing to say about literature.

Parsons is taken as the expression of orthodox structural-functionalism in sociology. But what is normally called 'the sociology of literature' - the work of Lucien Goldmann and Georg Lukacs - is explicitly derived from Hegel and (particularly in the case of Lukacs) Marx. At this point we summarise the main themes of Goldmann's 'Structural Geneticism' in the sociology of literature.

> "All human behaviour is an attempt at a meaningful response to a particular situation; in this way it tends to create an equilibrium between the acter and the changing world upon which he acts." (4)

This reads more like Weber or Parsons than Marx. However, Goldmann seems to avoid the static conclusions of functionalism by bringing in a pattern of change, a superimposition of 'dialectical' concepts. Thus:

> ".... human realities present themselves as double-sided processes: destructuring of old structures and structuring of new totalities (of meaningful responses) suited to the creation of equilibriums capable of satisfying the new demands of the social groups elaborating them" (5)

So we ask the question: does not the work of the novelist get written as part of this constant process? Goldmann asks the question in the following way. What is the true subject (creator) of creative work and of the whole 'structuring' of which they are a part? According to some Romantic historians and philosophers, it is 'the collective'; never very carefully defined. Goldmann says that Hegel and Marx came down on the side of 'the collective'; not an abstract of mystical collective but a complex network of interpersonal relationships.

There is, therefore, a relationship between any representative creative work and a given social group faced with the problem of shaping and re-shaping the world outlook. This relation between the creative work and the social group producing it is homologous with the relation between that work as a whole and its various parts, i.e. the structure (sum of relations between parts) is the same in each case.

Because of this emphasis on structure, the sociology of literature can concentrate on definitely literary or aesthetic criteria in which this is a principal question, (the nature of form, and the relation between form and content). We are directed towards what is specifically literary. We are not stuck in the mud of the normal "content analysis" which ends up simply telling us that "the novel reflects this or that social situation", which tells us no more than what we might say about a file of newspapers of the same period.

The third point, (..... a relationship between any representative creative work .....) seems obscure, and it may be best to make do with another quotation by Goldmann:

> "..... the fundamental hypothesis of genetic structuralism is that the collective nature of literary creation derives from the fact that the structures of the universe contained or implied in the work of art are homologous to the mental structures of certain social groups, or stand in an intelligible relationship to them. (Given that the artist has 'freedom' to people this universe with what persons and events he likes.)" (6)

It is to be borne in mind that firstly, the structures of the outlook of groups exist only as tendencies and are not fixed, and the individual never represents them purely, for all sorts of reasons. Secondly, the literary work is not just a 'reflection' of the structure of the group, but one of the active constituents, creators.

Finally, the social groups or collectives which are driven to develop outlooks covering all questions are CLASSES. They need a world-view either to conserve or to challenge the existing reality.

From the 'structuralist' standpoint of Goldmann, how should we analyse Lawrence's novels? What class or section of a class is the subject or producer of Lawrence's novels? What class, that is to say, has a world outlook whose structure is homologous with the structure of Lawrence's works? One could give the following answer: Lawrence's works express the outlook of that layer of the English middle classes around the turn of the century, recruited on the one hand from remnants of the old small business and professional classes, and on the other, more and more, from the upper layers of the working class, 'the labour aristocracy'. One could say about this class that it lacks homogeneity; had no independent historical future, felt from time to time severe pressures from crises of a monopolised economy over which it had no control; felt a similar pressure from the organised working class; formed potentially (and soon in fact) an anti-democratic and counter-revolutionary force as the plaything of a class interest other than its own (as contrasted with the subordinate but profoundly democratic and revolutionary role played by the lowermiddle classes at the dawn of the bourgeois epoch).

Historically, Lawrence's life spans the period in which this class formation matures and yet is at the same time revealed as being historically fissile and without a future. Alternatively, one might interpret Lawrence's work 'structurally' in terms of the outlook and problems of the English proletariat, with its unique historical difficulties of shaking off middle class consciousness. As Engels put it:

> "The English are not satisfied with a bourgeoisie and a bourgeois aristocracy, but seem to want a bourgeois proletariat." (7)

Either of these hypotheses would seem to allow for the intense and passionate search for a viable morality and revolt against mechanicalism which we find in Lawrence.

But the difficulty of taking only this as the starting point of analysis of Lawrence is that it is too general. The 'hypothesis' is too easily formed from general impressions and smacks of an 'a priori' method. With this approach it would be too easy to select innumerable examples of this or that opinion, or fear of the middle class, after

the manner of many 'left wing' critics from the thirties onwards who discovered in Lawrence forebodings of fascism.

Lawrence's teachings are interesting because they are a compendium of what a whole generation wanted to feel until Hitler arose, just after Lawrence's death, and they could see where the dark unconsciousness was leading them. Seen in this light, Lawrence represented the last phase of the Romantic movement; random, irresponsible egotism, power for power's sake, the blood cult of Rosenberg. And Lawrence was

> "representative, because tens of thousands of people living in England and Europe were uprooted people like himself." (8)

A better procedure might be to attempt a detailed analysis of the structure of the thought and feeling of Lawrence's novels, while at the same time building up as much relevant knowledge as possible on the side of the history and outlook of the classes in English society at the time. The social or 'sociological' aspects of D.H. Lawrence's writings are not a new subject. Raymond Williams in "Culture and Society" discusses D.H. Lawrence in relation to his (9) (Williams') notions of working class culture and seems to regret Lawrence's rather snobbish refusal to come back to it. Arnold Kettle in "Introduction to the English Novel" refers to Lawrence being a (10) 'snob' in that he (Lawrence) shares the attitudes of his middle class aspiring mother to the working class. It is of some interest that from the other side, i.e. T.S. Eliot and the right wing group around "The Criterion", we find the same accusation of 'snobbishness' but with Eliot it is associated with the criterion of Lawrence as lacking in real education and cultural background. F.R. Leavis defends Lawrence against Eliot. Far from being a snob, Lawrence is expert at exposing the evils of class, says Leavis. Far from being without culture and tradition, Lawrence represents the great tradition on the novel, a powerful antidote to the effete and precious productions of Eliot.

In the 1930's, Lawrence, after having suffered the approbrium of 'establishment' opinion, found himself condemned on ideological grounds by the left wing movements which went under the name of the

poetic renaissance (W.H. Auden etc.) in literature and the 'popular front' in politics. Christopher Caudwell in "Studies in a Dying Culture" writes of him in the period just before the popular front, and in effect condemns him as a literary apostle for those sentiments in the middle class which predispose it to Fascism. This becomes a very general attitude and is one of Lewis's targets. (11)

In the more general sense, any reader soon sees that Lawrence is an acute observer and vivid painter of the realities of English working class and lower middle class life.

His critics tend to object to his 'preaching' or introduction of explicit ideological principles and opinions into his novels. This could be easily taken as a starting point for a 'sociology of literature' analysis, since the 'sociology of literature' has often emphasised the necessity of deducing a writer's outlook from his creative works and not from his explicit philosophy or political view point. (The classic example is Balzac, regarded by most sociologists of literature as the great realist of the development of bourgeois society in France, and yet in his own opinion was a monarchist).

If we take a small part of Lawrence's work which can be reasonably said to be representative, for example, "The Daughters of the Vicar", we can illustrate the distance between these various forms of 'social' commentary on the one hand, and the problems before a sociology of literature of Lawrence on the other. (12)

In this story the vicar and his wife are trying to preserve their 'pride of dass' against the work people and against their actual poverty. However, one of their daughters, Louisa, marries a young collier, Alfred Durant, and the Lindley family is so far from being able to accept this fall from 'class pride' that Louisa and Alfred are banished from the village. In this story it is 'class pride' and not just abstract intelligence as against life which tyrannises over and crushes out life. In other words we do not have a metaphysical or mystical counterposing of life and ideas, but ideas conceived of as ideology. This is a literary

work, not a sociological work. (However, this historical limitation may later prove to be significant). The effects of 'class pride' (or status-consciousness) are taken to the extreme limits by Lawrence. They represent a powerful illustration of alienation in the sense that men and women surrender the autonomy of their own persons and their own powers to the reified marks of class superiority.

Now these are not unfamiliar themes in Lawrence's essays, in which he writes about the struggle between the 'real', 'living' man and the rationalising or dehumanising influence of industrialism. Raymond Williams says that Lawrence's basic theme is his criticism of industrial civilisation, and that his explorations into interpersonal relations constitute this criticism.

It is possible however to be more specific here, and this specificness comes from Lawrence's being part of the tradition of the great realist novel. By this we do not mean that he continues the 'romantic' defence of the individual and his desires against society, but that he comes from another tradition which exposes the hollowness of this romanticism, sees the autonomy of the individual's desires as an illusion, itself the product of alienation and yet which in the novel opens up a path to another kind of freedom. On this point, a well known example from Lawrence's explicit outlook, he insists that he is not for a sort of 'sexual liberation' revolt against establishment society and its morality. Such a thing makes people:

> "like all the rest of the modern middle-class rebels, not in a rebellion at all; they are merely social beings behaving in an anti-social manner." (14)

Lawrence indicates that his own striving for an end to alienation by insisting that the 'base forcing' of man into economic activities given their own independent value, with the rest of his personality allotted to various activities, including sex, must be answered by a thoroughgoing regeneration or revolution in human relations, with what he calls the 'social instinct.'

It is easy to compare Romanticism and its illusory individual freedom and mystical appeal to the past, with sociology, and its demonstration of the determination of individual behaviour, expectations

and orientations. But the great novel is so easily answered. Great realism demonstrates this determinism with great force, paints it 'larger than life', raises it to frightening or tragic or comic proportions, but it gives a different answer. This is because it asks a different question from sociology. It asks what Stendhal asks: Why can't men be happy? It asks the questions about modern society in terms of the felt quality of human relations (for Lawrence, particularly between man and woman). Its answers will therefore be in terms of the achievement of freedom by individuals against the effect of alienation. Great realists in the novel (as against Romantics, though often with a Romantic fringe), portray this as a liberation which is often tragic because it must come through a recognition of the necessity of what they are fighting against. The historical possibility of fully recognising this necessity and at the same time the potential forces that will challenge this necessity, varies in different periods. A consideration of these possibilities in the case of Lawrence will no doubt be important at a later stage of the analysis.

A parallel and a connection with Stendhal can be pursued here. Stendhal like Lawrence tried to see his creative work in relation to ideological and philosophical problems. When he called for abstract intelligence to be corrected by 'contact with experience' he was referring specifically to his study of the philosophers of the Enlightenment. Reason had supposedly triumphed in the French Revolution in 1789. The American war of Independence opened up a virgin continent to a society without feudal encumbrances. The advances of Napoleon's armies forced open the prisons of decadent Dukedoms all over Europe. Standhal vigorously threw himself into the experience of these changes, visiting several European countries and the United States. His novels pose the problem: why does not all this liberation from the old conditions and traditions, this creation of a new world, produce individuals who are 'noble' and happy? Here the novelist is obviously reacting to the same conditions which produced in this same period the birth of sociology and of Marxism. Stendhal's central concern is obviously related to the recurrent themes of sociology: community, alienation, and later, anomie. In his non-fictional works Stendhal does not get beyond everyday

current political prescriptions for social reform. But in his novels he gives another answer which would not be found in the sociological or political analysis - that we are not happy because we are 'vain'. Stendhal is indicating that men are deprived of fulfillment, of what he calls 'nobility', because their motives and desires are not the direct and conscious expression of what men are and need to become, but are 'mediated' by the actor's conception of what other people want. Further, this restriction on man is tightened by the illusion that desire is the spontaneous product of the individual which must overcome the obstacles to it. Girard says,

> "For the 'vaniteux' to desire an object it is necessary only to convince him that the object is already desired by a third person to whom a certain prestige is attached." (15)

This triangular relationship is portrayed by Stendhal in relation to love, business and ambition. In all of these, vanity rules. A man achieves nobility when he is fully master of his own desires, and able to direct all the force of his passion to their fulfillment. Competitive modern society leads to a loss of this spiritual nobility whose essence is self sufficiency.

> "A process of reflection begins, which gradually separates the noble man from his own nobility and changes the latter into a mere possession, mediated through the view of the non-noble." (16)

There are many examples in Stendhal's work and Girard insists that this 'mediation' is the true theme of all great novels.

To test Girard's case, and structuralist methods, in dealing with the work of D.H. Lawrence, would mean to study all Lawrence's main works as a whole. But even in the story mentioned before, "Daughters of the Vicar", there is some indication of the possibilities. Clearly snobbery, as in the work of Proust, is a classically 'triangular' relationship. The 'class pride' of the Lindleys may be compared in its disastrous effects with the ways in which Stendhal shows competitiveness to be destructive of 'nobility'. Lawrence's 'life' asserted against the deadening effect of 'mental consciousness' and 'abstract goodness' is the equivalent of Stendhal's 'passion'.

REFERENCES : INTRODUCTION

1. LAWRENCE, D.H. Fantasia of the Unconscious. Penguin. 1971. p.19.
2. LAWRENCE, D.H. Cf. F.R. Leavis. The Common Pursuit. Peregrine. 1969. p.246.
3. PARSONS, T. The Social System. New York:Harper Torchbooks. 1951. p.402.
4. GOLDMANN, L. 'The Sociology of Literature: Status and Problems of Method'. International Social Science Journal. Vol. 19. 1967
5. IBID.
6. GOLDMANN, L. Pour une Sociologie du Roman. Paris:Gallimard. 1964. p.345.
7. ENGELS, F. Marx and Engels : On Britain. Moscow. 1962. pp.537-538
8. PRITCHETT, V.S. The Living Novel. Chatto and Windus. 1946.
9. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. Penguin. 1966.
10. KETTLE, A. Introduction to the English Novel. Vol.II. Hutchinson. 1967.
11. CAUDWELL, C. Studies in a Dying Culture. Lawrence and Wishart. 1938.
12. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Daughters of the Vicar. Penguin. 1969.
13. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society.
14. LAWRENCE, D.H. 'John Galsworthy'. Selected Essays. Penguin. 1969. p.227.
15. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel : Self and Other in Literary Structure. Baltimore. John Hopkins. 1965. p.7.
16. IBID. pp.116-117.

Chapter I : Problems of Method

What is the relationship between literature and sociology? We are faced with a choice of two methods for solving sociological problems; firstly, that based on principles of 'positivism' in which a broad historico-philosophical generalisation is rejected and the inductive conclusions are based on an assembly of facts and statistics derived from them. Secondly, there is that method based on historico-philosophical concepts applying inductive and deductive principles and selecting facts in accordance with the concepts. This method is the only one possible for the solution to problems surrounding the social nature of art and the relationship between verbal art and society.

Literature transforms human life both in the relations of its objective social being and in the subjective world of its social consciousness. The artist has his own emotional interpretation of the social aspects of life and this interpretation has an ideological meaning and direction. Let us add that ideology is not simply a representation of intellectual convictions about life, but it also embraces feelings engendered by these convictions. Ideology is primarily a direct, emotional and total awareness of the different manifestations of social life - that is the writer's 'world-view'. Thoughts, impressions and feelings are to some extent a direct consequence of the social conditions in which the writer lives and acts, and they may prove to be in contradiction to a person's philosophy, religion or moral principles:

> "A person's social outlook is always more complete more vivid and more forceful in its ideological aspect than his abstract ideas and theoretical views." (1)

Such is the celebrated case of Balzac, and also, as we shall see, certain of Lawrence's work.

An artist's inspiration is therefore of a social nature, and examination of the social substructure of artistic creation can explain peculiarities of form and content in certain works and will enable us to see works in a new light.

Our purpose in this chapter will be to outline our basic methodology, and the basic assumptions and concepts such as humanism, realism and structuralism, which underlie our approach to questions of aesthetics. Let us state that we feel a structuralist method to be the most useful, although there are a number of criticisms which can be levelled at it. Before examining structuralism however, let us look briefly at conventional literary criticism.

The literary critic sees works of literature in an enclosed way. He is concerned mainly with imagery, syntax and metaphor and would reject the idea that a sociological approach can tell us a great deal about a novel. As Wellek says:

> "They (sociologists) tell us not only what were and are the social relations and implications of an author's work but what they should have been or ought to be. They are not only students of literature and society but prophets of the future, monitors and propagandists; and they have difficulty in keeping these two functions separate." (2)

However, both literature and sociology deal with the same thing - man in society - and we see no reason why a basic methodology cannot be worked out which will bridge the gap between the two. In the introduction it was pointed out that sociological investigation of a 'journalistic' kind must be rejected as being inadequate; 'practical criticism' in its turn is vulnerable on three basic points. Firstly, in its hardening into an apparently objective method which is based on subjective principles. Secondly, in its isolation of texts from contexts. Thirdly, in its contemplative aspects which have often made it hostile to a new work.

All of these weaknesses can be seen to follow from the specific social situation of its practitioners. The 'Practical Criticism' group was based on a sense of isolation from the main currents of a civilization in which all vitality was being destroyed. The interpretation which was given about works of literature was one of cultural decline but this acquires wider social explanations - the destruction of organic society by industrialism and 'mass civilization'.

In the 1930's this critique overlapped with another radical critique - that of Marxism - and immediately a strong hostility between the two was built up. This was because of the weaknesses of

Marxist criticism in important areas where practical criticism was strong, that is, the ability to give detailed explanations of the actual text and real consciousness. In contrast, the English Marxists stressed the relation between base and superstructure which gave rise to a theory and practice of reductionism. We hope in this thesis to be able to employ a method of analysis which will be able to examine actual texts and real consciousness whilst still maintaining the vital aspect of the link between base and superstructure.

The major literary critic who violently opposed any Marxist interpretation was F.R. Leavis. Yet he too, like Wellek's sociologists, (see reference 2) is guilty of paradoxical intentions as Anderson points out.

> "His book on Lawrence, his most important intellectual statement, exemplifies with particular clarity the logical paradox of an insistent metaphysical vocabulary combined with a positivist methodology." (3)

Let us begin, therefore, by outlining our own methodology.

The Structuralist approach is Marxist based and indeed, Marx and Engels were greatly interested in the nature of art and literature although they provided no systematic account of a theory of art and society.

The result of this has been that the theory has been developed by subsequent Marxists with poor results. Explanations have been generally based on a mechanical interpretation of the relationship between base and superstructure with literature being an epiphenomenon of the social structure. Marxists such as Lunacharsky, for example, saw literature purely as a reflection of

> "the conscious or unconscious psychology of that class which the given writer expresses." (4)

Two principle themes dominate the early writings of Marx and Engels, the influence of ideology and the division of labour. The conception of ideology pointed to the social conditioning of thought. That the perspective of thought was structured by the writers' class positivism and was therefore a distorted, one sided vision of the world. This question of ideology is very important for Goldmann's sociology and consequently for ours, as we shall see later.

> "The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises, morality religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence ....." (5)

Apart from the conception of ideology, Marx and Engels also state the idea that under the capitalist division of labour, mental production was separated from material production and that art and literature were being 'industrialised'. The artist's fragmentation extended even further in that artists were no longer able to have command over a wide number of mediums such as the 'whole man' of the Renaissance did. Now it was very rare to find artists such as Blake who were able to practise more than one specialised artistic skill. Marx and Engels refer to literature as reflecting reality in various ways, one of which is the reflection of the social function of money as a 'divine power' over men and an embodiment of man's 'estranged being'. His comments on 'Timon of Athens' by Shakespeare are illuminating in this respect. However, we shall deal with (6) this at length later on.

The question of art as a 'reflection of reality' poses certain problems for great art is more than pure description. However, to talk of 'reflection' is for many sociologists an opportunity for vulgar interpretation. Of course, literature is a direct reflection of various facets of social structure, population decomposition for example. But it is much more than this if it is to be great art, and it is this special quality of communication of feeling which concerns us here.

Stendhal talks himself in 'Scarlet and Black' of the novel being a 'mirror journeying down the high road' reflecting

> "the azure blue of heaven, sometimes the mire in the puddles". (7)

However, one has only to read 'Scarlet and Black' to realise that what is meant by this is no crude correlation between literary texts and social history but something far more penetrating. Laurenson and Swingewood state the problem in the following way:

> "If the novel is the mirror of an age, then this raises the question of whether or not purely literary devices may distort this portrayal ... There is too the question of generalisation: to what extent are the fictional

> characters and situations typical of a specific historical period? ... What useful sociological material is there in the Victorian novelist's conception of the English working class, which is not far more accurately conveyed from a close reading of contemporary journals ....." (8)

We would argue that the great artist portrays 'the whole man in depth', as Lowenthal puts it. That the artist's realism (9) reflects the underlying reality and not just surface phenomena. The sociological material which we are interested in is the artist's ability to communicate this reality to his audience and to make a pattern out of chaos. It is the detection of this ability and this realism which will provide a criterion for judging works of art.

Before going any further, it seems necessary to outline what we understand by 'realism'. What goal does the artistic reflection of reality set itself. Lukacs says that it is:

> "to provide a picture of reality in which the contradiction between appearance and reality, the particular and the general, is so resolved that the two converge into a spontaneous integrity in the direct impression of the work of art and provide a sense of inseparable integrity." (10)

This is to say, the universal becomes at once the particular and the general. As Engels says of characterisation:

> "Each is simultaneously a type and an individual." (11)

It follows that each work of art must therefore be self-contained and present a complete context with its own movement and structure. Similarly, the characters must evolve within the work and cannot be presented to the reader as a 'fait accompli'. Each significant work of art creates its own world and this representation of life is more structured than ordinary experience and is in an intimate relationship to the active social function. Such a depiction cannot possibly exhibit the sterile objectivity of an impartial copy, however, any tendentiousness in the work must spring from <u>within</u> it and not be subjectively superimposed. Certain of Lawrence's novels can be criticised on this count. '<u>Kangaroo</u>', '<u>The Plumed Serpent</u>' and '<u>Lady Chatterley's Lover</u>' all suffer from Lawrence's tendency to preach his own philosophy through the mouths of his characters. It is no coincidence that these novels are generally considered to be inferior to his earlier work where he does not allow this to happen. Lawrence's own philosophy has marked fascist

tendencies, however when he is true to himself as an artist and allows his work to be self-contained the quality of his art is raised accordingly. The tendency in the work of art speaks from the objective context of the world depicted in the novel, and is transmitted through the artistic reflection of reality and not the author's explicitly personal commentary.

In Marx and Engels' statements on aesthetics they see the primary role in a complex of interacting factors as being played by the economic - that is, the development of the means of production. However, we must beware of a vulgar marxist analysis when we consider the problem of the relation between base and superstructure. The existence and the rise and effect of literature can only be understood and explained within the total historical context of the entire system. The aesthetic value of literature is therefore that it is part of the social process in which man masters the world through his own consciousness. The principles of Marxist aesthetics are to be found in the doctrines of historical materialism, and it is well known that vulgar Marxists see the basic determinant of social development as being the economic base, and the literature and art are merely superstructural and secondary factors. However, it should be recognised that there is no simple, mechanistic relationship between base and superstructure. In his correspondence, Engels says the following:

> "Political, legal, philosophical, religious, literary and artistic developments rest on the economic. But they also react on each offer and on the economic base. It is not that the economic factor is the only active factor and everything else merely passive effect, but it is the interaction with the base which is always decisive in the last analysis." (12)

Also, if we examine Marx and Engels' work on literature and art, we can see that they did not generally treat art in a deterministic way although Engels is guilty of it on some occasions. (13) In the preface to his 'Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy' for example, Marx posed the interesting question of uneven development with reference to Ancient Greece. Here, there is an unequal relationship between the development of material production and artistic production. (14)

Undoubtedly for Marx, capitalism represents the highest stage of economic production but this mode of production is essentially unpropitious for the evolution of art. This is because, the more

intense are the attacks on human integrity and the greater the oppression of man by man, the more difficult it is to defend human integrity against attack and penetrate the reified terms of capitalist society. All good art is humanistic in the sense that it tries to do just this, and since under capitalism such attacks reach their greatest intensity because of objective reification, every artist is instinctively an enemy of this distortion of humanism, whether consciously or not.

The concept of 'realism' is at the centre of this aesthetic theory and it combats any idea of reality in consisting solely of surface phenomena.

> "True art aspires to maximum profundity, and comprehension at grasping life in its all-embracing totality. That is, it examines in as much depth as possible the reality behind appearance and does not represent it abstractedly, divorced from phenomena and in opposition to phenomena ....." (15)

Real art, therefore, represents life in its totality, in motion, development and evolution.

The idea of '<u>totality</u>' is an important concept both for Marx and Engels, and for Lukacs the most prominent Marxist theoretician of literature. Art is the means by which man makes sense of reality. Its task is to make a 'totality' out of the reality it reflects and it does this in two ways. Firstly, by seeking out the 'intensive totality' of the subject, in that it reproduces in an enhanced form the uniqueness of existence and also by discovering a generality in this uniqueness. What is then represented is 'typical' of a group or class. Secondly, it is '<u>total</u>' in that it is an artefact which is complete in itself. This concept of 'totality' springs from the Marxist basis of his work, because the need for man to feel whole is a basic need in a world fragmented by the division of labour. Art then, makes order out of chaos by revealing the totality of existence beneath the reified terms of everyday life. All great writers he says, are 'inspired by the ideal of the whole man'. In '<u>Studies in European Realism</u>' he puts the matter in this way:

> "For aesthetics, our classical heritage is that great art which presents the totality of man, the whole man in the totality of his social world ... The goal of proletarian humanism is man in his wholeness, the restoration of

> human existence in its totality in actual life, the practical real abolition of the crippling, fragmentation of our existence caused by class society. These theoretical and practical perspectives determine the criteria on the basis of which Marxist aesthetics recaptures the classics. The Greeks, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe, Balzac, Tolstoy and Gorky are at the same time adequate presentations of distinct great stages in the evolution of mankind, and signposts in the ideological struggle for the totality of man." (16)

The importance of the above mentioned artists is that they restore the lost experience of totality in their work. Obviously one could apply these points to some of Lawrence's work; 'The Rainbow' and 'Women in Love' for example. However, there are important criticisms to be made of the concepts of 'totality' and 'the typical', as means of evaluating a work of art. First of all, let us look at the connection between the two.

Lukacs' ontology is that man is a social animal and like Plekhanov (1857-1918) he tends to accept that there is a mechanical correlation between creative literature and class structure.

> "Cultural history", says Plekhanov, "is a reflection of the history of its classes of their struggle, one with the other." (17)

All literature, argues Lukacs, is written from the standpoint of a class, a 'world-view' and thus implies a perspective. We have no doubts that the concept of a writer's 'world-view' is a useful one, however it has certain limitations if it is applied dogmatically. It can only tell us so much about a work of art. Lukacs' criticism of modern literature, i.e. literature written after 1848, is that it denies perspective and pretends to be unbiased and objective and does not look towards the future with 'socialist realism'. This, says Lukacs, results in an inability to discriminate between the significant and the trivial in reality. It also leads to subjectivity in which man is depicted as isolated and essentially morbid without any relation to the 'totality' of existence. In 'The Meaning of Contemporary Realism' he denounces modernism for treating man as a solitary being and for seeing his solitariness as eternal. Modern solitariness is specific to capitalism, he says, and must not be turned into a 'condition humaine'. This leads him to reject (18) writers like Proust, Musil, Joyce and Kafka.

This solitariness will be transcended when the classless society is achieved and man is made whole. The notion of beauty in particular requires this faith; namely that the organic unity of the individual and society, the ideal of the whole man, is only possible in a classless society. Therefore, only the 'whole man' is beautiful. However, he is whole only if he is seen as part of that whole; he is beautiful if he is directly microcosmic of that whole. If man is microcosmic of that whole he is a 'type'. For Lukacs, contemporary literature has no perspective and therefore only depicts a partial reality. This lack of totality means that modern literature has no 'types'.

The type is a dialectical conception which combines the universal, the particular and the individual in a dynamic unity. Lukacs believes, like Engels, that

> "In addition to accuracy of detail, realism means, ... the faithful representation of typical characters in typical situations." (19)

He makes this a criterion for all literature and not just bourgeois realism. Therefore, because he sees modernist literature as lacking in 'typical characters', he rejects it. The 'type' is not an average for Lukacs; he or she must be a particular individual and must embody the most important spiritual, social and moral contradictions of the time.

The basic problem with the concepts of 'totality' and 'type' is that they seem to ignore a direct emotive response to art. They ignore the work of the imagination in art. In 'The Historical Novel' Lukacs devotes part of his time to praising Walter Scott as a great artist. Certainly, Scott fulfills all of Lukacs' theoretical (20) criteria for what constitutes a totality in a work; however, when we actually read Scott we find him to be turgid, flat and lacking in intensity. It seems to us that any theoretical justification for acclaiming a work of art as 'great' must be borne out by its emotive impact on the reader. In answer to all of Lukacs' praise, one might simply say, "Who today reads Walter Scott?"

Another problem is that modern literature tends to be dogmatically rejected because of its lack of 'types'. All experimental writings come under this category. Lukacs is relentlessly hostile to

modernism and the avant-garde, and this is not merely due to the restrictions of Zhdanovism. After 1848 he sees the writer turning from realism to naturalism, i.e. from the typical to the average. The bourgeois transcends its 'heroic' period of history and becomes a ruling class faced with potential revolution and socialism. The writer who does not recognise this does not participate fully in the active experience of social life which is the only way towards realism.

As Swingewood and Laurenson say,

> "This is Lukacs' at his dogmatic worst, incapable of understanding contemporary literature and assessing its aesthetic validity." (21)

They hypothesise, probably correctly, that Lukacs would have rejected Celine's 'Journey to the End of the Night' for its lack of types whereas Trotsky praises it for its honesty and its realistic presentation of life in post-war France and America. (22)

It is debateable whether an individual can deal with an entire era as Lukacs demands when he talks of 'totality' and 'world-view'. As Duvignaud says,

> "to think that a great artist crystallises in himself the widespread problem of his time and that he embodies in his work an entire civilization is to accept a romantic image which does not correspond to reality." (23)

Lukacs, for example, makes Goethe into the representative of everything his age contained. This established a 'norm' for artistic creation which tends to include only a handful of artists and therefore excludes writers with different perspectives to Goethe.

As stated earlier, Lukacs seems to ignore a direct, emotive response to art in that he is too 'academic'. The prophetic nature of art is lost in the attempt to see the writer's work as a reflection of the basic characteristics of his era, purely and simply. Duvignaud says that the great work of art cannot be merely a reflection of basic characteristics because

> "Art is rarely the representation of an order. Rather, it continuously and anxiously opposes and questions it." (24)

We would argue with this although we would also say that Duvignaud has not understood Lukacs properly. For Lukacs and for ourselves, to reflect the basic characteristics of an era is to penetrate the surface phenomena to the reality of human existence. In the case

of the novel, this is to depict the reality of existence under capitalism. (The novel is a capitalist form). To depict this reality and expose it is necessarily to oppose it.

Although we agree therefore with the underlying assumptions of Lukacs aesthetics and agree that concepts such as 'totality', 'type' and 'world-view' can be useful, there are certain problems involved. Notably, the schematic correlation which often postulated between class and literature. Also the rigidity of a theory which dismisses most of the writing done after 1848 as worthless and decadent and the failure of Lukacs to actually discuss the text of a novel as literature.

II

We have pinpointed the two basic methods in analysing literature. One which focuses its attention on the extrinsic factors to facilitate the understanding of a work of art. The other which concentrates purely on the literary text. Lukacs' work is an example of the former, the work of the Russian Formalists an example of the latter. Structuralism, which we will now go on to examine, attempts, in Goldmann's work, to be a common approach between the two.

Firstly, however, a word about the Formalists. They developed between 1913 and 1930 under the theories of Shklovsky, Tomashevsky and Jacobson and attempted to reinstate the text as the only viable means of evaluation. Art was seen as a self-enclosed system where the 'artistic device' existed within an 'aesthetic system' and performed specific functions. They see literature as a system, a 'totality', in which all the parts comprised a coherent whole.

Shklovsky says,

> "The form of a work of art is defined by its relation to other works of art, to forms existing prior to it ... The purpose of any new form is not to express new content but to change an old form which has lost its aesthetic quality." (25)

This is in itself a form of structuralism and it relates to what Goldmann has to say. However, we must distinguish between ahistorical and historical structuralism. The Formalists' approach frequently leads to a concentration on minute detail within the work

at the expense of the system's development outside itself. Goldmann, in contrast, conceives the text as 'historically specific' and explicable both in terms of its inner structure and its external history. We would argue however, that Goldmann goes too far the other way in that he stresses the external factors involved and although recognising the need for an analysis of the internal structure, is still unable to come to grips with the text.

Genetical structuralism is based on the idea that all reflection on human sciences is made from within society and is a part of social life itself according to its importance and effectiveness. In the human sciences, the subject of thought therefore forms part of the object to which it is directed. The object studied is one of the constituent elements of the structure of thought of the research worker. This affirms that the human sciences cannot be as objective as the natural sciences, and that certain value judgements are inevitable in the structure of theoretical ideas. This is not to say that the human sciences are less rigorous, but their rigour will be different and will have to take account of values which cannot be eliminated.

Secondly, all human facts are responses of the individual or collective subject, in an attempt to modify situations in favour of the subject's aspirations. Therefore, all behaviour, all human facts have a significant character. Starting from these principles, genetic structuralism favours a radical transformation of the methods of the sociology of literature.

Many sociological interpretations of literary creation are journalistic and direct attention to whatever in the work reproduces daily life and empirical reality. Consequently, the more that the sociology flourishes, the more mediocre are the works examined. This results in criticism of a documentary rather than a literary nature. Goldmann sets out five basic premises in the International Social Science Journal. These findings have important methodological (26) consequences. Firstly, in order to understand the work we must in the first place discover a 'structure' which accounts for the whole text. Also, we must explain the genesis of the text by trying to show how, and in what measure, the building up of the structure in the work has a functional character. That is, to what extent it institutes an instance of significant behaviour for the individual of collective subject in a given situation. One aspect of the problem which has a bearing on this is something which has already

been mentioned. That is, the dichotomy which often occurs between the author's intentions and his actual achievement. (Balzac is a case in point). In answer to the question, "What is the importance of the author's conscious intentions?", we can say that consciousness is only a partial element of human behaviour and has a content which is not adequate to the objective nature of that behaviour. 'Significance does not appear with consciousness'. Frequently, the desire for aesthetic unity makes the author write a book with an overall structure which constitutes a 'world-view' opposite to his thoughts and the convictions. Therefore the sociology of literature must treat carefully the conscious intentions of the writer and gather suggestions from them, but the conclusions must be based primarily on the text.

We must also explain why only some of the many influences on a writer affect him or why influences are distorted. The answers to these questions must be sought in the work of the writer and not in the works which influenced it.

Goldmann's method is a fusion of structuralism and dialectical materialism. He takes certain of his key-concepts from Lukacs (27) who had earlier demonstrated the importance in Marx's work of concepts such as 'totality', 'reification' and 'alienation' which had hitherto been ignored. Goldmann now carries over the idea (28) of 'totality' into his methodology. For Lukacs, 'totality' is not

> "the predominance of economic motives in the interpretation of society which is the decisive difference between Marxism and bourgeois science, but rather the point of view of totality. The ... domination of the whole over the part is the essence of the method which Marx took over from Hegel and ... transformed into the basis of an entirely new science." (29)

Goldmann treats literary works as wholes which can only be understood in terms of their parts. This totality is a dynamic structure for both Lukacs and Goldmann. It is also 'significant' because it embodies the crucial values and events of its time and Goldmann relates literature concretely to a specific social, economic and political structure. In this way we arrive at a dialectical method and let us state that we shall attempt to employ such a dialectical method in our subsequent analysis of Lawrence. On the question of totality and dialectics Goldmann has this to say:

> "... the investigator must always strive to recover the total and concrete reality even if he is able to succeed only in a partial and limited manner. He must seek to integrate into the study of social facts the history of the theories about these facts, and, in addition, try to link the study of the facts of consciousness to their historical localisation and to their economic and social infrastructure." (30)

also:

> "... we arrive at the second major methodological principle, that of the total character of human activity and the indissoluble bond between the history of economic and social facts and the history of ideas. This principle is axiomatic for dialectical thought ..."
>
> "For the dialectical thinker, the history of philosophy is an element and an aspect of the philosophy of history; the history of a problem is one of the aspects of the problem itself and of history in general ..." (31)

Certain fundamental elements of vision are defined in the planes of low religion and art. These tend to be expressed on coherent wholes. There are also amongst these coherent wholes transitional forms. To understand these we must consider the immanent need to maintain coherence of the old ideologies as well as counter forces which destroy this coherence, in order to reformulate the vision in a progressive manner. This is what Goldmann calls 'structuration' and 'de-structuration'.

His other important concept is that of 'world-view' which he also borrows from Lukacs. It is this which gives all great art its internal coherence and he defines it as 'a significant global structure' which attempts to make sense of reality.

> "What I have called a 'world vision' is a convenient term for the whole complex of ideas, aspirations and feelings which links together the members of a social group (a group which in most cases assumes the existence of a social class) and which opposes them to members of other social groups. ... In a few cases - and it is these which interest us - there are exceptional individuals who either actually achieve or who come very near to achieving a completely integrated and coherent view of what they and the social class to which they belong are trying to do. The man who expresses this on an imaginative or conceptual plane are writers and philosophers ..." (32)

For Goldmann, world-visions are forms of consciousness bound up with social classes. The world-vision is always the vision of a class.

> "... The fundamental hypothesis of genetic structuralism is ... that the collective character of literary creativity derives from the fact that the structures of the creative work's own world ("univers") are homologous with the mental structures of certain social groups in a meaningful relation with them, while at the level of contents of the work, i.e. of the creation of imaginary worlds ruled by these structures, the writer has a total freedom." (33)

> "... the very nature of the great works of culture indicates what the characteristics of these groups must be. These works, as we have said, represent in fact the world vision i.e. slices of an imaginary or conceptual reality, structured in such a way that allows a global world to be developed. ... This structuration can only exist in connection with those groups whose consciousness tends towards a global vision of man. From the standpoint of empirical research, it is certain that over a very long period social classes have been the only groups of this type ..." (34)

There are objections to this concept of "world vision". Duvignaud says that:

> "The cohesion in a work of art or in a style is no more than the result of the particular characteristics of a temperament or of a personality; it would be absurd to try and establish that Holderlin or Rimbaud was preoccupied with this." (35)

However, this is answered by Lukacs and Goldmann whey they point out that there can be a dichotomy between intentions and achievements. It seems to us that Duvignaud shows a misunderstanding of Goldmann with regard to this. There is after all, no reason to assume that every writer is totally conscious of the meaning of his work and its wider aspects. One more important criticism is that the idea of world-vision is no more that an ideology. However, Goldmann argues that the essence of an ideology lies in its one-sided, undialectical view of the world - 'false consciousness' as Marx would put it. Therefore it is suggested that with this world vision, man attempts to grasp at a true, total picture of reality as a whole, and this vision, embodied in literature, is true for him and his class at a particular historical moment.

As Laurenson and Swingewood point out, a difficulty arises over the precise nature of a world vision:

> "A world vision is therefore an abstraction; it achieves its concrete form in certain literary and philosophical texts. World visions are not facts, have no objective existence of their own, but merely exist as theoretical expressions of the real conditions of social classes at particular historical moments, and the writer, philosopher, or artist articulates this consciousness." (36)

Also, Goldmann makes extravagant claims for his concept, saying that a 'great' work of art can be distinguished by its world vision which gives it an internal coherence. He does not dismiss traditional literary criticism but says that this concept acts as the main methodological tool for an understanding of the whole text. However, as Laurenson and Swingewood point out, to explain ninety-five per cent of the text which Goldmann claims for his concept is to relegate traditional aesthetics to a minor role. This is in fact what happens and we would suggest that Goldmann fails to come to grips with the actual text because the concept of world vision is not able to deal with the aesthetic judgement of style, imagery etc. Albeit useful in the ways Goldmann says, we believe that it is over-used in his analysis to the exclusion of a judgement of the literature as art, although he recognises that such judgements are necessary.

It must be pointed out that what he and Lukacs have to say about reification is very important, for here, the domination of economic activity over other values is given a precise historical explanation. This fact is pinpointed as a specific characteristic of capitalist society and penetrates every other facet of consciousness. The idea of totality in the study of culture as a study of the relation between elements in a whole way of life is therefore important in its role as a critical weapon against reification. We will elaborate on this later.

The use of the concept of world vision raises one important point however. Most sociology of literature is concerned with the relation between what Goldmann calls real consciousness and ordinary literature. In other words, it sees literature merely as a reflection of society. Obviously, this tells us nothing about the aesthetic value of a work of art. However, genetic structuralism purports to overcome this because it :

> "will be concerned with the more fundamental relations of possible consciousness, for it is at the centre of his case that the greatest literary works are precisely those which realise a world-view at its highest possible level." (37)

Therefore we have to study not only biographical details, but more importantly, the essential structures which give works their unity and aesthetic character, and at the same time reveal this maximum possible consciousness of the social class which created them in and through their author. This requires a particular methodology because a world view can only be isolated at the level of structure and there must be continual cross-reference between text, author and social class in order to locate the structure of the work within the structure of the society to which it belongs.

Let us now look at the motion of 'potential consciousness'. Social classes are for Göldmann, and for us, the most important group which we have to deal with. In the definition of social class, two factors must be taken into account; function in production, and social relations with other classes. However, there is another factor which Goldmann states as follows:

> "From the old of antiquity up until the present time, social classes have constituted the infrastructure of world-views" (38)

This means that:

a) "Every time it's a question of finding the infrastructure of a philosophy, a literary or artistic current, ultimately we have been forced to consider ..... a social class and its relations to society."

b) "The maximum of potential consciousness of a social class always constitutes a psychologically coherent world-view which may be expressed on the plane of religion, philosophy, literature or art." (39)

This is not real but possible consciousness.

> "Real consciousness is a result of the obstacles and deviations that different factors of empirical reality put into opposition and submit for realisation by this potential consciousness." (40)

We must not confuse the two. Real consciousness is caused by the influence of social groups and natural factors on the consciousness of a class. But man is defined by his possibilities, and potential consciousness expresses possibilities at the level of thought and

action within a social structure. For example, the maximum potential consciousness of the bourgeoisie in France in 1789 was reached with the demand for legal equality. Economic equality was beyond this potential.

What is the importance of this concept for literary history? On the question of understanding historic events or literary events or works, an important methodological position is that of emanative logic, e.g. Hegelianism. This implies two ideas; firstly, the majority of human manifestation can be comprehended only as expressions of a deeper reality. However this idea of a deeper reality is a very speculative and metaphysical one. With a dialectical method it is possible to transcend this criticism by stating that although we do not favour the idea of a metaphysical reality, the totality of individual states of consciousness is not merely the sum of the parts. On the contrary, each can only be understood in terms of the totality of its relation with the other parts. In society, this gives rise to what Goldmann calls a 'psychic structure' which tends towards coherence and awareness of the self and the universe. By this he means a 'world-vision'; and expression of a collective consciousness. A world-vision, he says, is a social fact and great artistic works represent the coherent expression of world-views; also, their content is determined by the potential consciousness of the social class.

Having looked at Goldmann's principle concepts we must now examine the way in which he applies his methodology in 'The Hidden God'. This is necessary because in this work he develops the concept of 'tragic vision'. In our subsequent investigation of Lawrence we shall use thisidea as our principle means of criticism having first extended and modified it, for there are a number of objections which can be made of the way in which Goldmann utilizes the concept, some of which we have already pointed out in our discussion of 'world-views.'

In 'The Hidden God', Goldmann discusses the work of Racine and Pascal and shows that both expressed the view of a social group, the Jansenists, and a social class, 'The Noblesse de Robe'. Both express a 'tragic' view of life, that is, a rejection of the world coupled with a desire to remain in it and not to retreat into mysticism. This 'tragic vision' forks a triangular structure of Man: God: the World: in which the world is no longer in harmony with God and man, because although God is present, He is hidden, therefore in order for man to live, he must make a 'wager' on God's existence and hence on his own salvation. (41)

This idea of the tragic vision enables Goldmann to explain the change in attitude between Pascal's 'Provincial Letters' and the tragic extremism of 'The Pensees'. The change is due to the development of a world-vision, and this for Goldmann is the key to all great works of literature. However, there is a difference between Pascal's writings which are essentially philosophical; and the novel which is primarily concerned with the individual characteristics of its protagonists. One would expect to find structures such as 'world-views' in a work of philosophy but this is not so likely in a novel. Certainly, we do not find abstract structures in the novel; what we do find are structures which are described in terms of personal relationships between characters. Therefore the corruption of 'the whole man' by commodity fetishism, for example, is shown to us in terms of the oorruption of human desire and interpersonal relationships. We will deal with this in more detail later.

There is also another problem involved. Goldmann talks of a world-vision being the vision of a particular class, although in his discussion of Pascal he recognises that Pascal's position as a member of a religious group, the Jansenists, has a crucial bearing on his reason for expressing a 'tragic vision'. He also points out that,

> "Frequently the writer is a professional author unsupported by religious, political or court patronage and the history of the novel as a genre parallels the writer's growing emancipation from a servile and unstable literary fealty, to the status of a 'free-floating intellectual'. More particularly it raises the question of the writer's social position within a class or group, as well as his relations within the dominant class." (42)

This applies to Lawrence in that he is part of the intelligensia for most of his life. He is an unsupported writer. Obviously, one could not expect Goldmann to deal with this problem in relation to Pascal because this situation did not exist in seventeenth century France. However, it does apply to modern writers. This raises the whole question of the intelligensia in relation to social classes, and Lawrence's situation in particular. Gramsci has something to say on this but we shall deal with the problem when we come to examine the 'influences' on Lawrence's thought and his position in the English intellectual tradition. (43)

The novel, says Goldmann, develops as a result of class development, and he states that there is a definite relationship between class and literary structures. The novel is concerned with man's alienation from the social world where money takes prominance over humanity and man is degraded to the level of a commodity.

> "In market geared societies the collective consciousness progressively loses all sense of active reality and tends to become a simple reflection of economic life." (44)

This seems to us to be a far too mechanical conception of the relationship. He does however suggest that Capitalism has succeeded not merely in degrading the world but in transposing its economic activity into mental life.

This idea brings us nearer to our attempt to arrive at a concept which strives towards a totality and at the same time is able to deal with the text as literature in a more detailed way. We are attempting to achieve a synthesis of certain of Goldmann's ideas with those of Lukacs - a fusion of a more penetrating method of structural analysis with dialectical materialism. Goldmann, for example, sees Robe-Grillet's novel 'Le Voyeur' as reflecting 'one of the fundamental facts of contemporary industrial societies', where man is an object without the wish to transform life nor the ability to do so. As Swingewood points out, this is strange because world-visions strive for a total vision of the world but modern literature, especially Robe-Grillet, tend towards a wholly private, partial view. In our synthesis we shall attempt to construct a concept which does take account of man's ability to change qualititively and show how the novelist does this. Goldmann does not dismiss modern writers like Kafka, Musil and Proust as Lukacs does, however, to our mind he acclaims their novels for the wrong reasons. We shall now go on to elaborate upon our extension of Goldmann's concept. This involves a discussion of 'tragic vision' and what we shall call 'mediation'. Mediation is developed as a weapon of criticism by Rene Girard in his book, 'Deceit, Desire and the Novel'. (45)

This does not mean that we are substituting Girard for Goldmann and Lukacs; merely that we see Girard's 'mediation' as a necessary element in our revision of their concepts. Indeed there are some fundamental weaknesses in Girard's analysis. Firstly then, let us look at Girard's concept of 'mediation'.

The primary point of the analysis is that all desire is mediated. Every relationship between a subject and the object of its desire forms a triangular structure. This is because, in the world in which we live, a subject can never approach the object of desire directly and spontaneously. The desire must always be mediated through a third party, and this structure manifests itself in envy, jealousy, resentment.

There are two types of mediation as outlined by Girard; external mediation and internal mediation. In the former, the mediator remains external to the hero's world and there is an unattainable distance between the hero and the mediator. This type appears in 'Don Quixote' and 'Madame Bovary' for example. In 'Don Quixote', the hero is a typical victim of triangular desire in that he surrenders to Amadis (the model on which he bases himself) the individual's fundamental perogative: he no longer chooses the objects of his own desire - Amadis chooses for him; Amadis is the mediator. Chivalric existence is the imitation of Amadis in the same sense that the Christian's existence is the imitation of Christ. The mediator is always there, radiating towards both the subject and the object, and although the object changes with each successive adventure, the triangular structure remains the same.

Girard says:

> "The triangle is no Gestalt. The real structures are intersubjective. They cannot be localised anywhere; the triangle has no reality whatever; it is a systematic metaphor, systematically pursued. Because changes in size and shape do not destroy the identity of this figure ... the diversity as well as the unity of the works can be simultaneously illustrated. The purpose and limitations of this structural geometry may become clearer through a reference to 'structural models'. The triangle is a model of a sort ... but these models are not 'mechanical' like those of Claude Levi-Strauss. They always allude to the mystery, transparent yet opaque, of human relations ....
>
> A basic contention to this essay is that the great writers apprehend intuitively and concretely, through the medium of their art, if not formally the system in which they were first imprisoned together with their contemporaries." (46)

As an example of external mediation, Girard cites the court of Louis XIV at Versailles where the least desires on the part of the nobility must be legitimated and sanctioned by the monarch.

The 'Sun King' here is the mediator for everyone who surrounds him but he is separated from them by a great spiritual distance. The distance between subject and mediator which is involved in external mediation, means that the mediator (in this case the King himself) cannot become a rival or obstacle to his proper subjects. Louis is a god to his subjects, but with the destruction of the concept of 'divine right' in 1789, Louis-Philippe is later established as a 'bourgeois monarch' and the spiritual distance between him and his subjects is very much less. He is now in a position where, as mediator, he can become a rival to his subjects. As Girard says, with the rise of bourgeois society, 'the men become Gods to one another'.

This brings us on to the second type of mediation, for when this happens, the transition from external to internal mediation has occurred. This can be seen in Stendhal's work, in Proust, Dostoyevski, and in Lawrence (as we shall see later). The worlds of the hero and the mediator interpenetrate. In this situation, the mediator himself desires: he is therefore an obstacle as well as a model. For example, in 'Sons and Lovers', Paul Morel's feelings for Miriam are mediated through his mother. However, his mother becomes an obstacle as well as a model and this engenders jealousy, envy and resentment. In other words, in the world of internal mediation, contradiction is intensified. This concept of 'internal mediation' is essentially the same as Stendhal's 'vanité' and Lawerence's 'abstract intellect', and 'class-pride', from which his heroes try to free themselves and establish what Lawrence calls 'the quick of self'. This 'vanité' represents all the acute forms of jealousy, resentment and hate; it is an irresistable propensity to desire what others desire. Girard says, that this choosing of a model is behind all ambition; it is for example, behind the Christian's imitation of Christ.

The realism in all of this lies in two points. Firstly, it obviously does not lie in the character and exploits of someone like Don Quixote, which the novelist imagines, but in the nature of their mediated desire. Secondly, only the great novelists expose this truth of mediation: that the desiring of objects by an autonomous subject is not the true reality. The mediator is exposed.

We believe also that this can be taken further, in that exposure of internal mediation is, in particular, a critique of commodity fetishism. That is, that in capitalist society the truth behind the objects of appearance is the social relations of production between men. Also it is in general exposure of the mechanism of status, ego and the distortion of human relations under capitalism. We will elaborate on this at a later stage.

Stendhal in his 'Memories of a Tourist' warns against the modern sentiments of jealousy, envy and hate; they are the fruits of universal vanity, he says. Max Scheler numbers 'envy, jealousy and rivalry' among the sources of 'ressentiment', and we believe all the phenomena explored by Scheler to be the result of internal mediation. The word itself establishes the quality of reaction of mediation on the individual; that is, the admiration and desire to emulate the model which the subject chooses, is thwarted by the model itself and these passions recoil back on to the subject causing the kind of self-poisoning which is described by Scheler. He defines envy as:

> "a feeling of impotence which vitiates our attempt to acquire something, because it belongs to another." "Mere regret at not possessing something which belongs to another and which we covet is not enough in itself to give rise to envy, since it might also be an incentive for acquiring the desired object or something similar ... Envy occurs only when our efforts to acquire it fail and we are left with a feeling of impotence." (47)

Although this analysis is complete, Scheler has not perceived the relationship between self-deception with regard to the cause of the person's failure, and the paralysis that accompanies envy. This becomes clear if instead of beginning from rivalry, we begin from the rival himself - i.e. the mediator. The mediator confers his prestige on the object of desire, by wanting to possess it; therefore the subject is less capable than ever of giving up the object. Also behind this is a reverence for the mediator. Says Girard,

> "Only great artists attirbute to the mediator the position usurped by the object; only they reverse the commonly accepted hierarchy of desire." (48)

Scheler follows Nietzsche (the latter acknowledged a debt to Stendhal) in asserting that the romantic state of mind is thoroughly

possessed with 'ressentiment'. However, Stendhal seeks the source of this element in the imitation of individuals who are really our equals but who we endow with an arbitrary prestige. If the 'modern' sentiments flourish, he claims this is not because 'envious nature' and 'jealous temperaments' are multiplied in a mysterious manner, but because internal mediation is triumphing in a world where the differences between men are disappearing.

"The great novelists reveal the imitative nature of desire", however this becomes more and more difficult to discern as the relations between men become more distorted because the greatest imitation is the most persistently denied. In 'Don Quixote' the imitation is conscious and explicit whereas in Lawrence, Proust or Dostoyevski it is unconscious, complex and far more destructive. In the romantic hero, mediation is denied and 'spontaneity' and individuality are proclaimed and raised to the level of dogma. Stendhal's proclamation is that we should not be fooled by this because individualism of the most ardently declared nature only conceals copying in a new guise.

> "The romantic 'vaniteux' always wants to convince himself that his desire is written into the nature of things, or which amounts to the same thing, that it is the emination of a serene subjectivity, the creation ex nihilo of a quasi-divine ego." (49)

This notion of Girard's, that desire conceived as the individual's spontaneous being, and desire as being in the nature of things, equals the same thing, appears to be the same as Lawrence's insistence that materialism and idealism are the same.

He says of the many other dichotomies around the subject-object relation:

> "The objective and subjective fallacies are one and the same; both originate in the image which we all have of our own desires. Subjectivisms and objectivisms, romanticisms and realisms, individualisms and scientisms, idealisms and positivisms, appear to be in opposition but are secretly in agreement to conceal the presence of the mediator. All these dogmas are the aesthetic or philosophical translation of world-views peculiar to internal mediation. They all depend directly or indirectly on the lie of spontaneous desire. They all depend on the same illusion of autonomy to which modern man is passionately devoted." (50)

There is a distinction to be made between the works which reflect the presence of the mediator without revealing him and which we shall call 'romantic'; and the works which do reveal him which we will call 'realistic' or 'novelistic' as Girard says.

Cervantes, Flaubert, Lawrence and Stendhal in their great 'novelistic' works expose the reality of desire, as against romantic writers, but even so, their continuous attacks and denunciations do not go so far as to break it up.

The opposite to 'vanité' is what Stendhal calls 'passion' and Lawrence calls 'the quick of self'. In great works, the transition from 'vanité' to the 'quick of self' is inseparable from aesthetic happiness. It is the triumph of creation over desire and anguish. In fact Lawrence's 'quick of self' cannot be properly understood without taking into account the problems of aesthetic creation. It is to the full revelation of triangular desire, that is to his own liberation that the novelist owes his moments of peace. In Lawrence one thinks of such episodes as: the harvesting scene in 'The White Peacock', the conclusion of 'Daughter of the Vicar', the night scene in the garden of Paul Morel's house in 'Sons and Lovers'.

The concept of mediation encourages rapprochement at a level which is no longer that of the criticisms of genre. It clarifies works one by the other; understands them without destroying them, unites them without destroying their uniqueness. We can make obvious analogies between Proust's 'desire and snobbism', Stendhal's 'vanité' and Lawrence's 'class-pride' and 'intellect'. In Lawrence, the distance between the mediator and the desiring subject is even less than in Stendhal. The latter is nearly always external to the desire he describes and his tone is ironical compared to the agony which we find in Lawrence. Differences of tone conceal a similarity of structure.

The novelist effects the transition from the 'romantic' to the 'novelistic', only in the struggle of creating his novel and therefore it is to the novels that we must look to determine whether they are 'novelistic' or not.

III

Although we make this claim for the flexibility of the concept of 'mediation' we think that there are certain problems involved with the concept. In this section we shall attempt to integrate this concept with the fundamental ideas of genetic structuralism and dialectical materialism. As we have stated before this is not the substitution of Girard for Goldmann and Lukacs, rather an attempt to make of structuralism a method which is able to deal with text more fully while still recognising the wider aspects of literary creation. It will also attempt to overcome the static nature of things which is implied in the very word 'structure'. Goldmann himself says:

> "The word 'structure' unfortunately has a static connotation; which is why it lacks precision. One ought not to talk of structures - which actually exist in social life only rather seldom and for a short time - but of structural tendencies and processes ... The study and understanding of collections of human facts always presupposes that one studies them from two complementary angles, both as structural processes orientated towards a new structure, and as de-structive processes within old structures which have already been achieved." (51)

Firstly, however let us examine the connection between 'mediation' and Goldmann's 'tragic vision'.

'Tragic vision' is what Goldmann calls 'a significant structure'; and one immediate similarity with mediation is that it forms a triangular structure of relationships between; God, Man and the World. Tragic vision, he argues, could only have occurred at a particular historical moment, in this case, the moment when the crisis in the social world lay on the inability of the emerging bourgeoisie (the Noblesse de la Robe) to break royal absolutism and develop capitalist society. The Noblesse de la Robe was recruited from the Third Estate by the monarchy in order to offset the powerful position of the traditional aristocracy. However, with the rise of absolutism, the power and prestige of the Noblesse de la Robe diminished although they remained economically dependent on the crown. Goldmann suggests that this ambiguous position entailing both opposition to, and the need for a crown, produced in philosophy and literature a predominantly tragic outlook.

Goldmann says:

> "But all that tragic man finds before him is the 'eternal silence of infinite space'. And it is when he becomes aware of his true situation that he feels that he is going beyond loneliness, and is drawing close to Him, who, in an exemplary and superhuman manner, has fulfilled the function of a tragic mind and has become a mediator between the world and realm of supreme values, a mediator between the world and God." (52)

> "In fact the tragic mind comes to think of God in two distinct ways: as God, and as Mediator. It sees God as a hidden reality to whom the whole of man's life is devoted ... Between the tragic mind and this mediator there is a relationship of complete participation and even of identity." (53)

Goldmann goes on to talk of the relationship between the tragic mind and the mediator as one of imitation, and that the mediator is the hypostatis or underlying essence. The recognisation of man's tragic position with regard to a god which is there but always hidden, brings only death and suffering.

All of this amounts to what Girard outlines in his concept of external mediation. What we are arguing is that Girard's idea of external and internal mediation is merely an extension of Goldmann's concept and that Girard's notion must be treated as a 'significant structure' and a part of the genetic structuralist method which we are employing. If we equate 'external mediation' with 'tragic vision' what then can we say about Lawrence's novels? Goldmann has pointed out that tragic vision occurs at a particular historical moment when the crisis of the world lies in the inability of the emergent bourgeoisie to develop capitalist society. External mediation is the manner in which this tragic vision is expressed. The novelist Cervantes, or in the case of Goldmann, the playwright Racine, express this external mediation. In Lawrence we believe 'tragic vision' to be still evident although it is expressed not by the structure; Man: God: the World, but by; Man: Capital: the World. It is significant that there is also a crisis in Lawrence's era. At that particular moment it was the inability of the working class and the new white collar strata in England to cast off bourgeois consciousness. In the case of Lawrence, money and the commodity relation have taken the place of Racine's 'God'. This is where we see a weakness in

Girard's hypothesis. He posits a change from external to internal mediation with the development of bourgeois society. This is because, instead of the mediator being a great spiritual distance away from the one who desires - 'a god', he argues that the distance becomes insignificant because of increased political equality. "Men become gods to one another" he states. What he fails to recognise is the continuance of economic inequality and that money takes the place of God. This is not to say that we disagree with the idea of internal mediation or Girard's structure, only that we see human emotional, and mental, relationships as an expression of something else, that is, the commodity relationship under capitalism. Therefore, we argue that Lawrence expresses a form of tragic vision and that this is seen in terms of mediation. Also, although Lawrence talks in terms of the relationships between men and women on an emotional level, he is in fact dealing with the corruption of man's desire and the spontaneity of man's desire under capitalism. This allows us to deal with the specific text of Lawrence's novels by means of a structuralist method. It also allows us, when we recognise what is implied by this reading of 'mediation' and 'tragic vision', to posit a Marxist theory of literature which is not crudely reductionist.

In 'The Hidden God', God is the mediator, the hidden reality which watches and judges man. In Lawrence, the hidden reality is commodity fetishism, reification and alienation. Money is the new God with its subsequent distortion of desire, and its distortion of sexual relationships.

Goldmann puts it as follows:

> "In economic life ... every genuine relationship with the qualitative aspect of things and beings tends to disappear ... to be replaced by a mediated and degraded relationship: the pure quantative relationship of exchange values." (54)

Girard also says:

> "All particular idols are caught up together and engulfed by the supreme idol of the capitalist world: money. There is a 'rigorous homology' between every condition of our existence. Our emotional life and even our spiritual life have the same structure as our economic life." (55)

How does the expression of internal mediation and tragic vision in Lawrence relate to class consciousness and industrialism? We shall now attempt to pinpoint this relationship between mediation and class consciousness. Lawrence's tragic vision is an expression of this.

IV

The philosophy which underlies this interpretation of literature springs from the historical materialism of Marx. One of Marx's central formulations is that:

> "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness ... (As a result of economic change) the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. On considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out." (56)

Marx does not define the hostility of the capitalist mode of production to art in aesthetic terms. However, in his writings on economics he does provide a profound insight into the question. This is done by relating the appearance of things, that is, the reified relationships between man and nature, back to where they appear in reality - the relationships of production. These relationships are reified or fetishised under capitalism and therefore they are distorted. Because of this, a great intellectual effort is required in order to see through appearances and grasp the actual reality of men's relationships behind the reified terms which determine daily existence (goods, prices and so on). All things in capitalist society exist as commodities, and each commodity has a use-value, and an exchange value. Therefore, no commodity can be acquired unless it is bought for money. Money thus becomes the 'mediator' par excellence, and this is one important point which Girard omits to mention. It is important because it relates the idea of 'mediation' to our basic aesthetic framework and the proposition put forward in the above quotation - that social being determines consciousness. It also brings us on to the point of

mediation being a critique of commodity fetishism. The problems of money, reification, fetishism and alienation are all related and are all prime examples of triangular structure. It is precisely because Lawrence reveals these structures in his work that he is a great artist. Of course, he does not call these structures 'mediated desire', but his "corruption of 'spontaneous' relationships" amounts to the same thing. This translation of all relationships into value-form is revealed in Lawrence's work and shown in the distortion of relationships between men and women, and men and nature. He reveals the mediator at work.

Marx says this about the quality of money as a mediating agent:

> "The nature of money is not, in the first place, that in it property is alienated, but that the mediating activity of human social action by which man's products reciprocally complete each other is alienated and becomes characteristic of a material thing, money, which is external to man. When he exteriorizes this mediating activity he is active only as an exiled and dehumanised being; the relation between things, and human activity with them, becomes the activity of a being outside and above man. Through this alien intermediary - whereas himself be intermediary between men - man sees his will, his activity and his relation to others as a power which is independent of him and them. ... That this intermediary becomes a real god is clear, since the intermediary is the real power over that which he mediates to me." (57)

Lawrence unconsciously grasps this fact of economic unfreedom which perverts men's desire and men's relationships. What Lawrence is doing when he calls for man to fulfill his spontaneity and come down on the side of 'life' as against 'intellect' and 'pride of class', is the same as Stendhal's criticism of 'vanite', Proust's criticism of 'snobbism'; that is, in exposing the mediator he lays bare the unconscious essence of unfreedom that is inherent in the commodity relation; the translation of all relationships into value-form and the alienating effect that this has on the relationships of men.

> "Money, since it has the property of purchasing everything, of appropriating objects to itself, is therefore the object par excellence. The universal character of this property corresponds to the omnipotence of money, which is regarded as an omnipotent essence ... money is the pander between need and the object, between human life and the means of existence. But that which mediates my life, mediates also the existence of other men for me. It is for me the other person ...." (58)

Here lies the answer to Stendhal's question, 'Why aren't men happy in the world?' and to Lawrence's problem of unspontaneity. The only way in which men can be happy and spontaneous is if this unconscious essence of unfreedom is removed and 'aufgehoben' - negated, overcome. In this way, the realistic novel is itself a way of fighting alienation because it makes visible this unconscious essence, this mediator. 'Internal mediation' is an element which runs throughout capitalist society because of the fetishising and reifying of men's relationships. The genius of the artist is that he has the ability to tap reality for other people and reveals this element. What may appear just the chance history of an individual shows that there is a relationship between this character and the characteristic world of feeling of society and that this relationship is universal. This gives the reader hope that order can be made out of chaos, and in this sense, the realistic 'novelistic' novel is not merely about alienation but part of the fight against alienation.

Marx emphasises the dehumanizing effect of money which deforms mankind.

> "Shakespeare emphasises two aspects of money:
>
> (1) It is the visible divinity, the transformation of all human and natural qualities into their opposite, the general distortion and inversion of things; it reconciles impossibilities;
>
> (2) It is the universal whore, the universal pander between men and nations.
> 'The distortion and inversion of all human and natural qualities, the reconciliation of all impossibilities - the divine power - in money derives from its being essentially the alienated, alienating and self-alienating essence of the human species. It is the property of all mankind alienated. What I cannot do as a man, what is beyond my innate capacities, I accomplish through money. Money thus transforms each of these essential capacities into something that it is not in itself, this is, into its opposite." (59)

The hostility of the capitalist mode of production towards art is exemplified in the capitalist division of labour. Humanism then, which is the demand for the free development of the 'whole man' is therefore opposed - must be opposed - to the capitalist mode of production which brings about men's disintegration.

We have talked earlier about 'mediation' or exposure as a critique of the commodity relationship. Having shown that the question of 'money' is one of mediation, how is this related to commodity fetishism? Again, the commodity relation is a classic example of triangular desire. The capitalist division of labour demands that a man sells his labour power in order to earn money to satisfy his needs and desires. Man himself becomes a commodity and has a use-value and an exchange value. This is what fragments man and alienates him from himself, from his labour, from other men and from nature. He is put on the market and the market is a mediator in relation to his needs.

The problem of commodities is a central problem for us in our aesthetic considerations. However, it is more than this, for it cannot be considered in isolation as an aesthetic problem or an economic one, but as the central problem of a capitalist society in all its aspects.

The essence of commodity structure is that a relationship between people is distorted so that it takes a character of a thing and therefore acquires a 'phantom objectivity'. This objectivity has an autonomy which conceals all trace of its fundamental nature - that is, the social relations between men. It must be pointed out that this problem of commodity fetishism is specific to capitalist society and is not a permanent, universal phenomena. The question here is, how far and in what way is commodity exchange able to influence the total life of society?

The first point is that it made essentially episodic appearances in primitive societies. Marx says this about it:

> "As a matter of fact, the exchange of commodities originates not within the primitive communities, but where they end, on their borders at the few points where they come into contact with other communities. That is where barter begins, and from here it strikes back into the interior of the community, decomposing it." (60)

However, even when commodities have this decomposing effect on the internal structure of a society, it is not enough to make them constitutive of that society. To do this, the commodity structure must penetrate throughout society and remould it in its own image. This did not take place until the advent of capitalism, and as this process of the universalizing of commodity structure becomes more

advanced and more complex, it becomes more and more difficult to see through this veil of reification to the true nature of economic relations. We believe that the great novelist is of such insight that he is able to do this. Coupled with the fact that reification becomes more and more difficult to penetrate is the ironical fact that the commodity can only be understood in its true essence when it becomes the universal category of society as a whole. Only then does the reification which it produces have decisive importance for the evolution of society and men's attitudes towards it. The commodity then becomes a means of subjugating men's consciousness and their attempts to revolt against reification.

Marx describes reification as follows:

> "A commodity is therefore a mysterious thing, simply because in it, the social character of men's labours appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation existing not between themselves but between the products ot their labour. This is the reason why the products of labour become commodities, social things whose qualities are at the same time perceptible and imperceptible to the senses ... It is only a definite social relation between men that assumes, in their eyes, a fantastic form of a relation between things." (61)

The important thing here is that, because of this, man's own activity becomes something object and because of its alien autonomy exerts a control over him. Objectively, a world of objects and relations between things comes into being and confronts man as powerful forces. Subjectively, a man's activity, his labour, becomes a commodity independent of him.

> "What is characteristic of the capitalist age", says Marx, "is that in the eyes of the labourer himself, labour-power assumes the form of a commodity belonging to him. On the other hand it is only at this moment that the commodity form of the products of labour becomes general." (62)

Therefore, the fact that the commodity form is universal accounts both objectively and subjectively for the abstraction of labour incorporated in commodities.

It we look at the development of labour under capitalism we see a continuous trend towards greater rationalisation and specialisation until the full division of labour is complete and the activity loses

all of its human attributes. Also, fragmentation of the object of production, entails fragmentation of the subject. Man ceases to be master of the process of production and is incorporated at part of the system which functions with or without him. He is forced more and more into a contemplative role in the process.

In addition to this, the fragmentation of the process of production also destroys the bonds between people and the bonds which linked people to the community while production was still 'organic'. Work therefore, no longer brings individuals together organically, as Lawrence points out in 'Sons and Lovers', and (63) 'Women in Love'. (64) As rationalisation of labour increased and the commodity became universally dominant, the fate of the worker became that of society as a whole. Indeed, this had to be so in order for industrialization to develop. Industrial capitalism depends on the 'free' worker who is able to sell his labour-power as a commodity in the market place. Reification requires that a society satisfies all of its needs in terms of commodity exchange. The situation of the worker is that his only 'possession' is his labour-power, and this transformation of a human function into a commodity reveals the dehumanising nature of the commodity relation. This rational objectivication conceals above all the immediate character of things as things. When use-values appear universally as commodities, they acquire a new objectivity which they did possess in pre-capitalist societies and which destroys their original substantiality. We reach a point where it is only with the utmost difficulty that the true relations between men can be perceived through the reified terms of commodity relations. With the onset of mechanisation every facet of the personality is repressed and only one faculty is detached - man's labour-power - to become a commodity. In this way, the commodity relation penetrates the whole consciousness of man and it is this which is exposed in the 'realistic' novel.

We can, therefore, see a connection between 'realism' and 'alienation' in that realism is necessary for the exposure and overcoming of alienation, or what Lawrence calls 'unspontaneity', in human relationships. It is a means of achieving true consciousness by cutting through the fetishised world of appearances. This alienation or 'mediation', as Girard puts it, is exemplified in the commodity relation which permiates capitalist society. The realistic novel exposes this distortion, this fetishism, and hence fights against it. Girard's 'mediated desire', Lawrence's 'unspontaneity' and 'class-pride',

Stendhal's 'vanite', Proust's 'snobbism' and Marx's 'fetishism' all have the same meaning. Hence we have a relationship between all the central factors involved. In treating 'mediation' as a 'significant structure', to use Goldmann's terminology, we shall attempt to use genetic structuralism as a general method, bearing in mind the limitations which we have noted in this chapter. If 'realism' in the novel can therefore be said to lie in the nature of the 'mediation', we have also a specific aesthetic tool which we can now apply to Lawrence's novels in order to test out the hypothesis. That is, that Lawrence, in his criticism of industrialism and observations on class consciousness, is a realistic novelist, not only in the manner of the English 'tradition', but also of Proust, Cervantes and Stendhal, and all other novelists who expose the nature of mediated desire.

In the following sections we shall examine the concrete expression which Lawrence's world-view assumes in every day life. Goldmann puts it thus:

> "He (the historian of literature) must also ask what social and individual reasons there are to explain why this visinn should have been expressed in this particular way at this particular time. In addition, he should not be satisfied with noting the inconsistencies and variations which prevent the working question from being an absolutely coherent expression of the world vision which corresponds to it; such inconsistencies in variations, are not merely facts which the historian should note; they are problems which he must solve, and their solution will lead him to take into account not only the social and historical factors which accompanied the production of the work but also ... factors related to the life and psychological make-up of the particular author ..." (65)

REFERENCES : CHAPTER I

1. POSPOLOV, G.N. 'Literature and Society'. International Social Science Journal. Vo. 19. 1967. p.542.
2. WELLEK, R. and WARREN, A. The Theory of Literature. Peregrine. 1963. pp.94-95.
3. ANDERSON, P. 'Components of the National Culture'. New Left Review. No.50. p.51.
4. LUNARCHARSKY, A. On Literature and Art. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1965.
5. MARX, K. German Ideology. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1964. (Part 1).
6. MARX, K. Early Writings. (Ed.) T.B. Bottomore, C.A. Watts. 1963. pp.190-191.
7. STENDHAL. Scarlet and Black. Penguin. 1969.
8. LAURENSON, D. and SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. Paladin. 1972. pp.14-15.
9. LOWENTHAL, L. Literature and the Image of Man. Cf. F.R. LEAVIS. The Great Tradition. Chatto & Windus. 1948.
10. LUKACS, G. Writer and Critic. Merlin. 1970. p.34.
11. ENGELS, F. Quoted in Writer and Critic. p.35.
12. IBID. p.64.
13. Cf. ENGELS, F. on "The Illiad', in Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State. Chicago. 1902.
14. MARX, K. & ENGELS, F. On Literature and Art. New York:International Publishers. 1947. p.18.
15. LUKACS, G. Writer and Critic. p.77.
16. LUKACS, G. Studies in European Realism. Merlin. 1972.
17. PLENKANOV, G. Art and Social Life. Lawrence & Wishart. 1953. p.164.
18. LUKACS, G. The Meaning of Contemporary Realism. Merlin. 1963. pp.17-92.
19. LUKACS, G. Writer and Critic. p.77.
20. LUKACS, G. The Historical Novel. Merlin. 1962.
21. LAURENSON, D. & SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. p.57.
22. TROTSKY, L. The Basic Writings of Trotsky. (Ed.) I. Howe. Secker & Warberg. 1963. pp.343-356.
23. DUVIGNAUD, J. The Sociology of Art. Paladin. 1973. p.40.
24. IBID. p.42.
25. SHKLOVSKY, V. Quoted in D. Laurenson & A. Swingewood. The Sociology of Literature. p.60.
26. GOLDMANN, L. 'The Sociology of Literature : Status and Problems of Method'. International Social Science Journal. Vol. 19. 1967. pp.495-496.
27. GOLDMANN, L. The Human Sciences and Philosophy. Cape. 1969.
28. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. Merlin. 1971.
29. IBID. p.27.

(Cont.)

30. GOLDMANN, L. The Human Sciences and Philosophy. pp.35-36.
31. IBID. pp.62-64.
32. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. R.K.P. 1964. p.17.
33. GOLDMANN, L. Pour une Sociologie du Roman. Paris:Gallimard. 1964. p.345.
34. IBID. p.348.
35. DUVIGNAUD, J. The Sociology of Art. p.39.
36. LAURENSON, D. & SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. p.66.
37. WILLIAMS, R. 'Literature and Society'. New Left Review. No.67. p.13.
38. GOLDMANN, L. The Human Sciences and Philosophy. p.102.
39. IBID. pp.102-103.
40. IBID. p.118.
41. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. (See Part 1, and Chapter XV).
42. LAURENSON, D. & SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. p.71.
43. GRAMSCI, A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Lawrence and Wishart. 1971.
44. GOLDMANN, L. Pour une Sociologie du Roman. p.348.
45. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel : Self and Other Literary Structure. Baltimore. John Hopkins. 1965.
46. IBID. pp.2-3.
47. SCHELER, M. Ressentiment. New York:Free Press. 1960.
48. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel : Self and Other Literary Structure. p.14.
49. IBID. p.15.
50. IBID. p.16.
51. GOLDMANN, L. 'Genetic Structuralism in the Sociology of Literature'. The Sociology of Literature and Drama. (Ed.) E. Burns & T. Burns. Penguin. 1973. pp.118-119.
52. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.69.
53. IBID. p.77.
54. GOLDMANN, L. Quoted in The Sociology of Literature and Drama. (Ed.) E. Burns & T. Burns. p.108.
55. GIRARD, R. 'From the 'Divine Comedy' to the Sociology of the Novel'. Ibid. p.108.
56. MARX, K. 'Preface to the Critique of Political Economy'. Marx and Engels : Selected Works. Moscow:Foreign Language Publishing House. 1958. pp.362-363.
57. MARX, K. Selected Writings in Sociology. (Ed.) T. Bottomore & M. Rubel. Penguin. 1967. p.179.

(Cont.)

58. IBID. p.181.
59. MARX, K. Early Writings. (Ed.) T. Bottomore. C.A. Watts. p.192.
60. MARX, K. Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. New York: Charles Kerr. 1904. p.53.
61. MARX, K. Capital, Vol.I. Lawrence and Wishart. 1959. p.72.
62. IBID. p.170.
63. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. Penguin. 1967.
64. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. Penguin. 1972.
65. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.19.

CHAPTER II : THE WHOLE AND THE PARTS

I

> "All things flow and change, and not even change is absolute. The whole is a strange assembly of apparently incongruous parts, slipping past one another." (1)

In the following chapters we shall study a number of texts which are clearly defined units of empirical facts: "Sons and Lovers", "Women in Love", and "The Rainbow". We shall try to show that these are more understandable in terms of construction and subject matter when they are analysed from a dialectical standpoint. Our dialectical position states that there is no definite starting point from which to tackle a problem, and no problem which is finally and definitely solved. Consequently we cannot move forward in an absolutely straight line, since each fact or idea only reveals its importance when it takes its place in the whole. Similarly, the whole is only understood by our knowledge of the parts which constitute it.

The dialectical method is one of movement forward and back, from the whole to the parts and back again, in which increased knowledge of one throws light on the other. It is clear, therefore, that this will not be a complete study of Lawrence; by definition it cannot be so. We can only hope to bring to light new aspects of his work and pose new questions which will have to be modified and redefined in later studies.

Empirical facts must be integrated into a whole in order to be made concrete and fully comprehensible. In the previous chapter we criticised sociologists of literature for their blatant disregard for the works themselves, in basing their opinions entirely on epiphenomena. In this thesis we hope to redress this balance, moreover it must be pointed out that any hypothesis about literature arrived at from an examination of the social context in which the literature was composed, must, in the last analysis, be borne out by the art itself. However, the works of an author cannot be understood by looking only at what he writes, although they are the deciding factor in any conflict of opinion. We therefore quote Goldmann with this reservation in mind.

> "Ideas are only a partial aspect of a less abstract reality: that of the whole, living man. And in his turn, this man is only an element of a whole made up of the social group to which he belongs. An idea which he expresses or a book which

> he writes can acquire their real meaning for us, and can be fully understood only when they are seen as an integral part of his life and mode of behaviour. Moreover, it often happens that the mode of behaviour which enables us to understand a particular work is not that of the author himself, but that of the whole social group; and, when the work with which we are concerned is of particular importance, the behaviour is that of a whole social class." (2)

We must therefore make a distinction between Lawrence's 'mode of behaviour' as an individual, and his 'mode of behaviour' or 'world-view' as the member of a social group. In many cases, the complex relationship which a writer has with other men may separate his daily life from his creative imagination, therefore it renders the relationship between him and his social group too indirect to be analysed with any accuracy. In these cases, it is useless to try and understand works by simply studying the author's life because subjective meanings of the writer may differ from their objective significance. Balzac is the example which is usually given of such a case. Lawrence himself says:

> "The novel is a perfect medium for revealing to us the changing rainbow of our living relationships. The novel can help us live, as nothing else can ... if the novelist keeps his thumb out of the pan." (3)

> "Oh, give me the novel! Let me hear what the novel says. As for the novelist, he is usually a dribbling liar." (4)

Therefore, while a detailed study of Lawrence's <u>personal</u> life may not help us greatly to understand his novels, they can be partially explained, says Goldmann, by a study of his 'world-view' in relation to that of the social group from which he came. Obviously, we cannot exclude the study of biographical details as these often provide useful information. However, any explanation based entirely on such data will necessarily be partial and can never provide the final basis for a hypothesis.

What we have called 'world-view' is a convenient term for the whole complex of ideas, aspirations and feelings which links the members of a social group, and which opposes them to members of other social groups. Those who express this 'world-view' on an imaginative plane, are artists; and the more closely their works express this 'vision', the more they achieve the maximum possible awareness of the social group which they are a part of. The questions which must be posed are as follows: what was the social and economic position of Lawrence's social group, what were its characteristic attitudes (world-view), what are the attitudes expressed in the novels and how, if at all, do they

compare? Also, is it possible to pinpoint what Goldmann calls 'a significant structure' in Lawrence's world-view, which informs the structure of his novels? In future studies one would have to look at other novelists and see if this 'significant structure' is present, and whether it has the same meaning. One would then relate this 'part' to a greater 'whole'.

Our dialectical method is therefore intended to say something, not only about one writer, but also about the novel in general. It passes from the wider social context to the specific text and back to the whole novel form.

For Goldmann, social class is the most important aspect of 'world-view', and indeed, we agree with this. However, there are other aspects. Firstly his position as an intellectual, secondly, his relation to the preceding literary 'tradition' (or what Goldmann calls the effect of 'influences'). We must say now, that these 'influences' do not explain a great deal, they merely form part of the overall picture.

> "At any given historical moment every writer, thinker and likewise, every social group, is surrounded by a large number of positions which are religious, moral, political etc., and these constitute so many possible influences. From among them the writer, thinker, or social group selects one system or a small number of them, and this selection will be really influential. The problem posed to the historian and the sociologist is not that of knowing whether Kant was influenced by Hume ... but why they sustained precisely this influence in this particular period of their history or their life." (5)

Obviously, any discussion of English intellectuals in the late 19th and early 20th century must inevitably be bound up with English literary culture and vice versa. But, before proceeding it is necessary to discuss the phenomena of the intellectual in greater detail.

In view of Lawrence's social background, the question which Gramsci asks is an interesting one:

> "Are intellectuals an independent social class or does every social class have its own specialised category of intellectuals?" (6)

The problem is a complex one because of the forms taken by the real historical processes of the formation of different categories of intellectuals. Gramsci points to two important forms; firstly, every social class coming into existence on the basis of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates with it, organically, one or

more groups of intellectuals who give it homogeneity and consciousness of its function in the economic, social and political field. If not all capitalists, at least an elite of them, must have the capacity for organising society in general, because of the need to create the most favourable conditions for the expansion of its own class.

The second form is that every 'essential' social class emerging from the preceding structure, and as a result of the development of this structure, has found intellectual categories which were pre-existent and which appeared as representatives of a historical continuity which had been uninterrupted by the most complicated and radical changes in social and political forms. An example which Gramsci points to is 'the ecclesiastics'. The point about such groups is that they have a sense of historical continuity, and also see themselves as autonomous from the ruling social group. This, says Gramsci, gives rise to an idealist philosophy.

> "All men are intellectuals ... but all men do not have the function of intellectuals in society." (7)

In distinguishing between intellectuals and non-intellectuals therefore, we are only referring to an immediate social function. Every man outside of his own occupation, says Gramsci, shares a conception of the world and so contributes towards encouraging new modes of thought. To this extent, the notion of 'the intellectuals' is false. All men are intellectuals by way of having an intellect and using it, but not all are intellectuals by social function. Intellectuals in the functional sense fall into two groups.

Firstly, 'traditional' intellectuals such as writers, critics and scientists, whose social position has an inter-class aura about it, but ultimately derives from past and present class relations and has attachments to historical class formations.

Secondly, 'organic' intellectuals, distinguished not by profession but by function in directing the ideas and the aspirations of the class to which they organically belong.

In the early stages of British capitalism, the intellectuals made no attempt to think of themselves as a separate 'class' and their bonds with the church were strong until the nineteenth century. As a result of this, the intellectuals tended to be more reactionary than their mother class (with notable exceptions). The only group to exhibit any independence at all were the writers and artists such as Carlyle, Ruskin, and the Pre-Raphaelites. Such artists were hardly to be called 'revolut-

ionary' thinkers, and at best, were merely advocating refinements to a bourgeois ideology. Until the eighties and nineties and the upgrowth of a bohemian intelligensia, there was complete absorbtion of the intellectuals into the mother class. Moreover, as Gramsci points out, the new social grouping that grew up on the basis of modern industrialism shows a remarkable economic-corporate development, but advances very slowly in the intellectual and political field. There is an extensive category of organic intellectuals - that is, those who came into being on the same industrial terrain as the economic group - but in the higher sphere we find that the old land-owning class preserves its position of virtual monopoly. It loses its economic power but holds onto its intellectual and political supremacy, and is assimilated as a 'traditional' intelligensia and as a directive group by the bourgeoisie. (8)

Anderson also has noted this and claims that the 'unconsummated' (9) nature of the English revolution left no core of bourgeois revolutionary theory for emerging social classes to draw upon, as it had in France. One reason for this was the lack of any necessity for the intelligensia to attack the church - a foil which had provided the basis for much revolutionary thinking in France.

Of Lawrence's position as an intellectual one can say several things. Firstly, if Gramsci's theory is correct that each social group has the capacity for creating its own category of intellectuals, Lawrence can be said to be a petit-bourgeois intellectual. He was, in his own opinion, at odds with the reactionary, elitist intelligensia of the middle class such as T.S. Eliot, as we shall see later on. Also, he had no conscious love of the working class, although his aim of attacking bourgeois hegemony in order to create a 'new morality' was the same as theirs. (At first, that is).

Secondly, is his great, early novels, as an 'organic' intellectual of the petit-bourgeoisie, his 'world-view' and that of his social group give rise to profoundly <u>realistic</u> art, despite the idealism of his expressed alternative as a social philosophy, in that the historical ambitions of the petit-bourgeoisie necessitated a humanistic attack on middle class culture. Whether this is also true of other writers in this position is open to question.

Thirdly, with the failure of these historical ambitions, and the new role of Lawrence as a member of the 'traditional' intelligensia, this realism is no longer evident. The problem of the relationships between human beings and the subtle distortion of those relationships by industrialism, which had provided the themes for his earlier work, is no longer dealt with.

Fourthly, as an English author, certain pre-existing 'intellectual categories' were bound to influence him.

II

The 'social' novel arises in 1830 circa. and reached its zenith in 1840-50. There is a watershed around 1848 when the working-class movement both in England and in Europe collapsed. After this, fatigue set in to the progressive strata of society and the novel lost some of its aggressiveness. Social problems were not solved, but the edge was removed and we begin to see the advent of a more inward looking, psychological approach such as George Eliot's.

Eliot's intellectualism was not the only reason for this approach, for it was also a symptom of the recession of the social in favour of the psychological. The 'psychological novel' became the literary genre of the intelligensia as a cultural strata engaged in the process of emancipating itself from the bourgeoisie, just as the social novel was still fundamentally the literary form of a cultural stratum at one with the bourgeoisie.

However, it is not until the start of the Victorian period that the intelligensia comes through as a definable group which felt itself 'beyond all class distinction', 'mediating' between the various classes. (10) Until this time there had never been an intelligensia with any ideas of independence from the middle class and in revolt against it. A cultural stratum only maintains its position and its connection with the hegemonic class as long as this class allows it to have its own way. The estrangement which had been created between this class and the literary elite by the Romantic movement was smoothed over with the gradual conversion of the Romantic writers to conservatism. Writers such as Dickens were reformers who never considered the idea of changing society. They were, in fact, tolerated and esteemed by the middle class because of their function as a safety-valve, and their ability to give expression to the crises of conscience which were causing tension within the ranks of the middle class itself.

Only after its victory over the workers' movement and the defeat of Chartism did the bourgeoisie feel itself safe from any need for self-criticism. Thus the literary elite was deprived of its raison d'etre and tended to become isolated between the proletariat and the middle class. This 'independence' was also in accordance with the illusion cherished by this group that 'beauty' was above class distinction. The intellectuals tried to foster the notion of beauty and truth as absolute values because it made them appear as representatives of a 'higher'

reality and therefore a compensation for their lack of influence. For the bourgeoisie, this was convenient because it made a case for reality being composed of universal values to which any notion of class-differences was irrelevant. Like 'art for art's sake', this 'truth for truth's sake' idea is merely the product of the estrangement on the part of the intellectuals from practical affairs. Following up Girard's thesis here, it is evident that jealousy and resentment are at work on the part of the intellectuals towards the mother class. The group thinking that it possesses the truth resents the class which holds the power.

This composition of this cultural group was heterogeneous and therefore felt the boundaries dividing ideologies and cultures more sharply than earlier groups. This produced a sharper edge to its social criticism. From the beginning its task was to be the ideological mouthpiece of the middle class. In a world of practical business it fulfilled the function of contemplative thinking - introversion and sublimation. However, now that the bonds between the intellectuals and the middle class were loosened, the bourgeoisie began to criticise such intellectual notions as the principle of dynamics and renewal in anarchy, whilst the intelligensia became an agent of revolt. After 1848, it was more and more the champion of the working class. It felt its own insecurity at one with that of the working class. We believe that at the time of Lawrence's work, the new white collar class of the petit-bourgeoisie was in a position where their social aims were in some conjunction with the proletariat. The position of Lawrence as a petit-bourgeois intellectual therefore gives an added dimension to this for it can be said that the situation of the intelligensia had not changed from that outlined above by the end of the century. This is not to say that the intellectuals of the nineteen hundreds were all supporters of the workers, merely that they had as their aim the refashioning of society. Both left wing and right wing shared a similar discontentment, but what each saw as an alternative was different. This in the end gives us an explanation for the collapse of realism in Lawrence's work. As a mere pinpointer of ailments in society and their causes he provides us with a realistic picture of life under capitalism. Also, his characters take on a life of their own and become real. However, when the history of the new white-collar petit bourgeoisie could be seen to be inseparable from that of the middle class, Lawrence begins to let polemics override his art and puts forward an essentially reactionary social philosophy. Thus realism vanishes as Lukacs points out in his book, "Writer and Critic." Also, with the realisation of the true situation, (11) the political aims of this group became radically and obviously opposed to those of the proletariat.

The reasons for the insecurity of such groups must be looked for in the social upheaval which Britain went through from the fifties onwards. This entailed a change in social status for certain strata and the creation of new strata such as the new white collar workers. D. Mirsky in his book, "The Intelligensia of Great Britain", sees the major factor as being the economic rivalry of new capitalist countries which robbed Britain of its 'natural monopoly' position. This ended the social peace which had reigned since the defeat of Chartism in 1848. With the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, the middle class had been able to prevent any upsurge in revolutionary activity by a programme of liberal reforms. The problem was that this policy could only be carried out because of its low cost, therefore with the decline of Britain's monopoly position as the 'workshop of the world', this policy came to an end. In 1886, unemployment demonstrations took place and were followed by a dock strike in 1889. The only development which prevented these disturbances from continuing was, says Mirsky, the discovery of gold in the Transvaal in 1885 and the opening up of Africa in 1884-5. This boost to the economy enabled the middle class to stabilize certain higher layers of the working class and opened up the era of imperialist expansion. (12)

This new era produced 'imperialism' and 'socialism' as systems of thought. In the eighties the Fabian Socialists appeared and although they thought themselves to be above classes, it was a middle class movement. There were, nevertheless, signs of a new intellectual strata in the foundations of this movement. Most of this new strata was spawned by the petit-bourgeoisie. Since the 1850's there had been the growth of a new educated group of workers; factory inspectors, school inspectors, statisticians and so on. In the 1880's this growth became rapid when the reforming of local government created a demand for new men. Added to this was the foundation of new universities and the fact that the reform of the elementary and secondary school systems, and the establishment of a centralised state school system, made possible the formation of an educated lower middle class and working class.

This 'new intelligensia' of the petit-bourgeoisie was more advanced than the middle class. Also, it was not directly interested in the process of capitalist production. It considered itself above classes and to be an embodiment of 'society as a whole'. Of the Fabians, Engels wrote in a letter to Sorge:

they are,

> "an ambitious group here in London who have understanding enough to realise the inevitability of social revolution but who could not possibly entrust this gigantic task to the rough proletariat alone and therefore are kind enough to set themselves at its head. Fear of the revolution is their fundamental principle." (13)

George Bernard Shaw, the chief spokesman of the Fabians, shared many of Lawrence's convictions about the proletariat and the middle class, and although Lawrence never aligned himself explicitly with any political group, thinking his art to be above class antagonisms, we can find in his muddled social philosophy many strands of petit-bourgeois radicalism - Fabianism in particular. Shaw had no great liking for the working class.

> "... I was not old then and had no other feeling for the working classes than an intense desire to abolish them and replace them by sensible people." (14)

> "... We should refuse to tolerate poverty as a social institution not because the poor are the salt of the earth but because the poor in a lump are bad." (15)

We must add that he hated the rich equally.

> "For my part I hate the poor and look forward eagerly to their extermination. I pity the rich a little, but am equally bent on their extermination." (16)

If we compare this with Lawrence's ideas we can see a certain resemblance. His dislike of the working class has often been seen as stemming from his hatred of his father, and obviously this cannot be entirely ignored. However, when viewed in terms of the social and political position of the lower middle class intelligensia at the turn of the century we can discover a more valid hypothesis. Lawrence's situation like that of Shaw's was such that he felt not only the need but also the opportunity to create a new culture separate from the dominant bourgeois hegemony. This vision of a new morality was based on a misconception that the petit-bourgeoisie could exist as a class in itself. Nevertheless, several effects resulted from this world-vision. Firstly, that middle class society must be attacked, hence the denigration of industrialism and the effects on human relationships of a society based on commodity relations. Secondly, a hatred of the rich, and thirdly a fear of the organised working class.

It is significant for Lawrence's realism that this hatred of the proletariat is not as simple as it seems. The treatment of his father in "Sons and Lovers" is one example. As Dorothy Van Ghent has shown, although Paul Morel's father is portrayed as a brutal human being he is the one character in the book who remains true to himself. (17) It is also made clear that the reason for his brutalisation is to be found not in his own character, but in the dehumanising process of industrialism to which he is subjected. Thus, fear is mingled with respect, and the realisation that man is only free from mediation and alienation when he has attained a direct relationship with his labour. (There are several examples of this idea in the novel which I will discuss fully in Chapter Four). Lawrence, then, was true to himself as an artist and as a realist in that he realised even at this stage that any change in society and any new morality could only come from the power of the working class. But as we pointed out in Chapter One, the realism of his novels does not necessarily correspond with the artist's own personal philosophy. This realisation of the hopelessness of his strata's historical aims contains the seeds of what I have called Lawrence's 'tragic vision'. As Girard says of Stendhal's hero Julien Sorel, once a man has discovered the roots of internal mediation and realised his inability to change them, he is unable to face life and has no other alternative but to die. This is the fate, (metaphorically speaking) of all of the heroes in Lawrence's realistic novels. (18)

The Fabian movement is important, says Williams, because it fused two strands of a tradition which had hitherto opposed each other. That is, the fusing of the ideas of Ruskin and Carlyle with those of Mill and Bentham.

Following the Fabian movement came that of the Guild Socialists. This was inaugerated by Cole, Hobson, Orage and Penty. They attempted to offer an alternative to the intellectual theories of Fabianism:

> "The abolition of a wage system, the establishment of self-government in industry through a system of national guilds working in conjunction with other democratic functional organisations in the community." (19)

This line of thinking can be summed up, says Williams, in the word 'community' rather than 'state'. Again, elements of this idea can be detected in Lawrence. Novels such as "The Rainbow", and "Sons and Lovers" both deal with the destruction of the community due to the onset of

industrialism. Also, he himself attempted to found a 'community' in the form of a commune although the plans never got off the ground in any practical way. Such ideas were based on idealistic nonsense.

The first few decades of the twentieth century see a split between Lawrence and the right wing radical intellectuals like the Bloomsbury Group who merely wanted a rejuvenation of bourgeois culture and not the creation of something totally new as Lawrence did. The first years of the century also show a gradual undermining of Victorian life. Sexual morals changed, partly due to the investigations of antropologists into primitive culture and the appearance of works such as Frazer's "Golden Bough". Lawrence examines this decadent fascination for primitivism and introversion in "Women in Love" and comes out firmly against its corrupting influence.

The years before the Great War saw great hopes for British capitalism. The growth of productive forces saw a 'technical revolution' and a great increase in the intermediate class of black-coated workers as the backbone of all manner of reformism. However, as the war approached, the great hopes began to break down. This corresponds exactly to the development of Lawrence's world-view. The first novels begin in an optimistic mood although even they are tinged with tragedy as we shall see. After "Sons and Lovers" there is a gradual move towards pessimism as the vision he and his strata had held of their historical destiny became more and more unrealistic. Thus, we are left at the end of "Women in Love" with the two main characters left in limbo, unsure of what they want and the possibility of obtaining it.

With the end of the war, Dostoyevsky's cult of faith became important for the intelligensia and replaced George Bernard Shaw's nationalistic and rationalistic philosophy. The movement aimed at liberating the individual from social obligations. Meanwhile, from the late 1900's onwards, working class struggles were growing in intensity and whilst the workers tried to prevent the British government from intervening in Russia, the intellectuals withdrew deeper into their shells.

With all the distinctions between those who followed the Fabians and those who opted for Dostoyevsky and Freud, the two groups nevertheless did not remain distinct. The first group to emerge from the junction was based in Cambridge and combined middle class radicalism with an interest in highly abstract problems. This became known as the Bloomsbury

Group and was comprised of Bertrand Russell, Keynes, Strachey and Virgina Woolf. The basic traits of the group were philosophical rationalism, political rationalism, aestheticism and the cult of individuality. Mirsky says this of the group:

> it was,
>
> "a thin-skinned humanism for the enlightened and sensitive members of the capitalist class who do not desire the outer world to be such as might be prone to cause them any displeasing impression." (20)

All members of the Bloomsbury Group came from or married into an intellectual aristocracy: an elite of Oxford and Cambridge academic and intermarried families, attached to principles of high minded reformism and establishment norms. Lawrence wrote of them in a letter to David Garnett:

> "I feel I should go mad when I think of your set, Duncan Grant, Keynes and Birrell. It makes me dream of beetles ..." (21)

Lawrence was incompatible with the intellectualism of Bloomsbury. The aims of the group differed from those of Lawrence in that they were not attempting to replace the established order. He resented their wealth and their hold on literary and intellectual life which was a factor restraining an active interest in politics amongst writers in the twenties.

> "The patronage of the literati hurt Lawrence's pride, and he became conscious of the gulf between the artist who was a working schoolmaster, and the young artists who, often penniless themselves, yet lived within a charmed circle of influence and wealth." (22)

In "Women in Love", Lawrence lays bare the decadence and brutality behind the philosophy of this group with his descriptions of Hermoine and Loerke and the general atmosphere of Breadalby and the Cafe Royale.

We come now to the problem of Fascism. Lawrence has been branded as a harbringer of Fascism by Marxist critics such as Christopher Cauldwell but his relationship to this ideology is by no means simple. (23) Also, when discussing this, we have again to make the distinction between what his personal ideas were, and what he wrote in his novels. To most contemporaries, Fascism appeared as an unexpected product of the Great War. However, faith in progress had been shaken since before the war, not only amongst intellectuals but also amongst sections of the public.

The intellectuals who affiliated themselves to the movement regarded themselves as the guardians of ultimate values in society and saw Fascism as a way of realising these values. Needless to say, most of these intellectuals did not fully understand the mechanics of the movement. Their commitment was based on the dilemma that the society which was left after the war did not function properly and that its instability had to be transcended. Also, Fascism promised to restore culture to a society in which great art could flourish. It was believed that the liberal bourgeois age had collapsed and that art had been swamped in its shallow materialism. Certain artists saw the heart of the problem as the opening up of the human personality, therefore the transcendance of the present situation must emphasise the restoration of culture. Such intellectuals found their answer in Fascism which tended to describe the nation in aesthetic terms.

Many artists at first supported socialism but were repudiated and alienated as a growing orthodoxy amongst socialists made them increasingly suspicious of the allegiance of intellectuals to a working class to which they could not claim to belong. Also, it appeared that there was no room within traditional socialism for their art. As Christopher Cauldwell asserted, there was no neutral world of art which was free from deteriorating causes. (24)

If Lawrence is to be seen as having Fascist tendencies they were certainly at varience with other acknowledged supporters, at least in terms their ideas on culture. Lawrence can be viewed in some ways as the last of the Romantic movement, but the Fascist sympathizers of the English intelligensia favoured the very opposite. As John Harrison points out, Pound, Wyndham-Lewis and Eliot, all opposed Romanticism in the name of Classicism and a more austere approach to art. They felt (25) themselves to be an elite who alone understood Britain's cherished cultural heritage. However, position as artists came into conflict with the Fascist concept of hierarchy which was based on function and not on status, and on the needs of Fascism as a mass movement. They were caught in the cleft stick of wanting to participate in a mass movement which tended to compromise the cultural ideals of people who were deeply bound by bourgeois tastes and morals. Hamilton makes the point:

> "Ultimately, Yeats and Wyndham-Lewis were trying to achieve an intellectual integrity untarnished by politics ... Pound's madness lay in supporting his

> Utopia until the end. The others ... had drawn back in time. There came a moment when the writers using for their art ideas which could prove monstrous if put into practice, had to go against their artistic principles on a human level, in their day to day existence as men." (26)

Around 1925, a discussion developed between the Classicists and the Romanticists which marks a decisive stage in what Mirsky dramatically calls, the progress of some of the intelligensia, "from individualistic liberalism to disciplined fascism." The former group were led by (27) T.S. Eliot and were supporters of hierarchy and classical discipline. The latter, had their leader in Middleton Murray, a former friend of Lawrence.

In "After Strange Gods", Eliot's book on Lawrence, his themes are orthodoxy and tradition. He describes 'the struggle for our time' as being:

> "to re-establish a vital connection between the individual and the race ... the struggle against Liberalism." (28)

The stress of the book falls on the religious needs of the age. Eliot feels that Lawrence's work 'will appeal not to what remains of health in them, but to their sickness.' He then evokes Wyndham-Lewis as a writer whose work is far more healthy. We can see therefore a growth of right wing ideology after the war; amongst certain sections of the cultural elite, and although they denied having any interest in politics they were, in fact, writing politically whilst British capitalism fought off the crises of the General Strike, the Depression, and the growth of Nazi Germany. This is another argument against their claims for being above class antagonisms in their search for 'universal values.'

How then, in the light of this, does Lawrence relate to Fascism? There are aspects of his work which can be seen as having Fascist tendencies, particularly in "The Plumed Serpent" and "Aaron's Rod", but we are saying that Lawrence is misrepresented in that it is just as valid, on this basis, to select pieces from his muddled ideas on social issues which even at the end of his life were profoundly democratic. Scant attention is paid, in this respect, to his greatest novels which were produced before the petit-bourgeoisie had become a reactionary element in society. These, we hope to show, are works of a realistic nature which reveal the basis of social relationships without the later strident calls for the 'man of authority' to put society right. They show a great faith in humanity and a belief in the need to destroy alienation and restore the 'whole man'. This cannot be equated with Fascism in any shape or form.

III

All writers work within a tradition, an inherited literary and intellectual culture, and his own work will show in various ways the influence of this background. Writers are influenced also by other cultural traditions, especially philosophy and politics. The important point is not to examine these 'influences' in an abstract manner, but to determine to what extent he absorbs the influence and moulds it to become part of his 'world-view'.

The elements of antecedent tradition which are accepted or rejected will reflect to some extent the degree to which the social structure has changed. For example, there is a great difference between the work of Dickens and that of Lawrence, although both were concerned with the effects of industrialism. Throughout Lawrence's novels there is a feeling of 'exile' on the part of the author and his characters. This is not present in Dickens. However, by the time Lawrence came to write "Women in Love", a change had been wrought in the sense that man was more conscious of his exclusion from any idea of 'community' due to the development of monopoly capitalism. Also the social milieu of which he was a part was undergoing a deep crisis. This feeling of 'exile', to some extent, expresses the uncertainty of intellectuals who could no longer identify their assumptions with those of the ruling class. Dickens on the other hand may have been a 'dissenting intellectual' but he by no means was amenable to ideas of revolution, either consciously or unconsciously.

The influence of literature on literature must be considered and integrated into our method. Goldmann puts his emphasis not on tradition but on values, arguing that it is this which yields the writer's aesthetic structure. We agree with this to some extent but it is not possible to dismiss the English 'tradition' in such a way. Although we see Lawrence as being part of a far wider realistic tradition in the sense that he exposes the social mechanism of capitalism, it is from writers such as Dickens that inherits a certain mode of expression with which to put over his views on capitalism (or industrialism). It is also a fact that his 'world-view' is necessarily created by class conditions which give these ideas their structure. Obviously, we must look at both of these factors.

Lawrence absorbed certain influences from his immediate literary heritage which were products of the crisis in the social life of nineteenth century England. Goldmann remarks that great literature is created in moments of exceptional crises in man's relations with others and with the world:

> "On the social as well as the individual plane, it is the sick organ which creates awareness, and it is in periods of social and political crisis that men are most aware of the enigma of their presence in the world." (29)

There was certainly a crisis, both in the nineteenth century and at the time when Lawrence was writing as many historians have shown. (30) The turn of the century saw the final breakdown of a pre-industrial economy and way of life. The agricultural depression hit the landed aristocracy and the agricultural labourer; an event which Thomas Hardy so vividly recorded, and caused Lawrence to say that even the country man had become a 'town-bird' at heart. He also explores this breakdown at length in "The Rainbow".

The traumatic event which occurred in Lawrence's lifetime and which cut across his literary development was the Great War. This initiated the dissolution of familiar boundaries, hastened the emancipation of women, and above all shattered Britain's nation self-confidence and produced doubt, uncertainty and confusion.

Lawrence has this to say about the War and the intelligensia:

> "It was in 1915 the world ended. In the winter of 1915-16 the spirit of the old London collapsed; the city, in some way perished, perished from being the heart of the world, and became a vortex of broken passions, lusts, hopes, fears and horrors. The integrity of London collapsed and the genuine debasement began, the unspeakable baseness of the press and the public voice, the reign of that bloated ignominy, John Bull .... The well-bred, really cultured classes were on the whole passive registers. They shirked their duty. It is the business of people who really know better to fight tooth and nail to keep up a standard, to hold control of authority. Laisser-aller is as guilty as the actual stinking mongrelism it gives place to." (31)

The nineteenth century had had a long minority tradition of comment which criticised the social and cultural consequences of industrialisation and commercialism. Dickens, Arnold, Ruskin, Carlyle and Morris all dealt with these factors prior to Lawrence, however, at the end of the nineteenth century certain circumstances brought this criticism into far greater prominence. Signs of a relative decline vis-à-vis foreign

nations, a decline in the birthrate and an increase in immigration, all produced unaccustomed uncertainties in the economic market. The Reform Act of 1884 and the County Council Act of 1888, together with the development of university education and the rise of the grammar school after 1902 all implied a change in the political balance. Fed also by the administrative demands of imperialist expansion, the new 'white-collar' strata had arrived.

The development of monopoly capitalism with its reifying effects on human relationships, brought about an abstract, mechanical basis for any idea of 'community'.

Lawrence says:

> "Why do modern people almost invariably ignore the things which are actually present to them? ... They certainly never live on the spot where they are. They inhabit abstract space, the desert void of politics, principles, right and wrong, and so forth ... Talking to them is like trying to have a relationship with the letter X in algebra." (32)

In inheriting the forms and traditions of the realistic novel and the devices for perception and understanding created by the nineteenth century bourgeoisie, Lawrence brought to them a moral sensibility which was in part the product of the Victorian culture in which he grew up. The result of this was a series of major works which are clearly works of realism in that they render an actual human and material reality as opposed to the personal philosophising which is the chief subject of later works such as "Lady Chatterly's Lover". His novels of industrial England are a continuation of the ideas which we can follow in the works of Ruskin, Dickens and Morris.

Before proceeding there are a number of problems involved in talking of an 'English tradition'. Raymond Williams' book, "Culture and Society"(33) overlooks this. To begin with, the concept of a tradition must be used very carefully if it is not to lose its meaning. Williams tends to lump together a whole host of writers and literary figures such as Blake, Carlyle, Morris, Arnold, Eliot and Lawrence under one canopy because they were all critics of modern society, but there is a limit to the validity of this. Here we shall examine several of these writers, but only in so far as they provided elements which were incorporated into Lawrence's world-view. Apart from this it is very difficult to talk of such writers in the same breath. It is difficult to see how Eliot, for example, relates to the same tradition as Morris, who has been depicted by some authors as a revolutionary socialist. (34)

Thompson makes the point about 'the tradition':

> "If there is a revolution going on it is fair to suppose that it is a revolution against something ... as well as for something. Mr. Williams' answer would appear to be that it has been against 'a familiar inertia of old social forms', 'older human systems', 'authoritative patterns', ... but a sense of extreme fastidiousness enters whenever logic prompts us to identify those 'patterns', 'systems', 'forms' with precise social forces and particular thinkers." (35)

The concept of a 'tradition' is therefore to be seen as rather unsatisfactory. The three writers who are examined in this chapter are discussed not in so much as they are part of a tradition but because certain elements in their work are also present in Lawrence. All are critics of industrialism, with Carlyle, he shows a contempt of the working class, and later, an appeal for the 'hero' or leader, with Ruskin and Morris a belief that art is not possible because of the state of society, and with the latter, he shares a great understanding of the mechanisms and a revulsion of capitalism.

The questions to be asked about Carlyle are, what did Carlyle have to say that was important for Lawrence and why was it important for him at that particular moment in history? We suggest that a possible answer might be that Carlyle was a sustained critic of industrialism at a time when English society was moving into an era of capitalist expansion with all its ramifications for culture and social structure. Lawrence was also a critic of industrialism, as Williams points out, at a time (36) when society was moving into an era of monopoly capitalism. Also, Carlyle's emphasis on 'the hero' in his later writings corresponds to a similar demand in Lawrence for 'the man of authority', significantly, a demand (37) taken up by the rest of the petit-bourgeoisie at a later date in its turn towards Fascism.

However, there is a difference between the two writers which prevents us from linking them in the umbrella of Williams' 'tradition'. That is, that Carlyle is attempting to iron out the intellectual contradictions in bourgeois culture caused by industrialisation, whereas Lawrence is, in his opposition to Industrialism, trying to forge a new culture altogether. Similarly, he is at odds with Eliot's notions of culture e.g. the 'objective correlative', which again appears to be an attempt to revitalise bourgeois culture.

In the nineteenth century, as far as the intelligensia was concerned, Capitalism remained undisputed in its fundamental characteristics. There was no question of anything more than purely philanthropic mitigation of its abuses. This is clearly evident in the writings of Carlyle, but it applies to most Victorian thinkers. Their liberalism is expressed in a romantic hankering for the past, similar in many ways to Lawrence's proposal for a utopian 'community'. Nevertheless, such criticisms were grounded on a hostility to industrialism, as were Lawrence's early novels.

Carlyle's first main contribution on the society of his time was "Signs of the Time", published in 1829. This was a direct respose to 'The Age of Machinery' as he called it.

> "Nothing is done directly, or by hand; all is by rule and by calculated contrivance." (38)

Such statements were still relevant in Lawrence's time, as a look at "Women in Love" will show. (39)

Carlyle illustrates this first proposition with references to changes in the mode of production and the consequential social changes which followed.

> "Wealth has more and more increased, strangely altering the old social relations and increasing the distance between rich and poor." (40)

Again, this is explored by Lawrence in an immediate way in "The Daughters of the Vicar", "Sons and Lovers", and "The Rainbow".

Not only are actions managed by machinery, but also the internal and spiritual aspects of Man. Carlyle wants a restoration of balance (41) and he is writing a criticism of his society and not a rejection of it. Nevertheless, he sees clearly the spiritual emptiness of social relationships, and the cause of this.

> "With Cash Payment as the sole nexus between man and man ... and there are so many things for which cash will not pay." (42)

We contend that it is this fact of 'Cash Payment' being the sole mediator between man and man, which is basic theme for all of Lawrence's realistic novels. However, Carlyle's early radical views became somewhat modified under the tension of his criticism of society and his political alienation, for he becomes more and more involved with the

image of the 'hero'. Indeed, by the time of writing "The Shooting of Niagara", any idea of the dignity of the common man is replaced by contempt for the ' masses.'

> "Carlyle's call is for government; for more government, not less; more order, not less." (43)

Morris differs from both Carlyle and Lawrence in terms of his social 'remedy', but his basic theme is still the same. Morris advances much further than Carlyle, but is still not free from contradiction and compromise. Williams says:

> "The significance of Morris is that he sought to attach its (the tradition's) general values to an actual growing force - that of the organised working class." (44)

He restates the basic opposition to 'civilisation' - by which he means Capitalism:

> "Apart from the desire to produce beautiful things the leading passion of my life has been, and is, hatred of modern civilisation." (45)

Morris states that commercialism destroys even the things which the middle-class themselves value. This is partly due to the fact that the middle-class cannot regenerate itself in terms of the cultural tradition.

> "The world is everywhere growing uglier and more commonplace, in spite of the conscious and very strenuous efforts of a small group of people towards the revival of art, which are so obviously out of joint with the tendency of the age, that while the uncultivated have not even heard of them, the mass of the cultivated look upon them as a joke." (46)

Art, Morris argues together with Lawrence, depends on the quality of the society which produces it. There is no salvation in the idea of 'art for art's sake'; it is merely a symptom of the unhealthiness of the situation. His hope for art rested in the belief that:

> "The cause of art is the cause of the people ... One day we shall win back art, that is to say, the pleasure of life; win back art again to our daily labour." (47)

Art had become a peculiar quality of labour, and delight in work had been destroyed by the machine and the system of production. However, Morris argued, rightly, that it was the system which was to blame rather than the machine per se. Obviously there are a number of similarities between Morris and Lawrence but they have very different ideas on the alternatives to the evils of industrialism.

Ruskin must also be regarded in these terms. Lawrence grew to maturity while Ruskin was still regarded as a major writer, and although critical of him, he is never totally dismissed. "All Ruskinites are not fools" he says in his letters. Also, in a letter (48) to Garnett, he compares the situation of Paul Morel, (and therefore of himself) to that of Ruskin:

> "It's the tragedy of thousands of young men in England - I think it was Ruskin's, and men like him." (49)

We are able to obtain a good idea, both of the influence of Ruskin and Lawrence's opinion of him, from a study of Will Brangwen in the novel, "The Rainbow". As K. Alldritt points out:

> "The centre of the novel, the story of Will Brangwen ... is a memorable achievement of historical imagination. It is an emphathetic representation of a crucial tension in Victorian consciousness. Lawrence's full and extensive portrayal of Will's emotional life is also by implication a critique of the attitudes and influence of Ruskin; for Will Brangwen is the Ruskinite of Cossethay. (50)

Will Brangwen is shown to have a more extensive awareness than his father. He is a lace designer, a devotee of the arts and crafts and eventually a teacher. However, for all Lawrence's sympathy with the character, he points to several defects. Defects which say much for Lawrence's opinion of Ruskin. First of all, he is guilty of 'decadence both artistically and emotionally. This is due to a tendency to allow art to assume a transcendental importance divorced from life.

> "This endeavour becomes so absorbing that it leads to a gradual severance increasingly apparent from Ruskin onwards, of art from the interests of common life, and a constant tendency to turn art itself into the highest value, to assimilate aesthetic to religious experience." (51)

Secondly, neither he nor the followers of Ruskin are able, because of this, to attain a full and balanced consciousness. Thirdly, he is guilty of self-righteousness.

> "The deep damnation of self-righteousness sticks tight to every creed, ... but itlies thick over the Ruskinite, like painted feathers on a skinny peacock." (52)

The main thing which Lawrence drew from Ruskin was his attention to the ugliness of Victorian art, however, Lawrence put this into a more social setting. He was indeed influenced by Ruskin's ideas, but as Alldritt says:

> "Lawrence was under no illusion about the incongruity of Ruskin's exhortations and the Victorian actuality." (53)

IV

Having examined the cultural background to Lawrence's work, we shall now look in more detail at what he himself had to say on matters such as industrialism and society. The first point to be aware of is that it is easy, as Williams says, to recognise the (54)
effect of Lawrence on our thinking, but it is a different matter to give an account of his contribution in this area. Firstly, his public image is at variance with what he actually says in his art. This tends to lead to misunderstandings such as the idea that he saw sex as the panacea for all ills. There is also the emphasis which has often been placed on the Fascist idea of 'blood-ties'. These ideas appear to be derived from the study of his letters and his later novels whilst the earlier novels do not fit into such schema. One major difficulty is that his position on the question of social values is an amalgam of original and derived theories from the intellectual heritage which we have previously outlined. This amalgam is very difficult to unravel. Secondly, although we argue that the most important contribution of an artist is his art, his essays and letters cannot be separated or judged apart from his novels. (55)

His sweeping hatred of 'industrialism' runs throughout the novels but also in his essays and letters as well. The same problems which were the core of Ruskin, Morris, and Carlyle's work are also present in Lawrence.

> "The Pisgah-top of spiritual oneness looks down on a hopeless squalor of industrialism, the huge cemetary of human hopes. This is our Promised Land." (56)

> "After looking down from the Pisgah-top on the oneness of all mankind ... I admit myself dehumanised. The factory smoke waves much higher. And in the sweet smoke of industry I don't care a button who loves whom, nor what babies are born ... Here I am without a human sympathy left." (57)

> "The vast demon of life has made himself habits which ... he will never break. And these habits are the laws of our scientific universe. But all the laws of physics, dynamics, kinetics, statics are all but the settled habits of a vast, living incomprehensibility, and they can all be broken, superseded, in a moment of extremity." (58)

The tone of this essay is very like that of Carlyle in its bitter criticism of industrialism. Raymond Williams says this of the essay:

> "The case is reasoned and yet breaks down again and again into a blind passion of rejection, of which the tenor is not merely negative but annihilating - a threshing after power, which is known, ultimately, only in the force of mystery at the edge of which the human articulation breaks down. The impact of each man on the generation which succeeded him is remarkably similar in quality: an impact not so much doctrines as of an elusive, compelling, general revelation." (59)

The main point which Lawrence continues from the earlier critics is the condemnation of industrialism as an attitude of mind.

> "The industrial problem arises from the base forcing of all human energy into a competition of mere acquisition." (60)

When narrowed in this way to mere competitive acquisitiveness, human purpose is debased to 'sheer mechanical materialism'. The key words in his philosophy are, for Williams, 'mechanical, disintegrated and amorphous'. In the sense that he criticises a condition of <u>mind</u> rather than industry itself, there is perhaps an advance on the ideas of Carlyle. As we shall see later, in "Sons and Lovers" he sees the trappings of industry as being imbued with the <u>life</u> of the men who use them. It is the ethos of capitalism which is criticised for its (61) brutalising effects. In this, he is closer to Morris and the socialist idea that industry may in certain circumstances be beneficial to man and is at any rate a necessary stage of development that must be passed through on the road towards socialism.

Lawrence was little concerned with the origins of industrialism, however, his own origins are important in the light of his essays and novels. His father was a member of the working class although it was his petit-bourgeois mother who wielded most influence over him. He was brought up in a working class community and it may be that the closeness of the mining community served to amplify the destruction wrought on such processes of human contact by industrialism and the division of labour. As we have said, the need for community is continually stressed through out his work. His response to his situation was not that of someone observing, but of a man caught up in it. When he eventually escaped from this situation it was to a life of self-imposed exile, but at first his talent only exacerbated the problem. Because he was born into a working class background and had therefore lived through the process he was more conscious of the general failure and thus the general character of the system:

> "The whole human consciousness hammering on the fact of material prosperity above all things." (62)

He attacks the ugliness of life under a system of forced competitiveness. He attacks the debasing of the miners' consciousness by industrialism, and also, he shows how the acquisitive spirit of capitalism perverts the relationships between men and women. This is very important for it is this fact which is the basic material for all of his early novels.

> "The real tragedy of England, is the tragedy of ugliness. The country is so lovely: the man made England is so vile. I know that the ordinary collier had a particular sense of beauty, coming from his intuitive and instructive consciousness, which was awakened down the pit. And the fact that he met with just cold ugliness and raw materialism when he came up into daylight ... killed something in him, and in a sense spoiled him as a man." (63)

> "The collier fled out of the house as soon as he could, away from the nagging materialism of the woman." (64)

> "Now though nobody knew it, it was the ugliness which betrayed the spirit of man in the nineteenth century. The great crime of the moneyed classes and the promoters of industry was the condemning of the workers to ugliness. Ugly surroundings, ugly ideals, ugly religion, ugly hope, ugly love, ugly clothes, ugly furniture, ugly houses, ugly relationships between workers and employers." (65)

The inheritance of Ruskin and Morris was of great value to him for it served to clarify what had otherwise been a confused personal issue. Although in some respects he was a romantic and an idealist, he was under no illusions that introspection and individual protest were any way to a solution. Williams says:

> "Lawrence was so involved with getting free from the industrial system that he never came seriously to the problem of changing it, although he knew that since the problem was a common one, an individual solution was only a cry in the wind." (66)

From our analysis of Lawrence's world-view one can posit a reason for this failure to come 'seriously to the problem of changing it'. Although unlike Dickens and Carlyle he was not merely a reformist, his hopes for a changed society and a new morality not based on the power of the working class but of the petit-bourgeoisie, and this did not take into account the fact that there was no independent historical future for this strata separate from that of the middle class. Therefore he could not seriously come to the problem of changing society because on his basis it was not possible. Moreover, like his heroes, once he had realised the enormity of what human beings had to overcome

in order to form meaningful, unmediated relationships, and also, the impossibility of he and his social group being able to achieve this, he chose death for himself, in the form of exile. It is significant that this permanent exile occurred after the war and the breakdown of any hopes for independent class development. It also coincides with the death of realism in his art.

Lawrence realised that liberation was not merely a matter of achieving a release from labour or aspiring to the middle class. In fact, he saw the achievement of a true and meaningful relationship between man and his labour as one of the paths to liberation. Men must be liberated from the 'base forcing of all human energy into a competition of mere acquisition', that is, the system of social organisation under capitalism.

His alternative to the industrial thesis was partly a negative act of mere rejection, and partly the very process of himself as a writer. His 'endless venture into consciousness' is just this.

His ideas on 'community' formed the main alternative to the society he lived in. Another reason for his exile was that he felt that he was not part of such a community because industrialism had destroyed any such ventures.

> "We have frustrated that instinct of community which would make us unite in pride and dignity in the bigger gesture of the citizen, not the cottager." (67)

His upbringing as a child in a Nottinghamshire mining community gave Lawrence a sense of close, living relationships - the flow and recoil of sympathy - as he put it. This was the essential process of living which he attempted to portray in his novels both in its perversion by the 'base forcing' of the social system, and its attempted fulfillment.

> "Here lies the vast importance of the novel, properly handled. It can inform and lead into new places the flow of our sympathetic consciousness, and it can lead our sympathy away in recoil from things gone dead." (68)

From this amalgam of ideas, Lawrence derived a theory of democracy which was based on what he called, 'the quick of self'. This corresponds to what Stendhal calls 'passion' and what Girard calls 'unmediated' or 'spontaneous desire'. We stated in the introduction to this thesis that Lawrence opposed abstract intelligence and 'cerebral conceit' with what he called 'life'. This is another way of saying that he

opposed a society based on the 'cash-nexus' of materialism for it is this which gives rise to 'cerebral conceit' and alienation. He puts it in an idealistic manner.

> "You can have life two ways. Either everything is created from the mind, downward; or else everything proceeds from the creative quick, outwards into exfoliation and blossom ... The actual living quick itself is alone the creative reality." (69)

In other words, desire must be spontaneous, and this is the basis for individuality.

> "The only thing a man has to trust in coming to himself is his desire and his impulse. But both desire and impulse tend to fall into material reality ... all of our efforts in life must be to preserve the soul free and spontaneous ... the life activity must never be degraded into a fixed activity." (70)

The emphasis here is on the preservation of 'spontaneous life activity' against the rigidity of categorisation and abstraction of which the capitalist system is so powerful an embodiment. This leads to the following declaration of his faith in democracy.

> "So we know the first great purpose of democracy: that each man shall be spontaneously himself - each man himself; each woman herself, without any question of equality or inequality entering in at all; and that no man shall try to determine the being of any other man, or any other woman." (71)

In all of these statements we can see the limitations of Lawrence's philosophy as revealed in his essays. He is certainly no Marxist as his abhorence of science will testify. However one cannot label him (72) automatically as a Fascist. It may be that such emphasis on 'impulse' provided the seeds for an ideology of Fascism, but this was not Lawrence's intention. His ideas were simply interpreted by others for their own ends.

He differs from Eliot's cultural elite both in opinion and class background, but for all his opposition to the middle class, he could not <u>consciously</u> grasp the forces which were necessary to overcome middle class hegemony. This accounts for his somewhat escapist, romantic alternative to the 'base forcing' of capitalism. Mirsky contends that Lawrence's individualism was, in fact, a decadence which was symptomatic of the state of health of capitalist social organisation. This may be true of his personal opinions, and his

later, more propagandist novels, but we would contend that his early novels tell a different story. Indeed, in the later works which are more and more prone to mysticism and romanticism, he himself is shown to be guilty of 'trying to determine another man's being'. (See "Aaron's Rod"). (73)

Throughout his letters, but more forcefully in his early novels, he attacks materialism and 'possession' both in terms of money and human relationships. It is this which distorts spontaneity and corrupts relationships. We shall deal with this when we discuss its most powerful expression - in "Sons and Lovers" and "The Rainbow". In a letter to Lady Asquith he says of bourgeois society:

> "It is a dragon that has devoured us all; these obscene, scaley houses, this insatiable struggle and desire to possess ... this need to be an owner, lest one be owned. One feels a sort of madness come over one, as if the world had become Hell. But it is only superimposed; it is only a temporary disease. It can be cleaned away." (74)
>
> "One must destroy the spirit of money, the blind spirit of possession." (75)

Although the elements are here to permit a correct reading of the situation, Lawrence's philosophy is a jumble of many strands of thought. Apart from the realism of his art, which lays bare the heart of the problem without descending to polemic, his alternative to social problems falls into the trap of mysticism and idealism. This, to our mind, is the result of a world-vision and a level of consciousness which was unable to consciously recognise the relationship between material issues and human feeling. He could not see that the corruption of human desires was merely an expression of a society based on commodity relations, although his exploration of the process of mediation in his art shows that he grasped this unconsciously.

In conclusion we can say that the Great War and the crises, both before and after, brought about a breakdown in the Victorian ethos and its subtle domination of family relationships. Lawrence insisted on this power of bourgeois society with its materialism and industrialism, as being able to pervert the true potential of inter-personal relationships and of art. Like Ruskin, he felt that the necessary conditions for the production of 'great' art, were lacking, and like Morris and Carlyle he attacked industrialism as being the force which prevented the creation of these conditions. He saw the bourgeoisie as the class responsible for all of this, calling the nineteenth century, "the century of the mealy-mouthed lie", because of its hypocrisy and materialism.

> "The bourgeoisie with their greedy, dead materialism, have made morality and family and affection and trust all suspicion and repulsion." (76)

One obviously cannot examine such a writer as Lawrence purely from the point of literary style as do most literary critics. Even Leavis studies Lawrence's social criticism only "because Lawrence was an artist of genius and that is why they are to be considered." (77) This tends to minimise the importance of the criticism in itself and therefore assumes the style takes precedent over content. Lawrence himself went so far as to say:

> "It seems to me that even art is utterly dependent on philosophy; or if you prefer it, a metaphysic. The metaphysic or philosophy may not be anywhere very accurately stated and may be quite unconscious, in the artist, yet it is a metaphysic that governs men at the time, and is by all men more or less comprehended and lived." (78)

We can gather from this chapter that Lawrence assimilates certain elements of intellectual history and expresses them in his own way; the main element being a critique of industrialism and bourgeois culture. However, we are not saying that because he wrote novels he followed in the footsteps of previous novelists. After all, there were a great many writers who did not express an abhorrence of society. What we now have to determine is why Lawrence should be influenced by this particular element at this particular time. To reiterate what was said at the beginning of this chapter, 'influences' such as the writings of other intellectuals are limited in their ability to explain Lawrence's world-view because of <u>choice</u> and <u>distortion</u>. There is bound to be an amount of distortion in the way strands of Morris' work appear in Lawrence because Lawrence put over his ideas in relation to the historical situation at the time and the social objectives of his social group. We have attempted to show not so much what Morris and others wrote, but what Lawrence drew out of them and how he used these ideas. In order to determine <u>why</u> he used them and why he so vehemently criticised industrialism and strove to postulate a new morality, we must treat him as Goldmann suggests - as the spokesman of a world-view of the social group to which he belonged. Similarly, this cannot be viewed in isolation and to this end we shall now proceed to examine the economic and social class structure in England at the time. This in turn should provide us with a means of explaining the content of Lawrence's novels.

REFERENCES : CHAPTER II

1. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. (Ed.) A.A.H. Inglis. Penguin. 1968. p.186.
2. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. R.K.P. 1964. p.7.
3. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. pp.80-81.
4. IBID. p.174.
5. GOLDMANN, L. The Human Sciences and Philosophy. Cape. 1969. p.92.
6. GRAMSCI, A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Lawrence and Wishart. 1971. p.5.
7. IBID. p.9.
8. IBID. p.18.
9. ANDERSON, P. 'Origins of the Present Crisis'. Towards Socialism. Fontana. 1965.
10. HAUSER, A. A Social History of Art. Vol.IV. R.K.P. 1961. Chapter 1.
11. LUKACS, G. Writer and Critic. Merlin. 1970. p.82.
12. MIRSKY, D. The Intelligensia of Great Britain. Gollancz. 1935.
13. ENGELS, F. (Letter to Sorge. Jan.18th. 1893.) Marx and Engels : Selected Correspondence. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1965. p.453.
14. SHAW, G.B. Quoted in R. Williams Culture and Society. Penguin. 1966. p.182.
15. IBID. p.182.
16. IBID. p.182.
17. VAN GHENT, D. The English Novel : Form and Function. New York:Harper & Row. 1967. p.305.
18. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel : Self and Other Literary Structure. Baltimore. John Hopkins. 1965.
19. COLE, G.D.H. Essays in Social Theory. Macmillan. 1950. p.90.
20. MIRSKY, D. The Intelligensia of Great Britain. p.241.
21. LAWRENCE, D.H. Cf. 'Keynes, Lawrence and Cambridge'. F.R. LEAVIS. The Common Pursuit. Peregrine. 1969.
22. CORKE, H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography. (Ed.) E. Nehls. Univ. Wisconsin. Madison. 1957-1959. p.142.
23. CAUDWELL, C. Studies in a Dying Culture. Lawrence and Wishart. 1938.
24. CAUDWELL, C. Illusion and Reality. Lawrence and Wishart. 1946. p.218.
25. HARRISON, J. The Reactionaries. Gollancz. 1966. p.127.
26. HAMILTON, A. The Appeal of Fascism. Blond. 1971. p.290.
27. MIRSKY, D. The Intelligensia of Great Britain. p.113.
28. ELIOT, T.S. After Strange Gods. A Primer of Modern Heresy. Faber. 1934.
29. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.49.

(Cont.)

30. Cf. E. HOBSBAWM, COLE AND POSTGATE, DANGERFIELD.
31. LAWRENCE, D.H. Kangaroo. Penguin. 1972.
32. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selected Essays. Penguin. 1969. p.105.
33. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. Penguin. 1966.
34. THOMPSON, E.P. William Morris:Romantic to Revolutionary. Lawrence and Wishart. 1955.
35. THOMPSON, E.P. 'The Long Revolution'. New Left Review. no.9. p.25.
36. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. pp.199-213.
37. Cf. D.H. LAWRENCE. Aaron's Rod. Penguin. 1968
38. CARLYLE, T. Quoted in R. WILLIAMS. Culture and Society. p.86.
39. Cf. D.H. LAWRENCE, Women in Love. Penguin. 1972. Chapter entitled, 'The Industrial Magnate'.
40. CARLYLE, T. Quoted in R. WILLIAMS. Culture and Society. p.86.
41. IBID. p.88.
42. IBID. p.89.
43. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. p.92.
44. IBID. p.153.
45. MORRIS, W. Quoted in R. WILLIAMS. Culture and Society. p.154.
46. IBID. p.157.
47. IBID. p.158.
48. LAWRENCE, D.H. Collected Letters. (Ed.) Harry T. Moore. Heineman. 1962. p.29.
49. IBID. p.161.
50. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. Edward Arnold. 1971. p.69.
51. HOUGH, G. The Last Romantics. Duckworth. 1961. p.XVI.
52. LAWRENCE, D.H. Collected Letters. (Ed.) Harry T. Moore. p.30.
53. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.72.
54. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. p.199.
55. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.7.
56. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selected Essays. Penguin. 1969. p.52.
57. IBID. p.53.
58. IBID. p.53.
59. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. p.200.
60. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.109.
61. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. Penguin. 1967. p.154.
62. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.108.
63. IBID. p.108.
64. IBID. p.107.
65. IBID. p.109.

(Cont.)

66. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. p.203.
67. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.110.
68. LAWRENCE, D.H. Cf. F.R. LEAVIS. The Common Pursuit. Peregrine. 1969. p.246.
69. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.529.
70. IBID. p.532.
71. IBID. p.533-534.
72. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selected Letters. Penguin. 1971. p.11.
73. LAWRENCE, D.H. Aaron's Rod. p.347.
74. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selected Letters. p.86.
75. IBID. p.86.
76. IBID. p.321.
77. LEAVIS, F.R. For Continuity. Chatto and Windus. 1933. p.119.
78. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.217.

Chapter III : Class Structure and World-View

"..... the fundamental hypothesis of genetic structuralism is that the collective nature of literary creation derives from the fact that the structures of the universe contained or implied in the work of art are homologous to the mental structures of certain social groups, or stand in an intelligible relation to them. (Given that the artist has 'freedom' to people this universe with what persons and events he likes.)" (1)

There is a vast amount of information which needs to be taken into account if we are to place our assessment of Lawrence on a firmer basis.

As Goldmann says:

"..... facts concerning man always present themselves in a significant pattern, and this pattern can only be understood by explaining how it came into being. Any genuinely scientific study of this pattern must be based upon a knowledge of this development." (2)

It is not sufficient to concentrate solely on the life of the author concerned. We must first deal with the general climate of thought and feeling, to which the literary work gives a coherent expression. This climate must also be studied in relation to the wider economic, social, political and ideological life of which it forms part. This is the reason for examining such a wide expanse of historical data. The text is an expression of a world vision; the world vision is an expression of a social group; the group expresses this particular world vision due to certain economic and historical conditions; these conditions can only be understood by looking at the whole social activity of the society of which this group is a part.

In this section we shall attempt to locate Lawrence in the class structures which existed in England at the time which he produced his novels, having explained the importance of class in Chapter I. The problems involved in this are twofold. Firstly, Lawrence's position is a very ambiguous one. He was born into a working class community but had a mother with middle class aspirations and background. Also, he was a member firstly of the petit-bourgeoisie, then of the 'intelligensia' living solely by his writing and expressing an ambiguous personal attitude to the working class from which he came. It was indeed a love-hate relationship.

The second difficulty lies in unravelling the peculiar nature of class structures in England at the time, which resulted from a bourgeois revolution in the 17th century which succeeded in some ways but not in others.

What we have to determine is: firstly, what were the class structures which existed? Secondly, what interests did each particular class have at the time Lawrence was writing? Thirdly, in which class can we locate Lawrence, and lastly, how are the novels an expression of this class? What consequences does this have for the novels as works of art?

We shall now attempt to build up a picture of the developments in English society which led to a situation in Lawrence's lifetime where Liberalism and the Empire were in decline, monopoly capitalism began its expansion and working class militancy took on a revolutionary potential in its attempt to break out of middle class consciousness. In order to pinpoint the problems of class development, I shall begin by outlining the creation of a ruling class hegemony. This is important because it determines the historical conditions under which working class consciousness and that of the middle class was formed, and also how each were affected by it. This may enable us to explain Lawrence's attitudes and class affiliations.

The way was prepared for capitalist Britain by the 17th century revolution and the industrial revolution. From 1850-80 England had a monopoly of world industry, but her subsequent decline soon followed, with disturbing effects on the whole of British society.

> "The displacement of Britain from the position of world domination occupied by her, thus came to be openly revealed during the fourth quarter of the last century; and towards the beginning of the present century it produced a state of internal want of confidence and a ferment amongst the upper classes, and a profound molecular process of an essentially revolutionary character amongst the working classes." (3)

In 'Origins of the Present Crisis', Perry Anderson contends (4) that the capitalist 'hegemony' in England is the most durable in the world, because England had the most mediated and least pure bourgeois revolution of any major European country. This revolution led to the creation of modern capitalism but it was one in which the forces at work were enigmatic. He claims that a view of this conflict as one between the rising bourgeoisie and the declining aristocracy is untenable. The makers of the revolution were two segments of the land-owning class.

> "Neither were direct crystallisations of opposed economic interests, but rather were partially contingent but predominantly intelligible lenses into which wider more radically antagonistic forces came into temporary but distorted focus." (5)

He sees the struggle as unfulfilled because it was fought in religious and not economic terms. Therefore although the beneficiaries were bourgeois, it was a bourgeois revolution only by proxy. The main protagonists were a rural class in a conflict around a monarchy which threatened agrarian interests.

After 1832, there was a "deliberate systematized symbiosis of the two classes." The fusion was engendered by the creation (6) of a common education institution - the public school. The reform of the Civil Service in 1854 meant that entrance could only be obtained through these public schools. Also, "an increasing horizontal imbrication of landed, commercial and industrial capitalists took place." The end result, according to Anderson, was "a single (7) hegemonic class, distinguished by perpetually recreated virtual homogeneity and actual determinative porousness." Therefore the (8) parvenue bourgeoisie could enter the 'upper class' and enable aristocracy to become the vanguard of capitalism.

What does Anderson mean by 'hegemony'? He says that the analysis of a structural order which produces a previously developed power structure can be described as all-embracing hegemonic order. The hegemonic class is the determinant of the consciousness, character and customs throughout society. In England, the continuity of the dominant class is a striking example and its peculiar morphology resulted in an apparently absurd but in reality an effective hegemony.

Lukacs puts it thus:

> "For a class to be ripe for hegemony means that its interests and consciousness enable it to organise the whole of society in accordance with those interests. The crucial question in every class struggle is this: which class possesses this capacity and this consciousness at the decisive moment?
>
> ... It must not be thought, however, that **all** classes ripe for hegemony have a class consciousness with the same inner structure. Everything hinges on the extent to which they can become conscious of the actions they need to perform in order to obtain and organise power." (9)

'Hegemony' is an important concept throughout Anderson's article. It produces a proletariat distinguished by "an immovable corporate class-consciousness and almost no hegemonic ideology." (10) A 'corporate class' is here defined as "one which pursues its own ends within a social totality whose global determination lies outside it." The corporate class seeks to improve its position within (11) society while the hegemonic class seeks to transform society in its own image. Anderson's reason for the failure of the working class to establish its hegemony is that "the very intensity of its corporate class-consciousness in a hermetic, hegemonic structure, made the class unable to establish its own ideology." Capitalist (12) ideology demanded that each class saw itself as a separate estate, and this coupled with repression drove the working class in on itself, but at a time when there was no socialist theory to develop it into political dominance. Another determinant of this consciousness was the failure of the intellectuals. They were always allied ultimately to the middle class. Perhaps Lawrence's mediated position is the 'tragic' one of an intellectual placed between middle class and working class.

Anderson's two major points are that there was no English Enlightenment, and therefore no revolutionary legacy for the working class. Also that the British bourgeoisie was blindly empiricist and did nothing to engender Marxism. Thompson attacks this on four points when he rightly states that the Protestant bourgeois-democratic heritage is overlooked, so too is the importance of the English political economists. Thirdly, Anderson forgets the (13) contribution of the natural scientists, and lastly he confuses an empirical idiom with an ideology.

> "In the case of ideology, the hegemony of the dominant bloc in England is not aritculated in a major ideology but in a miasma of common place taboos. Two elements of this 'English fog' are 'traditionalism' and 'empiricism'. In claiming the lack of a major ideology, Anderson seems to disregard the work of the early materialists and the political economists." (14)

What form did this capitalist hegemony take? The bourgeoisie did not want a revolution in the French model, and therefore was forced to reject its own Enlightenment ideology. However, it still needed an ideological form to enable it to rule successfully. Bagehot provided this and saw that it was necessary to prevent the British (15)

regime being swept away. He did this by preserving the mystification of the old morality and Britain's intellectual strata grew up on this conservatism. This ideology was disseminated by the growth of public schools, and in this way,

> "by these custodians of academic enclave, was formed the British intelligensia - the paradox of intellectuals who conformed to the social order." (16)

Apart from individuals who reacted against this ethos and criticised Utilitarianism and the economic realities of capitalism, such as Morris, Carlyle and Ruskin, there was, at best, a series of dissenting intellectuals (although this is not to say that they were unimportant). George Eliot, for example, said that her dominant instinct was,

> "to cling to the old while accepting the new, to retain the core of traditions while mentally criticising their forms." (17)

The limitations of this rebellion are shown in the political weakness which accompanies it. The intellectuals were not so much lacking in faith for the revolutionary potential of the working class, but more afraid of it. Whereas in France there was a certain amount of populist sympathy amongst intellectuals which derived from the historical experience of 1789, in Britain, there existed a distrust of the working class on which conservative hegemony was based and which lead Carlyle, and Lawrence too, to the vision of the 'hero' or 'the leader'.

Lawrence began his writing at a time when certain long established facets of British society were beginning to crack. What was characteristic of this period, says Dangerfield, was,

> "an unconscious rejection of an established security." (18)

The economic, political and intellectual structure of Britain in the 19th century rested on three pillars: firstly, control of world industrial production. This provided the basis for laissez-faire economic Liberalism. Secondly, the peculiar compromise of 1832 where old political rulers applied the policies of the industrial bourgeoisie. Thirdly, military control of the world by the British Navy.

In the 1880's with electoral reforms, the Great Depression, and the emergence of the U.S.A., Germany and Japan, all three of these pillars were undermined. Consequently, the beliefs of the mid-Victorian age, such as the Liberal-Radical alliance, broke down. With no socialist theory to take its place, the Fabians as middle class intellectuals were forced to take on the role of the Liberal Radicals and because they opposed 'laissez-faire' they were regarded as 'Socialists'.

Another problem was what Nairn calls "a non-marxist universe". (19)

Without socialist theory, the British working class developed only trades union consciousness because they looked in on themselves and were a corporate body as stated earlier. Lenin insists that socialist consciousness can only be brought to the working class 'from the outside' - that is, from the middle class intellectuals (20) and their philosophical and scientific developments. Because the British proletariat had none of this revolutionary development to draw on, the class by itself produced only 'trades union consciousness' - that is, bourgeois consciousness. It accepted the framework of the bourgeois social order and the ideological and political forms of the particular society.

Labourism's relation to the class which it represented was a passive one.

> "The political plane is a plane of power: a political party lays claim to a specific form of hegemony over society and a socialist party intends using such hegemony to remodel society." (21)

But problems of hegemony were of a different order to those confronting the unions in 1906.

> "They imposed a hitherto subordinate class, a vast development, and this drive towards change did not arise mechanically from the working class and could not be transmitted to political leaders by a passive link between the former and the latter.
>
> "This apparent paradox is the key to this defect of British Labourism. The political potential of the working class is not realised when the political movement founded on it accepts as determinant, the structures and outlook already created by workers in their struggle as a subordinate class ..." (22)

Therefore, the whole apparatus of the political culture of the Labour movement tended to be bourgeois.

The working class was therefore diverted into reformism and Trade Union activity whilst some of the intellectuals who ought to have provided a transmission belt for socialist theory were directed towards fascism. Both groups were infused with a resurgence of nationalism and imperialism as Britain attempted to share the cracks which had appeared in its world monopoly. Lawrence has often been accused of being a forerunner of fascist tendencies which reached their height in the late 20's and 30's, but it is a mistake to over-emphasise his involvement, and the involvement of the British intellectuals in general at this point. He had a fleeting acquaintance with fascism due to his emphasis on blood and the spirit, however, his great novels speak differently to his social philosophy because they penetrate the appearances of men's relationships and lay bare the reality beneath, in what amounts to a cutting indictment of capitalism.

How then can we see Lawrence's position at the time he was writing? He was a petit-bourgeois intellectual who was revolted by the mechanicalism which surrounded him and a system which perverted the spontaniety of man's desire. He was living at a time when imperialism was breaking down along with Liberalism; when the working class was entering a period of very bitter struggle - 1911-14, but without a theoretical level which would enable it to carry through any of its revolutionary objectives. It was attempting to shake off a very durable bourgeois consciousness. At the same time, he was a part of the middle class which was newly recruited from the 'Labour aristocracy' and the remnants of the old small business and professional classes. His life spans the period when this class formation matures and yet, is at the same time revealed as historically fissile and without a future.

In some ways Lawrence can be seen as the last of the Romantic movement. His work contains elements of both realism and prophecy and the appeal which fascism may have briefly had for him is part of this - Lawrence seems to have had no faith in the working class although he portrays the conditions, both mental and physical, under which they laboured in capitalist society, with great realism.

The break-up of the established church in the 15th century allowed a specialisation of knowledge with Hobbes and Locke and assisted the growth of scientific enquiry. This created a situation completely different to that of France, in that there was no need for British

intelligensia to oppose society in terms of totalities, just as the industrial middle class had no need to oppose the aristocracy after 1832, having defined the limits of their power and created a thriving expansion of trade. (23)

Imperialism created a number of jobs which assimilated intellectuals like Lawrence into the ranks of the lower middle class and left them without any theoretical development. His works are a fusion of realism and prophecy, but as an intellectual with no revolutionary experience such as existed in France and with a working class labouring to cast off bourgeois consciousness, he was not able to concretize his proposals for changing society although it was a cause he was dedicated to. Due to this lack of concretisation, the element of prophecy appears, but at the same time he shows a profound insight and understanding of the mechanics and effects of capitalist society, hence his realism.

Another important factor in this combination in Lawrence's work, is the influence of Methodism. In the provinces a Marxist orientation was developed towards the I.L.P. by the methodist lay pulpit. There are two lines of intellectual descent for this. One runs from Tom Paine, Owen and Carlyle to the Marxist, and can be tracked back to the 17th century dissenters - the agnostics and Deists. The other goes back to the 17th century revolution and is a tradition of dissent derived from the Methodist revival. In 1880 came the breakaway by the Primitive Methodists who formulated important devices for class agitation - the camp meeting for example. Dissent provided the ideological rallying ground for the leadership of the movement, especially in the mining areas.

Two factors helped to maintain religion as a potentially radical force in 19th century Britain. Firstly, the 1640 revolution was fought out in religious terms,

> "under the religious form of Puritanism went the proclamation of the historical mission of a new class, while the predestination doctrine was a religious approach to historical systematisation." (24)

Therefore religion (unlike in France) was not primarily identified with the status quo. Labour churches were a half-way house between orthodox political liberal-radicalism and the ILP. Secondly, there was the enormous psychological strain of early industrialism in the

pioneer industrial country. The masses of working class looked for an emotional expression of their maladjustment. This gave rise to an apocalyptic atmosphere and revivalism.

However, although Methodism was a critique of a particular economic system and also a set of proposals for change, it was not attached to a political ideology. The consequences of this were, as Hobsbawm says,

> "only a slight shift of ideological emphasis was required to turn the revolutionary dissenter into a quietist." (25)

There is no doubt that Methodism influenced Lawrence, and as one can see in stories such as 'Strike Pay', he is also aware of its relationship to the working class.

Having built up a general picture of the class structure in Britain and the historical conditions which led to this formation, let us now look in particular at the labour aristocracy and the lower middle class. It is from these sections of British society that Lawrence developed his literary consciousness. The matter is complicated because Lawrence was born in a working class home with a collier for a father, whereas his mother came from the lower bourgeoisie. He himself became part of the new white collar class created by imperialist expansion when he became a teacher in Croydon. We have to determine the factors affecting the class to which Lawrence belonged and hence its world-view as a social group. We also have to determine what world-vision is expressed by Lawrence in his novels. (It is not necessarily true that Lawrence expresses the outlook of his own class in his art). The answers to these questions may show us why his earlier work is so much better aesthetically then the work written after 'Women in Love'.

Although Lawrence was born into a working class home, one cannot state simply that he was a spokesman of the working class. An added problem is the peculiar consciousness amongst the proletariat created by the historical conditions and class hegemony which we have outlined previously. The matter is put as follows in a letter from Engels to Marx written on October 7th 1858:

> "The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat alongside the bourgeoisie." (26)

In the light of this statement we must treat with caution the world-view of any artist who is purported to be a spokesman for the proletariat, especially if he comes from the proletariat. One can safely say that Lawrence was never either in status or in any other way a fully fledged member of the middle class. Nor was he a fully integrated member of the proletariat. The strata to which he belongs appears to fall somewhere in between.

The years 1889-90 and 1910-14 saw the rebirth of revolutionary movements. There were attempts by the middle class to re-integrate the labour aristocracy, but the militant surges of 1889 and 1911 had mobilized vast masses of the working class and with the resulting rise of General Unions, the labour aristocracy declined somewhat. However, this question of an 'aristocracy of labour' becomes a much more complex one because this group of reformist tendencies was now different to the 'artisan' class of 1860. There were a few groups of workers in 1860 that could be said to have benefited from the world monopoly of British capitalism. However, by the 1900's imperialism had changed this and, as Hobsbawm says,

> "it becomes hard to find groups which do <u>not</u> draw some advantage from Britain's position." (27)

Imperialism is an important factor in our discussion of class structure for it is this which created a distortion of working class consciousness. It also gave rise in Britain to a white collar class including teachers, and civil servants which displaced the labour aristocracy from their privileged position. Lenin in his book on imperialism says this:

> "And in speaking of the British working class, the bourgeois student of British imperialism at the beginning of the twentieth century is obliged to distinguish systematically between the 'upper stratum' of the workers and the 'lower stratum of the proletarian proper.' The upper stratum furnishes the bulk of the membership of co-operatives, of trades unions, of sporting clubs and of numerous religious sects." (28)

Imperialism creates privileged sections amongst the working class and detaches them from the rest of the class. This in turn creates opportunism and the disintegration of the working class movement; a process which was evident in Britain long before the turn of the century. The workers were allowed to reap certain

benefits from Britain's vast colonial expansion, and this had the effect of creating a proletariat with a bourgeois consciousness.

"The causes are: (1) exploitation of the whole world by this country (Britain); (2) its monopolist position in the world market; (3) its colonial monopoly. The effects are: (1) a section of the British proletariat becomes bourgeois; (2) a section of the British proletariat allows itself to be led by men bought by, or at least paid by, the bourgeoisie." (29)

The phrase 'aristocracy of labour' was used from the mid 19th century to denote the upper strata of the working class who were 'respectable' and politically moderate. The classical period of the nineteenth century labour aristocracy can be seen as stretching from the 1840's - 90's.

Hobsbawn notes six factors which ought to be considered when defining membership of this group. Firstly, regularity of earnings; secondly, prospects of social security; thirdly, conditions of work; fourthly, relations with the social strata above and below; fifthly, general conditions of living; lastly, prospects of future advancement. Of these, the first is the most important.

The labour aristocracy socially merged with what we may call 'the lower middle class'. Indeed the term 'lower middle class' would sometimes be used to include the labour aristocracy. For example, at the end of the century in Salford, the labour aristocracy was held to include

"commercial travellers .... clerks, lithographic printers, joiners, cabinet makers, grocers assistants and down to colliers." (30)

This merging with other strata is important because it helps us to explain the political attitudes of the group. This overlapping explains its liberal-radicalism in the nineteenth century and also its failure to form an independent working class party. It was only when imperialism cut off this strata from the managerial class with which it had merged and from the new conservative labour aristocracy - the white collar class created by imperialism - that the labour party began to recruit them.

Also, if there was evidence of merging into the middle classes there was no merging the other way. The line between 'artisan' and 'labourer' was a very definite one.

With regard to the size of this group in the period 1840-90, there are three important factors. Firstly, the decline of domestic work and the expansion of the factory system; secondly, the decline of textiles and the old consumer-goods trades and the rise of heavy industry; and lastly, the rise of woman labour. (It is noticeable that women heroines and the 'free' woman are featured in several of Lawrence's novels.) The first point did not necessarily increase the size of the labour aristocracy, but it placed them in a more prominent position and lowered the political temperature of the industries concerned.

Hobsbawm says,

> "The period therefore probably saw a transfer of the center of gravity within the labour aristocracy from the old pre-industrial crafts to the new metal industries, and the emergence of some elements of a labour aristocracy in trades previously regarded (wrongly) as composed essentially of labourers. Its relative numerical strength may not, however, have increased." (31)

The relation between the labour aristocracy and the higher strata worsened during the later nineteenth century, and this began to affect its status but not its earnings. It became more difficult but not impossible for a member of the labour aristocracy to rise into the ranks of the middle classes. This strata had been secure in the knowledge that they were respected and that they occupied a position just below the employers but far above everyone else. The advent of imperialism changed all this by placing a new class of white collar workers between the labour aristocracy and the employers. This reduced their social position and limited the chances of promotion by creating an alternative hierarchy of civil servants and teachers. Hobsbawm says:

> "Admittedly most of the new strata were, in one way or another, the children of the 'lower middle class' (including sections of the labour aristocracy), but this did not alter their effect. At any rate it is safe to say that by the end of the Edwardian era the gap above the labour aristocracy had widened, though below it had not significantly narrowed." (32)

From 1914 onwards we see a collapse of the labour aristocracy for several reasons. Firstly, the basic industries of the 19th century declined. These were the strongholds of the labour aristocracy. Secondly, a change in the system of wage payment caused the gap between the skilled and unskilled workers to decline. Thirdly, the rise of a large class of semi-skilled machine operators who were paid by results caused the gap between the lower strata of the working class and the labour aristocracy to be filled. Lastly, the growth of the white collar, managerial and technical strata (the 'office' against the 'workshop') lowered their social position still further.

Let us now see what Lawrence himself has to say about his own background and class position.

"I was born amongst 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 dialogue which my father spoke ....." (33)

Also, in 'Sons and Lovers' - a thinly disguised autobiography - we learn of Paul's (Lawrence's) mother:

"Mrs. Morel came of a good old burgher family, famous independents who had fought with Colonel Hutchinson and who remained stout Congregationalists. Her grandfather had gone bankrupt in the lace-market at the time when so many lace-manufacturers were mined in Nottingham. Her father, George Coppard, was an engineer ....." (34)

Lawrence goes on to say in 'Autobiographical Sketch':

"When I was twelve I got a county council scholarship, twelve pounds a year, and went to Nottingham High School.

After leaving school I was a clerk for three months .....

A year later I became a school teacher, and after three years' savage teaching of collier lads I went to take the 'normal' course in Nottingham University ..... From college I went down to Croydon, near London, to teach in a new elementary school at a hundred pounds a year." (35)

Lawrence therefore saw himself as a working class boy, however his mother came from the lower middle class and exerted a great influence on him with her middle class aspirations. Indeed, even

if he can be said to be of a working class background he moved up into the new white collar class when he became a teacher. Ultimately, whatever his personal opinions, it is apparent that he is cast mid way between the two. He has a deep insight into features of working class existence but he despises 'the masses' at the same time as praising their spontaneity and 'life'. Likewise he hates the bourgeoisie.

"Class makes a gulf, across which all the best human flow is lost. It is not exactly the triumph of the middle classes that has made the deadness, but the triumph of the middle class thing ....."
"But the working class is narrow in outlook, in prejudice, and narrow in intelligence. This again makes a prison. One can belong absolutely to no class." (36)

His novels are concerned chiefly with members of the lower middle class, of which he became a member. The major characters are school teachers, school inspectors, factory owners, gifted workers (Aaron's Rod), or farmers. (White Peacock and The Rainbow).

In chapter 1 we dealt with Goldmann's theory of world-visions, and our method now requires us to try and establish some facets of the world vision of the labour aristocracy and lower middle class, in the hope that it will explain certain aspects of Lawrence's novels.

The problem which faces us is this: what was the economic, social and political infrastructure of the group from which Lawrence came? If we look at English society during the years from 1900 - 1920 we see the development of monopoly capitalism, a decline of liberalism and a polarisation of society between the ruling class on one hand and the working class on the other. Imperialism had created a group of white collar workers with high aspirations to self-definition, but who were culturally, economically and socially dependent on the bourgeoisie. The upper strata of the working class also had benefited from imperialism as Hobsbawn points out. As a social layer, the reformist tendencies within the working class, and the white collar group constituted a fusion between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This is especially noticeable with members of the Labour party and the labour unions who were assimilated into the realms of constitutional government.

One thing we can state fairly certainly is that the intensity of conflict between the classes during the 1880's, 1890's and 1909–1918 was due to the growth of monopoly capitalism. There was increased industrialisation and division of labour, which was to bring about the collapse of the labour aristocracy; however 1914 was a deceptive 'indian summer' when these new tendencies had yet to make themselves felt. The labour aristocracy was a perpetration of class collaboration and shot through with reformism. It is significant that it was also the strata with the most developed system of trades unions. However, this reformism has two sides. Sectorial unionism fought against the rest of the working class for its special position, it also fought against the management for status and a right to a share of the profits:

> "In the course of this fight it established not merely a series of devices and institutions which have become the common property of the movement since ... but a whole system of the ethics of militancy." (37)

New groups of 'labour aristocrats' arose in the technical and white collar grades and here also we have an exhibition of 'the bourgeois proletariat'. Their earnings were not much higher than those of the artisans but in terms of status they raised themselves above the workers. Their opposition to labour was very strong and only later did the crisis of the imperialist economy bring them into the labour movement.

We have then two sectors, both of whom are desperately concerned with status, both feeling that they are destined for greater things and yet already being undermined by historical forces beyond their control, both wedged between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Lawrence's search for a viable morality, his criticism of industrialism and division of labour, his concern with snobbery and mediation, his 'tragic vision' (which criticises the dominant culture and yet is powerless to break from it) constitutes the world vision of these sectors.

In social and economic terms, his position as an intellectual and a teacher from the working class, links him also to these groups.

The basic infrastructure of this world-view is one of <u>paradox</u>. This paradox in our view also provides the infrastructure for Lawrence's novels. The strata was dependent upon a bourgeois culture with which

it was fundamentally dissatisfied, whilst at the same time it was dependent upon it for status both economic and social. Lawrence, in his personal life, tried to exile himself from the situation to find peace of mind, however, this lead only to solitude and death. Exile means that one gains a clearer idea of the mechanisms of social relationships, but at the same time it excludes man from any community and also shows the impossibility of attaining his desires without a perspective of the future. (38)

There seems to me to be a relationship between the optimism of 'Sons and Lovers' through to the pessmism of 'Women in Love' followed by the capitulation to authoritarianism in the later work, the increasing withdrawal from the world into exile, and the decline of the aspirations of this social group into a belief in the impossibility of achieving its historical destiny:

> "If a class thinks the thoughts imputable to it and which bear upon its interests right through to its logical conclusions and yet fails to strike at the heart of that totality, then such a class is bound to only a subordinate role ... Such classes are normally condemned to passivity, to an unstable oscillation between the ruling and the revolutionary classes, and if perchance they do not erupt then such explosions are purely elemental and aimless. They may win a few battles but they are doomed to ultimate defeat." (39)

> "Every time it is a question of finding the infrastructure of a philophy, a literary or artistic current, ultimately we have been forced to consider ... a social class and its relations to society."

> "The maximum of potential consciousness of a social class always constitutes a psychologically coherent world-view which may be expressed on the plane of religion, philosophy, literature or art." (40)

Two other points are important in defining social class, its function in production and its relations with other dasses. The function of the strata to which Lawrence belonged was one created by the expansion of imperialism in its 'indian summer' before 1914 and was later curtailed by the development of monopoly capitalism. Its relations with other classes are ambiguous in the sense that at some points its objectives coincided with those of the proletariat and at some points were extremely conservative to the extent that they were critical of the ruling class but in a reactionary and not a revolutionary manner. Lawrence's attack on industrialism cuts both

ways. That is, in some novels (The Rainbow, Women in Love) he explores the effect of industrialism and reification on human relationships, and in others (Lady Chatterley's Lover) he harks back in the manner of Carlyle after some pre-industrial paradise.

The scale of values of social classes are specific because they aspire each to a different ideal of harmonious social organisation, therefore, collaboration between the classes are only temporary means to attain different ends. For example, the collaboration between the French bourgeoisie and 'the people' under the common banner of 'liberty, equality, fraternity' in 1789, enabled the bourgeoisie to take power but did not grant the demands of 'the people.' This provides an answer to Stendhal's famour question, 'Why aren't men happy?' The fact was, that men were not happy after the revolution because economic unfreedom still existed even if political and religious unfreedom did not.

For Lawrence, the situation is more acute but the problem is still basically the same and, needless to say, the exposure of 'mediation' is an important element in the work of both writers. Let us here make a distinction between ideologies and world-views as being the partial and therefore distorting character of the former; and the total character of the latter. Hence, we can link ideology to all other social groups who put forward a partial and distorted character because they are defending their own privileges. Thus, if we look at class relations when Lawrence was writing the first of his novels, we see that 'world-views' were more than ever 'visions du monde' in the proper sense of the words.

This group with its roots in the proletariat regarded the bourgeoisie with envy because of its privileged position, and also with contempt and resentment because of the bourgeoisie's paralysing social and cultural hegemony. As we have stated, the group had links with the working class and were on the one hand attracted to the militancy and the revolutionary stirrings of this class in the years 1911-14 as a means of achieving their own ends. On the other hand they felt extremely threatened by this militant upsurge from below.

Because of their function as a social group they were also bound to the middle class economically, politically and culturally. Hence this group develops a vision wherein man appears to be torn between

two contradictory claims that the world prevents him from reconciling. It is a vision wherein Lawrence's heros and heroines are beset on one side by the working class and on the other by bourgeois culture. The central problem for them is to establish their own social and individual identity (what Lawrence calls 'life') by attacking the abstract intellect and shallowness of bourgeois society and its culture. This leads Lawrence to lay bare the mechanics of bourgeois society by exposing the reified relationships between man and man, and between man and nature. Hence his attack on industrialism and its dehumanising effects on man. It is noticeable that his heroes do not succeed in establishing any spontaneity of desire, or in developing any true relationship. Similarly, for this group as a whole, the war and the years after it showed that the group was historically fissile.

This situation gives rise to what I have called 'tragic vision' in the novels of D.H. Lawrence. Goldmann has used this term in connection with Pascal and Racine, and although there are great differences between Pascal and Lawrence, certain basic facets of the situation are the same in either case. Pascal's world-vision was formulated in his adherence to Jansenism and his membership of a particular social group whose class position resulted in an ambivalent attitude to the world. The same is true for Lawrence in his membership of the lower middle class. Tragic vision involved mediation in an important way, and we shall go on to discuss it with direct reference to Lawrence and his work.

Our hypothesis is that due to an ambiguous social position because of the historical situation outlined earlier and a strong ruling class hegemony, the labour aristocracy and the lower middle class developed a world vision which for some time coincided with a similar outlook on the part of the proletariat. This vision is outlined in Lawrence's novels up to 'Women in Love'. After this book, due to new circumstances, Lawrence's world view parted ways with the militant working class and it is no coincidence that the elements which caused his artistic production to be aesthetically good, now were not present. We shall attempt to determine what these elements were, and what this 'tragic vision' entailed.

Lukacs says:

"The outlook of the other classes (petty bourgeois or peasants) is ambiguous or sterile because their existence is not based exclusively on their role in the capitalist system of production but is indissolubly linked with the vestiges of feudal society."

"This class (the petty bourgeois) lives at least in part in the capitalist big city and every aspect of its existence is directly exposed to the influence of capitalism. Hence it cannot possibly remain wholly unaffected by the fact of class conflict between bourgeois and proletariat. But as a transitional class in which the interests of two other classes become simultaneously blunted ... 'it will imagine itself' to be above class antagonisms." (41)

REFERENCES : CHAPTER III

1. GOLDMANN, L. Pour une Sociologie du Roman. Paris:Gallimard. 1964. p.345.
2. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. R.K.P. 1964. p.89.
3. TROTSKY, L. Where is Britain Going? Plough Press. 1970. p.2.
4. ANDERSON, P. 'Origins of the Present Crisis'. Towards Socialism. Fontana. 1965.
5. IBID. pp.13-14.
6. IBID. p.19.
7. IBID. pp19-20.
8. IBID. p.20.
9. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. Merlin. 1971. p.52.
10. ANDERSON, P. 'Origins of the Present Crisis'. pp.33-34.
11. IBID. p.34.
12. IBID. p.34.
13. THOMPSON, E.P. 'The Peculiarities of the English'. Socialist Register. Merlin. 1965.
14. IBID. 'The Peculiarities of the English'. Section 1.
15. BAGEHOT, W. The British Constitution. Fontana. 1966.
16. NAIRN, T. 'The Fateful Meridian'. New Left Review. no.60. p.12.
17. WILLEY, B. Nineteenth Century Background. Pelican. 1972. p.205.
18. DANGERFIELD, G. The Strange Death of Liberal England. Capricorn. 1961. p.141.
19. NAIRN, T. 'The Nature of the Labour Party'. Towards Socialism. Fontana. 1965.
20. LENIN, V.I. Essential Works. New York:Bantam. 1966.
21. NAIRN, T. 'The Nature of the Labour Party'. p.172.
22. IBID. p.172.
23. See ANDERSON. 'Origins of the Present Crisis'.
24. TROTSKY, L. Where is Britain Going? Plough Press. 1970. p.97.
25. HOBSBAWM, E. See 'Labour Traditions'. Labouring Men. Weidenfield & Nicholson. 1968.
26. MARX, K. & ENGELS, F. Selected Correspondence. Moscow: Progress Publishers. 1962. pp. 537-538.
27. HOBSBAWM, E. 'Trends in the Briitsh Labour Movement Since 1800'. Labouring Men. p.324.
28. LENIN, V.I. Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1968. p.99.
29. IBID. p.101.
30. HOBSBAWM, E. 'The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth Century Britain'. Labouring Men. p.274.

(Cont.)

31. IBID. p.284.
32. IBID. p.297.
33. LAWRENCE, D.H. 'Autobiographical Sketch'. Selections from the Phoenix. Penguin. 1968. p.14.
34. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. Penguin. 1967. pp.14-15.
35. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.14.
36. IBID. p.17.
37. HOBSBAWM, E. Labouring Men. p.323.
38. See GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. R.K.P. 1964.
39. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. Merlin. 1971. p.52.
40. GOLDMANN, L. The Human Sciences and Philosophy. Cape. 1969. p.102.
41. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. p.59.

CHAPTER IV: The Novels

> "In all that has been written about Lawrence by his admirers, nothing has amused me or amazed me more than the suggestion that he was indifferent or intolerant of class distinction. Lawrence - I say it deliberately - was, without qualification, the most class-conscious man I have ever known." (1)

The novels which have been selected for examination in this chapter are those written between 1910 and 1920. This separation of 'early' works from the 'later' novels is an orthodox view of Lawrence's development. However, we have other reasons than literary orthodoxy for following this trend. We are concerned here with Lawrence as a 'realistic' writer and his perception of consciousness and industrialism. Our opinion is that during the years 1910 and 1920, his world-view as the expression of the potential consciousness of the petit-bourgeoisie was such that his work is characterised by realism. We believe that there is a positive correlation between realism, as we understand it, and aesthetically 'great' literature. After 1918, due to a change in the historical situation and the social position of his class, his world-view became distorted by reaction and polemic, with disasterous consequences for his art. Novels such as "The Plumed Serpent" and "Lady Chatterley's Lover" are not as good, aesthetically, as the earlier works. Literary critics have sought the cause of this in the style and form of the works, whereas we seek the cause in the changing consciousness of Lawrence and the petit-bourgeoisie together with the other social forces at work in society. Alldritt says this about the early novels:

> "This development begins with certain basic categories and configurations inherited from diverse nineteenth century sources and continues in a succession of very original styles of fiction, the last of which, "Women in Love", is significantly affected by Lawrence's experience of modernism in painting and sculpture. In the novels written after the Great War there is a marked deterioration brought about by the sudden deficiency of cultural confirmation for Lawrence's characteristic mode of seeing." (2)

Our view is that this 'deficiency' was brought about by the sudden collapse of the hope for a petit-bourgeoisie as a separate and hegemonic class in society. With this situation there could be no 'cultural confirmation' for Lawrence's world-view.

I. 'Tragic Vision'

The nineteenth century had seen a breakdown of religious beliefs with the revelation of Darwinism and the development of capitalist 'practicality'. At the turn of the century, monopoly capitalism increased rationality and mechanisation. The bourgeoisie was in a firm hegemonic position, but was threatened from below by rising militancy in the working class. In between these two forces lay the labour aristocracy whose position was being eroded, and the petit-bourgeois white collar strata which had been created by the demands of imperialism and the subsequent increase in educational opportunities. This turn created increased aspirations on the part of this strata which were not to be realised. It is not surprising then, to find that resentment is a major element in the characters which people Lawrence's novels. It is also significant that resentment is one of the components which, for Girard, constitutes 'mediated desire'. Both the working class and this white collar group felt the need to develop their own culture and break away from bourgeois hegemony.

Rationality had destroyed any idea of community and replaced it with the concept of the isolated individual. Also, the old concepts of hierarchy were broken down and replaced by the more subtle situation of a collection of free, equal, isolated individuals whose relation to one another was that of buyer and seller. It is our contention that Lawrence's perception of this market relationship at first coincides with that of the proletariat in its determination to overcome this means of corruption of spontaneous and direct relationships.

In this context, 'tragic vision' represents Lawrence's demand for a new morality and culture - a new set of human values. However, it is 'tragic' precisely because it is a vision founded on the misconception of petit-bourgeois independence, and thus it never actually reaches the stage of being able to offer a consistent set of ideas which are capable of taking the place of bourgeois hegemony.

> "Lawrence spent a good deal of time trying to generalise about the necessary common change; he was deeply committed, all his life, to the idea of reforming society. But his main energy went, and had to go, into the business of personal liberation from the system." (3)

> "What he achieved ... was an antithesis to the powerful industrial thesis which had been proposed for him. But this, in certain of its aspects, was never more than a mere rejection, a habit of evasion." (4)

Lawrence was a realist in that he understood and revealed the mechanism of alienation which underlies capitalist rationalisation. However, he was unable to put forward any coherent alternative. Any conjecture about the future descends into Utopian idealism about community living without realising that such schemes cannot take place within the present society but can only come about as part of an overall change. With this ahistorical perspective, he follows in the footsteps of such great bourgeois realists as Mann, Balzac, and Stendhal. Once again, we make the point that if Lawrence is part of any 'tradition' it is this one, rather than the diverse sources of English literature from which he drew his social philosophy. On the point of ahistorical world-views, Goldmann says:

> 'However, tragic vision is incapable of seeing itself in this historical perspective. It is essentially unhistorical, since it lacks the principal dimension of history which is the future. Refusal, in the radical and absolute form which assumes in tragic thought, has only one dimension in time: the present." (5)

Goldmann's use of the term, 'tragic vision', differs from ours in the sense that he refers in "The Hidden God" to a metaphysical deity, whereas we, in discussing Lawrence, take this 'God' to symbolise the commodity relation which creates the reified relationships between man and man, and between man and nature. Thus, under capitalism, all men appear to be equals, (or as Girard says, "Men become gods to one another".) on a political level, whilst the economic unfreedom between man remains unchanged.

> "In economic life ... every genuine relationship with the qualitative aspect of things and beings tends to disappear ... to be replaced by a mediated and degraded relationship: the purely quantitative relationship of exchange values. All particular idols are caught up together and engulfed by the supreme idol of the capitalist world: money." (6)

Lawrence puts it this way:

> "Our last wall is the golden wall of money. This is a fatal wall. It cuts us off from life, from vitality, from the alive sun and the alive earth as nothing can. Nothing, not even the most fanatical dogmas of an iron-bound religion, can insulate us from the inrush of life and inspiration as money can." (7)

The problem for Lawrence was how to overcome the fetishism of a world of commodity relations.

When we talk of 'tragic vision' and 'tragedy' this does not refer to the genre. Obviously, Lawrence's novels are not the same in <u>form</u> as Shakespeare's tragedies, however, it is a fact that all forms of tragic vision have one feature in common: they all express a deep crisis in the relationship between man and his social and spiritual world. Tragedy, in our sense, is merely a term which covers any literature where this crisis makes its appearance.

> "On a social as well as an individual plane, it is the sick organ which creates awareness, and it is in periods of social and political crisis that men are most aware of the enigma of their presence in the world. In the past, this awareness has tended to find its expression in tragedy." (8)

Tragic man is forced to accept that the world exists in a particular way but he cannot feel part of it. He is shut out and condemned to exile because he accepts the existence of society but refuses to accept the mode of existence as a desirable one. Lawrence refuses to be a part of the 'base forcing' of man, and in his early works he strives towards a critique of industrialism that is not an absolute refusal of the world. Later on, when in 'exile', this critique becomes an absolute rejection and thus deprives the world of its meaning and renders it an abstract, anonymous obstacle.

Lawrence's realism is tragic and because it is based on a petit-bourgeois world-view and as such it is ahistorical, in the sense that it lacks the element of the future.

> "We know the flower of today, but the flower of tommorrow is beyond us all." (9)

His vision, and the vision of his social group, is one of criticism without any alternative for the future which is workable. Even so, in his treatment of industrialism and class consciousness and his attempt to forge a new morality, Lawrence attains a level of realism which is unsurpassed.

> "The man who lives solely in the world, but who remains constantly detached from it, finds that his mind is freed from all the current illusions and limitations which beset his fellows, with the result that the art and ideas which are born of the tragic vision become one of the most advanced forms of realism." (10)

This refusal of the world is a refusal to be satisfied with its present state, and sets up against this a demand for real values - that is - <u>totality</u>.

> "For the tragic mind, authentic values are synonymous with totality." (11)

As we have pointed out in chapter I, 'totality' is a pre-requisite of realism. The task of the writer is to portray the 'whole man' in opposition to capitalist fragmentation.

> "To be alive, to be man alive, to be whole man alive: that is the point. And at its best, the novel, and the novel supremely, can help you ... For 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, man alive, and live woman." (12)

II

In the pervious chapters we have attempted to explore theoretically the relationships which exist between literature and social background. We have also examined the problem of Lawrence's world-view and the literary sources from which he drew some of his more important ideas. It has also been stressed that there is no mechanical relationship between base and superstructure, between literature and the socio-economic conditions which existed. We have stated that the sociology of literature must concern itself primarily with literature as art and not merely as a reflection of society.

Previously, a major part of the sociology of literature has been concerned with the availability of markets, the writer's social status, the structure of the audience and so on. Obviously these factors are important and we have dealt with some of them in this thesis. However, they tell us nothing of the significance of the novel as art and the way in which it conveys its message to its audience, or indeed, what exactly that message is.

> "The whole point about literature is precisely its creative activism, the fact that literary creation is a process which struggles with the world it sets out to depict; positivistic sociology in its extreme forms renders literature as a passive cultural object." (13)

Analysis of the actual text, which is what the structuralist method involves, can only be carried out on works which attempt to go beyond the transient features of a culture. This literature therefore

finds itself constantly in conflict with the norms and values of its socio-economic environment and tries to give man a better understanding of his social world. This distinguishes great from lesser novels and as such this literature can be seen as a structural unity.

> "The concept of a world-vision involving both social groups, social classes, and social structures, together with problematic values and a reaching out beyond the conventional, is part of a method which allows literature to be discussed sociologically without losing its status as literature." (14)

It may be argued that Goldmann, from the study of one French writer (Malraux), has developed a general theory of the novel which fails to take account of many aspects of literature. However, we believe that Girard's concept of 'mediation', if handled with care and integrated into the 'significant structure' of tragic vision, can render Goldmann's mode of analysis far more universal in its implications. If mediation and its relation to alienation and commodity relations can be pin-pointed in Lawrence, a case can then be presented which placed Lawrence in the same tradition as other great realists such as Cervantes, Proust and Stendhal who also expose this mechanism of social fragmentation.

The rise of the 'stream-of-consciousness' school of writers such as Joyce and Woolf at the beginning of the twentieth century seemed to suggest that the conventional form of the novel had been brought to its logical end. The stable bourgeois world of the nineteenth century had been replaced by an era of ambiguous values where notions of doubt and anguish figure as central features. In Lawrence's key works, "Sons and Lovers", "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love", he traces the transition from the stability and sense of community of the 19th, to the instability of monopoly capitalism in the 20th century. The works are a curious mixture of optimism and pessimism. They are optimistic in the sense that they celebrate the humanistic desire for the re-establishment of the 'whole man', and pessimistic in that Lawrence's social group had not the power to achieve this. This is what creates the tragic vision and imbues even the most hopeful of the novels with a feeling of isolation and tragedy.

We are not yet at the stage where human relations are the relations between objects as in the novels of Robe-Grillet, but even so, money, sometimes explicitly sometimes not, undoubtedly functions as one of the major structures through which human relations are mediated. Sometimes Lawrence shows us the way in which relationships are perverted by indus-

trialism or the break-up of the community, but what he is revealing here is the effect of the pervading ethos of monopoly capitalism and the way in which man becomes a commodity on the market. We see mediation, therefore, as revealing the commodity structure of human relationships. The same is true in the case of Proust, Balzac, Stendhal and Henry James ("The Spoils of Poynton").

Lawrence's concern with alienation is due in part to his sense of exile and loss of community. It is also a function of his insecure position as a member of the intelligensia. As we have shown, he rose into the lower middle class from a working class background and was certainly not at home in the Bloomsbury circle of the bourgeoisie.

Swingewood and Laurenson point out:

> "The pervasive sense of alienation which now dominates the modern novel had not yet entered bourgeois realist literature. It does so at the moment the novelist begins to lose his secure position within his class, a process which had been developing since the late eighteenth century, and from this highly problematic situation he communicates an overpowering sense of alienation." (16)

This alienation and tragic vision creates the world-view of a group whose social position is admirably expressed by the concept of 'mediation'; the petit-bourgeoisie being literally a 'go-between' for the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The main components of Lawrence's world-vision are: alienation, industrialism, commodity fetishism, community and exile, mediation and class pride. It should be remembered that all of these components are related to one another and any discussion of them is bound to overlap.

The concept of alienation is given its most concrete form in the writings of Marx. He defined it as being the process by which man becomes an outsider in the world of his own creation. Man is an outsider because of the capitalist division of labour which creates vast accumulations of wealth but separates the worker from the products of his own labour. In fact, man's labour is turned into a product or <u>commodity</u> which is bought and sold on the market.

> "This fact implies that the object produced by labour, its product, now stands opposed to it as an alien being, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labour which has been embodied in an object and turned into a physical thing; this product is an objectification of labour." (17)

This results in the workers alienation from the products of his labour. Also, man's 'essence', his labour, is turned against him and this alienates him from the production activity itself. Because work is now essentially unrewarding, man feels free only in his leisure time and is alienated as a 'species-being' in that he now lives for himself and produces for himself instead of for the whole of nature.

Man's relationships are therefore reified. That is, they are relationships between <u>things</u> or commodities rather than people.

> "... trying to have a relationship with a human being is like trying to have a relationship with the letter X in algebra." (18)

This idea of relationships between things is called 'commodity fetishism' by Marx. Lukacs says the following:

> "The problem of commodities must not be considered in isolation but as the central, structural problem of capitalist society in all its aspects."
>
> "... The essence of commodity structure is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires a 'phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every aspect of its fundamental nature: the relation between people." (19)

Also,

> "The relation of the producer to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their own labour. This is the reason why the products of labour become commodities, social things whose qualities are at the same time perceptible and imperceptible by the senses ... It is only the definite social relation between man that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things." (20)

As this process becomes more advanced, complex and less direct,

> "... it becomes increasingly difficult and rare to find anyone penetrating the veil of reification." (21)

This is a total process and affects all of society including the writer of novels. In fact, as Swingewood says, "alienation and reification now inform the basic structures of contemporary literature."

III

Another component of Lawrence's world-view which is expressed in the novels is that of 'community' and 'exile'. Obviously, this is related to alienation; the critique of industrialism is also involved.

Throughout Lawrence's own personal life he attempted to break out of the 'base forcing' of industrialism, and the characters in his novels are also shown to try and accomplish this with a singular lack of success. He sees industrialism as the destroyer of the old communities and traces this destruction in "The White Peacock" and "The Rainbow".

> "We have frustrated that instinct of community which would make us unite in pride and dignity in the bigger gesture of the citizen, not the cottager." (22)

Certainly, his childhood in the Nottinghamshire mining community was to provide him with a sense of close living which he was to hark after for the rest of his life. However, he was not to remain a part of the working class although he continued to strive after a new morality in a way which coincided in many ways with the aims of the working class.

In the mining community of his childhood, the material processes of satisfying and coping with human needs were not divorced from personal relationships, and as Williams points out:

> "The intellectual critiques of industrialism as a system were therefore reinforced and prepared for by all that he knew of primary relationships." (23)

In the novels too, it is in his examination of primary relationships that the effect of community break-up and industrialism are felt at their most powerful. He thought that the industrial system had crippled 'spontaneous life-activity' with its abstractions and categorisations. Indeed, in so doing, he was exposing in his novels the processes of mediated desire and fetishised relationships - the basis of the industrial system.

Lawrence did not like the situation of exile, and here we echo Williams' distinction between 'exile' and 'vagrant'. (24)

The vagrant is content to wander away from his homeland, whereas the exile wants the situation in his homeland changed so that he can return home.

> "Men are free when they are in a living homeland, not when they are straying and breaking away." (25)
>
> "Men are free when they belong to a living, organic, believing community, active in some unfulfilled, perhaps unrealised purpose." (26)

He was a man who desperately wanted to commit himself but with his own limited world-view and that of his social group he was unable to find anything constructive or progressive to ally himself to. He wanted to change society but kept on insisting that the change must come first in feeling and not economics. Williams rightly points out:

> "... almost everything to which he had borne witness might have shown how much 'in the head' this conclusion was." (27)

Nevertheless, in his early realism, he never relinquishes his vision of the 'whole man'. He expresses the tragedy of society's destruction of this, and the community as a whole in his essay on Thomas Hardy. The sentiments expressed here apply equally to Lawrence's heroes and to Lawrence himself.

> "This is the tragedy of Hardy, always the same: the tragedy of those who, more or less pioneers, have died in the wilderness, whither they had escaped for free action, after having left the walled security, and the comparative imprisonment of the established conventions. This is the theme of novel after novel: remain quite within the conventions and you are good, sage, and happy in the long run, though you never have the vivid pang of sympathy on your side: or, on the other hand, be passionate, individual, wilful, you will escape, and you will die, either of your own lack of strength to bear the isolation and the exposure, or by direct revenge from the community or both." (28)

IV

For the tragic mind, the mediator is always present whether in the shape of another person, or in the explicit form of commodity fetishism. The triangular structure of mediation takes the form of MAN: CAPITAL: THE WORLD. Tragic vision sees the mediator: money, as the hidden reality, to whom the whole of man's life is devoted. Any relationship which man has with his fellows or with the world is not a direct one, but is mediated through this hidden god.

> "Money, since it has the property of purchasing everything, of appropriating objects to itself, is therefore, the object par excellence. The universal character of this property corresponds to the omnipotence of money, which is regarded as an omnipotent being ... Money is the pander between need and object, between human life and the means of subsistence. But that which mediates my life mediates also the existence of other men for me. <u>It is for me the other person</u>." (29)
> (My emphasis.)

> "I who can have, through the power of money, everything for which the human heart <u>longs</u>, do I not possess all human abilities?" (30)

Any revealing of this process of mediation by the novelist is therefore a statement of true consciousness as opposed to the false consciousness of Naturalism, which limits itself to surface phenomena

and journalistic documentation. Any humanistic novelist, by definition, will expose the triangular structure of 'longing' or desiring because it is in direct opposition to the establishment of the whole man against the effects of alienation.

There is also another relationship with the mediator. This being may be greater than man, an idealised being, as in "Don Quixote", in which case the mediator becomes a focus for emulation and imitation. On the other hand, he may be man's equal and therefore does not hold the man at a spiritual distance. In this case, as Girard says, "men become gods to one another", as in the novels of Proust, Dostoyevski or Lawrence. In this situation where the mediator becomes not an idol but an obstacle to the spontaneity of desire, the 'modern sentiments', as Stendhal calls them, take over: 'jealousy, envy and impotent hatred'.

The human mind therefore knows this mediator in the most certain and immediate fashion possible. In fact, it is him. There is a relationship of participation and identity between the man and the mediator whether this being takes the form of God, an idea, another man, or money. Far from creating happiness, this does not enable man to transcend his loneliness or relieve tension. Only an awareness of this mediation brings relief, however, it also brings tragedy and death. The man who realises this process, unless he has a vision which takes account of the future, (and we have said that tragic vision lacks this vital element) only realises the impossibility of achieving his desires in a spontaneous way. A good example of this is the conclusion to Stendhal's "Scarlet and Black". Here, Julien Sorel grasps this impossibility and chooses to die rather than continuing to live in a world which is dominated by mediation and fetishism. Lawrence's heroes do not necessarily die physically, but certainly they die spiritually or dispense with their ideals. For example, the ending of "Sons and Lovers" has often been criticised for being 'tacked on'. However, using our method we interpret it as follows. Paul Morel unconsciously realises the impossibility of achieving his values but refuses to acknowledge this and tries to break 'towards the lights of the glowing town' in a mood of determination which is not in keeping with the previous writing. Rather than criticise this as a flaw in Lawrence's style, we would seek to provide a reason for this by saying that the ending seems to be 'tacked on' because Lawrence's world-view is essentially a bourgeois one. In adding this optimistic note he is not being true to himself as an artist. Even at this stage he unconsciously sees the impossibility

of the historical aims of the petit-bourgeoisie, but he refuses to acknowledge this. The tension which is therefore created is aesthetically invalid because it does not correspond to reality. Paul Morel is a tragic hero and Lukacs says this of such characters:

> "Death is an immanent reality, indissoluably linked with all the events of his existence."

Goldmann puts it thus:

> "In the perspective of tragedy, clarity means first and foremost, awareness of the unchangeable nature of the limits placed on man, and of the inevitability of death. There is no possible future reality for man in history, and his greatness can lie only in the conscious and willing acceptance of suffering and death, an acceptance which transforms his life into an exemplary destiny. Tragic greatness transforms the suffering which man is forced to endure because it is imposed upon him by a meaningless world, into a freely chosen and creative suffering, a going beyond human wretchedness by a significant action which rejects compromise and relative values in the name of a demand for absolute justice and truth." (31)

This admirably describes the character of Paul Morel as seen in the novel.

V

We once more put forward our claim that Mediation is not meant to be a substitute for Goldmann's theory. Mediation is seen as a 'significant structure' in the novels, and a necessary component of Lawrence's world-view (tragic vision). We also say that Girard's concept, as he states it, is inadequate, and we have attempted to integrate it into a Marxist framework by relating it more closely to the fetishism of commodities. The point about this is that it gives us a method which enables us to understand not only Lawrence, but the work of other writers as well. It clarifies works one by the other, without destroying the artistic qualities in them.

Girard's theory is that the heroes created by these novelists are never motivated by their own values; they never choose the object of their desire themselves, they let a model choose for them. Desire is mediated and spontaneity gives way to imitation. Girard talks at length of Proust's 'snobbism' and it is easy to equate this with what Lawrence calls 'class-pride'. In each, the triangular structure of subject - mediator - object is dominant. Obviously, this structure is immediately applicable to love relationships, but it is also applicable to social

relationships and questions of human needs in general. It may be argued that the mediator in Girard's sense, is only relevant to human characters, i.e. the mediator can only be equated with another human being. This may be so, but it is only the fault of Girard's analysis. In his theory, he fails to take account of the mediating effect of money and commodity relations which enables us to extend his analysis beyond purely love relationships.

Lawrence outlines this in "Daughters of the Vicar","Sons and Lovers" and the other novels, however, he does this without itemizing the characters' bank accounts, mortgages and so on, he does it by showing the destructive effect which industrialism has on personal relationships. In this way we cannot separate mediation from economics and similarly, we cannot separate economics from human relationships because the fetishism of commodities makes its presence felt throughout man's consciousness.

> "Transformation of the commodity relation into a thing of 'ghostly objectivity' cannot content itself with the reduction of all objects for the gratification of human needs to commodities. It stamps its imprint on the whole consciousness of man." (32)

One may ask, does Lawrence's work have any sociological value? We are frequently told that his novels disregard any social setting, and that in "Women in Love" for example, there is no mention of the Great War or any other social upheaval; we are told that his works lack breadth and objectivity. Girard answers these comments thus:

> "Beneath these unfavourable comments we recognise the old realist and positivist conception of the art of the novel. Novelistic genius draws up a detailed inventory of men and things; it should present us with a panorama as complete as possible of economic and social reality." (33)

Merely because Lawrence does not engulf us in journalistic details does not mean to say that he does not present us with a total picture of human activity and a plea for the re-establishment of the whole man. In "The Rainbow" and "Sons and Lovers" he gives a few details of the Bragwens' and Morel's background, but in the main, he conveys his information by way of the inner life of the narrative and conversation between characters. Also, he never introduces these for their own sake in order to present us with a picture - a fait accompli - but always relates the details to the novel as a whole in a way that enlarges our understanding of different things, each by the other.

To say that Lawrence's work does not portray social aspects is to posit a crude relationship between base and superstructure.

> "... the Marxist conception of realism is not to be compared with any photographic reproduction of daily life. Marxist aesthetics simply asks that the writer represent the reality which he has captured not abstractly but as the pulsating life of phenomena of which it forms an organic part and out of whose particular experience it evolves. But in our opinion it is not necessary that the phenomena delineated be derived from daily life or even from life at all. That is, free play of the creative imagination and unrestrained fantasy are compatible with the Marxist conception of realism." (34)

One may argue that Lawrence's later works such as "The Plumed Serpent" seem more applicable to the category of fantasy, and yet we are ignoring them. However, we do not say that the early works are realistic merely because they are set in industrial England. They are realistic because they cut through the reified forms of daily life and expose mediation and commodity relationships whereas the later works do not.

In reply to the critics who complain about Lawrence's lack of explicit social comments, we must agree with Girard when he says:

> "We have learnt enough to reject this narrow concept of the art of the novel. The novelists truth is total. It embraces all aspects of individual and collective existence ... Sociologists can recognise nothing in Proust which reminds them of their own approach because there is a fundamental opposition between the sociology of the novel and the sociology of sociologists. This opposition involves not only the solution and methods but also the data of the problem to be resolved." (35)

Lawrence is not indifferent to social reality, indeed, this is his one concern, the effects of social reality on human relationships. To the novelist of triangular desire interior life is already social, and social life is always the reflection of individual desire. It is this dialectic of the individual and the general which gives rise to the concept of 'the type' in the work of Lukacs, Marx and Engels.

VI

In the following sections which deal with the novels in detail, we will find references to passages which explore the relationship between labour and art. Why is this important? Since great art deals with the whole man, and labour and man's humanity are historically bound up,

labour, as the way in which man finds his 'wholeness', is potentially the novel's greatest theme. Marx called labour, "the open book of man's essential powers". Man's freedom and happiness therefore depend on the relation he has to the product of his labour, and the labour process. The most terrible crime that the capitalist system can perpetrate against man's human essence is the alienation of man from his labour and its products, that is, from his objectivised self. Work is alienated as a human activity. The ruling class despise it and the working class hate ite, therefore labour tends to take a smaller and smaller place in the art of class society.

In most bourgeois literature where the subject appears, it takes the form of a mystical deification of the Beauty of Labour, as in Nazi Germany or the writings of Carlyle, or as a negative protest against human misery as in Zola's "Germinal". Lawrence's treatment of the subject oscillates between neo-fascist deification and a realistic, positive attitude. He does not make specifically detailed accounts of men at work as we find in "Robinson Crusoe and "The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist" rather it is the unconscious effects of alienation and the division of labour which manifest themselves in the relations between men. A good example of this is the description of Gerald and the effects of Taylorism in the chapter of "Women in Love" entitled 'The Industrial Magnate' but we shall explore this in more detail later.

"THE DAUGHTERS OF THE VICAR"

We shall look first at this short story before examining the major novels because it is an excellent microcosm of Lawrence's style, and also because the theme of mediation is very obvious.

F.R. Leavis, the most distinguished defender of Lawrence, has insisted on Lawrence's intelligent grasp of the social reality of English life, against Eliot's accusations that his work is simply an uncultivated, plebian and emotional protest. At certain points it seems possible to go further than Leavis in exposing the nature of Lawrence's realism. (36)

The 'mediation' in the story is transparently obvious. Mary's true humanity is destroyed by her imitation of Mr. Massey's 'higher freedom'. Her physical, sensuous being is 'henceforward out of consideration ... there remained only the direction of her activity towards clarity and high-minded living'. Now clearly Lawrence is not simply counterposing 'instinct' or 'life' to some abstract or generalised 'mind'. This is

a common caricature of Lawrence - the triangular relationship is not merely described in some 'functional' way, it is a trap for Mary. She persuades herself that she now has a 'higher freedom, a freedom from material things'. This ideological mechanism provides the 'legitimation' in the best English hypocritical style, of the mother's crude materialism. For all Leavis' insights he seems unable to grasp what Lawrence grasped: that the social relationships through which the deadening effects of 'mind and will' are effected, are sympathetic and 'necessary', and are part and parcel of this very deadening. (The novelist's model for these relationships, which forms the structure of his work, is the triangular one of mediation). Leavis gives the impression that we have characters, albeit with internal contradictions, who represent the evils of 'mental consciousness' and industrial civilisation on the one hand, and on the other a healthier morality built around 'life'. Lawrence in this story exposes with hatred the price of 'consensus'.

> "She had sold a lower thing, her body, for a higher thing, her freedom from material things." (37)

'Mary is safe for life', and for this middle class safety, a price must be paid.

Later in the story Lawrence describes the love affair between Louisa, Mary's sister, and a collier - Alfred. If we look at the passage where Louisa first becomes aware of Alfred, and then see what Leavis has to say about it we can observe the limitations of Leavis' analysis. He says this of the passage: (38)

> "The passage has its perfect dramatic inevitability; 'the body' here is in the most ordinary sense a body - a collier's body that has to be washed after work; the significance, without there being any suggestion of a special intention, makes itself felt with great power immediately." (39)

Leavis is compelled to ignore the last three lines of the passage even though their difference in tone cries out for comment.

> "She put down the towel and went upstairs again, troubled in her heart. She had seen only one human being in her life, and that was Mary. All the rest were strangers. Now her soul was going to open, she was going to see another. She felt strange and pregnant." (40)

He is forced to ignore this last section because he is restricted by his own theme.

> "'Reverence' and 'life', the large terms I have used in referring to the positive side of Lawrence's attitude, get their definition in the course of the tale. As the ugliness bred by the thwarting of life takes on its most sinister form, at the same time the positive becomes insistent and its significance begins to define itself for recognition." (41)

If the theme and the few remarks of Leavis on the 'bath-tub' passage from which we have just quoted exhausted its meaning, Lawrence need not have inserted the last few lines. And yet these lines are from one point of view the quintessence of the story. They represent the overcoming of Louisa's earlier subjection to a subtle form of mediation:

> "... perhaps she ought still to feel that Mary on her plane, was a higher being than herself." (42)

It is not at all a matter of dramatic inevitability of the collier's body confirming Leavis' thesis. On the contrary, the passage ends on a disturbing and problematic note.

> "She felt strange and pregnant." (43)

Here we have, not Leavis' imagined anecdote illustrating "the positive's significance beginning to define itself for recognition", but rather, a definite break to new relationships. Lawrence concretises the emergence of a new quality created from the struggle of opposites. Again, 'life' and 'mind' are not two alternative moralities posed before the individual citizen, they are names for the actual forces of ideological oppression in a society dominated by alienation, and the forces of revolt at the same time produced in the course of this oppression.

When Lawrence writes about "... abandoning cerebral conceit and willed ambition", he characteristically points to this struggle and at the same time harks back to the almost identical formula of Stendhal in his attack on the 'modern' sentiments, the fruits of 'universal vanity'.

"SONS AND LOVERS"

The first point to be made about this novel is that it reveals Lawrence's sense of social and individual growth, change and development whilst making it clear that his vision of the future is to say the least vague. (See quote no.9). Everything is:

> "... a vast, shimmering impulse which waves onwards towards some end ..." (44)

The novel was written in 1911 and contains both the early optimism and the basic tragedy within Lawrence's world-view. Like George Saxton in "The White Peacock", the hero's consciousness, ultimately does not have the strength to develop. He attempts to break away from bourgeois consciousness and evolve his own vision of the world, but is, in the end, unsuccessful.

One of the themes running through the book is Paul Morel's development as an artist. This artistic vision is a reflection of progress towards a realistic view of the world. The first phase of this progress, as seen in the descriptions of his attempts at painting, is in the manner of the pre-Raphaelites with its romanticism and medieval overtones. The second appears to be in the manner of Naturalism with its delineation of purely surface phenomena, and the third is one of realism where his aim is to depict the inner reality of things.

> " 'It seems so true.'
> 'It's because - it's because there is scarcely any shadow in it; it's more shimmery, as if I'd painted the shimmering protoplasm of the leaves and everywhere, and not the stiffness of the shape. That seems dead to me. Only this shimmeriness is the real living. The shape is the dead crust. The shimmer is inside really." (45)

This speech gives the lie to Naturalism. The function of these references to art is to suggest Paul's development in perception and feeling. It also serves to establish the important position in time, of the hero and his evolution. "Sons and Lovers" is first and foremost a novel about the play of historical and social forces on the individual. It is a novel about an individual's struggle to hold true to a particular way of seeing at a particular time. As a realist, Lawrence is aware that men do not exist in a vacuum, but act upon social forces, and are acted on by them.

In the first few chapters, Paul is only a minor character as Lawrence focuses upon the parents and their social environment. It is a revealing picture of family life in a mining village at the turn of the century. The first paragraph of the book tells us much about the development of industrialism from its earliest times and also about the living conditions which it gives rise to. But like all of Lawrence's writings in the early novels, it does not appear to be out of place and leads us in naturally to the characters in the book. (46)

He goes on to describe the miners' dwellings, and with characteristic insight he contrasts the outer facade with the inner reality.

> "... So the actual conditions of living in the Bottoms that was so well built and that looked so nice, were quite unsavoury because people must live in the kitchen, and the kitchen opened onto that nasty alley of ash-pits." (47)

Immediately, he takes us right to the core of the capitalist ethos. The houses are cheaply built and their outer surface hides an inner reality of squalor. He is not criticising the miners here, but rather the industrialists who have devised this cheap, brutalising accommodation and the ethos of a society which placed profit before human beings and desecrates the countryside with its industrial waste.

In the next paragraph, the principal theme of the novel - class consciousness - makes its appearance in the form of Mrs. Morel's attitude to her social position. This paragraph is also important in that it (48) introduces the first example of 'mediation' as a manifestation of industrialism and capitalism. Indeed, mediation and class consciousness are very much related. In this paragraph, the esteem of the 'Bottoms women' for Mrs. Morel, who comes from a petit-bourgeois background, is mediated by the fact that she pays extra rent and lives in an end house. She enjoys "a kind of aristocracy" over the others. The point is, that the other women do not base their opinions of her on what kind of <u>person</u> she is, but on what her social and <u>economic</u> standing is. Thus as Marx says "... money ... is for me the <u>other person</u>." Similarly, Mrs. Morel's 'desire' is for the women to regard her with esteem, therefore she desires the end house. In other words, she desires the house not because it is comfortable to live in but for the superiority of status that it will bring her. This is an example of what Girard calls 'internal mediation' where the fetishism in the relationship is veiled and mystified, and the mediator becomes 'an obstacle' to her desires. As Lawrence says; "This superiority in station was not much consolation... " The novelist's realism is thus able to penetrate reification and this deceit. Mrs. Morel's desires are not spontaneous, and to this extent she stands for the 'intellect' (Stendhal's 'modern' sentiments) against 'life' and 'spontaneity'.

It may be argued that our thesis revolves around a problem of semantics when we talk of 'mediation' in this way, however, it is more than this. Girard omits the economic factor in his analysis while we attempt to integrate it. Also, we are able to construct a 'significant structure' in equating Lawrence's world-view with 'tragic vision'. The components of this structure, we believe, enables us to say something about the novel as a genre and not merely one particular writer. As Goldmann suggests, we try to explain factors one <u>by</u> the other.

In the opening pages the main focus is on the parents. This is a sexual struggle on one level, and on another level, it is a struggle between the petit-bourgeois values of the mother and the working class values of the father. This antagonism is one of the moulding factors in Paul's development. In "Sons and Lovers" the antagonism takes on a far more explicitly class basis than in the later works but this does not mean that such a basis does not exist in the later novels. The reason for this increased mystification liesin the progression of Lawrence's world-view and the gradual break-down of realism in his work, combined with the changing situation of the petit-bourgeois strata after 1911. Nevertheless, we are not saying that writers should write explicitly about class warfare. Any thoughts about this must be inseparable from the inner life of the novel. This is the secret of the great novelists' ability to communicate. So, Lawrence relates the problems of class society by outlining the effects of mediated desire with this triangular structure. This is inescapably linked with the problems of industrialism. As Gramsci says:

> "The history of industrialism has always been a continuing struggle against the element of 'animality' in man. It has been an uninterrupted, often painful and bloody process of subjugating natural instincts to new, more complex and rigid forms and habits of order, exactitude and precision which can make possible the increasingly complex forms of collective life which are the necessary consequence of industrial development." (49)

This adequately states the reason for Lawrence's opposition to industrialism and its consequences. Gramsci goes on to make a point about sexual relations which explains a lot about Lawrence's 'Utopias', and about the relationship between the Morel parents in this novel.

> "It is worth noting that in 'Utopias' the sexual question plays a large and often dominant part. Sexual instincts are those that have undergone the greatest degree of repression from society in the course of its development ... The truth is that the new type of man demanded by the rationalisation of production and work, cannot be developed until the sexual instinct has been suitably regulated, and until it too has been rationalised." (50)

Therefore, it is through Lawrence's treatment of love relationships that we learn of the brutalising effects of industrialism.

Paul Morel becomes the third party in the antagonism between the mother and the father. His predicament seems to represent the agony of the petit-bourgeoisie in its choice between siding with the working

class or the middle class at this particular moment in history. Eventually the middle class mother wins the contest. Their struggle shows the antagonism between the two classes on a sexual level and it results from Walter Morel's failure to live up to the bourgeois values demanded by the mother. He refuses to give up his 'spontaneity' for her 'high moral sense'.

Both come from entirely different social backgrounds. "She still had her high moral sense, inherited from generations of Puritans." However, in her generation, the old Puritanism has been distorted into the Victorian Puritanism of the industrial capitalist. Also, her family has gone down steadily in status over the years, from 'the good old burgher family' of Colonel Hutchinson, to George Coppard, 'a man bitterly galled by his own poverty'. So, Mrs. Morel is the aspiring bourgeois. (51)

Her husband is very different. His physical description alone points out the difference. Lawrence communicates to his audience by means of (52) nuance and compression of detail into what Lukacs calls, 'the type'. This is not the <u>average</u>, but a true character who we can identify with and who contains all the elements of his epoch whilst at the same time representing a unique individual.

> "He danced well, as if it were natural and joyous in him to dance. His grandfather was a French refugee who had married an English barmaid - if it had been a marriage." (53)

Here then we have the contrast between two 'types' and two classes portrayed in microcosm. It is a contrast which we have already seen in "<u>Daughters of the Vicar</u>"; that of 'the sensuous flame of life' as against the wife who, 'loved ideas, and was considered very intellectual'. From our reading of the aforementioned story, it is obvious that Lawrence's sympathies lie with 'life' and 'spontaneity' as against 'intellect'. Even in this novel, although the father is generally seen as a figure of abuse, Morel is the only character who is true to himself. He may be irrational but he symbolises the life principle. As Van Ghent points out:

> "In "Sons and Lovers", only in Morel himself, brutalised and spiritually maimed as he is, does the germ of self-hood remain intact; and - this is the correlative proposition in Lawrence - in him only does the biological life force have single, unequivocal assertion. Morel wants to live, by hook or by crook, while his sons want to die." (54)

One can regard this as a realisation by Lawrence, even at this early date, that it is the working class which has a historical future and not his own strata. His tragic vision arises from this recognition that the petit-bourgeoisie cannot be a class in its own right but is inescapably bound to the middle class.

The conflict between husband and wife is inevitable as Mrs. Morel strives to implant middle class values in the father. This is a battle which the father loses. He is beaten down and stripped of his personality. What division of labour and industrialism do to the miner on a social level, the wife does just as effectively on a personal level. The result of this is that Paul to some extent sides with his mother, the woman of ideas, however, he is still critical of her in many ways. He is an unconvinced bourgeois seeing the failings of her outlook on the world, but in the end, being forced to submit to it. Likewise, the lower middle class was forced to submit to bourgeois hegemony until it divorced itself by way of Fascism. (55)

One of Paul's main criticisms of his mother is her Puritanism. This is no accident because the Puritan tradition is seen in the book as the great impetus behind industrialisation and Mrs. Morel strongly endorses the notion of industry and business, both in the spiritual sense and the capitalist sense. In all of these questions, Paul is in opposition to his mother. However, there is more to it than this. Some years later Lawrence said of the Puritans,

> "The Puritans made the last great attack on the God who is Me. When they beheaded Charles the First, the king, by Divine Right, they destroyed, symbolically, for ever, the supremacy of the Me who am the image of God, the Me of the flesh, of the senses..." (56)

In attacking Puritanism in this way, Lawrence is attacking the purveyors of <u>internal</u> mediation. The Puritans created this because they substituted for a situation where there was an unattainable distance between man and God, the internalised relationship whereby Man was deemed more of God's favour, not by his worthiness as a man, but by his ability to accumulate wealth. Charles the First takes on the same significance in this analysis as "The Sun King" does in Girard's. He is (57) an idol whom men imitate but cannot approach. There is therefore no way in which he can become an <u>obstacle</u> to desire and thus give rise to jealousy and resentment. When the Puritans beheaded the king, all men became 'equal' and money became themediator par excellence. It also became an obstacle breeding jealousy, greed and 'impotent hatred'. It is significant that Lawrence accuses Baxter Dawes of being possessed by 'impotent hatred'. Dawes is the third party in the 'triangular (58) structure of desire' between Clara, Paul and Dawes.

Mrs. Morel's aspirations for her sons in the business world also express themselves in her ideas on class. She considers that she married beneath herself when she married a miner, and it is her children's success that will return her to the bourgeoisie. We are told that, "She frankly wanted him (Paul) to climb into the middle classes, a thing not very difficult, she knew. And she wanted him to marry a lady." This is yet another example of mediation in that Paul becomes the agent through which she can satisfy her own desires. However, his ideas on the matter are different to those of his mother.

> "I don't want to belong to the well-to-do middle class. I like my common people best ... from the middle classes one gets ideas, and from the common people - life itself, warmth." (59)

'Ideas', 'intellect' and the middle class all walk together as symptoms and perveyors of mediated desire. Lawrence, as a realist, naturally attacks this.

Another factor which is fundamentally linked with the above concepts is industrialism. Van Ghent says, "Throughout the book, the coal-pits are always on the horizon." (60)

They make their appearance in the first paragraph of the novel and are constantly seen as a form of imprisonment, always at variance with nature in the way they affect man. Even before Paul goes to work at Jordan's factory he, "seemed to feel the business world, with its regulated system of values, and its impersonality, and he dreaded it." (61)

> "Already he was a prisoner of industrialism ... Already his heart went down. He was being taken into bondage." (62)

Lawrence puts the bondage of industrialism in contrast with the rhythm of nature. However, he does not attack labour in itself, but merely the system which brutalises man. Indeed, for Lawrence, labour is man's true expression of himself and it is in labour that the greatest relationships are forged. (See the threshing scene in "The White Peacock"). So, although the pits are always on the horizon, they symbolise at one and the same time, the 'life' of the working class, and their inability to express this life because of the alienated relationship to their labour under the capitalist mode of production. Lawrence's tragedy is that he recognises this 'life', but his social group is, in itself, unable to be a part of it.

" 'This world is a wonderful place', she (Mrs. Morel) said ...

'And so's the pit', he said. ... 'And all the trucks standing waiting, like a string of beasts to be fed', he said.

'And very thankful I am that they <u>are</u> standing', she said, 'for that means they'll turn middling time this week.'

'But I like the feel of men on things, while they're alive. There's a feel of men about trucks, because they've been handled by men's hands, all of them.' " (63)

While Paul sees the machinery as symbolising the life in men, Mrs. Morel sees the scene only in money terms. Once again the mediator makes its appearance.

The symbolism of the pit is identified with that of the father, the life principle which is brutalised by the bourgeois values of the mother and the straitjacket of reification and alienation. As we have said, Paul's attitude to his father is ambivalent because of his world-view. Significantly, the times when the father is seen in a beneficial light, and the times when harmony reigns in the Morel household, is when the father is engaged in labour for <u>himself</u> and therefore in a direct, unmediated relationship. It is then that Paul recognises the germ of self-hood that his working class father still possesses.

"The only time when he entered again into the life of his own people was when he worked, and was happy at work ... Then he always wanted several attendants, and the children enjoyed it. They united with him in the work, in the actual doing of something, when he was his real self again." (64)

Although Lawrence is not a Marxist, he integrates into his novels, the same ideas about the factory system and the ethos of industrialism which Marx states in his "<u>Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts</u>". Because of the alienation of man's own activity - his labour- this becomes something objective and independent of him, something that controls him by virtue of an autonomy alien to man. Or as Lukacs says:

"... fragmentation of the object of production necessarily entails fragmentation of the subject."

"In this respect too, mechanisation makes of them isolated, abstract atoms whose work no longer brings them together directly and organically; it becomes <u>mediated</u> to an increasing extent exclusively by the abstract laws of the mechanism which imprisons them." (65)

Hence the reason why Morel is observed to be his 'real self' only when he is working for himself and happy in his work. Hence Lawrence's declaration of industrialism as 'bondage'. The one thing that he strived for as a novelist was the reassertion of the 'whole man' and capitalist division of labour specifically prevents this.

We can take this further in that, in this situation, man's labour is reified to the position of a commodity. The commodity structure is that of a triangle: PRODUCER: MARKET: PRODUCT: This corresponds directly with the triangle of mediated desire: SUBJECT: MEDIATOR: OBJECT. The two are, to our mind, one and the same, and have the same effects. In the novel it is the latter structure which is most visible, however, the relations between characters merely play out on another level the commodity structure in a way that is far more meaningful to the reader, but relates to him precisely because it reflects this underlying reality.

> "The essence of the commodity structure ... is that a relation between people takes on the character of a thing, and this acquires a 'phantom objectivity', an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to cancel every trace of its fundamental nature; the relation between people." (66)

> "There is ... no way in which man can bring his physical and psychic 'qualities' into play without their being subjected increasingly to this reifying process." (67)

It is understandable, therefore, that terms such as 'mediation', 'possession', 'class', 'jealousy', 'industrialism', 'alienation' and 'commodity' form the basic themes of the novel and lie at the heart of Paul's conflict with his mother, Miriam and Clara, and the relation between his bourgeois mother and proletarian father.

Having said this, we shall now go on to see how mediated desire exhibits itself as a component of 'tragic vision'. In the episodes in the book where mediated desire makes its presence felt, the principal emotions to be engendered are: resentment, snobbery, class hatred, vanity and jealousy. It is not possible to examine the whole of the novel due to lack of space. We shall therefore limit ourselves to certain examples while making it clear that this phenomenon is to be found throughout the book.

The basic theme which runs through Mrs. Morel's perception of the world is class pride or snobbery: "she shrank a little from the Bottoms women". However, they too have their 'model' in Mrs. Morel. They bestow on her a "kind of aristocracy" because of this. However, they cannot attain the same position as her, and therefore harbour resentment. In Girard's words, the model becomes the obstacle in internal mediation.

Paul, on the other hand, is unsure of his model. He represents a social group in a state of flux. He has certain desires which he tries to accomplish in the course of his relationships with his mother, father, Miriam and Clara, but the difference between he and they is that he has the perception to be able to see that his desires are impossible to realise spontaneously. This is exemplified by his development as an artist. On the surface this is an occupation where one might think that he could have a direct relationship with the object of his creation. However, he sees that even the artist is constrained by the straitjacket of the money market and that painting is merely another example of mediation. The connections are drawn in one of the arguments about class which takes place after a visit to some 'well-to-do' people in order to sell one of his paintings. Finally he rejects art by saying that "painting is not living".

As we have said, Paul is drawn to his mother in some ways, and disagrees with her in many fundamental issues. The story traces his adoption of his mother and her middle class aspirations as a model for his desires and world-view, and his eventual rejection of this. His rejection comes with the realisation that he cannot attain self definition within the hegemony of the bourgeoisie but at the same time, he cannot escape from it. This tragic vision leaves him only with "the drift towards death" having known only briefly the peace which a direct relationship can bring. In his dealings with both Miriam and Clara, his mother provides the model or mediator whom he tries to imitate. The mediator's prestige is imparted to the object of desire and confers upon it an illusory value. For this reason, Paul is constantly seeking approval from his mother for his relationships. The fact that this is not forthcoming cripples him emotionally, and his brother also, for his brother is in the same situation. In fact, his brother dies as a result of the mother's resentment and possessiveness.

This view of things makes the failure of Paul's two love affairs more intelligible. They break down as a result of the problems of Paul and, symbolically, the petit-bourgeoisie, in their attempt for self definition.

Snobbery and 'possession' are the two main elements of Mrs. Morel's outlook. Her snobbery crystallises around the question of material possessions, this is highlighted on page 20, when she realises with horror that the furniture in the house is not paid for.

She, the descendant of property owners and an imitator of bourgeois values, does not even own her own furniture. The connection between materialism and human feelings is made here because the effect of this discovery is to change her attitude towards her husband. In this way, the mediation of the commodity structure distorts all emotions.

> "She said very little to her husband, but her manner had changed towards him. Something in her proud, honourable soul had crystallised as hard as rock." (68)

When the first child, William, is born, he becomes the model and the object of possession with which Mrs. Morel replaces her husband. Unlike the father she is able to totally possess the child.

> "She made much of the child, and the father was jealous." (69)

Once more, we see Girard's argument borne out, that the mediator becomes an obstacle and jealousy enters into a relationship as soon as the subject chooses a model.

> "At last, Mrs. Morel despised her husband. She turned to the child; she turned from the father." (70)

Still, in her desire for possession of the man she attempts to force him out of his true self and to make him live up to the model which she has in her mind. This results in his de-humanisation.

> "The pity was, she was too much his opposite. She could not be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him. She injured, hurt and scarred herself, but she lost none of her worth. She also had the children." (71)
>
> "Still there was one part of her that wanted him for herself." (72)

But increasingly, William becomes the model which fulfills her desires.

> "She saw him as a man, young ... making the world glow for her." (73)

He is greatly influenced by her and attempts to rise into the middle class. Like Stendhal's Julien Sorel, he is fired with ambition, choosing for his model, not Napoleon as in "Scarlet and Black", but the 'bourgeois of Bestwood'. (74)

The innumerable triangular relationships which figure in the novel also extend to the two brothers themselves who become jealous of each other in their desire for possession of the mother. (75)

An analysis of Paul's class consciousness is shown when he goes to collect his father's wages. By now, Paul's allegiance is to the petit-bourgeois values of the mother, and the feeling which he has in the company of workers is one of being threatened. He criticises them as being 'common', and his feelings represent an accurate description of the position of the petit-bourgeoisie at the time when the novel was written. As we have pointed out in Chapter III, this group felt itself severely threatened by working class militancy from below, and also pressurised by the bourgeoisie from above. (76)

Miriam, Paul's first love, represents a classic case of mediation.

> "She can do nowt but go about thinkin' herself somebody. 'The Lady of the Lake'." (77)

Her models are chosen from the romantic novels of the nineteenth century, however, her form of the disease is different to that of Paul's and Mrs. Morel's. It would correspond to what Girard calls 'external' mediation - the form found in "Don Quixote". This form precedes 'internal' mediation because the distance between the subject and the mediator is so great that it cannot become an obstacle which engenders jealousy and resentment. This form of the relationship takes place predominantly in the early stages of capitalism, before the commodity structure has taken on a universal dimension and internalised matters. (Nevertheless, external mediation can obviously occur at any time in the progress of capitalism. Likewise, Girard points out that both forms are discernable in "Don Quixote" although the external form pre-dominates.)

It is significant therefore, that the character in the novel who exhibits external mediation most strongly should represent a pre-industrial stage of society. Miriam is as invariably associated with the country as Clara is with the town. She represents an archaic type of femininity and in the first paragraph of her description, Lawrence identifies the phase of history from which her outlook is derived. The mysticism and religion contained in this outlook is a symptom of the 'external' nature of the mediation. The mystic or the Christian can choose Christ as his model, but as Girard says, the spiritual distance between them is so great that there can be no contact between the two.

> "The girl was romantic in her soul. Everywhere was a Walter Scott heroine being loved by men with helmets or plumes in their caps. She herself was something of a princess turned into a swine-girl in her own imagination... So to Miriam, Christ and God made one great figure, which she loved tremblingly and passionately when a tremendous sunset burned out the western sky, and Ediths, and Lucys,

> and Rowenas, Brian De Bois Guilberts, Rob Roys, and Guy Mannerings, rustled the sunny leaves in the morning or sat in her bedroom aloft, alone, when it snowed. That was her life." (78)

As a 'type', she represents another possibility for Lawrence's social group and world-view. However, this possibility is backward-looking, mystical and romantic, and as Paul in the end rejects Miriam, so he rejects this alternative in his search for self definition.

'External' mediation also affects her character in other ways. It accounts, in part, for her serenity because this form of mediation is essentially contemplative. Miriam dreams a great deal and tends to shy away from physical desire. Her love is, 'love in the head' or 'cerebral love' as Lawrence puts it. Paul's desires, in contrast, are very physical. One reason for this difference is that:

> "The closer the mediator comes, the more feverish the action becomes. In Dostoyevski, thwarted desire is so violent that it can lead to murder." (79)

Likewise, in "Sons and Lovers", the thwarting of desire leads to William's death.

Miriam is also representative of emotionally crippling possessiveness in her application of 'mental love' as opposed to direct, physical relationships. She must possess even the flowers in the field.

> "'You don't want love - your eternal and abnormal craving is to be loved. You aren't positive, you're negative. You absorb, absorb, as if you must fill yourself up with love, because you've got a shortage somewhere.'" (80)

In this respect, the girl is similar to Paul's mother. The 'shortage' which Paul refers to is, in fact, a distortion of spontaneous desire. A distortion caused by Miriam's mediated consciousness and by the tirangular structure of relationships through which she experiences the world. Paul, too, is subject to this, but he has the vision to be able to see the mechanism which is at work and to attempt to break free from it. For Lawrence the relationship of the girl to the flowers, is that of a possession which denies the separateness of individual, living entities. Her attitude towards Paul is the same as that to the flowers and it is this which contributes to the breakdown of their relationship.

The contrast between Miriam's possessiveness and Paul's attitude comes in Chapter 11 of the novel, where Paul, in the garden of the Morel house, finds a direct relationship with nature. Like the hero of "Scarlet and Black" it is at these moments when he finds peace of

mind. Both Julien and Paul have the perception to be able to recognise mediation in all its forms, even though they are unable to break from it except at certain brief moments. This is what gives rise to the 'tragic' nature of their vision, and the subsequent emotional 'angst'.

Obviously, this applies not only to fictional characters, but also to the author himself. In this way, the breakdown of this triangular structure of desire has its effect on the actual style of the writing. It would seem that the direct relations between subject and object which occur in the passage mentioned above, and for example, when Mr. Morel is engaged in a direct relationship to his labour, are reflected in the novel. Van Ghent certainly sees the effect of this on Lawrence's style without realising the reason for it. Talking of Morel at work she says:

> "There is a purity of realisation in this very simple kind of exposition that, on the face of it, resists associating itself with any 'symbolic' function - if we tend to think of a 'symbol' as splitting itself apart into a thing and a meaning, with a mental arrow connecting the two. The best in Lawrence carries the authenticity of a faithfully observed, concrete actuality that refuses to be so split; its symbolism is a radiation that leaves it intact in itself. So, in the passage, the scene is intact as homely realism, but it radiates Lawrence's controlling sense of the characterful integrity of objects ... Thus it is another representation of the creative life-force witnessed in the independent objectivity of things that are wholly concrete and wholly themselves." (81)

This is an important statement, for it makes a connection for us between content and stylistic features which are deemed to be aesthetically good, and the author's exposure of mediation and the destruction of the commodity structure. In other words, we have a link between this idea of realism, and the evaluation of literature as <u>art</u>. The one begets the other. In these moments of peace when spontaneity is achieved and man's activity, whether it be loving or working, is not alienated from him, even the <u>style</u> of the writing is raised to a new level. As Van Ghent says, even the symbolism is 'intact in itself', with no split between 'thing and meaning'. We are presented with the 'objectivity of things that are wholly concrete and wholly themselves'.

The Freudian implications which are often seen in the novel are unable to explain the true meaning of the work. The relationships between Paul, Mrs. Morel, Miriam and Clara do not break down because of an oedipus complex, but because of the failure of Paul to achieve self-definition, and because of the thwarting of spontaniety due to the relations governing industrial capitalism.

The position of Clara has deep implications for the thematic pattern of the novel. She is a 'type' in the true sense of Lukacs' definition. Lawrence gives her full and careful characterisation, while at the same time presenting her as a 'representative' figure, in contrast to Miriam. She is a product of a certain phase of Protestant and industrial culture. She is the 'independent woman' who earns her living, is resistant to conformity, politically conscious and active as a Suffragette, and dissatisfied with her husband's role of masculine dominance. She is essentially a liberal-bourgeois figure.

Paul accepts this independence, but their relationship is thwarted by the fact of Clara's marriage and the triangular structure which develops between them and the husband. Another important factor in their break-down is the same which distresses both Miriam and his mother; that is, an inconcistency and unreliability, a failure to recognise his own historical destiny and that of his class.

> "Watching him unknown, she said to herself there was no stability about him ... There was something evanescent about Morel, she thought, something shifting and false. He would never make sure ground for any woman to stand on." (82)

This is quite correct. Throughout the book, in all the people which he comes in contact with, Paul is offered various alternatives for his personal and historical direction. He is offered various world-views but is unable to give positive committment to any of them. In this way, the four principal characters with Paul is involved, can be seen to represent different traditions of thought and feeling, each of which affects him, but none of which he accepts.

His mother represents the aspiring petit-bourgeoisie backed by Puritan tradition, Miriam - the cult of feeling characterised by the Romantic era, and a feudal strata of society, Clara - the self-consciousness of the liberal bourgeoisie, his father - the working class brutalised by industrialism but nevertheless with its own distinct self-identity.

The fact that Paul rejects all of these alternatives is explained by the fact that he, like Lawrence, is concerned to construct his <u>own</u> world-vision. That he fails to do so is due to the inability of the potential consciousness of the petit-bourgeois strata to rise to a level where it becomes an independent class in its own right. The fact was that there <u>was</u> no alternative for Paul. Lawrence is forced to conceed this because he is ultimately committed to a realistic view of the world.

This realism leaves its mark on the style and the content of the novel. He gives us a closely observed picture of life in a mining community:

> "... Yet the great abundance of this detail is always kept properly subordinate to the narrative and thematic development. There is no piling up of detail for its own sake after the fashion of the naturalists. Everything is carefully arranged and patterned to further the articulation of the themes." (83)

To this extent, Lawrence conforms to Engel's view of realism. (84) However, he goes further than merely giving us an accurate description and integrating it into the story. This alone does not constitute realism. Rather, he attempts to go beyond the world of appearances and render both the underlying process of life which is perceived only in moments of intuitive awareness, and the mechanisms which normally prevent this perception. The point is, that once man has seen this underlying, unmediated process of life, if he is not in a position to change society so that this becomes the norm, he cannot bear to continue living in the world as it is. Therefore, we find that although these moments of awareness and peace do occur, an element of tragedy is always present. One such moment is when Paul is 'at one with nature' in the garden of the house. Another is when he stares down upon Nottingham.

> "He was brooding now, staring out over the country from under sullen brows. The little, interesting diversity of shapes had vanished from the scene; all that remained was a vast, dark matrix of sorrow and tragedy ..." (85)

Mediation is merely a component of 'tragic vision', and tragic vision is what Goldmann calls, 'a significant structure'. This is because Lawrence only exposes mediation without being able to formulate a way of destroying it. The reason for this is that tragic vision is essentially bourgeois and ahistorical. Hence its tragic aspects. Therefore if we can locate examples of mediation in the novel, we should also be able to detect the significant structure of tragic vision, and relate it to the world-view of a social class.

"Sons and Lovers", along with the other two novels which we shall examine, is an exploration of the idea that a strata of the middle class can exist in the world and create its own social values, independent of the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. It is also the exposure of this idea as an illusion. The novels are characterised by the tragic hero, or heroine, who undergoes the illusion that he, or she, can still live in the world and impose his own laws upon it, without choosing or abandoning anything.

In "Sons and Lovers" the world is full of 'vanity'. Capital is the silent spectator, or 'hidden god', and the hero is alone. Paul has the illusion that he can create his own moral values, and still exist in the world without concessions or compromise. This hope results in tragedy, because the social group whose consciousness he expresses, cannot break away from the hegemony of the mother class.

Lawrence's hero is left with the 'drift towards death', but the social and political situation at the time which the novel was written, explains what has been widely criticised as a 'tacked on' ending. That is, that Paul turns "towards the lights of the glowing town". On one level, this appears to be a mood of optimism and determination which is not in keeping with the previous pages. We submit that this has been inserted after the logical, realistic ending, because at the time when Lawrence wrote the novel, it would not be absurd for a member of the new and growing ranks of teachers and white-collar workers, formed by the demands of imperialist expansion, to see itself as a new class formation with an independent future. This also explains Lawrence's preoccupation with class-consciousness and industrialism. In order to challenge a social order effectively, one must know how it works. Hence, Lawrence exposes the mechanisms of capitalism. Lukacs says:

> "This class (the petit-bourgeoisie) lives at least in part in the capitalist big city and every aspect of its existence is directly exposed to the influence of capitalism. Hence it cannot possibly remain wholly unaffected by the fact of class conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. But as a 'transitional class in which the interests of the two other classes become simultaneously blunted ...' it will imagine itself to be above class antagonism." (86)

The ending which leaves Paul facing the 'drift towards death', is what Goldmann would term, the 'potential consciousness' of the petit-bourgeoisie. It is this potential which Lawrence, the realist, felt bound to portray. Unconsciously, he is bound to admit that this group can never sever its links with bourgeois hegemony.

> "... if a class thinks the thoughts imputable to it and which bear upon its interests right through to its logical conclusions, and yet fails to strike at the heart of that totality, then such a class is bound to play only a subordinate role ... such classes are normally doomed to passivity, to an unstable oscillation between the ruling and the revolutionary classes, and if perchance they do erupt, then such explosions are purely elemental and aimless. They may win a few battles but they are doomed to ultimate defeat." (87)

However, even allowing for the optimism and determination of the last paragraph of the book, there is an underlying irony contained in it. Lawrence says:

> "He would not take that direction, to the darkness, to follow her. (His mother). He walked towards the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly." (88)

Although Paul walks towards the town, the town has, throughout the novel, been associated with Paul's mother, and is a symbol of bourgeois corruption. Alldritt notes this:

> "... Paul remarks to her, 'You've got town feet, somehow or other, you have.' Paul himself is unable to share wholeheartedly his mother's love for the town." (89)

Marx himself comments on this antagonism between town and country, as an expression of the division of labour in capitalist society.

> "The antagonism of town and country can only exist as a result of private property. It is the most crass expression of the subjection of the individual under the division of labour, ... a subjection which makes one man into a restricted town-animal, the other into a restricted country-animal, and daily creates anew the conflict between their interests " (90)

Again, it is significant that this antagonism figures strongly in other authors who expose the nature of desire to be mediated. For example, Stendhal in "Scarlet and Black", and Flaubert in "Madame Bovary". (91)

Finally, we must return to 'tragic vision' and the two themes which are bound up with this, industrialism and class-consciousness. We have already mentioned the town and the country, but there are three 'characters' in the novel which represent three kinds of reality and value. The third is'the pit'. All three could be termed, 'Hidden Gods', for they all act as silent spectators, but they never intervene. Paul's oonfusion arises (92) from class-consciousness, and the fact that he is bound to each of them, but refuses all three.

The most direct relationship which Paul has, is with the country - that is, with Miriam and his art. He rejects both of these and the retrograde step in consciousness which it symbolises.

The pit, although associated with the inhumanity of industrialism, is also seen as a life-force in its connections with Mr. Morel and the working class in general. Van Ghent says:

> "The image associated with Morel is that of the coal-pits where he descends daily and from where he ascends at night blackened and tired. It is a symbol of rhythmic descent and ascent, like a sexual rhythm, or like the rhythm of sleep and awakening or of life and death." (93)

She also points out that this is a brutalised life-force.

> "True, the work in the coal-pits reverses the natural use of the hours of daylight and dark, and is an economic distortion of that rhythm in nature - and Morel and the other colliers bear the spiritual traumata of that distortion ..." (94)

The town, as we have said, represents the bourgeoisie.

Paul's tragedy results from his refusal to choose between these alternatives, whilst still thinking that he can live in the world and develop his own consciousness. Inevitably he fails. (See quote no. 87). His choice is made for him.

" THE RAINBOW "

Due to limitations of space, we are unable to examine the novel in great detail. What we shall attempt to show are the general themes and positions outlined in the novel, the way in which they continue the notion of realism which we have proposed and how they reflect, and are changed by, the various class positions of Lawrence's social milieu.

"The Rainbow" was written between 1912 and 1915 and substantially continues the themes of "Sons and Lovers". However, the new novel is far more ambitious in its design and characterisation. It encompasses a far greater area of history than "Sons and Lovers".

In Ursula Brangwen it has a heroine who, like Paul Morel, demands a greater intensity of life than can be allowed by the actual environment, and the historical possibilities open to her. She is tempted to betray her aspirations, is educated by unsatisfactory love affairs and tries to make her escape.

The basic theme belongs to a well established tradition of fiction. The young, unmarried woman as a representative of the suffering of the human spirit in the consolidation of the bourgeois hegemony is one of the characteristic subjects of the 19th century realistic novel. Lawrence was well read in this kind of fiction.

We shall now examine what he had to say with regard to realism, because it helps explain his own work more fully.

Speaking of "Anna of the Five Towns" by Arnold Bennett, he says:

> "I hate England and its hopelessness. I hate Bennett's resignation. Tragedy ought really to be a great kick at misery. But "Anna of the Five Towns" seems like an acceptance - so does all the modern stuff since Flaubert. I hate it. I want to wash again quickly, wash off England, the oldness and grubbiness and despair." (95)

In this statement he bears out much of what we have said ourselves. He perceives the 'resignation' of modern naturalism and that tragedy, like his own 'tragic vision' should not merely dwell on man's misery but depict the tragic situation of the 'whole man' and his potential being crippled by industrialism and bourgeois values.

It is from the great realists such as Mann and Balzac that he draws his inspiration. In 1908 he wrote of "Eugenie Grandet":

> "I consider the book as perfect a novel as I have ever read. It is wonderfully concentrated; there is nothing superfluous, nothing out of place. The book has that wonderful feeling of inevitableness which is characteristic of the best French novels ... Can you find a grain of sentimentality in 'Eugenie'? Can you find a touch of melodrama, or caricature, or flippancy? It is all in tremendous earnestness, more serious than all profundities of German thinkers, more affecting than all English bathos ... Balzac can lay bare the living body of the great life better than anyone in the world ... he goes straight to the flesh; and, unlike Maupassant or Zola, he doesn't inevitably light on a wound ..." (96)

The relevance of the French novelists for Lawrence is not hard to understand. There is the same concenn in both, with the straitjacket of provincial life, the same indictment of the cult of money, the 'cash-nexus' and the emotional crippling of man by the middle class commercial and industrial system. As in the novels of Stendhal, Balzac and Flaubert, Lawrence's early work is very much concerned with the lag in consciousness, culture and manners between provinces and the capital. There is also a concern with history and generations, especially in "The Rainbow", which characterises the French realistic novel. However, perhaps the most important effect of French realism on Lawrence was to confirm his fictional epistemology. This was the basic assumption that human experience can only be truely understood when the human experience is portrayed as part of the total material environment in which it is enacted. This is what makes "Sons and Lovers", "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love" part of the great realistic tradition.

This is Lawrence's true literary inheritance, that of realism and the exposure of mediation. Viewed in this way, perhaps the influence of Morris, Carlyle and Ruskin is of lesser significance.

As we stated in Chapter I, the progress of capitalism makes the novelist's task far more difficult. Lawrence's characterisation in the three novels under discussion attempts to cope with this by elevating the characters to the level of 'types'. I use this term in the sense of Lukacs' definition.

In "The Lost Girl" he says:

> "... But we protest that Alvina is not ordinary ... There have been enough stories about ordinary people ... Every individual should, by nature, have his extraordinary points. But nowadays you may look for them with a microscope, they are so worn-down by the regular machine-friction of our average and mechanical days." (97)

Lawrence highlights the extraordinary points whilst at the same time making the character representative.

To do this, was to try and arrest a process which had been going on for some time. The unsuitability of modern society as a means of objectifying the deepest concerns of the novelist accounts in part for the decline of 19th century realism. Lawrence pinpoints the problem in the following way:

> "The trouble with realism - and Verga was a realist - is that the writer, when he is a truely exceptional man like Flaubert or like Verga, tries to read his own sense of tragedy into people smaller than himself. I think it is a final criticism against 'Madame Bovary' that people such as Emma Bovary and her husband Charles are simply too insignificant to carry the full weight of Gustave Flaubert's sense of tragedy." (98)

We suggest here, that the reason for Lawrence's success is that unlike the previous authors, his 'world-view' was slightly different in that he was a spokesman for a new strata of the bourgeoisie. His 'world-view' was a fresh one and one which he and his group considered to have a historical future. He was therefore able to bring his work to bear on life in the way that Stendhal wrote of, what Lukacs calls, 'the heroic period' of bourgeois history.

Lukacs comments on the decline of the realistic tradition:

> "The great writers of our age were all engaged in a heroic struggle against the banality, aridity and emptiness of the prosaic nature of bourgeois life. The formal side of the struggle against this banality and insipidity of life is the dramatic pointing of plot

> and incident. In Balzac, who depicts passions at their highest intensity, this is achieved by conceiving the typical as the extreme expression of certain strands in the skein of life. Only be means of such mighty dramatic explosions can a dynamic world of profound, rich and many hued poetry emerge from the sordid prose of bourgeois life." (99)

Lawrence is no Marxist, however, there is a lot in Lukacs' remarks which remind us of Lawrence's attitudes. Indeed, the distinction made between 'the average' and 'the typical' character is one which is useful in discussing "The Rainbow". It helps explain the difference between the minor characters and the main characters who are its heroes. Another immediate link with classical realism is the fact that "The Rainbow" is a 'familien roman', a novel of successive generations of a family. This is a characteristic design of realism with its concern for history. "Buddenbrooks" by Thomas Mann, Balzac's "Comedie Humaine" and Zola's 'Rougon-Maquart' sequence, are other examples. The last two are also, like "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love", examples of the 'roman fleuve' and 'retour des personnages'. A series of continuous novels by which the novelist is able to best render particular characters and relationships whilst still locating them in the larger historical process. Proust's "A la Recherche du Temps Perdu" also falls into this category.

"The Rainbow" is the story of the interaction of 'intellect' and 'life', of self-consciousness and vital dynamic, traced through four generations of the Brangwens. It is the story of the emergence of a social group (and its decline), as spontaneity becomes more and more corrupted by bourgeois values.

Both this novel and "Women in Love" are preoccupied with the nature, class and culture, decadence, art and consciousness in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

The story begins in 1840 when a colliery canal is cut across the Brangwen's farm where they have lived in seclusion for two centuries. With this invasion, the Brangwens are forcibly introduced to the onrush of industrialism and begin to undergo an enhancement of consciousness.

Of the first generation, it is Tom Brangwen the gentleman farmer who possesses the consciousness to go beyond his immediate surroundings by marrying Lydia Lensky, a refugee Pole. Tom is a 'typical' character in contrast to his brother and sister. He embodies the highest point of awareness of his social group at a particular time and as such, is a growing point of the culture.

In the next generation, the story takes up the stormy marriage of Tom's Polish step-daughter Anna Lensky, who is very much the alien and the aristocrat, to his nephew Will Brangwen. The theme is developed through notions of possessiveness, religion and art, will and spontaneity. In the subsequent generation the intellectual and social sophistication is greater still. Ursula is the heroine who goes to university and becomes a teacher. In "Women in Love" she goes on to know the social range of England.

The history of the Brangwen family may be seen as the microcosmic re-enactment of the progress of this social group and its battle against what Lawrence perceived as modern decadence. That is, the propensity to see everything in terms of intellectual abstractions and solipsistic individualism; the fight between spontaneous and mediated desires. For Lawrence they are very much an apocalyptic group because they are to him the last element of English society to emerge into historical consciousness. The period when these novels were written corresponds to the period in which the hopes of this newly formed white collar and labour aristocracy strata were rising to a peak, only to be dashed after the 1st World War.

In "Women in Love" the working class element does not figure as it did in "Sons and Lovers". The main arrows of Lawrence's criticism are directed against the middle class and the aristocracy. These criticisms are directed particularly to the question of culture and art. This is perhaps a symptom of the growing sophistication of consciousness within the group. Lawrence seems to be trying to carve out new moral values, for he still attacks industrialism and particularly Gerald's application of Taylorism, and also cultural values.

Ursula's function, in part, is to draw Birkin away from the decadent Whig culture represented by Breadalby - a thinly disguised picture of the Bloomsbury circle of right wing intellectuals. Lawrence writes:

> "Ursula felt that she was an outsider ... She was almost a parvenue in their old cultural milieu. Her convention was not their convention, their standards were not her standards ... He and she together, Hermione and Birkin, were people of the same old tradition, the same withered, deadening c ulture. And she, Ursula, was an intruder." (100)

Again, Hermione says:

> "Rupert (Birkin) is race-old - he comes of an old race - and you seem to me so young, you come of a young, inexperienced race." (101)

Another implication here is that it is Ursula's lack of history that makes her so effective with regard to Birkin:

> "... he who was nearly dead, who was so near to being gone with the rest of his race down the slope of mechanical death, could never be understood by her ... She was so new, so wonder-clear, so undimmed." (102)

There is much in "The Rainbow" and "Women in Love" that we have discussed in the previous chapters. The Bloomsbury intellectuals, the onset of industrialism and all it entails, the growth of a new strata society due to the development of education and imperialism (Ursula and Birkin are both teachers, Sknebensky is a liberal aristocrat who goes off to fight for the empire). Will Brangwen embodies the ideas of Ruskin. However, for all this historical diagramming, the novels are much more than this. They represent the world-view of a particular group in its fight to achieve selfrealisation, to preserve its spontaneity and resist intellectual abstractions. That fight fails for the same reasons set out in "Sons and Lovers".

The story can be divided into successive generations. In each of the generations is a heroic 'type': Tom, Will and Ursula. Each of these characters has sufficient self-consciousness to try to raise themselves onto a new level of social awareness: Tom by marrying the strange Polish woman - Lydia; Will by marrying Anna, another 'alien', and by extending his interest in art and culture; Ursula by becoming a teacher and grappling with the core of bourgeois culture. Each of them is defeated (Ursula in "Women in Love" and not so obviously) by the growing mesh of mediation which grows more complex with each move to a higher level of consciousness.

Tom's story is one of a gentleman farmer and his generation who are forced off the land by the encroachment of industrialism (and society's necessity to develop a 'free' labour force to man its urban factories). He is sufficiently aware to want to extend his particular vision. Lydia Lensky, the Polish woman, has the attraction of 'strangeness' for him. He feels himself to be grappling with the unknown. Indeed this (103) element of strangeness is stressed in all of the generations which Lawrence explores. (104)

The generations proceed from complexity to complexity as they become more and more entangled in the bourgeois snare. This process of consciousness is inevitable in any developing social group. The difference with this group is that it is unable to develop beyond that

of the bourgeois because ultimately it is part of the bourgeoisie. Its 'potential consciousness' to quote Goldmann has certain limits and it is to Lawrence's credit as a realist that he is able to define these limits and recognise the historical futility of the Brangwen's mission.

Will Brangwen is no exception. He is an embodiment of Ruskinite ideals and the literary successor to Paul Morel, the struggling artist of "Sons and Lovers". In embodying these ideals, and the emotional and spiritual crises that acoompany them, Will is a 'typical' character. However, as with all true 'types', he is more than this conglomeration of ideals; he is a unique individual in his own right. His career as an artist is defined by his particular range of vision and resources of feeling. These are conditioned and exemplified in his relationships with his wife and with society. Common to both Paul Morel and Will Brangwen is the felt relationship between sexuality, feeling and society and the art which is created. It is significant that Gothic art and architecture provides a 'model' for Will. It is the go-between and the obstacle between he and Anna and embodies sexual, spiritual, aesthetic and social asepcts:

> "He was interested in churches, in church architecture. The influence of Ruskin had stimulated him to a pleasure in the medieval forms. His talk was fragmentary, he was only half articulate." (105)

Will's medievalism and his attachment to Ruskin's ideas are significant in that they show the limits of his 'potential consciousness'. As we have tried to show in Chapter II, Ruskinism is essentially a middle class reformist movement and its idealisation of the past was due in part to its basic inability to overcome the contradictions in capitalism and posit a true alternative for the future. Will and his social group are not revolutionary despite their criticism of the status quo. Neither was Ruskin. Basically, they merely desire a refinement of bourgeois culture and any thoughts of creating a new morality such as Lawrence may have had, are prime examples of false consciousness. As such, Lawrence's personal philosophy with its Utopian ideals runs headlong against the realism expressed in his novels.

Anna is far more self-conscious than Will and is the true predecessor of Ursula Brangwen. She has a common-sense positivism about her which throws into conflict with Will's idealism. Once more we see the theme of 'possessiveness' is raised as in "Sons and Lovers", with the church as a mediator.

> "He was very strange to her, and, in this church spirit, in conceiving himself as a soul, he seemed to escape and run free of her. In a way, she envied him, this dark freedom and jubilation of the soul, some strange entity in him. It fascinated her. Again she hated it. And again, she despised him, wanted to destroy it in him." (106)

Once more envy and resentment are present as a component of mediation. Once more the characteristics of mediation cut both ways as we pointed out in "Sons and Lovers". Anna's possessiveness is counterposed against Will's mixture of spontaneity and idealism. It is Will who is beaten. Anna is at a higher level of awareness and the crippling effect of mediation is that much greater. The characterisations are not as clear cut as in the earlier novel, partly because of the increasing complexity of the spiritual problems engulfing such a social group, and partly because Lawrence's vision of his social destiny was beginning to run out and be recognised more explicitly by the writer. The war had begun, shattering his hopes and the militancy of the working class was growing in strength. Anna, the bourgeois, defeats Will, as Paul Morel is defeated also. (107)

Anna brings about the brutalisation of her husband in the same way as Mrs. Morel does, and at the same cost:

> "Like Mrs. Morel, who also sought to transform her husband into a responsible individual, Anna succeeds only in making her husband admit tacitly and resentfully her greater assurance and his essential dependence." (108)

Also for her, victory and realisation of her dominance is also recognition of her inability to achieve any further development in herself because it is only through relations with other human beings that man progresses. This relationship now no longer exists. Mediation prevents any such relationship unless it is recognised and resisted.

At this point, the story moves beyond them both. Anna becomes a minor character, bearing children, and Will becomes more deeply entrenched in Education. At face value this may seem to be something of an achievement but Lawrence implicitly defines it as a retreat. His feelings on the value of education are no further explored in his treatment of Ursula. Will Brangwen's life is at best a compromising of the self. Birkin says of him in "Women in Love", "he was not a coherent being, he was a roomful of old echoes." (109)

For Lawrence the movement to individuality signifies a developing consciousness of the self as a function of time and history. Although Tom and Will confront the same basic problems in their lives, their experience of it is essentially different. Will's nature is beyond his

Uncle's understanding because their level of social consciousness is different. (110)

When Will and his family moved into petit-bourgeois surburbia, they are engaging in something beyond the comprehension of Tom:

> "After all, they would be, as one of their acquaintances said, among the elite of Beldover. They would represent culture. And as there was no-one of higher social importance than the doctors, the colliery managers, and the chemists, they would shrine, with their Della Robia beautiful Madonna, their lonely reliefs from Donatello, their reproductions from Botticelli." (111)

Will Brangwen's increased sophistication of world-vision is pointed out not only in social and intellectual terms but also in artistic terms. However, Lawrence also uses this artistic parallel to point out in an oblique way, the limits of Will's vision.

The failure of Will's generation to achieve self determination of self-realisation is suggested by his enthusiasm for Donatello and Della Robia. He, like the artists he admires, is essentially preliminary to full and balanced consciousness:

> "In his first passion, he got a beautiful suggestion of his desire. But the pitch of concentration would not come. With a little ash in his mouth he gave up. He continued to copy, or to make designs by selecting motives from classic stuff." (112)

This idea is also explored in "Study of Thomas Hardy" which was written at this time. (113)

Again Lawrence's realism is such that one cannot make bold statements of this kind to suggest that he 'inserts' theories of this kind willy-nilly. The paintings mentioned in the novel are fully integrated in the story and as well as being involved in his idea on culture, play specific roles in specific situations. One function they perform, as in "Sons and Lovers", is that of mediators.

For Anna, in her first pregnancy, "Entry of the Blessed into Paradise" is a confirmation of her own sense of innocence and as such, provides a model for her desires.

For Will, the paintings provide him with the same release as Gothic architecture. They are not a means of seeing reality in more clarity, but a way of experiencing the heightened consciousness that life does not allow.

In describing Will's encounter with Lincoln Cathedral, Lawrence also criticises the ideas behind the Ruskin movement with its backward looking medievalism. This is yet another example of the way in which realistic art often runs contrary to an author's professed philosophy. Warringer describes the Gothic feeling as follows:

> "Distressed by actuality, debarred from naturalness, it aspires to a world above the actual, above the sensuous. It uses this tumult of sensations to lift itself out of itself. It is only in intoxication that it experiences the thrill of eternity. It is this exalted hysteria which is above all else the distinguishing mark of the Gothic phenomena." (114)

Finally the relationship between Anna and Will breaks down. His relationship with the world is replaced and mediated by the cult of the Gothic. Likewise his relationship with woman is replaced by passion (in Stendhal's sense of the word), vanity and fetishism. (115)

For historical reasons, Will is unable to fulfill himself. His level of consciousness is such that he cannot realise the inability to create his own cultural forms. Like Paul Morel and Tom Brangwen before him, his social group is forced to capitulate to the hegemony of bourgeois culture because in the final moment, he is part of this mother class.

We now encounter the third generation in the last section of "The Rainbow" and in "Women in Love". Ursula and Gudrun are the Brangwen's two eldest children and it is Gudrun who continues her father's artistic traits, developing in a manner which Lawrence sees as 'decadent'. She 'attends the Art School in Nottingham'. She does not figure as the heroine of their generation. She bears out Paul Morel's judgement that 'art is not living'. Indeed it goes further. Gudrun's art has the thematic function of raising the following issue: to what extent is twentieth century 'art' both decadent, and a form of destruction?

The role of heroine is rightly reserved for Ursula, a woman of far greater self-consciousness. However, to talk of Gudrun as a minor character does not mean that she is a pasteboard figure; far from it. As a 'typical' character, she and other minor figures such as Skrebensky, Hermione and Loerke stand as individuals in their own right. Such is the talent of Lawrence's realism.

Ursula is the first female heroine of the novel. She is the woman who is preoccupied with "this one desire to take her place in the world". Significantly, this female heroine arises at a time when English society was experiencing growing pressure from the Suffragettes, a militant but

essentially middle class movement. It is also significant that the motivation for Ursula's feelings on this part, spring not from her involvements with loves such as Skrebensky, but from the rift between her and her father. Logically we would expect that the vanguard of the new generation's consciousness would begin by overcoming what was once the vanguard of the old generation - her father.

The estrangement between her and Will is suggested when Ursula first broaches her determination to go out to work. (116)

Ursula is aware in a historical sense, far more than her predecessors. She has Anna's relationship with Tom Brangwen as a standard of comparison for her relationship with her own father. In the former relationship there was also strain. Mediation, which gives rise to resentment, envy, vanity and jealousy is present in every generation. With Tom and Anna for example:

> "She was going away, to deny him, to leave an unendurable emptiness in him, a void that he could not bear. Almost he hated her." (My emphasis) (117)

However, any resentment is always accommodated by affection on both sides. For Ursula and Will, resentment has a full and direct effect. Will is not a figure of strength as Tom had been, he is a failure, and in this reflects the failure of his social group to develop in the way which Lawrence hoped. As the petit-bourgeois group strived to make its own history, it necessarily became a victim of internal mediation and fetishism, without the class formation and consciousness to be able to overcome it.

Gudrun is far more in accord with her father and has the same limitedness to her artistic creation. The 'Rainbow' of the title is at once, the limited, domineering symbol of the Gothic arch and Will and Gudrun's consciousness, and also of the 'Rainbow' of a new freedom and flexibility of awareness which Ursula aspires to. The Gothic form is increasingly despised by Ursula and is inextricably linked with education, i.e. bourgeois culture. (118)

At the same time she is unable to rid herself of it completely. This goes to create the cultural tension - the dialectic between tutored vision or intellect, and the actuality of 'spontaneity of desire', which informs the progress of Ursula's world-view. (119)

After the description of Ursula's childhood, the stages of her life as teacher, student and Skebensky's lover, are all dominated by the division between 'the average' and 'the typical' or 'heroic'. As Lawrence put it:

> "... by the heroic effort we mean that instinctive fighting for more life to come into being which is a basic impulse in more men than we like to admit; women too ... Life without the heroic effort, ... is just stale, flat and unprofitable. As the great realistic novels will show you." (120)

Ursula has this heroic effort, and indeed as a great realistic novel, "The Rainbow" shows the staleness and flatness of life without the heroic effort. We see it in Gerald Crick, Gudrun, Loerke, Skrebensky and many others. Those who have heroism, such as Paul Morel or Ursula, are doomed to tragedy because the end of the rainbow is, for their social group, unattainable. Having seen through the 'average' quality of bourgeois existence they are unable to accept it once their heroism has failed.

As with Paul Morel, the contrast between town and country is of great importance for Ursula. Wiggiston colliery is the first explicit example of industrialism in "The Rainbow". It shows that Lawrence's views on the subject are no different than before. It also supports our hypothesis that industrialism and class consciousness are intimately related to interpersonal relationships. The problem of commodity fetishism is constantly beneath the surface at the core of mediated desire.

Tom Brangwen and Winifred Inger are not affected by the colliery. They are both now determinedly bourgeois; Tom becomes colliery manager. However Ursula is deeply appalled by the sight of "human bodies and lives subjected in slavery to that symmetric master of the colliery." (121)

It is also interesting that one can detect here, the limitations of Lawrence's own world-vision being defined. Previously when a more optimistic future for his social strata might have been possibility, the colliery was seen as a symbol of life in that it was 'touched by the hands of men'. (See also "Sons and Lovers"). Now, as the destiny of his strata is seen by its more perceptive members to be historically fissile, elements of bourgeois idealism can perhaps be detected. Like Carlyle and Ruskin, Lawrence now seems to criticise 'the machine' in itself, without being able to grasp, as Morris did, that industrialism was an obstacle that had to be overcome, (aufgehoben) and not rejected.

The theme of "The Rainbow" is the attempt by successive generations of a newly formed social grouping, to advance their consciousness beyond that of the established social order. It is also the story of their failure to do this. The opening pages of the novel show the Brangwens in awe of the glamourous world of the Hall.

> "The lady of the Hall was the living dream of their lives, her life was the epic that inspired their lives. In her they lived imaginatively ..." (122)

Let us point out that this is a classic example of external mediation. External, because the models drawn from the English aristocracy, were such a great spiritual distance away from their admirers in the newly emerging petit-bourgeoisie, as to present the 'obstacle', to use Girard's term.

From here on, things become more complicated. As Brangwen consciousness advances, the web of mediation becomes more and more intense, leaving the comparative simplicity of Tom Brangwen's relationships for the more distorted social and emotional relationships of Anna and Will, and finally, those of Ursula, 'the new woman' of the twentieth century middle class.

Ursula consistently opposes the predominent life and culture of the established social and political hegemony, with her own attempts to break out of mediated relationships, and found a new culture and morality. However, by this time, the social and political hegemony which she opposed, was itself more complicated, due to what Anderson calls, 'a symbiosis' of the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy. This occurred for certain complex historical reasons, which we have stated briefly in Chapter III. The first example of this is the portrayal of the lifeless Skebensky, the 'liberal' aristocrat in "The Rainbow". The more detailed example occurs with Hermione in "Women in Love".

Originally, the Brangwen culture had been totally different from that of the old rural gentry and aristocracy, but by the turn of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, this was not entirely so. The English bourgeois hegemony had entrenched itself by linking with the aristocracy. Ursula, as a member of the new white-collar strata, in reality merely provides the other side of the coin to the right wing elitism and decadence of Hermione, and Lawrence's literary representation of Bloomsbury. To this extent, her hopes, and Lawrence's, for a new culture, are misguided. She is merely proposing to cleanse bourgeois capitalism of its evils, whilst still remaining part of it. It is significant that she does not succeed.

The opposition to this established culture is seen by Lawrence in terms of establishing a successful relationship with another person. This entails the exposing and defect of mediated desire. One could give

many examples from "The Rainbow" as we have done, with regard to "Sons and Lovers". We maintain that this must provide the basic theme for any realistic writer. All of the relationships in the novel are mediated through some model and the resentment and vanity that this gives rise to, are very evident. One glance at the chapter entitled 'Anna Victrix' shows this.

We now come to the finale of the novel, which poses similar problems to those at the end of "Sons and Lovers". In that case, we are left with Paul Morel in the 'drift towards death', and a 'tacked on' ending which attempted to hide Lawrence's own pessimism and sense of tragedy, at a moment in history when petit-bourgeoisie self-determination may have seemed a possibility for less perceptive individuals.

In "The Rainbow" the problem is the same. The passage can be divided into three episodes. In the first, the description of the landscape is a counterpart to Ursula's original nature: "It was very splendid, free and chaotic." In the second episode, where the horses appear to begin to harrass her, we see the petit-bourgeois position realistically symbolised. Ursula is extended, frightened and out of her depth. The situation threatens to overwhelm her, just as the shifting middle class culture does. In the third episode, she breaks free from this situation and glimpses her vision of the rainbow.

> "... Under all her illness, persisted a deep, inalterable knowledge." (123)

This is indeed correct. As the most class-conscious member of her strata, she recognises exactly what she is fighting against - mediation, reification and industrialism. However, this recognition is useless without an alternative for, and a vision of the future, which is grounded in practicality. The symbol of the rainbow is essentially idealistic and unattainable. Significantly, as a symbol, it also contains elements of the Gothic arch, which Ursula despised.

Like the ending to "Sons and Lovers", this ending has also been criticised for being 'tacked on'. And again, this is because it is an unrealistic image, although it does effectively restate the distinction between the ravaged industrial landscape, from which Ursula tries to escape, and the vision of a new order and morality.

However, "The Rainbow" does not entirely end here, like "Sons and Lovers", but continues with "Women in Love", where Ursula's vision is shown to be an idealistic view of the future, which is doomed to ultimate failure.

"WOMEN IN LOVE"

The novel was conceived and written during the Great War. It was a period of rising militancy on the part of the working class, and a growing despondency amongst men such as Lawrence, who had thought that a new social order was in the offing. His prophetic remarks about the state of Germany, which he had discerned on an earlier visit, had come true. (124)

"The Rainbow" was completed in March 1915, and published in September of that year. On the 3rd of November, the book was seized, and ordered to be destroyed on the grounds of obscenity. Nevertheless, this did not deter him from continuing his work on a new manuscript. This was both a sequel to "The Rainbow", and a self-contained novel in its own right. This novel was to become "Women in Love".

It deals with the period of the war, although not explicitly mentioning it, and it takes us one step further than "The Rainbow". It portrays the same Ursula in her struggle to find a viable morality, in a society, which in Lawrence's view was undergoing a profound degeneration.

This is the author's last great work, and its mood is in part dictated by the experiences which he, personally, went through during this period. These were, the supression of "The Rainbow", his difficulty in publishing work, and his deportation from Cornwall under suspicion of spying. Throughout the book, there is also a deep sense of social dislocation caused by what was now a losing battle for self-determination on the part of the petit-bourgeoisie. It is noticeable that, whereas in the two previous novels, he had criticised what he saw as reactionary elements in the consciousness of his own social strata, i.e. Will Brangwen, his main concern now is the overwhelming pressure of bourgeois culture. This is seen to a large extent in terms of the degeneracy and decadence of bourgeois art-forms.

The whole pace of the book is speeded up in a way which is quite different from "The Rainbow". The average length of the chapters is about a dozen pages, as compared to fifty or sixty in the other novel. Also, "The Rainbow" covers some six or seven decades, whereas the action in "Women in Love" takes less than a year. The effect of this is to stress even more the lack of a perspective of the future, which Goldmann says is a characteristic of 'tragic vision'. Not only this, Lawrence pays no attention to the past either. There is no idea of process or development: it is the depiction of a 'moment' in the history of society,

and a profoundly important moment at that.

It is the story of a last ditch fight for self-determination on the part of Ursula, Lawrence, and those that they represent. It is also the last great work of realism which Lawrence produced, and one in which he recognised the failure of his ideals, together with the magnitude and the mechanisms of the forces which he opposed. Although the book is about England, and a turning point in English consciousness, Lawrence sees that the fate of the characters applies to Europe as a whole. Significantly, the novel begins in an English spring and ends in an alpine winter. Indeed, the fight which Ursula is engaged in, is a fight against a European bourgeoisie and not merely an English one. In realising this fact, Lawrence cuts through the jingoism of the war and presents a class struggle which is international and not nationalistic in its aspects.

The subject of the book, is that of the world on the brink of destruction, and the tone is that of stress and tension. It informs all of the relationships in the novel.

Alldritt points out that the reason why social process does not figure in the book, is that:

> "Lawrence has surrendered his earlier optimistic feelings concerning the future course of man and civilisation." (125)

The situation was such, that there was no place in Lawrence's writing for any idealism. This time we do not find the same, optimistic, tacked-on ending which we found in the two previous books. Here, the final pages are full of failure, inconclusiveness, and misunderstanding. Needless to say, the characters themselves express this far better than we can, as is the case in all realistic works. As Frank Kermode has observed:

> "'Women in Love' is concerned with a moment of history understood in terms of a crisis archtype." (126)

This degree of social tension and dislocation is once more seen through the medium of personal relationships. Through this medium we can discern the effects of industrialism, fetishism and mediation. We also see the last struggles of a social group in its attempt to cast off the hegemony of its mother class and establish a new order. As the process of integration into the middle class becomes more overpowering, and the pessimism in the novel grows more apparent, so the examples of working class life which could have provided a real alternative to the bourgeoisie,

figure less and less. Although the attacks on industrialism are still there, the social circles which Ursula confronts in "Women in Love" are all establishment circles like Breadalby and the Cafe Royal.

It is not crude reductionism to see the progress of the relationships in the book as being a reflection of class consciousness and social developments. Nor is it reductionism to see the structure of these relationships as a reflection of the nature of desire and the commodity structure. As Proust himself says:

"Society is only a reflection of what happens in love." (127)

The only difference between the two is whether the sentiment which is engendered by mediation is that of snobbery (economic), or jealousy (love). The mimetic nature of desire is such that characters can be called jealous if their mediator is a lover, and snobbish if their mediator is a money relationship. The triangular structure is the same for both and the nature of the 'vices' is identical.

Unlike the other two novels, the relationships are not so straightforward. The triangular pattern of our 'significant structure' appears again and again, even within the same relationship, creating a complex interaction of counterforces on which balance the future of 'civilisation' seems to depend. We see the triangles of; Ursula-Birkin-Gudrun; Gerald-Gudrun-Ursula; Birkin-Gerald-Ursula. The permutations are many. The prevailing forces throughout these relationships are, envy, resentment, possession, vanity and snobbery - as one would expect from desire of this intensity which was corrupted by mediation. The only tenable relationship is that between Ursula and Birkin, the most self-conscious and class conscious of the four. In the final analysis even they are doomed to uncertainty, as Lawrence's 'tragic vision' makes clear.

Having stated what the prevailing forces are, let us see how they make their appearance. The novel was originally to have been called, "The Sisters", and the relationship between the two women is a highly important part of the story. Their feelings for each other are a complex mixture of friendliness and hostility, ending in fundamental incompatibility. This is caused by their different levels of consciousness. Ursula adheres to 'life' and spontaneity, whilst Gudrun tends to thwart her own responses and give way to 'intellect' and decadence. It is the same formula that we witnessed in "Daughers of the Vicar". Gudrun represents the stifling decadence of middle class culture, whilst Ursula shows a higher level of awareness in her search for freedom.

Seen in Girard's terms, Ursula is Gudrun's model whom she tries to imitate. However, in the world of internal mediation, the mediator becomes an obstacle because she too has the capacity to desire.

> "... the mediator himself desires the object, or could desire it: it is even this very desire, real or presumed, which makes this object infinitely more desirable in the eyes of the subject. The mediation begets a second desire in the eyes of the subject. This means that one is always confronted with two competing desires. The mediator can no longer act his role of model without also acting or appearing to act as the role of obstacle." (128)

Spontaneity and dynamic are the things which Gudrun admires most of all in her sister because she does not possess these qualities. But, for the reasons outlined above, it is not admiration which comes to the fore, but envy.

> "How deeply, how suddenly she envied Ursula! Life for her was so quick, and an open door - so reckless as if not only this world, but the world that was gone and the world to come were nothing to her. Ah, if she could just be like that, it would be perfect.
>
> For always ... she felt a want within herself." (129)

Gudrun is perfectly correct in her assessment of Ursula. Her sister's consciousness is sufficiently developed for her to realise that the world that is past and to come are indeed meaningless for her particular strata. She exists in a historical 'moment' where the future of this strata as a self-determining entity are historically fissile. In this, she stands with Paul Morel, although the situation which Ursula is in, is far more acute.

There are many instances of Gudrun's envy but we have only enough space for a few examples. For instance, the ballet that is improvised at Breadalby, where:

> "The interplay between the women was real and rather frightening. It was strange to see how Gudrun clung with heavy, desperate passion to Ursula, yet smiled with subtle malevolence against her ..." (130)

At a later stage Lawrence talks of, "Gudrun's ultimate but treacherous cleaving to the woman in her sister ..." (131) The word, 'passion' in the former quotation is the same sentiment that is denounced by Proust, and the equivalent to Stendhal's 'vanity' and Lawrence's 'intellect'.

> "One might object that Stendhal celebrates passion while Proust denounces it. This is true, but the opposition is purely verbal. What Proust denounces under the name

> of passion, Stendhal denounces under the name of vanity. And what Proust praises under the name of 'The Past Recaptured' is not always far from what Stendhal's heroes celebrate in the solitude of their prisons." (132)

We would also add that it is not far from what Paul Morel and Ursula Brangwen celebrate in the few moments of peace when they are free from the mediated nature of desire, either through a direct relationship with nature, with their labour, or with another human being.

A more intense instance where envy is the directing feeling for Gudrun is appearance of the highland cattle. As Alldritt points out, (133) Gudrun suffers from "a dissipation of spontaneity."

> "At the great climaxes of experience in the novel Gudrun is never abandoned to feeling; her responses are limited to role-playing and to the selection of appropriate notions and styles of feeling." (134)

In other words, her desires are mediated by certain models. She imitates these models to the extent that they dictate what her feelings will be. This, in turn, deprives her of her own individuality. This is well illustrated when Gerald's sister drowns.

> "She had wild ideas of rushing to comfort Gerald. She was thinking all the time of the perfect comforting, reassuring thing to say to him. She was shocked and frightened, but she put that away, thinking of how she should deport herself with Gerald: act her part. That was the real thrill: how she should act her part." (135)

The 'model', 'acting one's part, role-playing and the persona all amount to the same thing in the world of internal mediation.

As well as the two sisters there is the important relationship between Birkin and Ursula. He, in turn, has a profound effect upon the two sisters for it is at his insistence that they become suspicious of all self-consciousness and intellectualising. The tension between Ursula (136) and Gudrun which is caused by the counterforces of spontaneity and intellect, is duplicated in the relationship of Birkin and Gerald. So there is this continuous interrelation between the parties.

Gerald is the epitome of industrial capitalism, and it is through him that Lawrence explicitly attacks industrialism. Whereas Gerald is a coal magnate and an industrial innovator, Birkin is more akin to Lawrence's own position, being an intellectual with a private income, having resigned his job as a school inspector. This resignation is

portrayed as an act of rejection of society as it stands and his thoughts about education echo those of the author, who himself spent some time as a school teacher in Croydon.

> "I shall give up my work altogether. It has become dead to me. I don't believe in the humanity I pretend to be a part of, I don't care a straw for the social ideals I live by, I hate the dying organic form of social mankind - so it can't be anything but trumpery, to work at education." (137)

Indeed, we can see much of Lawrence in the characters of Ursula and Birkin. They are both 'types', being both unique individuals and also representatives of their social milieu. Birkin is the archtypal radical intellectual in the tradition of Morris and Ruskin, and a member of the new white-collar strata which we pin-pointed in Chapter III. Ursula is of the same group and is an example of the 'new woman' of the liberal middle class.

There are other 'types' in the novel, even down to minor characters whom Lawrence depicts with such penetration. Gerald figures as the new capitalist, although this bald statement does not do the complexity of the character any justice. Loeke is the decadent artist who represents all that Lawrence, and Ursula, hates in bourgeois culture. Hermione is a parallel of Bloomsbury and the cultural elitism of the middle class. The novel explores these 'typical' characters in order to give a picture of English society at a moment in time. This picture is deficient in one respect, however. He fails to make any inclusion of the working class.

The relationship between Birkin and Gerald is one of conflict between spontaneity and intellectualising. Although we have said that Birkin is an intellectual he is not a stagnant individual - rather a man of action. Gerald, on the other hand, is all for self-control. Like Gudrun, he is too controlled although he has enough self-awareness for this to cause problems.

> "Towards the end of the first chapter, Birkin argues for individual spontaneity against Gerald's belief in the need for control and for standards of behaviour ..." (138)

Although we have stated the themes of the novel in abstract terms such as mediation, class-consciousness and industrialism, these problems are encapsulated in the novel in the single idea of the impossibility of forming a relationship with another human being.

This interrelation of relationships gives rise to a multitude of triangles. For example, when Birkin first establishes some form of connection with Ursula, he realises at the same time that he is confronted with another problem - his connection with Gerald. This (139)
occurs in the episode entitled 'Gladiatorial', and it is a classic example of the mediator in action. Having been rejected by Ursula, Birkin comes to wrestle with his 'good angel' - Gerald, the figure of stability and order. It is these qualities which he envies in Gerald, although he frequently argues against them. Alldritt says:

> "Only after the struggle with Gerald is Birkin able to compose himself and to understand the true nature of his relationship with Ursula." (140)

He also points out that Birkin's failure to sustain his friendship with Gerald results in his own deterioration and a limitation upon his friendship with Ursula. But the struggle between the two men is far more than this. It raises issues such as the damaging disjunction between sensibility and industrialism, individual needs and mass production, and art and sociology.

Gerald's deterioration is made evident in the exploration of the mindless way in which he goes about reorganising his mine in order to obtain maximum efficiency. This reduces, not only Gerald's workers, but also Gerald himself, to a shell of humanity. He is the epitome of the new capitalist, totally fragmented in his nature, and totally ruled by the ideology of 'the machine'. "He was the God of the machine" (141)
so he thinks, when in reality these roles are reversed. The machine is his God, his mediator.

It is worth examining in detail the chapter entitled 'The Industrial Magnate', for in this chapter, the crippling effects of industrialism on human relationships are laid bare.

We are informed that Gerald's father is now on the verge of death. A death, it is made clear, which has been partly caused by his involvement with the mines, and partly by the failure of his relationship with his wife.

> "Only, in his vague way, the dread was of his wife, the destroyer, and it was the pain, the destruction, a darkness which was one and both." (142)

He also is a 'type', representing the old capitalist entrepreneur of the nineteenth century. In sticking by his ideals, he has seen them progressively destroyed by the onset of monopoly capitalism. He has seen too, the effect of this on his workers and on himself. He is (143)

charitable to his workers and is broken when, in the face of changing historical conditions, his workers refuse this charity and go on strike. He is unable to grasp (as Lawrence obviously does) that the progress of industrialism intensifies class conflict.

It breaks his wife too, and both of them retire from 'this world of creeping democracy' into their own worlds. (144)

Gerald, as a young man, is confused.

> "He rebelled against all authority. Life was a condition of savage freedom." (145)

He represents a destructive force in the novel, that is, the alternative of dictatorship. Even Gerald is not willing to accept the corruption of the industrial system, but he does not look to the working class for a historical perspective. Instead, he places his faith in 'order' which is carried to such an extent that it becomes destructive as in Fascism.

> "So he took hold of all kinds of sociological ideas, and ideas of reform. But they were never more than skin-deep, they were never more than a mental amusement. Their chief interest lay in the reaction against the positive order, the destructive reaction." (146)

The models which he chooses to imitate are the 'strong men' and the 'heroes'. These are his mediators.

> "The days of Homer were his ideal, when a man was chief of an army of heroes, or spent his years in wonderful Odyssey." (147)

Lawrence's jusgement of this alternative is final and damning. Gerald dies a frozen death in an alpine winter, as he has lead a frozen life.

He takes over the running of the mines as a means of exercising power. There is not even the profit motive in his mind, and in this way Lawrence exposes the pure core of class conflict which lies at the heart of the new ethos of capitalism.

> "Many ugly industrial hamlets were crowded under his dependence." (148)

> "He saw the stream of miners ... thousands of blackened, slightly distorted human beings with red mouths, all moving subjugate to his will ... They were all subordinate to him. They were ugly and uncouth, but they were his instruments. He was the God of the machine." (149)

He introduces the new methods of Taylorism into his mine, whereby everything is judged purely on efficiency.

> "Everything in the world has its function, and is good or not good in so far as it fulfils its function more or less perfectly." (150)

In doing this, he reduces himself and all the human beings that work for him to the lowest common denominator. But as well as attacking Gerald's methods, Lawrence has no love for the hypocrisy of Gerald's father - the liberal capitalist. In his description of the strike which broke the father, Lawrence shows that there is no room for paternalism in the world of capitalist economics.

> "The idea flew through them (the miners); 'All men are equal on earth', and they would carry the idea to its material fulfilment. After all, is it not the teaching of Christ? And what is an idea, if not the germ of action in the material word. Whence then this obvious <u>disequality</u>?' It was a religious creed pushed to its material conclusion. Thomas Crich at least had no answer. He could but admit, according to his sincere tenets, that the disequality was wrong. But he could not give up his goods, which were the stuff of disequality. So the men would fight for their rights. ... The passion for equality, inspired them ... But the God was the machine." (151)

Lawrence continues with a description of Gerald's effects on the industry. He underlines the chaos of industrialism when pushed to its farthest, inhuman extent.

> "It was pure organic disintegration and pure mechanical organisation. This is the first and finest state of chaos." (152)

Gerald's total success leaves him utterly devoid of humanity, held together only by his will.

> "His mind was very active. But it was like a bubble floating in the darkness. At any moment it might burst and leave him in chaos." (153)

The complex nexus of relationships in the novel is completed by Ursula's brief friendship with Gerald, and Gudrun's with Birkin. In both relationships there is a moment of sympathy which gradually declines. Neither friendship achieves any lasting bond.

The two important minor characters in the story - Hermione and Loerke - are representative of the bourgeois cultural elitism of Bloomsbury, and of emotional and cultural decadence, respectively. Loerke is an extension of the forces at work in Gerald's character, and it is his influence to which Gudrun succombs when Gerald is no

longer subtle enough to proceed in what Alldritt calls, "the cultivation of sado-masochistic sensation."

> "The implication is that the particular corruption of Loerke's art is a more refined and more advanced version of the corruption of the modern industrial order." (154)

We are constantly forced to look upon the progress of Ursula-Birkin and Gudrun-Gerald, as a confrontation between good and evil, life and death, civilisation and barbarism, and spontaneity and mediation. Birkin and Ursula attempt to combat mediation and industrialism by trying to establish a direct, balanced human relationship. It is part of Lawrence's 'tragic vision' that they do not totally succeed. Alldritt describes Gudrun and Gerald, on the other hand, as:

> "... the modern artist and the modern capitalist, who together represent the full emotional range of a society in the first stages of the process of degeneration and decay." (155)

Even so, both sets of lovers see their relationships as a possible means of release from the corruption and compromise of society.

The novel ends in Europe, where Gerald dies symbolically in the snow of the Alps, and Birkin's relationship with Ursula remains unconsummated.

We have traced in the three novels, the progress of Lawrence's world-view from a surface optimism in "Sons and Lovers", to a more pessimistic appraisal of reality in "Women in Love". Although we have also shown that Lawrence's awareness was such that his grasp of the essential futility of his ideals was realised even from the beginning. However, this descent from optimism to pessimism can be seen in the actual use of language in the books. For example, in the earlier novel there is a responsive appreciation on the part of the author, to the subject he is describing. The narrator's sympathetic understanding of his characters gives us the sense of a living individual. However, in "Women in Love", except in passages dealing with Birkin and Ursula, this sympathetic vision is broken. Objects and people are more alien and distant. We note for example, the description of Gudrun in the Cafe Pompadour. (156)

Here, Lawrence creates a sense of coldness and sterility by his use of words like, 'silver', 'sheen', and 'glossy'. Even the description of the natural scenery which were rendered with such directness in "Sons

and Lovers", are now "blackened with distance, as if seen through a veil of crape". This is not surprising, in the sense that any identification with the working class, and therefore with the landscape and the pits, has now been dissipated by both Lawrence and the social strata of whose world-view he is the supreme expression. As Alldritt says:

> "Reality as apprehended by both the narrator and the characters in "Women in Love" is no longer directly, confidently orcreatively ascertained. And feeling is subject to involution, frangmentation and an analytical self-consciousness which make impossible the great synthesising energy that we find in "The Rainbow". (157)

In "Women in Love" we find the first evidence of the breakdown in continuity between the author and his subject matter, which was to grow increasingly in his later work and destroy the realism and integrity of his novels. This is no accident or an incomprehensible lapse of style. The reason is that although Lawrence retains his hatred of industrialism right through to "Lady Chatterley's Lover", the protest becomes impotent because it is based on a demand for a new morality and culture that is an impossible objective. By the time "Women in Love" was completed, any opportunity for the petit-bourgeois white collar strata to create its own culture, independently of the middle class had gone. (If indeed the chance ever existed.)

In "Women in Love", the main themes are the break-up of English culture and the emergence of modern capitalism. Lawrence's opposition to the alienation and fragmentation which this system entails, is explored through the medium of the attempted relationship between Ursula and Birkin. However, the power of the forces which are pitted against this are too much for a class-consciousness which does not align itself with the most powerful basis of opposition in society - the working class. We begin to see the emergence of narrative fragmentation and many-sided social analysis replacing the confident representation of the 'type' and the 'typical'. All of this, and particularly, the breakdown in sympathetic visual imagination, point forward to the absence in his work from here on, of his great synthesising vision of realism.

REFERENCES : CHAPTER IV

1. GRAY, C. Lawrence: A Composite Biography. Vol.I. (Ed.) E.Nehls. Univ. Wisconsin:Madison. 1957-1959. p.433.
2. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. Edward Arnold. 1971. p.viii.
3. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. Penguin. 1966. p.203.
4. IBID. p.204.
5. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. R.K.P. 1964. p.34.
6. GIRARD, R. 'From the 'Divine Comedy' to the Sociology of the Novel'. The Sociology of Literature and Drama. (Ed.) E.& T. Burns. Penguin. 1973. p.108.
7. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. (Ed.) A.A.H. Inglis. Peregrine. 1968. p.459.
8. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.56.
9. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.188.
10. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.56.
11. IBID. p.57.
12. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.188.
13. LAURENSON, D. & SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. Paladin. 1972. pp.169-170.
14. IBID. p.170.
15. GOLDMANN, L. Pour une Sociologie du Roman. Paris:Gallimard. 1964.
16. LAURENSON, D. & SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. p.211.
17. MARX, K. Early Writings. (Ed.) T. Bottomore. C.A. Watts. 1963. p.122.
18. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selected Essays. Penguin. 1969. p.105.
19. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. Merlin. 1971. p.84.
20. IBID. p.86.
21. IBID. p.86.
22. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.121-122.
23. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. p.206.
24. IBID. p.203.
25. LAWRENCE, D.H. Studies in Classic American Literature. Penguin. 1971. p.12.
26. IBID. p.12.
27. WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. p.211.
28. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. pp.195-196.
29. MARX, K. Early Writings. pp.189-190.
30. IBID. p.191.
31. GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God. p.81.

(Cont.)

32. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. p.100.
33. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel:Self and Other in Literary Structure. Baltimore. John Hopkins. 1965. p.216.
34. LUKACS, G. Writer and Critic. Merlin. 1970. p.78.
35. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel:Self and Other in Literary Structure. p.217.
36. LEAVIS, F.R. D.H. Lawrence:Novelist. Peregrine. 1964. pp.82-83.
37. LAWRENCE, D.H. Daughters of the Vicar. Penguin. 1968. p.68.
38. IBID. pp.86-87.
39. LEAVIS, F.R. D.H. Lawrence:Novelist. p.94.
40. LAWRENCE, D.H. Daughters of the Vicar. p.67.
41. LEAVIS, F.R. D.H. Lawrence:Novelist. p. 78.
42. LAWRENCE, D.H. Daughters of the Vicar. p.67.
43. IBID. p.87.
44. LAWRENCE, D.H. Collected Letters. (Ed.) Harry T. Moore. Heineman. 1962. p.76.
45. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. Penguin. 1967. p.189.
46. IBID. pp.6-8.
47. IBID. p.8.
48. IBID. p.9.
49. GRAMSCI, A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Lawrence and Wishart. 1971. p.298.
50. IBID. pp.294-297.
51. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.15.
52. IBID. p.15.
53. IBID. p.17.
54. VAN GHENT, D. The English Novel:Form and Function. New York. Harper Row. 1967. p.305.
55. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.23.
56. LAWRENCE, D.H. 'The Lemon Gardens'. Twilight in Italy. Penguin. 1972. p.46.
57. Cf. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel:Self and Other in Literary Structure. Especially Chapter V.
58. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.229.
59. IBID. p.313.
60. VAN GHENT, D. The English Novel:Form and Function. p.305.
61. LAWRENCE, DH. Sons and Lovers. p.116.
62. IBID. p.114.
63. IBID. pp153-154.
64. IBID. p.82.

(Cont.)

65. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. pp.89-90.
66. IBID. p.83.
67. IBID. p.100.
68. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.22.
69. IBID. p.23.
70. IBID. p.23.
71. IBID. pp.25-26.
72. IBID. p.61.
73. IBID. p.63.
74. IBID. p.69.
75. IBID. p.89.
76. IBID. pp.89-93.
77. IBID. p.158.
78. IBID. p.177.
79. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel:Self and Other in Literary Structure. p.85.
80. LAWRENCE. D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.214.
81. VAN GEHNT, D. The English Novel:Form and Function. p.309.
82. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.494.
83. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. pp.37-38.
84. Cf. ENGELS, F. in Chapter 4. 'Art and Objective Truth'. LUKACS, G. Writer and Critic. pp.43-44.
85. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.333.
86. LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. p.59.
87. IBID. p.52.
88. LAWRENCE, D.H. Sons and Lovers. p.511.
89. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.22.
90. MARX, K. The German Ideology. (Ed.) R. Pascal. New York:International Publishers. 1947. p.44.
91. FLAUBERT, G. Madame Bovary. Penguin. 1952.
92. See GOLDMANN, L. The Hidden God.
93. VAN GEHNT, D. The English Novel:Form and Function. p.305.
94. IBID. p.305.
95. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selected Letters. Penguin. 1971. p.45.
96. IBID. pp.35-36.
97. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Lost Girl. Penguin. 1972. p.107.
98. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence. (Ed.) McDonald. 1936. p.226.

(Cont.)

99. LUKACS, G. Studies in European Realism. Merlin. 1972. p.148.
100. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. Penguin. 1972. p.337.
101. IBID. p.333.
102. IBID. pp.416-417.
103. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Rainbow. Penguin. 1970. pp.32-33.
104. IBID. p.26.
105. IBID. p.113.
106. IBID. p.159.
107. IBID. SeeChapter 6. 'Anna Victrix'.
108. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.78.
109. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. p.291.
110. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Rainbow. p.114.
111. IBID. p.422.
112. IBID. p.355.
113. LAWRENCE, D.H. 'Study of Thomas Hardy'. Selections from the Phoenix. pp.194-254.
114. WORRINGER, W. Form in Gothic. A. Tiranti. 1964. p.79.
115. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.94.
116. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Rainbow. p.359.
117. IBID. p.119.
118. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.104.
119. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Rainbow. p.265.
120. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. p.194.
121. LAWRENCE, D.H. The Rainbow. p.350. See also, pp.345-352.
122. IBID. pp.10-11.
123. IBID. p.491.
124. LAWRENCE, D.H. Selections from the Phoenix. pp.116-120.
125. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.163.
126. KERMODE, F. Continuities. R.K.P. 1968. p.132.
127. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel:Self and Other in Literary Structure. p.25.
128. IBID. p.491.
129. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. p.424.
130. IBID. p.7.
131. IBID. p.102.
132. GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel:Self and Other in Literary Structure. p.25.
133. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. pp.186-192.

(Cont.)

134. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.167.
135. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. p.213.
136. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.168.
137. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love p.147.
138. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.170.
139. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. p.231.
140. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.174.
141. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. p.250.
142. IBID. p.241.
143. IBID. pp.241-242.
144. IBID. p.244.
145. IBID. p.249.
146. IBID. p.249.
147. IBID. p.249.
148. IBID. p.250.
149. IBID. p.250.
150. IBID. p.251.
151. IBID. p.253.
152. IBID. p.260.
153. IBID. p.261.
154. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.178.
155. IBID. p.182.
156. LAWRENCE, D.H. Women in Love. p.434.
157. ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. p.211.
158. LAWRENCE, D.H. Kangaroo. Penguin. 1972. p.87.

POSTSCRIPT

THE NOVELS OF THE TWENTIES

We stated at the beginning of this chapter, our intention to divide Lawrence's work into two periods. Any full and comprehensive analysis of his work would have to deal with the shortcomings of these novels in detail. Here, we have only the space to mention them briefly. The previous analysis has shown many reasons for Lawrence's decline as a great artist. In "Kangaroo", Lawrence says:

> "You feel as if you can't see - as if your eyes hadn't the vision in them to correspond with the outside landscape." (158)

This sentence, in itself, suggests one of the basic failings of all of his later works. His novels lack realism in that they fail to penetrate any further than surface phenomena. He does not reveal the inner mechanisms of relationships and tends to indulge in personal polemic rather than letting the characters speak for themselves. It is these works - "Aaron's Rod", "The Plumed Serpent", and "Lady Chatterley's Lover", that any charges of Fascism can be upheld against Lawrence. In it is no coincidence that by now, the petit-bourgeoisie was a firmly reactionary social force. Lawrence's artistic demise corresponds absolutely to his inability to sustain realism in his writing. A fact not helped by his physical isolation from England.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted to show Lawrence's progress as a writer, and the social forces which moulded this development, together with his effect on these forces. We have outlined the basic themes of his work as, industrialism and class consciousness and determined that his choice of these themes was a result of class formations and the development of a world vision which necessitated a fundamental opposition to the status quo. This world-vision was that of the petit-bourgeoisie, the newly created white-collar group, who felt themselves in a position where they could establish an independent class formation. This was a misguided assumption, and it was due to Lawrence's realism that he realised this even though he himself was a member of this white-collar strata.

It was this realisation which gave rise to the fundamentally tragic nature of his vision, which has been explored in the previous chapter.

The 'significant structure' of mediation has been pin-pointed particularly in "Sons and Lovers" although it occurs in both of the other novels. (Space does not allow us to go into as much detail as we would wish). This structure is not only a significant factor in his world-view, but also a methodological tool which allows a more detailed explanation of the text as art, which has not always been possible before.

There has been an attempt to seek the reasons for Lawrence's undoubted decline as a writer in the failure of the petit-bourgeoisie to break out of the stranglehold of the ruling class and align themselves with the more progressive and more powerful sections of society.

We submit that the 'tradition' to which this novelist belongs, is not so much English tradition, although he drew from this his basic critique of industrialism, but to the more international group of realists who all share the same fundamental opposition to man's fragmentation, and to this end expose the mechanism of mediated desire. This applies whether in connection with man's relationship to his labour, to other men, to nature or as a critique of the triangular structure of commodity fetishism in capitalist society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLDRITT, K. The Visual Imagination of D.H. Lawrence. Edward Arnold. 1971.

ANDERSON, P. 'Components of the National Culture'. New Left Review. No.50.
'Origins of the Present Crisis'. Towards Socialism. Fontana. 1965.

BAGEHOT, W. The British Constitution. Fontana. 1966.

CAUDWELL, C. Illusion and Reality. Lawrence and Wishart. 1964.
Studies in a Dying Culture. Lawrence and Wishart. 1938.

COLE, G.D.H. Essays in Social Theory. MacMillan. 1950.

COLE, G.D.H. & POSTGATE, R. The Common People. Oxford:Oxford University Press. 1956.

DANGERFIELD, G. The Strange Death of Liberal England. Capricorn. 1961.

DUVIGNAUD, J. The Sociology of Art. Paladin. 1973.

ELIOT, T.S. After Strange Gods. A Primer in Modern Heresy. Faber. 1934.

ENGELS, F. Marx and Engels:On Britain. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1962.
Origins of the Family. Private Property and the State. Chicago. 1902.
Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1965.

FLAUBERT, G. Madame Bovary. Penguin. 1952.

GIRARD, R. Deceit, Desire and the Novel : Self and Other in Literary Structure. Baltimore. John Hopkins. 1965.
'From the 'Divine Comedy' to the Sociology of the Novel'. The Sociology of Literature and Drama. (Ed.) E.& T. Burns. Penguin. 1973.

GOLDMANN, L. 'Genetic Structuralism in the Sociology of Literature'. The Sociology of Literature and Drama. (Ed.) E.& T. Burns. Penguin. 1973.
Pour une Sociologie du Roman. Paris:Gallimard. 1964.
The Hidden God. R.K.P. 1964.
The Human Sciences and Philosophy. Cape. 1969.
'The Sociology of Literature:Status and Problems of Method'. International Social Science Journal. Vol.19. 1967.

GRAMSCI, A. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. Lawrence and Wishart. 1971.

HAMILTON, A. The Appeal of Fascism. Blond. 1971.

HARRISON, J. The Reactionaries. Gollancz. 1966.

HAUSER, A. A Social History of Art. Vol. IV. R.K.P. 1961.

HOBSBAWM, E. Labouring Men. Weidenfield and Nicholson. 1968.

HOUGH, G. The Last Romantics. Duckworth, 1961.

(Cont.)

KERMODE, F. Continuities. R.K.P. 1968.

KETTLE, A. An Introduction to the English Novel. Vol.II. Hutchinson. 1967.

LAURENSON, D. & SWINGEWOOD, A. The Sociology of Literature. Paladin. 1972.

LAWRENCE, D.H. Aaron's Rod. Penguin. 1968.

Collected Letters. (Ed.) Harry T. Moore. Heineman. 1962.

Fantasia of the Unconscious. Penguin. 1971.

Kangaroo. Penguin. 1972.

Lady Chatterley's Lover. Penguin. 1970.

Selected Essays. Penguin. 1969.

Selected Letters. Penguin. 1971.

Selections from the Phoenix. (Ed.) A.A.H. Inglis. Peregrine. 1968.

Sons and Lovers. Penguin. 1967.

Studies in Classic American Literature. Penguin. 1971.

The Daughters of the Vicar. Penguin. 1969.

The Lost Girl. Penguin. 1972.

The Plumed Serpent. Penguin. 1968.

The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence. (Ed.) McDonald. Heineman.1936.

The Rainbow. Penguin. 1970.

The White Peacock. Penguin. 1971.

Twilight in Italy. Penguin. 1972.

Women in Love. Penguin. 1972.

LEAVIS, F.R. D.H. Lawrence:Novelist. Peregrine. 1964.

For Continuity. Chatto and Windus. 1933.

The Common Pursuit. Peregrine. 1969.

The Great Tradition. Chatto and Windus. 1948.

LENIN, V.I. Essential Works. New York:Bantam. 1966.

Imperialism:The Highest Stage of Capitalism. Moscow:Progress Publishers.

LUKACS, G. History and Class Consciousness. Merlin. 1971.

Studies in European Realism. Merlin. 1972.

The Historical Novel. Merlin. 1962.

The Meaning of Contemporary Realism. Merlin. 1963.

Writer and Critic. Merlin. 1970.

LUNARCHARSKY, A. On Literature and Art. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1965.

(Cont.)

MARX, K. Capital. Vol.I. Lawrence and Wishart. 1954.
Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. New York:Charles Kerr. 1904. (Trans. N.I. Stone).
Early Writings. (Ed.) T. Bottomore. C.A. Watts. 1963.
Marx and Engels:On Britain. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1962.
Marx and Engels:Selected Works. Moscow:Foreign Language Publishing House. 1958.
On Literature and Art. New York:International Publishers. 1947.
Preface to the Critique of Political Economy. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
Selected Correspondence. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1965.
Selected Writings in Sociology. (Ed.) T. Bottomore & M. Rubel. Pelican.1967.
The German Ideology. Moscow:Progress Publishers. 1964.
The German Ideology. (Ed.) R. Pascal. New York:International Publishers.194?

MIRSKY, D. The Intelligensia of Great Britain. Gollancz. 1935.

NAIRN, T. 'The Fateful Meridian'. New Left Review. No.60.
'The Nature of the Labour Party'. Towards Socialism. Fontana. 1965.

NEHLS, E. (Ed.) D.H. Lawrence:A Composite Biography. Vol.I. University of Wisconsin: Madison. 1957-1959.

PARSONS, T. The Social System. New York:Harper Torch Books. 1951.

PLEKANOV, G. Art and Social Life. Lawrence and Wishart. 1953.

POSPOLOV, G.N. 'Literature and Society'. International Social Science Journal. Vol.19. 1967.

PRITCHETT, V.S. The Living Novel. Chatto and Windus. 1946.

SCHELER, M. Ressentiment. New York:Free Press. 1960.

STENDHAL. Scarlet and Black. Penguin. 1969.

THOMPSON, E.P. 'The Long Revolution'. New Left Review. No.9.
'The Peculiarities of the English'. Socialist Register. Merlin.1965.
William Morris:Romantic to Revolutionary. Lawrence and Wishart. 1955.

TROTSKY, L. The Basic Writings of Trotsky. (Ed.) I. Howe. Secker and Warberg. 1963.
Where is Britain Going? Plough Press. 1970.

VAN GHENT, D. The English Novel:Form and Function. New York:Harper & Row. 1967.

WELLEK, R. & WARREN, A. The Theory of Literature. Peregrine. 1963.

WILLEY, B. Nineteenth Century Background. Pelican. 1972.

WILLIAMS, R. Culture and Society. Penguin. 1966.
'Literature and Society'. New Left Review. No.67.

WORRINGER, W. Form in Gothic. A. Tiranti. 1964.